IMAGINING *RŪM* IN MAMLUK CAIRO
ᶜABD AL-BĀSIṬ AL-MALAṬĪ AND THE OTTOMAN DOMAINS

by
ÖMER FARUK İLGEZDİ

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
August 2020

IMAGINING *RŪM* IN MAMLUK CAIRO
ᶜABD AL-BĀSIṬ AL-MALAṬĪ AND THE OTTOMAN DOMAINS

Approved by:

Asst. Prof. Ferenc Péter Csirkés . . . .
(Thesis Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Yusuf Hakan Erdem . . . .

Assoc. Prof. Derin Terzioğlu . . . .

Date of Approval: August 18, 2020

ABSTRACT

IMAGINING *RŪM* IN MAMLUK CAIRO
ᶜABD AL-BĀSIṬ AL-MALAṬĪ AND THE OTTOMAN DOMAINS

ÖMER FARUK İLGEZDİ

HISTORY M.A. THESIS, AUGUST 2020

Thesis Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Ferenc Péter Csirkés

Keywords: Mamluk-Ottoman Relations, The Fifteenth Century, Abd al-Basit al-Malati, Bayezid II, Patronage

This thesis is a study of a neglected late Mamluk scholar and historian Abd al-Basit b. Khalil b. Shahin al-Malati with a special focus on the image of the Ottomans and their patronage in his historical works and especially his biographical dictionary. Al-Malati depicts the Ottoman sultans as generous patrons of knowledge and portrays the contemporary Ottoman ruler Bayezid II as a scholar-king. The present thesis attempts to introduce al-Malati and his oeuvre, contextualize his historical works, also searching for how he learned about the Rumi sultans. Informal networks between these two regions played a significant role in al-Malati's description of Ottoman patronage. By informal networks here, we mean al-Malati's encounters with various scholars, merchants, emigres, and captives from the Ottoman lands outside the formal channels of diplomacy and scholarly activities. The thesis also contextualizes al-Malati's observations about Rumi scholars and Bayezid II's patronage and argues that al-Malati's trouble with contemporary Mamluk patronage led him to adopt a pro-Ottoman attitude amid the power struggle between the Mamluks and the Ottomans in the eastern Mediterranean. Building on these points, the study also seeks to problematize the idea that the Ottoman lands were marginal to Islamic learning before the Ottoman conquest of Greater Syria and Egypt in 1517. A careful study of al-Malati and his environment suggests that Ottoman scholarly life was appreciated in Mamluk scholarly circles in the late fifteenth century, already before the Ottoman expansion into the Arab lands.

ÖZET

ABDÜLBÂSIT EL-MALATÎ'NİN ESERLERİNDE OSMANLI TAHAYYÜLÜ

ÖMER FARUK İLGEZDI

TARİH YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, AĞUSTOS 2020

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Ferenc Péter Csirkés

Anahtar Kelimeler: Memlük-Osmanlı İlişkileri, On Beşinci Yüzyıl, Abdübasıt el-Malati, II. Bayezid, Patronaj

Bu çalışma bir geç Memlük dönemi alim ve tarihçisi olan Abdübasıt el-Malati'nin eserlerindeki Osmanlı sultanlarının, devlet adamlarının ve Osmanlı entelektüel patronajının yansımalarına dair bir incelemedir. Müellif genel olarak Osmanlı sultanlarını alimlerin cömert hamileri, dönemin hükümdarı II. Bayezid'i ise patronajının yanı sıra bir alim-sultan olarak tasvir etmektedir. Hakkında kapsayıcı bir çalışma bulunmayan el-Malati'nin eserleri, içerikleri ve siyasi bağlamları bakımından incelenecek ve müellifin Osmanlı sultanları ve onlarla ilişkili alimler hakkında ne tür yollarla bilgi edindiği irdelenecektir. Kahire ve İstanbul arasındaki gayriresmi ağlar el-Malati'nin Osmanlı tasavvurunda önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Burada gayriresmi ağlardan kastımız, müellifin Rum diyarından çeşitli alim, tüccar, sığınmacı ve esirlerle diplomatik ve ilmi müesseselerin resmi kanallarının dışında geliştirdiği kişisel ilişkilerdir. El-Malati'nin Osmanlı tasavvurunu tarihsel bağlamında incelemenin ardından tez, müellifin Memlük topraklarındaki mevcut patronajdan memnun olmadığı için Osmanlı yanlısı bir tutum izlediğini öne sürmektedir. El-Malati ve yakın çevresinin incelenmesiyle birlikte çalışmamız, Osmanlı hakimiyeti altındaki Diyar-ı Rum'un, 1517'de Arap vilayetlerinin ele geçirilmesinden önceki dönemde Memlük topraklarında ikamet eden alimlerin gözünde entelektüel canlılık bakımından görece önemsiz bir konumda olduğu kanısını tartışmaya açmayı önermektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

in this study are mine.

Dedicated to
my dear mother Emine Sevim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

In this thesis, I have followed the IJMES Transliteration System for Arabic and Ottoman Turkish. I have transliterated Arabic works and terms according to Arabic standards, and Ottoman Turkish works and terms according to Ottoman Turkish standards. If a person was primarily a Mamluk subject, then I referred to him/her according to Arabic transliteration. If a person was primarily an Ottoman subject, then I referred to him/her according to Ottoman Turkish transliteration.

LIST OF FIGURES

1.   INTRODUCTION

ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ al-Malaṭī (d. 920/1514) was a renowned physician, Ḥanafī jurist (*faqīh*) and historian who resided in Cairo at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Born in Malatya seventy-five years before the Ottoman take-over of the city, al-Malaṭī set out on travels that took him as far as North Africa and al-Andalus in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Despite this vast geographical swath in which he was active, what makes al-Malaṭī the subject of the present thesis is his references to the Ottoman dynasty and their men of the pen and the sword in his historical works, especially in his biographical dictionary *al-Majmaʿ al-mufannan bi al-muʿjam al-muʿanwan* (The ornamented collection with entitled dictionary, henceforth: *Majmaʿ*). The *Majmaʿ* depicts the Ottoman sultans as generous patrons of knowledge (*ʿilm*) and even portrays the contemporary Ottoman ruler Bāyezīd II (r. 1481-1512) as one of the greatest scholars of his time. Completing his work in 1498, al-Malaṭī dedicated six pages to Bāyezīd II's biography and told an unusual story of the Ottoman sultans by laying great emphasis on their sympathy for scholars. Moreover, the *Majmaʿ* sheds light on the mobility of late fifteenth-century scholars, merchants, and statesmen, who traveled back and forth across the Ottoman-Mamluk frontier for reasons such as pilgrimage, employment, trade, political asylum and captivity.

It seems natural, given the extensive content of the work, that the author provides considerable coverage of the Ottomans, who had aroused interest in Cairene circles for at least a century. However, repeated references to Ottoman patronage in various biographical entries raise some questions about the intellectual and political history of these two regions during the fifteenth century. Why did a scholar who spent most of his life in Cairo and other regions in North Africa place such an emphasis on the sultans of Rūm and their patronage? What does the *Majmaʿ* tell us about late fifteenth-century scholarly networks between Cairo and Istanbul? How did al-Malaṭī learn about Bāyezīd II and Ottoman scholarly circles?

Addressing these questions, the present thesis will contextualize al-Malaṭī's observations about Rūmī scholars and Bāyezīd II's patronage. I regard the paradigm of

patronage as a crucial concept that transcends geographical divisions discussed by conventional area studies. In other words, my analysis of al-Malaṭī's works, specifically the *Majmaʿ*, is intended to reassess late fifteenth-century Ottoman patronage by emphasizing its transregional character. Building on these points, the thesis argues that al-Malaṭī's trouble with contemporary Mamluk patronage led him to adopt a pro-Ottoman attitude amid the power struggle between the Mamluks and the Ottomans in the eastern Mediterranean. Based on this observation, the present thesis also seeks to problematize the idea that the Ottoman lands were marginal to Islamic learning before the Ottoman conquest of Greater Syria and Egypt in 1517. A careful study of al-Malaṭī and his environment suggests that Ottoman scholarly life was appreciated in Mamluk scholarly circles in the late fifteenth century, already before the Ottoman expansion into the Arab lands. Since al-Malaṭī's works have not yet been subject to analysis in the framework of Mamluk-Ottoman relations, this thesis will be an attempt to incorporate him into the existing scholarship on Mamluk-Ottoman interactions by introducing his works, and by providing an in-depth analysis of the *Majmaʿ*.

Al-Malaṭī's works were part of a tradition of history-writing represented by scholars such as Ṭaqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449) and Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497) in the fifteenth-century Mamluk sultanate. Following the contemporary Mamluk style of writing biographical dictionaries, the *Majmaʿ* is not restricted to scholars, but it also compiles the biographies of figures from a wider social and geographical spectrum.[1] A detailed comparison of al-Malaṭī's style with his contemporaries requires an extensive study of the sources, which, however, lies beyond the scope of the present thesis. Nevertheless, the secondary literature allows us, to a certain extent, to appreciate al-Malaṭī's place in late fifteenth-century history-writing.

Even though al-Malaṭī's writings have much in common with the previous Mamluk-literature, they differ from many of them in three aspects: the increased visibility of everyday life together with the strong presence of non-scholarly and non-bureaucratic personalities, the distinctive personal voice of the author, and the text's geographical focus. Biographical dictionaries which served as a form of elite communication among Muslim scholars already became inclusive of soldiers and bureaucrats in the early examples of the genre in the Mamluk lands (Ayaz 2020). Broadening the scope of the groups of interest, many works still had a clear focus in their orientation. For

---

[1] For a categorization of the historical works in Islamic historiography, see (Robinson 2003). In his elaborate discussion on the Mamluk period, Fatih Yahya Ayaz classifies Mamluk historical works and biographical dictionaries according to the period they were produced in (whether they were written in *Baḥrī* and *Burjī* periods of Mamluk history), and whether they were written in Egypt or Greater Syria. He points out how these factors reflected on the written products, and discusses genres based on the authors' social backgrounds. See (Ayaz 2020).

example, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's biographical dictionary *Durar al-kāmina,* which al-Malaṭī highly respected, focuses on hadith transmitters (Gharaibeh 2018, 35-56). Although the *Majmaʿ* seems to be a book of celebrities or a "who is who" of the fifteenth century, it is certainly not restricted to the ruling and scholarly elite. A Genovese merchant called Bernardo al-Faranjī, a Jewish physician who confirmed Muḥammad's prophethood, booksellers in Cairo, the Ottoman princess İlaldı, the governor of Transoxiana Ulugh Beg and Mālikī scholars in Tripoli are only some of the one thousand one hundred and ninety-five characters mentioned in the dictionary.

Together with the *Majmaʿ,* al-Malaṭī's historical works *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim fī ḥawādith al-ʿumr wa al-tarājīm* (Gardens smiling upon events of lifetimes and life stories, henceforth: *Rawḍ*)[2], and the *Nayl al-amal fī zayl al-duwal* (Achieving the hope in the sequel to *the States*, henceforth: *Nayl*) also cast light on a large variety of social groups and everyday life in Cairo. In his *Nayl,* the author narrates major political and diplomatic events, suicides committed by ordinary people, dream narratives, rumors surrounding the public baths and miraculous events together on the same pages.

The abovementioned works are also egodocuments in which the author wrote about himself. In the biographical entries of the *Majmaʿ,* al-Malaṭī's inclination to inflate his personal involvement in various affairs is quite visible. On many occasions, al-Malaṭī writes in the first person singular, expresses his emotions and curiosities about the world around him in numerous anecdotal narratives. In the *Rawḍ,* which is a personalized history of the Muslim dynasties, he weaves the political history of the Islamicate world in his lifetime with the story of his travels across North Africa. We learn about his itineraries, and his experiences, including the individuals he met on the road, his imprisonment in Tripoli, his journey to Rhodes on a Genovese ship in which he encountered Franks and Jews, and observed the implementation of "Frankish law" over a robbery incident. Given the intensity of his personal voice, while narrating biographies and events, it would be legitimate to consider the *Majmaʿ,* the *Rawḍ,* and the *Nayl* as reflections of the world around al-Malaṭī. However, we should keep in mind that al-Malaṭī's world extends from Greater Syria to Muslim Spain.

Though they include the adjacent territories that were relevant to the authors' intent, most Mamluk historical pieces and biographical dictionaries focus on Egypt and Greater Syria (Ayaz 2020, 151). In this regard, al-Malaṭī's emphasis on the events and personalities of North Africa is striking. To a lesser extent, al-Malaṭī also

---

[2]The translation of the title belongs to Carl Petry. See (Petry 1993, 335).

includes characters from the eastern lands of Islamdom. In this sense, the *Majmaʿ* not only presents a view of Rūm from Cairo, but it also makes a transregional analysis of late fifteenth-century Ottoman intellectual life possible in the context of the Persianate world and both the eastern and western Mediterranean.[3] Al-Malaṭī never visited the Ottoman lands. This aspect of his life inspired the title of the present thesis as he imagined the region based on what he had heard and read.

Since this thesis aims to address the existing debates on Mamluk-Ottoman relations, the focus will be on the Ottoman sultan and the scholars affiliated with him. However, Al-Malaṭī's works are about much more than this. They shed light on the everyday aspect of Mamluk-Ottoman interactions, too. Our scholar demonstrates how the political interactions and popular culture were inseparable in the historical writing of the period. Given the focus of the thesis, the following quote from the *Nayl* exemplifies this harmony in the best way. As regards events of the year 896 H. (1489-90), al-Malaṭī says the following:[4]

> "A reliable person (*al-thiqa*) told me the following. A person from the army (*al-jund*) slaughtered a goose and sprinkled water to the fire to boil it. An orphan boy living with the soldier approached to the cauldron to flare up the fire. When he looked inside the cauldron, he saw a group of small creatures in human shape, and they were talking to each other. The orphan paid attention and heard them saying, "Ibn ʿUthmān [i.e. Bāyezīd II] died.".[5] The boy was scared and passed out. When he came back to his senses, he told the soldier what he had just seen. The soldier approached the cauldron and he also saw the creatures. "Who are you?" he asked. They said. . .[6] The soldier called his wife and con-cubine to look at the cauldron. They also saw what the soldier and the boy had seen. They went to Moghulbāy al-Sharīfī, one of the *muqaddim*s (a Mamluk judicial position). The soldier, his wife, and concubine told what had happened. Moghulbāy took the soldier to the sultan [i.e. Qāyitbāy]. This story brought happiness to the court and circulated in Cairo. However, later it turned out that the soldier and his family had fabricated this story." (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 177-178)

---

[3] Rūm is a historical region that corresponds to today's Central and Western Anatolia and the Balkans. For a detailed assessment of the term, see (Cemal Kafadar 2017). Al-Malaṭī's conceptualization of the region will be discussed below.

[4] All translations, including transcriptions, are mine unless stated otherwise.

[5] The original sentence is "*Inna Ibn ʿUthmān qad māta*". Both "*inna*" and "*qad*" puts emphasis on certainty of the knowledge.

[6] This part is missing in the manuscript.

During a diplomatic crisis between the two sovereigns in the last decades of the fifteenth century, the Ottoman sultan was not only a rival of the Mamluk sultan; he was also the subject of fantastical tales in Cairo.

On another occasion, al-Malaṭī narrates an event in 1487 about the reflection of the Mamluk-Ottoman military conflict on the life in Cairo.

> "One day, the Quran reciters were brought to the house of the *Atabak* Uzbak. The reciters took up reciting the surah of "*Ghulibat al-Rūm*". The *Atabak* raged at the reciters and ordered a bastinado for them. Well done." (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 182)

The *Atabak* Uzbak was the famous Mamluk commander who inflicted heavy losses on Ottoman troops in the conflicts between 1486 and 1490.[7] Apparently, the reciters chose the wrong surah, namely the surah of *Rūm,* whose first verses (30:1-5) say that the *Rūm* (the Byzantine Empire) was defeated in battle, but they will gain victory in a short period of time. This anecdote not only illustrates how the Ottomans were equated with Rūm in Mamluk Cairo, but it also exemplifies how inter-state conflicts reverberated among the wider public.

Before elaborating on how al-Malaṭī's works provide answers to the questions articulated about Mamluk-Ottoman interactions on the first folio, as a student of Ottoman history I must say that the abovementioned characteristics of al-Malaṭī's corpus irresistibly remind one of Evliyā Çelebi (d. after 1685), the seventeenth-century Ottoman writer who left behind the longest travel account in Islamic literature.[8] Evliyā Çelebi was a part of a new social and intellectual world conceptualized by Cemal Kafadar as the Age of *Çelebi*s. As part of early modern global developments, seventeenth-century Istanbul was marked by a flourishing urban culture with the proliferation of places of socialization such as coffeehouses and public baths (Kafadar 2012, 46-47). One of the characteristics of this urban identity was, on the one hand, the increased literacy outside the *madrasa* circles which was best exemplified in the proliferation of *majmūʿa*s (compilations or anthologies) which brought together various genres of popular literacy, and, on the other hand, vernacularization of the literary language (Kafadar 2012, 47-51). Increased literacy went hand in hand with a more visible daily life and stronger personal voices in the written world.[9] It goes

---

[7] *Atabak* was the office of the second-ranking military officer after the Mamluk sultan. For Uzbak's clashes with the Ottoman troops, see (Muslu 2014, 146).

[8] For Evliyā Çelebi's biography and significance, see (Dankoff 2016)

[9] A similar discussion was held by Nelly Hanna in the context of Cairo between the sixteenth and the

without saying that Evliyā and the Age of *Çelebi*s have their own context which significantly differs from that of al-Malaṭī. First, Evliyā Çelebi's work is unique in terms of its exceptionally elaborate accounts of events. Al-Malaṭī reveals that he travelled to study medicine in the Maghrib, whereas it seems that Evliyā Çelebi was gripped by wanderlust. Secondly, the literary circles out of formal learning institutions, i.e. the *madrasa*s, are far more apparent in the Istanbul of the Age of *Çelebi*s than they are in fifteenth-century Cairo.

Having their peculiarities in mind, the similarities go beyond both writers' passion for recording their travels. Medieval Egypt and Levant hosted highly literate societies compared to the other regions of the world. In his study of reading practices in these regions in the Middle Period that stretches between the eleventh and the sixteenth centuries, Konrad Hirschler suggests that already in the twelfth century literary works were consumed not only by scholars but also by a wider social group including non-elite individuals who played an active role in reading and producing literary works (Hirschler 2013, 18-25). Their involvement in literary circles through public reading sessions led to the rise of new genres such as popular epics, as well as to a gradual change in the style of the other genres which had been monopolized by scholars such as chronicles and biographical dictionaries (Hirschler 2013, 26). When it comes to the fifteenth century, al-Malaṭī's Cairo was a highly literate urban space where authors from various ranks of society produced texts and addressed a large social spectrum.[10] Modern historians of the period also proposed that some late Mamluk writers used a vernacular form of Arabic in their works, just like in the case of the Age of *Çelebi*s.[11]

One of the major examples that Kafadar gives to describe the intellectual outcomes of Age of *Çelebi*s is the anecdotal notes in Aḥmed b. Mūsā's *majmūʿa* from the seventeenth century. In his compilation, Aḥmed makes very brief notes on the events in Istanbul and at the imperial palace by mentioning the day, month, and year (Kafadar 2012, 50-51). This is more or less the case in al-Malaṭī's *Nayl*, which shortly narrates crocodile attacks in Cairo, miraculous experiences in its ancient quarters (*Miṣr al-ʿatīq*), public reactions to political events, the Mamluk sultans' dialogues with courtiers, sometimes with brief comments. The only difference is that al-Malaṭī rarely mentions the days of such events; instead, he contents himself

---

eighteenth centuries. See (Hanna 2003).

[10]The Mamluk literary elite's consciousness about their urban identity is best exemplified in al-Malaṭī's near contemporary al-Maqrīzī's *Kitāb al-mawāʿiz wa al-iʿtibār bi dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa al-āthār*, which provides a detailed plan of Cairo and its artifacts. For a description of the work, see (Ayaz 2020, 165). Two examples of historians from the lower ranks of society in the late Mamluk period are Khatīb al-Jawharī (d. 1495) and Kutubī (d. unknown) (Ayaz 173).

[11]For what modern historians call "Middle Arabic" in Mamluk historiography, see (Kortantamer 1994, 69).

with the years.

I do not imply that certain genres were transmitted from the Mamluks to the Ottomans, or simply suggest that Mamluk writers predate their Ottoman colleagues in producing a certain type of knowledge. We are even unable to explore the textual transmission from the Mamluk lands to the Ottoman domains. I raised these similarities in order to call attention to the need for a perspective of connected history in the case of Mamluk and Ottoman histories, which is the concern of the present thesis. However, I am not concerned with only demonstrating their connectedness; I address here, instead, how this connectedness was functioning in a micro example: al-Malaṭī's works.

This comparison also brings us to a discussion of temporality in the Islamicate world. Characteristics such as connectivity, the rise of multi-ethnic and bureaucratic empires, and the transmission of cultural forms have long been attributed to the early modern period in the relevant literature, which, however, has rarely strayed before the sixteenth century. More recent scholarship challenged this perspective proposing that the features associated with the early modern period were also present in the so-called Middle Ages in some parts of the world, especially outside Europe.[12] For instance, Sanjay Subrahmanyam argues that the early modern period extends from the early fourteenth to the mid-eighteenth century (Subrahmanyam 1997, 736-37), while some other scholars propose a more generous definition of the Middle Ages, being cautious about the notion of early modernity.

As for "Ottoman early modernity," which roughly begins in the sixteenth century, it is manuscript culture and popular reading practices that have been considered as characteristic features of the intellectual aspects of the notion. In a recent article, Nir Shafir asks a question highly relevant to this part of the thesis: "Why start the clock at the sixteenth century, the beginnings of what we now call the 'early modern'? Mamlukists such as Konrad Hirschler would point to popular reading groups and public libraries in thirteenth-century Damascus. Others would take it back to the book revolution that occurred in Abbasid Baghdad with the introduction of paper" (Shafir 2020, 65). In this sense, al-Malaṭī can be considered a part of both late medieval and early modern Islam if we adapt Subrahmanyam's concern about the chronological coverage of the history of global connectivity for the history of reading and writing in Islamdom. Hence, the comparison between al-Malaṭī, and Evliyā Çelebi and Aḥmed b. Mūsā, again, can best be presented in the framework of connected history in the case of the Mamluks and Ottomans, as this will facilitate

––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

[12]For a meticulous analysis of the discussions about the notions of the Global Middle Ages and Global Early Modernity, see (Strathern 2018).

our discussion of temporality in history writing.

Though it reflects only one aspect of the complex world of encounters in the Mediterranean basin, the vertical axis between the Arabic-speaking lands and Rūm was among the most dynamic routes of mobility for merchants, slaves, and especially for scholars from the thirteenth through the fifteenth century. Economically, Rūm played a crucial role for Egypt in supplying slaves and horses from the Dasht-i Qipchaq (the northern Black Sea steppe) held by the Golden Horde and its successors (Peacock 2019, 56). The intense interaction of scholars, merchants, and diplomats between the two regions also predate the Ottomans.[13]

1.1 Evaluation of Previous Scholarship

This thesis is linked to the existing scholarship from various aspects. In my analysis of the relevant literature, I will focus on two main issues. First, we will discuss the literature about Mamluk-Ottoman relations in the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries when al-Malaṭī was active as a writer. The second point will be the modern studies about al-Malaṭī. By doing so, I also hope to introduce the argumentative points of the thesis that will be discussed in the following chapters. Before embarking on an analysis of the issues mentioned above, let us briefly discuss the main works providing the inspiration for the principal focus of the thesis, patronage.

Gülru Necipoğlu, in her seminal article "Cosmopolitanism and Creative Translation" discusses the Ottoman ruler Meḥmed II's (r. 1444-46/1451-81) interaction with Renaissance cultural production and demonstrates how the fifteenth-century Ottoman court, unlike other contemporary Muslim rulers, engaged with Italian arts as a manifestation of its legitimacy (Necipoğlu 2012). Meḥmed was not only interested in Italian artistic works but was also an admirer of the Persianate cultural production. A similar perspective was adopted by İlker Evrim Binbaş for the Timurid court, offering a complex view of contemporary paradigms of patronage and outlin-

---

[13]One astonishing example is the story of Timurtash who was the Ilkhanid governor of Anatolia and took refuge in the Mamluk lands in the 1320s (Peacock 2019, 50). This anecdote is particularly important for the present study, since it exemplifies the continuation of the Mamluks' role as an asylum for individuals from Rūm for three centuries. Al-Malaṭī also mentions several Ottoman émigrés who ended up at the Mamluk court in the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries, as will be discussed below.

ing informal networks of scholars across the Eastern Islamicate world (Binbaş 2016). Although the author does not put the concept of patronage in the center of his work, he highlights that many contemporary scholars from the Arabic-speaking lands and Rūm ended up at the Timurid court as beneficiaries of the generous patronage of the Timurid rulers.

In recent years, many modern scholars have provided a nuanced view of intellectual history of pre-modern Islam in what Shahab Ahmed calls "the Balkans-to-Bengal-Complex" (Ahmed 2017). Countering the Arab-centrism of the traditional scholarship, Ahmed justifiably focused on the horizontal axis that connected the Balkans to Iran and South Asia. Binbaş's work is especially thought-provoking in that he does not restrict his analysis to the scholarly mobility between Rūm and the Persianate world, but also tries to delve into the bewitching world of Mamluk scholarly circles, adopting a triangular approach to these regions.[14] In addition to Binbaş's work, Christopher Markiewicz's studies on kingship in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Islam, and in historical works produced in the same period, also adopt this triangular approach in his analysis of courtly patronage (Markiewicz 2017, 2019). These studies of Necipoğlu, Binbaş, and Markiewicz explore the possibility of tracing the entangled histories of the contemporary courtly patronage in Islam, and they lay the groundwork for further elaboration of the Istanbul-Cairo connection.[15]

In the traditional scholarship of the twentieth century, Ottoman history has rarely been considered a part of the larger Islamic history. This perspective has been challenged in the last decades from many aspects, especially in terms of intellectual history, indicating that the discussions initiated in the Arab and Persianate lands between the eight and fifteenth centuries later became subjects of discussion among the Ottoman scholars, of course with nuanced, and "Ottomanized" contexts.[16] When the connections of the Ottoman empire with the larger Islamic world are taken into consideration, the general tendency among scholars has been to search for these connections in the Seljuq East and the larger Persianate World, instead of the Arabic-speaking lands.[17] Despite the innovative studies, the vertical axis be-

---

[14]In another study, Binbaş examines Ibn Jazarī's (d. 833/1429) adventures between Arabic-speaking lands, Ottoman Rumelia and Transoxiana. See (Binbaş 2014).

[15]Although Cairo and Istanbul are the main cities that the present study will focus on, we should admit that the link between these two regions was rarely a direct one in the fifteenth century. As many primary sources reveal, Amasya, Antioch, Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were frequent destinations for go-betweens in the Mamluk-Ottoman context.

[16]Numerous examples can be given from various fields ranging from philosophy to literature. The two most relevant studies to the present thesis are Derin Terzioğlu's case study on the Turkish translation of a political treatise written by Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), see (Terzioğlu 2007), and Helen Pfeifer's analysis on the reception of several prominent Mamluk-era scholars, such as Ibn Ḥajar and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), in Ottoman Istanbul, see (Pfeifer 2014, 130-131).

[17]Fuat Köprülü's pioneering studies on Ottoman intellectual history and the formation of the Ottoman state

tween the Arabic-speaking lands and Rumelia/Anatolia has been secondary to "the Balkans-to-Bengal-Complex" in recent scholarship.

The scholarly interest in Egypt has not been well-developed in twentieth-century Turkish academia. A quick research reveals that the studies about the relations between Rūm and Egypt has focused on such topics as the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 and Kavalalı Meḥmed ʿAli Pasha period (r. 1805-1848).[18] Şehabeddin Tekindağ stands out as the first scholar who made leading publications both about the Mamluks and the Ottoman-Mamluk relations in the pre-conquest period. His study on the Arabic sources that are relevant to Ottoman history, where he evaluates the reliability of those sources, is of particular importance for our purpose (Tekindağ 1973).[19] The present thesis might be regarded as a continuation of that pioneering study in that we will explore another Mamluk scholar's works' relation to Ottoman history.[20]

Cihan Yüksel Muslu's major work titled *the Ottomans and the Mamluks: Imperial Diplomacy and Warfare in the Islamic World* fills an enormous gap in the literature, and it is the backbone of the present thesis (Muslu 2014).[21] Muslu is the first one to demonstrate how extensive and complex the Ottoman-Mamluk relationship was. Based on numerous Mamluk and Ottoman sources, she suggests that the relationship between the two realms went far beyond warfare and it had ups and downs. Although her book is based on diplomacy, Muslu also sheds light on intellectual encounters and reveals that the two empires were connected through careful diplomacy pursued not only by soldier-bureaucrat intermediaries but also by scholars. As active participants in diplomacy, scholars who were already mobile around the region were important agents in the politics of the two empires. Muslu's study focuses on the period between the late fourteenth century when the first records of the interactions began

---

in 1918 and 1935 exemplify this attitude. See (Köprülü 2014) and see (Köprülü 2015). This attitude was not probably independent from the republican ideology, which aimed at isolating the Ottoman past from the Arab lands.

[18] The numerous studies completed in Turkey and outside Turkey about the Mamluks that are independent of their relation to the Ottoman Empire are not evaluated in this study.

[19] Tekindağ's other studies about Mamluk history and Ottoman-Mamluk relations are (Tekindağ 1961), and (Tekindağ 1967).

[20] Just like many recent studies of Ottoman history refrain from terming the scholars who lived in the pre-sixteenth century Ottoman lands "Ottoman", the term "Mamluk scholar(s)" might also be problematic to define the scholars that lived in the Mamluk realm between the late thirteenth and the early sixteenth centuries, and who moved to the Mamluk realm from across the Islamicate world. The term also has an ethnic and political connotation since it reminds us of the sons of the Mamlūk military elite who later became scholars. Although the fact that many Mamluk-era Arab and other non-Mamlūk-origin scholars had strong ties to Mamluk rule makes it safer to use the term as opposed to the Ottoman context, I will only use the term to define al-Malaṭī and other Mamlūk-origin scholars, whereas I will use the term "Mamluk-based scholars" for the others.

[21] Muslu has several other pioneering studies about the diplomatic, intellectual and social aspects of Ottoman-Mamluk interaction. See (Muslu 2013), (Muslu 2017), and (Muslu 2019).

and the end of Bāyezīd II's reign, calling attention to the fact that the relations between the two polities were not restricted to the Ottoman-Mamluk war in 1516-1517.[22]

Confirming the role of contemporary scholars as veritable interimperial subjects as proposed by Muslu, Abdurrahman Atçıl asserts that scholars in the Ottoman empire enjoyed relative independence in the pre-1453 period, after which they gradually became closely affiliated with the ruling elite and adopted a distinct identity that Atçıl terms scholar-bureaucrat (Atçıl 2017). Their former economic and political independence suggests that scholars considered themselves a social group present in a vast geographical swath that extended from the Atlantic coast of Africa to the Central Asian steppes, rather than being institutionally bound to a certain state. Hence, they were able to seek patronage in this vast area.[23] This context provides many insights into why Bāyezīd II's patronage had repercussions in al-Malaṭī's biographical dictionary.

A larger portion of the studies on Mamluk-Ottoman relations has concentrated on the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 and the post-conquest period.[24] The debates coming out of that literature lie beyond the scope of this thesis. However, Helen Pfeifer's studies are of particular importance for the present thesis. Although her studies focus on the aftermath of the Ottoman conquest of Arab lands, they make invaluable comments on the intellectual exchange between Arab lands and Rūm in the sixteenth century. She thoroughly examines the encounters between Arab and Rūmī scholars in this period as a process of cultural interaction, which has been a disregarded aspect in the traditional scholarship, which assumes no significant cultural transmission in the region, since both sides were predominantly Sunni Muslims (Pfeifer 2014). Pfeifer has observed that the interactions of the scholars of the two regions accelerated with the Ottoman expansion into Arab lands. It was especially scholarly gatherings (*majālis*) that served as spaces where Damascene and Rūmī scholars could come together and learned more about each other's intellectual backgrounds (Pfeifer 2015). Despite their political power in the aftermath of the conquest, Pfeifer argues, the Ottomans lacked sufficient religious and cultural pres-

---

[22] Among some other studies that focus on juristic, cultural, diplomatic and Sufi aspects of the interaction between the two regions, we can mention (Johansen 1988), (Burak 2015), (Atçıl 2017), (Muhanna 2010), (Har-El 1995), and (Geoffroy 1995).

[23] In a recent article, Christopher Markiewicz calls attention to a common discourse among some late fifteenth-century Muslim scholars in defining history as a science. The approach to the paradigm of patronage taken by the present study seeks to contribute to the scholarship examining the connected intellectual history of fifteenth-century Islam, in that the similar discourses across different regions might point to the existence of shared patronage networks. See (Markiewicz 2017).

[24] Among many, we can mention Michael Winter's publications about early Ottoman Egypt. See (Winter 1992, 1998). A recent work by Stephan Conermann and Gül Şen includes various articles on Mamluk-Ottoman transition period after 1517. See (Conermann and Şen, 2016).

tige in the eyes of Mamluk-based scholars, who viewed the Ottoman domains as the backwater of Islamic scholarship. Acknowledging that fifteenth-century Ottoman scholars were already integrated into the wider networks of Islamic learning, and that the transfer of scholars like Mollā Gūrānī into the Ottoman domains aroused a limited interest among some Mamluk-based scholars in the scholarly affairs in the Ottoman lands, Pfeifer suggests that the intellectual "asymmetry" between Rūmī scholars and their Arab counterparts was reversed, or balanced only towards the end of the sixteenth century when the Arabs lost their intellectual prominence within Rūmī scholarly circles (Pfeifer 2015 219-222).

The present thesis shares Pfeifer's views that throughout most of the fifteenth century scholarship in the Ottoman lands was quite limited compared to the Mamluk cities, and that only a few Mamluk-based scholars moved to Rūm, whereas movement in the opposite direction was more significant. A similar point can be made about the transmission of books from one region to the other. However, al-Malaṭī poses a challenge to this perspective on the last three decades of the fifteenth century in that he and several prominent scholars from his network appreciated, even admired, intellectual life in Ottoman Istanbul already in the late fifteenth century. Their views on the scholarly life in the Ottoman lands were shaped by Bāyezīd II's patronage in Cairo. Moreover, the non-scholarly gatherings seem to have played just as crucial a role as did scholarly gatherings in al-Malaṭī's conceptualization of Ottoman patronage and scholarly affairs in Rūm. These two aspects of al-Malaṭī's works and environment will be given special focus in the last section of the second chapter and the first section of the third chapter, respectively.

Al-Malaṭī and his works have not yet been subject to a comprehensive academic study. His father Ghars al-Dīn Khalīl b. Shāhīn (d. 873/1468) is a better-known figure who is at least the subject of an article in the *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Gaulmier and T. Fahd 2012). Nevertheless, our scholar's works have been discussed from certain aspects in some studies. The *Rawḍ* and its parts about al-Malaṭī's travel to Muslim Spain attracted attention in the early decades of the twentieth century. Hence, the earliest reception of al-Malaṭī in modern scholarship emphasized his identity as a traveler.[25] The Italian Orientalist G. Levi Della Vida wrote a pioneering study of the *Rawḍ,* which exists in a unique manuscript in the Vatican (Della Vida 1933, 307-334). This was followed by Robert Brunschvig's dissertation, in which some parts of the *Rawḍ* were translated into French and al-Malaṭī was compared with his Belgian contemporary Anselme Adorno (d. 1483).[26] Last but not least, Kikuchi

---

[25]For the studies that described al-Malaṭī as a traveler, see (Aḥmad 2007, 307-316), (Ḥasan 2008, 72-177), (Hāshim 1957, 438), and (ʿInan 1970, 95-111).

[26]Brunschvig's dissertation completed in 1936 was published later. See (Brunschvig 2001)

Tadayoshi makes a meticulous analysis of al-Malaṭī's method of writing history based on the *Rawḍ* and Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*, comparing their descriptions of the year 848 H. / 1444 CE (Tadayoshi, 2006).

Among al-Malaṭī's works the *Nayl* is the most frequently referenced source in the secondary literature. This is not surprising, since it is a very comprehensive work that provides information on social, economic, political, and intellectual history of the late Mamluk period. For instance, Sami G. Massoud compares the *Nayl* to other chronicles against the background of the historical writing in the Circassian period (Massoud 2007, 67-69, 136-137). On the other hand, in his dissertation Wan Kamal Wujani uses both the *Rawḍ* and the *Nayl* to shed light on late Mamluk economics (Wujani 2006).[27] Earlier, an M. Litt. thesis was dedicated to a critical edition of some parts of the *Nayl* (Al-Wahaibi 1992).[28] The text was also one of the sources used in Bernadette Martel-Thoumian's study about suicide in Mamluk historical sources (Martel-Thoumian, 2004). The *Nayl* is also a useful source for environmental history. For example, Kristine Chalyan-Dafner's dissertation about the natural disasters in Mamluk Egypt have plenty of references to this work by al-Malaṭī (Chalyan-Dafner, 2013).

In his article on late Mamluk patronage and scholarly criticism, Carl Petry describes and briefly discusses al-Malaṭī's *Rawḍ* and *Majmaʿ al-bustān al-nawrī li ḥaḍrat mawlānā sulṭān al-ghawrī* (Anthology of the enlightened arbor presented to our lord Sultan al-Ghawrī),[29] which al-Malaṭī presented to the Mamluk sultan Qansawh al-Ghawrī (r. 1501-1516) (Petry 1993, 326-338). Christian Mauder has an article about the latter work which provides insights into the literary sessions held by al-Ghawrī (Mauder 2015).

At this point, we should also mention ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Salām al-Tadmurī's critical notes at the beginning of his edition of the *Rawḍ*. In it, he provides invaluable comments on the author and his life; and he thoroughly examines al-Malaṭī's place in Mamluk history writing (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 1-126). Our scholar is also the subject of an article in the Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Encyclopedia of Islam (Özaydın 1988). As for the *Majmaʿ*, I have not yet come across an academic study that refers to this biographical dictionary on which the present thesis develops its main arguments.

----

[27] Another study that makes references to the *Nayl* in the context of economic history is Jere L. Bacharach's quantitative analysis. See (Bacharach 1975).

[28] The other studies that drop references to the *Nayl* are (Muslu 2014, 243-244), (Banister 2014), and (Yosef 2017), and (Yosef 2019). Fatih Yahya Ayaz also examines al-Malaṭī's style in history writing and categorizes the author among the historians of *awlād al-nās* origin without mentioning the title of his works. See (Ayaz 2020, 158, 168, 173, 175).

[29] The translation of the title belongs to Petry. See (Petry 1993, 335).

1.2 A Synopsis of Mamluk-Ottoman Interactions

As Muslu has observed, diplomatic relations between the Ottomans and Mamluks go back to the late fourteenth century (Muslu 2014, 4). The Ottomans first attracted the attention of the Mamluks during Bāyezīd I's reign (r. 1389-1403), when the former began to assert themselves in the zone of Mamluk influence in Anatolia. Despite this short period of conflict, relations were mostly friendly. The Ottomans constantly attempted to gain recognition from the Mamluk court, and they sent gifts to Cairo after their conquests and raids in the Balkans in the reigns of Meḥmed I (r. 1413-1421) and Murād II (r. 1421-1444, 1446-1451). Muslu further demonstrates that although the Mamluks maintained their relative superiority, Meḥmed II's ambitions to become the foremost leader of the Islamic world caused high tension between the Ottoman sultan and his Mamluk counterparts Aynāl (r. 1453-1461), Khusqadam (r. 1461-1467), and Qāyitbāy (r. 1468-1496). In the first decade of Bāyezīd II's reign, the Ottomans began to challenge Mamluk superiority in the diplomatic sphere. The crisis between the two sovereigns led to a series of battles in today's Southern Anatolia between 1485 and 1491 in which neither side could gain the upper hand. At the turn of the sixteenth century, however, the conflict between the Mamluks and the Ottomans turned into cooperation against the Portuguese threat in the Red Sea (Muslu 2014, 12-23).

The earliest references to the Ottomans in Mamluk narrative sources go back to the early fourteenth century. Shihāb al-Dīn al-ʿUmarī's (d. 749/1348) *Masālik al-abṣār* and *al-Taʿrīf bi al-muṣṭalaḥ al-sharīf* was the first text to refer to the Ottomans (Muslu 2014, 69). Ṭaqī al-Dīn b. Nāẓir al-Jaysh's (d. 786/1384) *Kitāb taṭqīf al-taʿrīf bi al-mustalah al-sharīf*, and al-Qalqashandī's (d. 821/1418) *Ṣubḥ al-aʿshā fī ṣināʿat al-inshā* are the other Mamluk sources that cast light on the early Ottoman period, together with the other principalities in Rūm. The Ottomans feature in fifteenth-century narrative sources with an increased emphasis, with Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* as a possible turning point in terms of Ottoman reputation in Egypt and Greater Syria. As Muslu explores, Ibn al-Furāt's (d. 807/1405) *Taʾrīkh al-duwal wa al-mulūk*, al-Maqrīzī's *Durar al-ʿuqūd al-farīda fī tarājīm al-aʿyān al-mufīda*, Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba's (d. 851/1448) *Taʾrīkh Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba*, Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī's (d. 855/1451) *ʿIqd al-jumān fī taʾrīkh ahl al-zamān*, Ibn Taghrībirdī's (d. 874/1470) *al-Nujūm al-ẓāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa al-Qāhira*, and Burhan al-Dīn al-Biqāʿī's (d. 885/1480) *Taʾrīkh al-Biqāʿī* are the other major

Mamluk narrative sources that present information about the Ottomans. These sources shed light on different aspects of Mamluk-Ottoman relations. For instance, based on al-Biqāʿī chronicle in Muslu's study, we might suggest that al-Biqāʿī wrote more elaborately on diplomatic letters exchanged between the two regions (Muslu 2014, 111-112), unlike his contemporary al-Malaṭī who laid a greater emphasis on non-bureaucratic aspects of the interactions, probably as a result of their different occupational status.

As for the intellectual interactions, the route between the Ottoman lands and Mamluk Egypt was quite active. Many prominent scholars, including Dāʾūd al-Qayṣarī (d. 751/1350), Aḥmedī (d. 815/1412), Shaykh Badr al-Dīn (d. 823/1420), Hacı Pasha (d. after 827/1424), Mollā Fenārī (d. 834/1431), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bisṭāmī (d. 858/1453), and Mollā Gūrānī (d. 893/1488), who ended up at the Ottoman court were trained in Mamluk lands.[30] However, the intellectual encounters were not restricted to the scholars' movement. The Ottoman sultans seem to have been interested in the literature produced in the Mamluk lands. For instance, Murād II commissioned a translation of Ibn Kathīr's (d. 774/1373) history into Turkish (Erdem 2018); Selīm I (r. 1512-1520) commissioned the translations of Ibn Khallikān's (d. 681/1281) *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*, and al-Damīrī's (d. 808/1405) *Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān* into Persian (Markiewicz 2019, 189).

As stated above, in traditional scholarship of Ottoman intellectual history, the discussion of interactions with Arabic-speaking lands has played second fiddle to interactions with the larger Persianate world. The phenomenon can be best observed through the flow of a significant number of scholars from the Eastern Islamic lands to the Ottoman realm.[31] More recent scholarship has also supported this perspective in terms of the transmission of books from one region to the other. The inventory of Bāyezīd II's library, which has recently been published by Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar and Cornell Fleischer, shows that the vast majority of the books transferred from outside the Ottoman domains came from the Persianate east (Necipoğlu and Kafadar 2019). Although some contributions in the publication present examples of the books from the Arab south, it seems that those books were marginal in the late fifteenth-century palace library.[32] Al-Malaṭī's oeuvre is not enough to challenge

---

[30] For information about the scholars who came from the Arab lands in the fifteenth century, see (Uzunçarşılı 1961, 520–521).

[31] According to Abdurrahman Atçıl, the relative instability in the Timurid and Turkmen lands in the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries played a significant role in this scholarly movement from the east to the west. See, (Atçıl 2016, 323).

[32] For some examples of the works from the Mamluk realm in the inventory, see (Taşkömür 2019, 395-96), (Fleischer and Şahin 2019, 574), (Markiewicz 2019, 660-61), (Csirkés 2019, 683, 688, 697), (Gardiner 2019, 737), and (McGill Team 2019, 832).

this well-grounded perspective that associates Ottoman intellectual history with the Persianate east. However, it can be considered another source that calls for further research in the Mamluk-Ottoman line.

Since there is no comprehensive study about our scholar, the following chapter offers al-Malaṭī's biography, and an analysis of his network before elaborating on our discussion of the Mamluk-Ottoman context. In addition, the second chapter will also discuss the importance of his works in the broader framework of fifteenth-century Mamluk scholarly life. While doing this, the chapter will have a special emphasis on the Ottomans in al-Malaṭī's works. We will also shed light on al-Malaṭī's religiosity and his favorite shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyajī (d. 879/1474), which provide insights into both al-Malaṭī's intellectual make-up and his conceptualization of Ottoman patronage. The third chapter will offer a brief reflection on al-Malaṭī's connection to Rūm and contemporary Ottoman patronage, before moving on to a more detailed assessment of the Ottoman image in the *Majmaʿ*. We will also provide an intertextual analysis that contextualizes al-Malaṭī's attitude to the Rūmī sultans, primarily to Bāyezīd II.

2. THE AUTHOR, HIS WORKS, AND THE CONTEXT

Building on the general introduction about al-Malaṭī in the introduction, let us first discuss his works before a more detailed assessment of his biography, since the near-contemporary historical sources, Shams al-Dīn al-Sakhāwī's *al-Ḍawʾ al-lāmiʿa* and Ibn Iyās' (d. 930/1524) *Badāʾiʿ al-ẓuhūr*, offer only limited information about al-Malaṭī. However, thanks to their highly personalized tone, the author's works include a significant amount of autobiography. His best-known works are of a historical character, such as the *Nayl al-amal fī zayl al-duwal*, which bridges the gap between the previous generation of historians, such as al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Taghrībirdī and the later ones, such as Ibn Iyās and Shihāb al-Dīn b. Ḥimṣī (d. 934/1528). Another historical work by al-Malaṭī bears the title *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim fī ḥawādis al-ʿumr wa al-tarājim* and aims at reporting the major events from across the Islamic world during the author's lifetime. His other works will also be introduced below. However, only the *Majmaʿ*, the *Rawḍ* and the *Nayl* will be given close attention in this thesis.

2.1 Al-Malaṭī's Corpus

Al-Malaṭī's three above-mentioned works are connected to each other. The *Rawḍ* and the *Nayl* include references to one another, while the *Majmaʿ* alludes to the *Rawḍ* in multiple loci.[1] Al-Malaṭī likely considered the *Rawḍ* to have a central role in his oeuvre, because, on the one hand, in his introduction to the *Majmaʿ*,

---

[1]One example comes from the *Nayl*, as the author talks about the Mamluk victory against the Ottomans in 1486: "The discussion on the details of the event is long and we explained it in our history *al-Rawḍ al-bāsim*" (*Al-kalām fī juzʾiyyātihā ṭawīl qad bayyannāhu fī taʾrīkhinā al-Rawḍ al-bāsim*); (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8:18)

he unequivocally states that the purpose to compose the work is to list the names mentioned in the *Rawḍ* (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 27), and, on the other hand, in the *Nayl* he refers to the *Rawḍ* as *taʾrīkhunā al-kabīr* (our great history) on several occasions.

In the *muqaddima* of the *Majmaʿ*, the author states that he had completed the *Rawḍ* before the completion of the *Majmaʿ* (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 28). I have not seen any reference to the *Majmaʿ* in the *Nayl*. Though the *Majmaʿ* seems to have been completed last, it would be misleading to put these works in chronological order. Al-Malaṭī, like many other pre-modern authors, constantly revised the content of his works. The *Majmaʿ* and his historical works are full of biographical information which ends with the statement "he died after this biography [was written]" (*māta baʿda hādhihi al-tarjama*), while some others end with "he is still alive" (*mawjūdun al-ān*).[2] We can conclude therefore that the author revised the biographies after the subjects died. Hence, the *Majmaʿ* and al-Malaṭī's other works were probably still in the making until al-Malaṭī died in 1514. Further, the author likely modified other sections, too, in addition to the death records, revising his comments on the subjects in the process.

The dynamic content of al-Malaṭī's works can be observed in its final forms, too. Comparing some biographies in the *Rawḍ* and the *Majmaʿ* tells us about the changes in the author's preferences in emphasizing different aspects of the events. The biographies of the scholars Ibrāhīm al-Karakī and Mollā Gūrānī, and the Mamluk sultan al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā (r. 1467-1468) might exemplify these changes, which I will detail in the last chapter. Though the *Rawḍ* is supposedly a larger work, al-Malaṭī reviewed these biographies by projecting his updated thoughts about Ottoman patronage.

It seems that al-Malaṭī, for some reason, decided to bring the Ottoman dynasty to the fore in his biographical dictionary even more. While the *Rawḍ* begins with a description of the Muslim rulers in the year he was born, 844 (1440/41), in this narrative the Ottoman sultan Murād II plays a minor role compared to not only the Mamluk sultan but also to the Timurid and Ḥafṣid rulers of the day. Moreover, the existing part of the *Rawḍ* contains no praise for Ottoman patronage during Meḥmed II's reign. His choices in the *Rawḍ* might also reflect the *Realpolitik* of the age. Nevertheless, how al-Malaṭī revised his narratives can help us reconsider history-writing in the Mamluk period,[3] because historical works in the age reflect not only ideologies of groups, but also personal opinions. For all this, al-Malaṭī cannot be considered as a mere compiler or a passive transmitter. He took up themes and

---

[2] For the example for these statements, see (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 34, 98, 110, 745).

[3] For an analysis on narratological perspectives in Mamluk historical writing, see (Frenkel 2018).

revised them based on the political and economic context of his time.[4]

After this general introduction, we can have a closer look into the codicological and contextual characteristics of the *Majmaʿ* and the other works as they relate to the purposes of this study.

2.1.1 *Al-Majmaʿ*: What makes it interesting?

Although some crucial details about the *Majmaʿ* have already been mentioned in the introduction, and some further ones specifically concerning the Ottoman lands will be discussed in the last chapter, the work still needs to be introduced from various other aspects. As stated above, al-Malaṭī's *al-Majmaʿ al-mufannan bi al-muʿjam al-muʿanwan* aimed at collecting the biographies of the characters mentioned in the *Rawḍ*, though the function of the work went beyond this aim. The titles of most contemporary Arabic works reflected their authors' scholarly ties. In this regard, it is reasonable to think that al-Malaṭī might have been inspired by the famous scholar of the age, Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's (d. 852/1449) *al-Majmaʿ al-muʾassas li al-muʿjam al-mufahras* (The organized collection of a catalogued dictionary). As I will outline below, the so-called *ḥāfiẓ al-ʿaṣr* (the guardian of the age) Ibn Ḥajar was not only arguably the most influential scholar in the Mamluk realm in the first half of the fifteenth century, but he was also a close associate of al-Malaṭī's father. Al-Malaṭī refers to Ibn Ḥajar in various places of the *Majmaʿ*. However, the similarity of the titles of these two works tells us more about the function of al-Malaṭī's dictionary. Ibn Ḥajar's *al-Majmaʿ al-muʾassas* is a very personal encyclopedic work that lists the shaykhs in his training process in alphabetical order (Kandemir 1999), and it contains some autobiographical information, too.

Al-Malaṭī's *Majmaʿ*, on the other hand, claims to cover a much larger group of people. In the introduction of the work, the author says:

> "In this collection of mine, I put together a selection from the biographies of the notable and wise people of our age, scholars, caliphs, kings and sultans, viziers and governors, judges and *amīr*s, people of intelligence

---

[4]Wadad Kadi suggests that biographical dictionaries were first created in the Islamic world to present scholars' alternative views to chronicles, which were politically oriented. See (Kadi 2006).

and comprehension (*ahl al-ḥidhq wa al-fahm*), men of letters and poets, and several others, such as physicians and philosophers, and those who have experienced marvelous and unusual events (*ʿajāʾib wa nawādir*) or those who have wisdom in their biographies."

Indeed, the number of statesmen, scholars, notable women, and non-Muslims from across the Islamicate world included in the *Majmaʿ* confirms al-Malaṭī's sentences. Despite this broad coverage, the work provides us with hundreds of personal anecdotes and the author's feelings, as well as his dialogues with some other scholars and merchants. The purpose of these dialogues is mostly to indicate how he made contacts during his wonderings in a large swathe of land from Damascus to al-Andalus; sometimes he also tells us how his father was influential by sharing a conversation with one of his father's old friends. The purpose of including dialogues might also be political. For example, on several occasions al-Malaṭī shares his conversations with his Rūmī shaykh al-Kāfiyajī in order to criticize the Mamluk bureaucracy.[5] We also see that the author conveys political messages with reference to humor pathology. For instance, he relates that when the Mamluk sultan al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā (r. 1467-1468) was enthroned, al-Kāfiyajī ridiculed the sultan to al-Malaṭī (*māzaḥanī shaykhunā*) (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 788). The author also joked with his shaykh, saying that the people are afraid of the sultan. As the narrative goes, Al-Kāfiyajī laughed and said in retort, "I am not afraid of him because I know that power is not in his hands."[6]

The characters chosen for the dictionary support the assumption that the *Majmaʿ* is a highly personalized book of the celebrities of the author's age. Following the *Rawḍ*, the author states that he will not mention those who died before 844 H. (1444), the year he was born.[7] A gradual personalization in the styles of the *Nayl*, the *Rawḍ* and the *Majmaʿ* is easily observable. Both the *Rawḍ* and the *Majmaʿ* include the political, scholarly, and commercial celebrities of the age, especially those whom al-Malaṭī knew in person. As a person who traveled a lot and who interacted with thousands of people from various regions, al-Malaṭī instrumentalized his biographical collection as a tool of self-representation. In this regard, it is plausible to argue that putting the Ottoman, Timurid, and Mamluk sultans, as well as the other elite personnel

_____

[5] Al-Kāfiyajī criticizes the sultan and his appointments in the scholarly bureaucracy. (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 63-70)

[6] These political jokes should have had a place in late Mamluk culture. It is interesting to see everyday conversations between late medieval scholars and what they laughed at. This is a greatly neglected subject. However, Amalia Levanoni's study arguing that the medieval Muslim readers belonged to the same "emotional community" and shared collective modes of expression and understanding of emotions helps us contextualize the anecdotes in the *Majmaʿ*. See (Levanoni 2018, 72)

[7] This might also be a critique directed at those historians who wrote about periods they had not experienced, specifically Ibn Taghrībirdī's *al-Nujūm al-ẓahira fī mulūk miṣr wa al-qāhira*.

in harmony with his own microcosm can be related to the author's image-making efforts in the highly competitive environment of Mamluk Cairo.

Although numerous institutions in Mamluk Egypt and Syria offered stipendiary positions (*manṣib*) to scholars from all over the Islamicate world,[8] competition for the scholarly and bureaucratic *manṣib*s was an essential feature of the period, and this competition was not independent from the political struggles.[9] The competitiveness of the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Mamluk scholarly environment was undoubtedly related to economic crises and their possible impact on the availability of jobs at the *madrasa*s and in the bureaucracy.[10]

As will be seen in his biography below, al-Malaṭī pursued neither a bureaucratic nor a judicial career. However, his father Khalīl b. Shāhin was a very influential bureaucrat and diplomat for the Mamluk sultans. Thanks to his father, al-Malaṭī had a comprehensive knowledge of chancellery and the political cultures of the surrounding Islamic states. Under no circumstance does our scholar express a desire to join bureaucracy, but he fiercely criticizes it, constantly trying to promote his network both inside and outside Mamluk domains.[11] These characteristics of the *Majmaʿ* and al-Malaṭī's other works suggest that al-Malaṭī may have wanted to secure a position in either the scholarly or non-scholarly hierarchy. Meeting a Rūmī merchant in Tripoli and a Jewish physician in al-Andalus might have been symbols of social status in the late Mamluk context. Writing about an Ottoman princess or statesman can be understood as the author's attempt to show the boundaries of his network in a geography that aroused special interest in Mamluk Cairo.

Aside from sharing his personal opinion about his subjects, the author prefers to inject himself into the biographies whenever possible. Dwight Reynolds suggests that "beginning in the late fifteenth century, Arabic autobiographers become more

---

[8]For a comprehensive analysis of the institutions that offer stipendiary positions in the early Mamluk period, see (Midilli 2020).

[9]Michael Chamberlain's book on medieval Damascus discusses the availability of jobs in the Mamluk *madrasa*s and the competitiveness of *manṣib*s. He demonstrates that, already in the beginnings of the fourteenth century, which al-Malaṭī describes as a golden age, the *madrasa*s were highly competitive places where the sultan, governors, households of *amīr*s constantly intervened for their political interests (Chamberlain 1994, 92-93, 106). The bureaucracy was also very competitive, which can be illustrated by the ups and downs of al-Malaṭī's own father Khalīl's bureaucratic career.

[10]I have not come across a study of the relation between financial crises and *manṣib*s in the late Mamluk period. However, al-Malaṭī drops several references to the devaluation of the currency. See (Al-Malaṭī 2014 3: 120) and (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 141). More importantly, he also mentions that his shyakh Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyajī had a hard time funding the residents of the *khānkāh* of *Shaykhūniyya* (Al-Malaṭī 2014 4: 209). Wan Kamal Wujani uses the *Rawḍ* and the *Nayl* to shed light on late Mamluk economics in his dissertation about the economic decline in the late Mamluk period. The author shows that al-Malaṭī offers valuable information about the prices and the influence of natural disasters such as the plague or the floods of the Nile on the economy (Kemal Mujani 2006, 16-18). For a general evaluation of al-Malaṭī's works in terms of economic history, see (Mujani 2013).

[11]In this thesis, we will revisit his critiques as far as they are relevant for our discussion.

and more concerned with the careful framing of their texts, the articulation of their motivations, and defending themselves from potential charges of vanity, falsification, and innovation." (Richardson 2016, 29).[12] Indeed, modern studies have observed an increase in egodocuments in the late Mamluk period.[13] Al-Malaṭī's contemporary polymath, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī's (d. 911/1505) autobiography *al-Taḥadduth bi niʿmat Allah* is the best known first person narrative of this age.[14] Although none of al-Malaṭī's works falls into the genre of autobiography, I believe that al-Malaṭī's style and motivations have parallel features to the tendency that Reynolds describes. Throughout his works, al-Malaṭī provides many occasions in the first person singular.

Al-Malaṭī was not alone to supplement biographical writing with autobiographical information and his own personal opinions. His bitter hostility towards the famous Mamluk historian Jamāl al-Dīn b. Taghrībirdī (d. 874/1470) likely comes from Ibn Taghrībirdī's personal opinions about the persons whom al-Malaṭī or his father had met.[15] Al-Malaṭī accuses Ibn Taghrībirdī of distorting or exaggerating the facts on more than fifteen occasions. While doing this, al-Malaṭī takes direct quotations from Ibn Taghrībirdī, and compares his writings with that of al-Maqrīzī and Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī, in order to falsify Ibn Taghrībirdī (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 32). Most cases when al-Malaṭī offers his father's and his own perspective as opposed to that of Ibn Taghrībirdī are unsurprisingly political ones, such as anecdotes about the lives of bureaucrats, the images of sultans and discussions held at the court. This is another example supporting the assumption that the *Majmaʿ* and al-Malaṭī's other works are not mere compilations, but also reflect the politics of self-representation.[16]

The *Majmaʿ* exists in a unique 260-folio manuscript in Alexandria, which serves as the basis for its edition.[17] The manuscript has 33 lines to a page. The first biographical entry is that of Abān al-Makkī; the last one that of Jānibeg min Ṭaṭakh al-Ẓāhirī. The rest of the letter *jīm* and the following letters are missing. The incipit page has two ownership statements: Walī al-Niʿam al-Ḥaj Ibrāhīm b. ʿAskar and

---

[12]Kristina Richardson makes a similar point in her article about the evolution of the biographies of two Ḥanbalī judges in the fifteenth century. See (Richardson 2016)

[13]For an overview of the literature and the primary sources on this issue, see (Frenkel 2018, 11-14). Frenkel also introduces Ibn al-Ḥimṣī's personal accounts in his chronicle (Frenkel 2018, 12). Aḥmad Ibn Ṭawq's (d. 914/1509) diary was extensively studied by Tosten Wollina (Wollina, 2014). Lastly, Li Guo's studies on al-Biqāʿī's chronicle shed light on the history of egodocuments in the late Mamluk period. See (Guo 2000) and (Guo 2005). All the three historical names are near contemporaries of al-Malaṭī.

[14]For Elizabeth Mary Sartain's dissertation on Jalal Al-Dīn Al-Suyuṭī's work, see (Sartain 1975).

[15]There was also hostility between Ibn Taghrībirdī and al-Malaṭī's father. (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 91)

[16]Criticism in the late Mamluk historical writing is another big issue. For example, al-Malaṭī criticizes one of his most respected Ibn Ḥajar, too. (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 32)

[17]For the manuscript, see (Alexandria B800). It was edited by ʿAbd al-Allah Muḥammad al-Kandarī. See (Al-Malaṭī 2011).

Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī.[18]

Whether the author completed the work is open to debate. In the *muqaddima*, he claims to cover all the letters of the Arabic alphabet, but this might only reflect his intention. There is quite a number of references to the letters after *jīm*, saying that the biography of those people will come in their place. However, almost all these sentences are accompanied with the phrase *in shāʾa llāh* (if God wills). The front page includes a sentence, saying this volume is one of the four volumes. Although the script of this sentence differs from that of the text, and the other volumes are missing, it is plausible that the original work was longer.

In the *muqaddima*, al-Malaṭī clearly states that he started writing the work in the early days of Jumādā al-Ūlā 889 H. (1484), but we do not know when or whether he completed it. The colophon of the available volume does not give the date after saying that "It is completed" (*tamma bi ḥamd Allāh*). Given that the author occasionally revised his text, the latest death date, 903 H. (1497-98) he mentions might give us an idea. However, a biographical entry that refers to the execution of the Ottoman Grand Vizier Ḳoca Muṣṭafā Pasha (d. 918/1512) suggests that the author did not stop writing in 1498 (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 492). As discussed in the previous part, it is also possible that the author kept updating the content until his death in 1514. We should also note that although he was alive during the reign of the Ottoman sultan Selīm I (r. 1512-1520), al-Malaṭī did not go back and add Bāyezīd II's date of death.

ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad al-Kandarī claims in his introduction to the edition that the manuscript belongs to the author. A careful examination of the whole text in its entirety including the notes on the margins might confirm the idea. However, it is challenging to identify al-Malaṭī's handwriting. No name is mentioned in the colophon. Moreover, the script of the colophon and the rest of the text differ from each other. Also, his name is rarely mentioned in his other works, either, the manuscript copies of which were penned in significantly different scripts. The colophon of the *Rawḍ* suggests that at least one volume of the work was executed by the author. There is also a significant similarity between the script of the *Rawḍ*, kept in the Vatican library, and that of al-Malaṭī's work on medicine, the *Sharḥ qānuncha*, which exists in the Beyazıt Library.

It should be noted that this biographical dictionary and al-Malaṭī's historical work, the *Rawḍ*, were also intended to be studied at the *madrasa* and *khānkāh*s. Although

---

[18]Though I am unable to confirm who the first owner was, the latter one has a potential to shed light on the influence and the later audience of the text. Al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1791) was an influential eighteenth-century Indian scholar who ended up in Cairo in the latter half of the century, and is best known for his great dictionary *Tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs.* For al-Zabīdī's biography, see (Durmuş 2013).

they are both full of personal anecdotes that we might today deem unsuitable for a curriculum, al-Malaṭī reveals his intention to have his works used for instruction on several occasions. For instance, in the biography of one of his pupils, Ismāʿīl b. Ḥasan al-Rūmī, al-Malaṭī states that Ismāʿīl completed the reading of the *Majmaʿ* with him.[19] In addition, at the beginning of the *Rawḍ*, the author explains that he used a red pen in the marginalia as a study aid for students.[20]

Most of the people whose biographies are given in the *Majmaʿ* are from Egypt and the Maghreb, particularly Tripoli, Tlemcen, Fes and Constantine. They are followed by people from Rūm, the Levant and al-Andalus. This distribution might be misleading because of the abundance of Turco-Circassian names in the available letters: *alif, bā,* and *jīm*.[21] Nevertheless, since the *Majmaʿ* was based on the *Rawḍ*, it is likely that the dominance of Cairo and the Maghreb does not change in the rest of the work. One interesting thing is that al-Malaṭī, unlike al-Sakhāwī's *Ḍawʿ*, does not separate the biographies of the fifteen women he covers; instead, he places them among the others in alphabetical order.[22]

In addition to the Ottoman domains and Mamluk lands, the *Majmaʿ* is a valuable primary source for the social, political, and intellectual history of the Maghreb, Tripoli, and Muslim Spain. It is also a fresh source on non-Ottoman Rumelia and today's eastern Anatolia, as well as Qarāmānid, Dhu'l-Qadrid and Aqquyunlū polities.

---

[19] The statement the author makes is "*Akmala al-Majmaʿ ʿalayya*". See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 543). The *Majmaʿ* and the *Rawḍ* introduce eighteen pupils of al-Malaṭī. Apparently, he trained students mostly in Ḥanafī jurisprudence, medicine, and Arabic philology. The most common works that these students studied with al-Malaṭī (*qaraʾa ʿalayya* in the author's terms) are the followings: *al-Hidāya* of Burhān al-Dīn al-Marghinānī (d. 593/1197), and *al-Mukhtaṣar* of Aḥmad al-Qudūrī (d. 428/1037) in Ḥanafī jurisprudence, *al-Qanūn fī al-ṭibb* of Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037) and his own *Sharh qānuncha* in medicine, and *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī* of Ibn al-Ḥarīrī (d. 443/1052) in Arabic literature. (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 65-67)

[20] It is extremely noteworthy that some biographical dictionaries were circulating in Mamluk cities through public reading sessions. Donald P. Little's study on al-Ṣafadī's (d. 764/1363) *al-Wāfī bi al-wafayāt* shows that public readings of Mamluk biographical dictionaries was taking place already in the late fourteenth century (Little 1976). Although we do not have evidence for the public readings of the *Majmaʿ*, we can suggest that the existence of ordinary characters in the dictionary can be related to the demands of the public audience in Cairo. For a more nuanced analysis on the popular reading sessions, see (Hirschler 2013, 22-27).

[21] Arkmās, Uzbak, Ākbardī, Āltunboghā, Taghrībirdī, Jānibeg are some of the most common names mentioned in the dictionary.

[22] For the purposes of the thesis, the most important female character of the work is the Ottoman princess İlaldı. She is mentioned *as Āl Alzī Khātūn ukht Murād b. Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān al-Khātūn al-Kubrā Zawjat al-Amīr Ibrāhīm Qaramān wa ʿAmmat al-Sulṭān Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān*. There is no detailed information about her in the *Majmaʿ* except the names of her children. (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 562). Çağatay Uluçay notes that İlaldı, Ibrāhīm b. Qaramān's wife, was the daughter of Meḥmed I, not Murād II (Uluçay 2011, 30). For a meticulous analysis on the role of women in the Mamluk intellectual life and their place in the biographical dictionaries, see (Kaya 2019).

2.1.2 *Nayl al-amal fī zayl al-duwal* (*Achieving the hope in the sequel to the States*)

The *Nayl* is the most frequently used work in the limited studies referring to al-Malaṭī.[23] Running to 704 folios in length in two volumes, it is al-Malaṭī's largest work; like several of his other works, it also survives in a unique copy.[24] The author presents the *Nayl* as a *zayl* (sequel or supplement) to the *Kitāb duwal al-Islām* by the famous hadith scholar al-Shams al-Dīn Dhahabī (d. 748/1348).[25] The work covers the period between 744 and 896 H. (1343/44-1490/91). The author lists the important events chronologically from his own perspective. The obituaries (*wafayāt*) of celebrities are not placed together as a separate section at the end of the years; instead, they can be found among other events in chronological order.[26] The obituaries also give short biographies of the subjects.

Al-Malaṭī does not clarify why he chose al-Dhahabī's work to write his sequel, except for stating that noble people and scholars requested him to do so.[27] He describes the period of the Baḥrī Mamluks in the previous century as a golden age. He might have intended to compare that period with his own time by using al-Dhahabī's work as a point of departure. Since the title of the work includes the word *duwal* (states), al-Malaṭī might have considered it his duty to exhibit his vast knowledge about the polities of western Islamdom. Parallel to this, he implies that the focus of the work will be the *duwal*. Despite this intention, the *Nayl* contains detailed information about everyday life in fifteenth-century Egypt. The author records events, rumors, suicides of ordinary people in Cairo. One of the most frequent themes in the work is marvelous and wonderous events (*ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib*). We even come across various people's dreams recorded in the *Nayl*. The subjects of *ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib* are the bureaucratic elite, ordinary people of Cairo, and sometimes the Ottoman sultan, as was seen in the example given in the introduction, where Bāyezīd II is rumored to

---

[23] The works that refer to the *Nayl* are (Mujani 2013), (Frenkel 2018), (Massoud 2005), (Kemal Mujani 2006), (Yosef 2017). Khalid al-Wahaibi has an M. Litt. Thesis about the contribution of al-Malaṭī to Mamluk historiography. The thesis also provides a critical edition of some parts of the *Nayl*. See (Wahaibi 1992).

[24] For the manuscript, see (Bodleian 285)

[25] Yehoshua Frankel claims that many Mamluk authors presented their text as a continuum of a previous of a prestigious book produced earlier. However, the term *zayl* is misleading. The authors used primary texts as points of departure to their original style and content. See (Frankel 2018, 25)

[26] According to Fatih Yahya Ayaz, decreasing the role of the *wafayāt* sections started with al-Maqrīzī. See (Ayaz 2020, 158).

[27] Konrad Hirschler states that al-Dhahabī is among the earliest examples that told the story of non-scholarly individuals. This might play a role in al-Malaṭī's choice. See (Hirschler 2013, 163)

have dead by a soldier and his family.[28]

The *Nayl* plays a crucial role for the present study, since to a certain extent it makes up for what the *Majmaʿ* misses about the Ottomans. The Ottoman sultans Murād II and Meḥmed II, as well as Prince Cem (d. 900/1495), whose biographies were promised in the *Majmaʿ*, appear in the *Nayl* together with Ottoman grand viziers, envoys, and war captives. Al-Malaṭī was an eyewitness to Cem's visit to Egypt, although we do not have evidence that he personally met him. The *Nayl* has 130 references to the Ottoman dynasty and characters affiliated with it. Many of these references are unique. The editor al-Tadmurī notes that he could not find these references in any other contemporary source.[29] Some of them will be discussed in the last chapter of this thesis about the image of Ottoman patronage in Mamluk Egypt. As for the rest of the work, noteworthy is the abundance of rumors regarding the deaths of Meḥmed II and Bāyezīd II, and Ottoman interventions to Egypt.

Al-Malaṭī frequently narrates *ishāʿāt* (rumors) and *arājīf* (fake news) about the Ottomans. These rumors belong to the reign of Meḥmed II on the one hand, when Mamluk-Ottoman relations started to deteriorate, and the reign of Bāyezīd II on the other hand, when these relations intensified. It was rumored three times that Meḥmed II died (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 5: 458). The third rumor was true. Al-Malaṭī says that he waited for a while to confirm the news. Although Meḥmed II's last campaign is a controversial issue in Ottoman historiography, some Mamluk-based scholars, including al-Malaṭī, are certain about the issue.[30] He is pretty sure that Meḥmed II died when he was on his way to attack Egypt.[31]

Bāyezīd II is also rumored twice to have been dead (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 182-189). In the midst of the long-lasting military struggle between the Mamluks and the Ottomans (1485-1491), al-Malaṭī records rumors about the Ottoman campaigns that were led by Bāyezīd himself on three different occasions (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 420, 8: 55, 317). The Mamluk scholar even says that Bāyezīd crossed the Bosporus

---

[28]According to Ulrich Haarmann, *ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib* were entertaining elements and were an outcome of the "literarization and popularization" of Mamluk historiography. He suggests that chronicle-writing extended from the *ʿulamāʾ* to the "lower" classes, such as soldiers in the Mamluk period. For a summary of Haarmans's views, see (Guo 1997, 33). This discussion lies beyond the scope of the present thesis. However, we should note that al-Malaṭī urges us to be cautious about drawing boundaries between the *ʿulamāʾ* and the public. He also shows that *ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib* were essential parts of the worldview of not only the common people, but also the sultans. Nevertheless, Haarman's ideas on *ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib* are still helpful to conceptualize al-Malaṭī's environment.

[29]Some others are only available in the works of the later generation Ibn Iyās and Ibn al-Ḥimṣī who might have taken the information from al-Malaṭī. For example, Ibn Iyās in his *Badāʾiʿ* refers to al-Malaṭī regarding the events between 1493 and 1505. (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 56)

[30]For a discussion of the last campaign, see (Erdem 2017)

[31]Al-Sakhāwī also in his *Wajīz al-kalām fī al-zayl ʿalā duwal al-Islām* states that Meḥmed II's last campaign was against the Mamluks (Al-Sakhāwī 1995, 927).

(al-$khal\bar{\imath}j$ al-$qus\d{t}ant\bar{\imath}n\bar{\imath}$) with his army (Al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath} 2002, 8: 317).[32] Even if these rumors were wrong or only partially true, how and why they were circulating in Cairo are important questions.[33] Another interesting point in the *Nayl* is that it reflects how the Mamluk sultan Q\bar{a}yitb\bar{a}y (r. 1468-1496) was concerned about a possible Ottoman campaign led by B\bar{a}yez\bar{\imath}d. According to al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath}, the rumors about the campaign led to great panic through Cairo and the court.

2.1.3 *Al-Raw\d{d} al-b\bar{a}sim f\bar{\imath} \d{h}aw\bar{a}dith al-ʿumr wa al-tar\bar{a}j\bar{\imath}m (Gardens smiling upon events of lifetimes and life stories)*

Beginning with the year 844 H. (1440/41), when the author was born, and ending with 874 H. (1469/70), the *Raw\d{d} al-b\bar{a}sim* focuses on the Muslim dynasties in the Mediterranean basin and narrates the author's travels to North Africa and Granada.[34] It also survives in a unique manuscript, divided into four volumes. The first volume was copied by one Jam\bar{a}l al-D\bar{\imath}n b. Shuhna al-Th\bar{a}lith,[35] while the rest of the manuscript was handwritten by the author himself (Al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath} 2014, 1: 81). Based on the two occasions in the *Nayl* where al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath} says that in his *Raw\d{d}* he further elaborates on the Mamluk-Ottoman conflict during the reign of B\bar{a}yez\bar{\imath}d II in the *Raw\d{d}*, we can conclude that the later parts regarding the post-1469 period are missing (Al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath} 2002, 5: 458, 8: 18). There is a colophon stating that the work was completed by its author. The language of the colophon suggests that it was penned by al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath}.

The work lists political events and anecdotes about the author and his family chronologically. On some occasions, our scholar uses the *Raw\d{d}* as a diary by narrating the events on a day-to-day basis. For instance, when narrating the death of his five-year old daughter, ʿĀʾisha, on a Thursday night in Ramadan of 893 H. (1487), the author relates in detail how he had educated his daughter, how he had taught her to write

---

[32] The Ottoman sources also mention that B\bar{a}yez\bar{\imath}d was planning to cross to Üsküdar and launch a campaign; however, he was persuaded not to do so in a council held in Beşiktaş. See (Muslu 2014, 145)

[33] Torsten Wollina contextualizes the news and rumors circulating in Mamluk Damascus based on the account of the court clerk A\d{h}mad b. \d{T}awq (d. 914/1509). Like al-Mala\d{t}\bar{\imath}'s rumors, Ibn \d{T}awq also mentions the struggle between B\bar{a}yez\bar{\imath}d and Cem in his accounts. See (Wollina 2014).

[34] The incipit page of the first volume carries the title "*al-Taw\bar{a}r\bar{\imath}kh al-mul\bar{u}kiyya f\bar{\imath} \d{h}aw\bar{a}dith al-zam\bar{a}niyya*". See (Vatican 728-729).

[35] I could not find an information about Jam\bar{a}l al-D\bar{\imath}n b. Shuhna al-Th\bar{a}lith.

and how he fell ill from sadness about ʿĀʾisha's loss. Hence, just like the *Majmaʿ*, the *Rawḍ* is also a valuable source for the greatly neglected history of emotions in fifteenth-century Muslim world.

The work describes many North African cities and their elite residents, with a lot of original information about the histories of the Maghreb and al-Andalus (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 85). Despite its highly distinctive style in devoting a large space to the world outside the Mamluk domains, the author states in the introduction that the *Rawḍ* is intended to be a historical piece similar to "the great historians'" works such as al-Badr al-ʿAynī's *ʿIqd al-jumān*, Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* and al-Maqrīzī's *al-Sulūk li maʿrifat duwal al-mulūk*, which al-Malaṭī references in his work (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 148).

The Ottoman history as covered in the existing parts of the *Rawḍ* corresponds to the reign of Murād II and some of the reign of Meḥmed II. The most astonishing anecdote about the Ottomans is al-Malaṭī's four-page account on the battle of Kosovo in 1448 (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 323). The *Rawḍ* is the only Mamluk source that refers to the battle. After reporting the arrival of the war captives sent by Murād II as a gift to the Mamluk sultan in 849 H. (1449), the author provides an exceptionally elaborate description of the battle. The fact that the story of the battle is romanticized and embellished with Quranic verses and descriptions of miraculous events suggest that it was copied from or at least modeled on the letter that the Ottoman envoy announced at the Mamluk court. This part ends with the author's statement, "Those who witnessed this event informed me of most of what I have mentioned here. Among them are those whom I trust." (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 324). Given the context, the word *event* in the sentence most probably refers to the battle rather than the arrival of the captives. Since al-Malaṭī was born in 1444, it is unlikely that he was personally in touch with participants of the battle. These sentences might be based on the accounts of his father, who was active at the court. Throughout the text, there are many direct quotations from his father, whom he invokes with the phrase *bi-khaṭṭ al-wālid* (from the father's writings). In the *Rawḍ*, we see al-Malaṭī being more sensitive to the bureaucratic and diplomatic tradition than he is in the *Nayl* and the *Majmaʿ*, which might be explained by his father's influence. For example, he carries out an in-depth analysis of Dhu'l-Qadr Beg Shāh Suwār's (d. 876/1472) letter to the Mamlūk sultan. Al-Malaṭī explains that the letter breached diplomatic etiquette by elaborating on the places of the Quranic verses on the page and the pen used in the letter (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 4: 37).

2.1.4 Al-Malaṭī's Other Works

Some of al-Malaṭī's works are preserved in a compendium titled *Majmaʿ al-bustān al-nawrī li ḥaḍrat mawlānā sulṭān al-ghawrī*.[36] I will start by introducing the compendium and the treatises that it contains. Then I will briefly mention the rest of his works.

***Majmaʿ al-bustān al-nawrī li ḥaḍrat mawlānā sulṭān al-ghawrī* (Anthology of the enlightened arbor presented to our lord Sultan al-Ghawrī):**[37] This is a short freestanding treatise, placed at the beginning of the compendium, also serving as an introduction to the rest of the work; its heading is also a generic title for the entire compendium. Al-Malaṭī uses the word *daftar* to define the collection. At the end of the first treatise, the author says that the compendium includes fourteen books (*kitāb*) without mentioning the *Majmaʿ al-bustān* among them. The anthology ends with a selection of al-Malaṭī's poems, one of which is in Turkish (Ayasofya 4793, 211). The author also provides the contexts in which the poems were composed.

The manuscript is well decorated in the Mamluk style. The script differs appreciably from al-Malaṭī's handwriting in the *Rawḍ*. He might have employed a professional scribe to pen the work to be presented to the sultan. The codicological features of the manuscript and the fact that the work was presented to Mamluk sultan Qansawh al-Ghawrī (r. 1501-1516) suggest that it might have been taken from the Mamluk royal palace to Istanbul after the conquest of Egypt in 1517.[38] As to its date of completion, given that the author defines Selīm I (Sālim Shāh) as the king of Rūm of the present time, it must have been written between Selīm's enthronement in 1512 and the author's death in 1514. The first pages of the *Majmaʿ al-bustān* confirms this idea by providing a detailed account of al-Malaṭī's severe illness that most probably caused his death (Ayasofya 4793, 11). Our scholar is grateful to al-Ghawrī and the sultan's nephew Tūmān Bāy (d. 922/1517), who would later become the last Mamluk sultan, for their interest and patronage during his illness.

It is clear that al-Malaṭī collected his relatively short works and presented them

---

[36]For the manuscript, see (Ayasofya 4793). For a discussion of this work, see (Mauder, 2015).

[37]Translation of the title belongs to Carl Petry. See (Petry 1993, 335).

[38]For a comment on the books transferred from the royal palace in Cairo to İstanbul, see (Erünsal 2008, 131). Gülru Necipoğlu refers to a document at the Topkapı Palace archives that gives the number of the books in al-Ghawrī's mosque in Cairo. See (Necipoğlu 2019, 69).

to al-Ghawrī, hoping to receive his patronage. The *Majmaʿ al-bustān* praises al-Ghawrī as a great king and protector of scholars. Throughout the text, al-Ghawrī is represented as a mediator among kings.[39] In this regard, al-Malaṭī also mentions the Ottoman prince Ḳorḳūd's (d. 919/1513) presence at the court.[40] According to the author, al-Ghawrī negotiated a peace between Ḳorḳūd and his father Bāyezīd II. Al-Malaṭī also mentions the arrival of the two sons of Prince Aḥmed (d. 919/1513), another son of Bāyezīd, referring to Aḥmed as sultan.[41]

The other works included in the *daftar* are the following: *Al-nafḥa al-fāʾiḥa fī tafsīr sūrat al-fātiḥa*,[42] *al-Qawl al-khāṣṣ fī tafsīr sūrat al-ikhlāṣ*,[43] *Ghāyat al-sūl fī sīrat al-rasūl*,[44] *al-Qawl al-ḥazm fī al-kalām ʿalā al-anbiyāʾ ʾūlā al-ʿazm*,[45] *al-Rawḍat al-murbiʿa fī sīrat al-khulafāʾ al-arbaʿa*,[46] *Nuzhat al-asāṭīn fī man waliya mulk miṣr min al-salāṭīn*,[47] *al-Sirr wa al-ḥikma fī kawn khams ṣalawāt*,[48] *Nuzhat al-albāb fī mukhtaṣar aʿjab al-ʿujāb*,[49] *al-Adhkār al-muhimmāt fī al-mawādiʿa wa al-awqāt*,[50] *al-*

----

[39] Christopher Markiewicz meticulously discuss al-Ghawrī's patronage and image making as a mediator among kings (Markiewicz 2019, 106-110).

[40] Ḳorḳūd renounced his right to the throne in 1509 and went to Mecca claiming that he would devote himself to scholarly activities. The Mamluk sultan offered a place of residence of him in Cairo. The prince became a subject of diplomacy between the two sovereigns. For an analysis on Ḳorḳūd and his scholarly identity, see (Al-Tikriti 2005). For Ḳorḳūd's role in the fight for the Ottoman throne, see (Çıpa 2017, 29-61).

[41] Aḥmed who never became the sultan is famous for his struggle with Selīm I for the throne. For a detailed account on Aḥmed, see (Çıpa 2017). Al-Malaṭī gives Aḥmed's biography in the *Majmaʿ* and refers to him as "*al-amīr shams al-Dīn*" (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 237). It is possible that al-Malaṭī's life corresponds to a period when Aḥmed's image in Cairo was quite powerful. Al-Malaṭī does not mention the names of Aḥmed's sons in *Majmaʿ al-bustān*.

[42] A short commentary on exegesis of the Quranic surah *al-Fātiḥa*. It is mentioned in Bağdatlı İsmail Pasha's *Hadiyyat al-ʿĀrifīn*. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 493).

[43] A short commentary on exegesis of the Quranic surah *al-Ikhlāṣ*. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 493).

[44] A biography (*sīra*) of the prophet Muḥammad. In addition to the Ayasofya version inside *Majmaʿ al-bustān*, it has a copy in the Topkapı Palace Library (Ahmed III 527). For its edition, see (Al-Malaṭī 1988).

[45] A history of the prophets. It is mentioned in *Hadiyyat al-ʿĀrifīn*. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 194).

[46] It is a history of the first four caliphs of Islam. It is also the longest work in *Majmaʿ al-bustān*. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[47] This is another historical piece by al-Malaṭī. The work is a summary history of the rulers of Egypt from the reign of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. Ayyūb (1171-1193) to the reign of Qanṣawh al-Ghawrī. In addition to the Ayasofya version inside *Majmaʿ al-bustān*, three other copies exist: one in the Topkapı Palace Library (Topkapı 6038 A), one in the Süleymaniye Library (Laleli 2044/1), another in the Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library in Petna, India (Khuda Bakhsh 2322). It is likely that the Khuda Bakhsh copy went to India from the Ottoman lands since the copy presents the last ruler of Egypt as Selīm I. I do not believe this statement necessitates revising the date of death of al-Malaṭī, since a comparison of the existing copies suggests that the rule of Selīm I is a later addition to the original text.

[48] A treatise on the virtues of the five daily prayers. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[49] It is a translation of some parts of Maḥmūd b. Qādi Manyās' *Aʿjab al-ʿajāʾib* which is a compilation of matters of religious law, mathematical calculations and occultism. A chapter of the original work is considered the first arithmetic's work in the Ottoman lands (Özkan 2003). Al-Malaṭī's version focuses on the virtues of the Quranic surahs. It is mentioned in *Hadiyyat al-ʿĀrifīn*. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[50] A short work on the proper times for various *dhikr*s (the act of reminding and oral mention of God). See (Ismail 1951, 1: 494).

Qawl al-mashūd fī tarjīḥ tasahhud Ibn Masʿūd,[51] *al-Manfaʿat fī sirr kawn al-wudūʾ makhṣūṣan bi al-aʿḍāʾ al-arbaʿa*,[52] *al-Zuhr al-maqtūf fī makhārij al-ḥurūf*,[53] *Najm al-shukr*, *al-Wuṣlat fī masʾalat qibla*.[54]

His other works include *Sharh qānuncha*,[55] *al-Qawl al-maʾnūs fī ḥāshiyat al-qāmūs al-muḥīṭ wa al-qābūs al-wasīṭ al-jāmiʿ li mā dhahaba min kalām al-ʿarab shamāṭīṭ*,[56] *Risāla ʿalā awwal sharh al-kāfiyya*,[57] *al-Durar al-wasīm fī tawshīḥ tatmīm al-takrīm fī taḥrīm al-ḥashīsh wa waṣfihi al-dhamīm*,[58] *Ghabṭat al-ikhwān fī al-taḥdhīr khulṭat al-sulṭān*.[59]

In the case of a neglected scholar like al-Malaṭī, it is quite possible that some of his works are still waiting to be discovered. For instance, the editor of the *Rawḍ*, ʿUmar al-Tadmurī notes that al-Malaṭī also has a work titled *Taʿlīq ʿalā dhihāb nāmūs mulk Miṣr bi dhihāb al-qawāʿid al-mulūkiyya* (Comment on the disappearance of the code of the domains of Egypt with the removal of the royal law), referring to the manuscript (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 75). In the relevant part of the edition, we see that al-Malaṭī makes a very similar sentence to the title of the work (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 3: 47). However, the author does not mention that he wrote something about the issue. Indeed, the title of the possibly existing work is quite assertive and highly critical of Mamluk rule, as is the sentence mentioned above. The context of the relevant part in the *Rawḍ* is closely related to the purposes of the present thesis. I will discuss the sentence and the context in the last chapter.

---

[51] A treatise on an essential element of Muslim prayer. The issue has been highly controversial between the Ḥanafī and Shāfiʿī jurists in Islamic history. The work is mentioned in *Hadiyyat al-ʿĀrifīn*. See (Ismail 1951, 1: 494).

[52] A short work on *al-wudūʿ* (ritual ablution). See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[53] A treatise on the pronunciation of letters for recitation of the Quran. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[54] A guidebook for determining the direction of the qibla. See (Ismail, 1951 1: 494).

[55] It is al-Malaṭī's prominent work in medicine. The work is a commentary on the thirteenth-century physician and astronomer Maḥmūd al-Chaghmīnī's (d. 617/1221) *Qānuncha*. The manuscript of the work exists in the Beyazıt Library. See (Veliyüddin 2510).

[56] *Al-Qawl al-maʾnūs* is a commentary on the Persian lexicographer al-Fīrūzābādī's (d. 817/1415) famous Arabic dictionary *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*. See (Kātip Çelebi 1971, 2: 1308).

[57] It is a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥajīb's (d. 646/1249) grammar work, *al-Kāfiya*. The work exists in a unique manuscript in Damascus. See (Al-Ẓāhiriyya, 207).

[58] I could not find an information about the content of *al-Durar al-wasīm*. It is seemingly a treatise on opium in Islamic law. See (Kātip Çelebi 1971, 1: 470).

[59] There is no information about *Ghabṭat al-ikhwān* in the sources. Its title suggest that it might be a treatise about the proper relationship between the sultan and scholars. Moreover, the work might reflect al-Malaṭī's personal experience at the court. It exists in a unique manuscript in Damascus. See (Al-Ẓāhiriyya, 23627).

2.2 Al-Malaṭī and His Environment

Contemporary sources refer to the author as ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ b. Khalīl b. Shāhīn al-Shaykhī al-Ṣafawī al-Malaṭī al-Qāhirī al-Ḥanafī.[60] He was born in Rajab 844/1440 in Malatya where his father Khalīl b. Shāhīn al-Ẓāhirī was the provincial governor (*nāʾib*). The name of his mother is Shukurbāy, and her ethnic origin is unknown. His father and grandfather are known by different *nisba*s because of their different birthplaces and military affiliations. Although the origin of the family cannot be traced, it is understood that the family was of Mamlūk descent. Some of his family members achieved brilliant administrative careers under the Mamluk sultans Barqūq (r. 1382-1399), Barsbāy (r. 1422-1438) and Jaqmaq (r. 1438-1453), al-Ashraf Aynāl (r. 1453-1461) and Khushqadam (r. 1461-1467) (J. Gaulmier and T. Fahd, 2012).

The only near contemporary sources that contain al-Malaṭī's biography are al-Sakhāwī's *Ḍawʾ* and Ibn Iyās' *Badāʾiʿ*. While al-Sakhāwī's version focuses on al-Malaṭī's training and scholarly life as it will be pointed out below, Ibn Iyās sheds more light on his social status. Ibn Iyās, whose *Badāʾiʿ* is the most frequently addressed text by the historians of the Ottoman conquest of Egypt, was a pupil of al-Malaṭī. According to Ibn Iyās, al-Malaṭī was an expert on Ḥanafī jurisprudence and medicine though he only studied language and philology with him.[61] Nevertheless, the works that he lists as the most prominent works of al-Malaṭī are the historical pieces the present thesis also focuses on.[62] Ibn Iyās also mentions al-Malaṭī's physical appearance.[63] One thing here is significant. We learn that al-Malaṭī had a fringe in his hair as an expression of his Sufi affiliation;[64] he was also able to speak Turkish and he was esteemed by members of the Turkish elite.

---

[60]The *nisba*s "al-Ṣafawī" and "al-Shaykhī" indicate that al-Malaṭī's grandfather Shāhīn was a *mamlūk* of Amīr al-Shaykh al-Ṣafawī. See (Al-Sakhāwī 1934, 3:195), and see (Ibn Iyās 1975, 3:25)

[61]Ibn Iyās says that he completed the reding of *al-Durra al-muḍiyya fī ʿilm al-ʿarabiyya* with al-Malaṭī (Ibn Iyās 1975, 62, 263).

[62]Ibn Iyās names the *Majmaʿ* as "alphabetical obituaries" (*al-wafayāt ʿalā ḥurūf al-muʿjam*) which, I believe, misses the primary function of the work. However, his impression is crucial to understand al-Malaṭī's legacy (Ibn Iyās 1975, 4: 374).

[63]Although his physical appearance is not important for the subject of the thesis, Ibn Iyās notes how al-Malaṭī's exceptionally big nose became a subject of friendly humor in both some contemporary poets' verses and al-Malaṭī's own poems; this is a good illustration of ways of communication in Mamluk literate circles in the fifteenth century (Ibn Iyās 1975, 4: 374).

[64]The only information I could find about attributing spiritual meaning to different parts of hair relates to the *Rifāʿiyya* (Caferov 2010). I will further discuss our scholar's Sufi affiliation below.

Because of its geopolitical position in the lands of Rūm, Malatya, the birthplace of al-Malaṭī, saw recurrent periods of political instability for several centuries.[65] The city was an area of conflict among the Mamluks, Ilkhanids, Timurids, and later, the Aqquyunlūs, together with the dynasties based in the lands of Rūm such as the Ottomans and the Dhu'l-Qadrids (Göğebakan 2003). The city also had a long history of *ghazā* (holy war) since it was a borderland between the Abbasid and the Byzantine empires in the eight and the nineth centuries (Göğebakan 2003).[66] Malatya maintained its vital role in diplomacy in the Mamluk-Dhu'l-Qadrid-Ottoman triangle up until the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517.[67] Since al-Malaṭī was born into this environment, the intricate political image of the region finds an echo in the *Majmaʿ*. The abundance of Ottoman, Aqquyunlū, Qaramanid and Dhu'l-Qadrid subjects in the dictionary is a result of al-Malaṭī's close relation to the region. He established this relation partially through his father's intricate network in the region. Therefore al-Malaṭī wrote about the region in a much more elaborate way than his contemporary Cairene biographers. Indeed, his whole corpus is a reflection of al-Malaṭī's personal network extending from Malatya to the Maghreb. For a better understanding of the image of the Ottoman domains in his works, we should have a closer look at our scholar's training and connections. His network in Rūm will be discussed under a separate subtitle at the beginning of the third chapter.

2.2.1 Al-Malaṭī's Training and the Geographical Scope of His Works

As to his educational background, al-Malaṭī was trained in multiple disciplines in a wide geography, including Cairo, Tripoli and the Maghrib (Al-Sakhāwī, 1934 4: 27). After the elementary training he received from his father, it was in *Bilād al-shām*, chiefly Aleppo and Damascus, that al-Malaṭī took the opportunity to study with a remarkably wide range of scholars. Among al-Malaṭī's mentors were prominent Ḥanafī scholars, such as Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Nuʿmānī and ʿAlāʾ al-Rūmī, the *qāḍī ʿaskar* (military judge) of Damascus (Al-Sakhāwī, 1934 4: 27). Based on his writings and

---

[65]For a summary of the political and military struggle in the region and the role of the Mamluks in the fourteenth century, see (Peacock 2019, 1-29). For the following century, see (Muslu 2014).

[66]This history of the city might partially explain al-Malaṭī's admiration for Ottoman campaigns in the Balkans.

[67]Malatya was the scene of some of the military confrontations between the Mamluks and the Ottomans, for instance, a battle in 1484. See (Muslu, 2014, 139).

al-Sakhāwī's account, it seems that al-Malaṭī studied medicine (*ṭibb*) mostly in the Maghrib.

Born to an affluent family, al-Malaṭī spent long years traveling to the major centers of the fifteenth-century western Islamicate world. His travels through North Africa extended to al-Andalus.[68] These journeys must be responsible for his inclusion of a significant number of anecdotes in his writings, especially in the *Rawḍ.* Nevertheless, he spent most of his life in Cairo, where he died in 920/1514.

After spending his childhood around Malatya, he moved with his father to Tripoli in today's Lebanon (*Ṭarāblus al-Shām*) in 1454. Here he was trained in jurisprudence, prose and *ta'bīr* (dream interpretation).[69] When he became seriously ill, he was cured by one Ibrāhīm Yūnus al-Ghirnaṭī, a physician from Granada. This might have been one of the motivations that led him later to study medicine in al-Andalus. During his childhood in Greater Syria, he also accompanied his father Khalīl to Mecca, when Khalīl was appointed as the *amīr al-ḥajj* (commander of the pilgrimage).

After spending some time in Cairo, al-Malaṭī resolved to travel to the Maghrib primarily to study medicine, planning to fund his journey through trade. He bought linen (*kattān*), later sold it to a Rūmī merchant in Tripoli, and in 1456 boarded a Genovese ship in Alexandria that set off to Rhodes and thence to Tripoli. On this ship, which carried Franks, Jews, and Muslims, al-Malaṭī witnessed a robbery and the execution of the robber.[70]

In Tunisia, he trained with Ibrāhīm al-Aḥḍarī and met scholars and merchants from al-Andalus. His notes shed light on his non-scholarly activities as well. On several occasions we see that he was impressed by the size of Genovese ships. One day, curiosity got the better of him and he boarded one of the ships at the port of Tripoli. He met a Turkish-speaking captive by the name of Mubārak from Khorasan and spoke with him in Turkish, and later saved him by paying his ransom. Mubārak accompanied al-Malaṭī until he turned back to Cairo, where he died of the plague. Al-Malaṭī learned a lot from him about Mongol rule in Central Asia.

After spending considerable time in Jerba, Constantine, Kairouan, Jazair and Tlimcen, in 1466 our scholar took another Genovese ship to Malaga. Aside from studying

---

[68]For al-Malaṭī's travels in al-Andalus see (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 116-118), and see (Alvarez de Morales Ruiz Matas, 2014)

[69]Al-Malaṭī commented on the intellectual environment in the city. He believed that the scholarly life in the region was gradually deteriorating. See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 733).

[70]Al-Malaṭī states that he observed the proceeding according to the "Frankish law" in this ship.

medicine with Mūsā al-Yahūdī (the Jew) in Muslim Spain, al-Malaṭī also appeared at the court of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Girnaṭī, the Nasrid ruler of Granada (r. 1464-82/1483-85). Abū al-Ḥasan asked him about Cairo, Greater Syria and Tlimcen. He also granted al-Malaṭī exemption from tax probably for the scholar's trade activities. Al-Malaṭī implies that he was aware of the political and financial decline of Muslim rule in Spain, but he does not elaborate on that.

He went back to Cairo following the same route. Cairo as the intellectual center of the western Islamicate world played the most crucial role in his training. Here, in addition to jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and *hadith*, he studied the Arabic language with the Crimean scholar Najm al-Dīn al-Qirimī and some of the rational sciences - logic (*manṭiq*) and theology (*kalām*) - with Yūnus al-Rūmī. Most importantly, he met his favorite shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Ḥanafī al-Kāfiyajī (d. 879/1474), the well-known Ḥanafī scholar of the fifteenth century, in Cairo, and accompanied him until the shaykh died. In Cairo, he spent most of his time in the *Shaykhūniyya* complex. We know less about the later periods of his life, as this part is missing from the *Rawḍ*.

As was seen, al-Malaṭī was active in the central and western regions of the Islamicate world. However, Timurid influence was also visible in the circles he frequented in these regions in the late fifteenth century. Except for several scholars with the *nisba* "al-Khurāsānī", "al-Shirāzī", "al-ʿAjamī" and "al-Hindī", most persons from the east whom he discussed were the major political figures of the region. The Timurid ruler Shāhrukh (r. 1405-1447) appears as an important figure of Mamluk politics in the *Nayl* and the *Rawḍ*, although he does not have a special vignette in the *Majmaʿ*. The governor of Transoxiana Ulūgh Beg (r. 1447-1449), the ruler of Khurasan Bābūr b. Bāy Sunqur (r. 1449-1457), the ruler of Herat Badīʿ al-zamān b. Ḥusayn Bayqara (r. 1506-1507) are the members of the Timurid dynasty mentioned in the *Majmaʿ*. Tūrān Shāh, the ruler of Hormuz, and the famous Bahmani vizier Maḥmūd Gāwān's son Aḥmad are two other prominent figures from the Persianate world in the *Majmaʿ*.

2.2.2 Al-Malaṭī's Father and the Family's Relation to Mamluk Rule

His father, Ghars al-Dīn Khalīl b. Shāhīn al-Shaykhī al-Ẓāhirī (d. 873/1468), who was a learned statesman, is very significant for our reconstruction of al-Malaṭī's biog-

raphy. Khalīl served in the Mamluk bureaucracy in several positions, such as *atabeg* and *nāʾib* of cities such as Alexandria, Malatya, and Jerusalem (Ibn Taghrībirdī 1984, 2: 58). In 1436-37 he served as *vizier* to Barsbāy,[71] who married him to the sister of one of his wives, this marriage greatly facilitating Khalīl's rise in the bureaucracy. In addition, Khalīl was sent as an envoy to Ūzūn Ḥasan, the sultan of the Aqquyunlū, in 1466-67 (Loiseau 2019). In the long biography of his father in the *Rawḍ*, al-Malaṭī states that several rulers, including Murād Beg b. ʿUthmān and Ibn Qaramān, exchanged letters with Khalīl (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 4: 136).[72] At the same time, he was a disciple of the famous Ashʿarī Hadith scholar Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī.[73] In this sense, he is a representative example of how fluid contemporary career tracks were.

The key concept that underlies this occupational complexity in Mamluk society is *awlād al-nās* ('sons of the people', i.e. 'descendants of Mamlūks'). Both al-Malaṭī and his father were members of this distinguished group, which consisted of the sons of the Mamlūk military elite, who were not supposed to follow their fathers' career paths, because nobility was non-hereditary, which means that, at least theoretically, only those who were born "infidel" and raised as slaves belonged to the Mamlūk upper class (Ayalon 2012). The *awlād al-nās* formed the upper stratum of the *ḥalqa*, the latter being the socially inferior group of the Mamlūks.[74] They were part of the military but could not attain the highest ranks. Since the *awlād al-nās* had a relatively good educational background compared to other members of the *ḥalqa*, some of them were able to become full-fledged members of scholarly circles.

Khalīl b. Shāhīn cannot be categorized solely as a soldier-bureaucrat when his writings are taken into consideration. The most famous works attributed to him are the *al-Ishārāt fī al-ʿilm al-ʿibārāt*, a book of dream interpretation, which suggests that the author might have had a Sufi affiliation, and the *Kashf al-mamālik wa bayān al-ṭarīq wa al-masālik*, which seems to be a geography book about Egypt and the adjacent regions, and includes a political treatise as well.[75] The genre of these two works indicates that Khalīl combined his scholarly background and chancellery

---

[71] Al-Malaṭī is called *Ibn Vazīr* in some sources. See (Kātip Çelebi 1971) and (Ismail 1951, 1:494)

[72] It is possible that the author exaggerates the diplomatic letters written by Khalīl on behalf of the Mamluk sultan.

[73] Al-Sakhāwi mentions the poems that Ibn Ḥajar and Khalīl wrote for each other. See (Al-Sakhāwī, 1934, 3: 196)

[74] Probably because of his proximity to Barsbāy, Khalīl was an exceptionally successful *walad al-nās* who came to be called *sulṭān awlād al-nās*. See (Loiseau 2019).

[75] For a detailed assessment of Khalīl b. Shāhīn and his *Zubdat Kashf al-mamālik*, see (Ayaz 2020, 156-160). Only an abridged version of the latter work, entitled *Zubdat Kashf al-mamālik*, has survived. See (Ibn Shāhīn al-Ẓāhirī 2011). For the edition of *al-ʿIshārāt fī ʿilm al-ʿibārāt*, see (Ibn Shāhīn al-Ẓāhirī 1993).

skills in his career. Apparently, Khalīl's career was marked by both bureaucratic and scholarly achievements.[76] In addition to his scholarly works, Khalīl served as a consultant for the inexperienced Mamluk sultans. For example, Khūshqadam asked him once about the difference between the terms *malik al-umarāʾ* (the viceroy of Syria) and *nāʾib* (a more common term for the Mamluk governors) (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 3: 21). On the other hand, as the fourth-generation member of a family of Mamlūk origin, al-Malaṭī was a historian, *faqīh* and physician, and he did not, or could not pursue a bureaucratic career.

Because of the blurred lines between military society and religious notables in the fifteenth century, we should stress the need for caution in the use of the term *ʿālim* (scholar) both for Khalīl and his son, al-Malaṭī. Mamluk biographical dictionaries meticulously distinguish between the terms *ʿālim, fāḍil* and *shaykh*, putting forward different layers of being a scholar. Al-Sakhāwī's *al-Ḍawʿ al-lāmiʿa* implies that Khalīl was not one of Ibn Ḥajar's ordinary pupils, as he narrates the poems that they wrote for each other; however, al-Sakhāwi does not use the title *ʿālim* for Khalīl, while he confers it to many other people he mentions. It is also misleading to consider al-Malaṭī as a distinguished member of late Mamluk scholarly life, since he never wrote a work in the classical Islamic disciplines, except for short treatises.[77] Such a scholarly profile was more common among the *awlād al-nās*.[78]

Here we can ask how al-Malaṭī made a living. I have not come across any instance when al-Malaṭī's works or the other contemporary sources refer to his judicial career. Thus, his relation to jurisprudence should likely be understood as scholarly activity. Both al-Sakhāwī and Ibn Iyās acknowledge his expertise in medicine. In addition to his occupation, the Mamluk sultan Khusqadam granted a very generous *iqtāʿ* (tax-farming grant) to Khalīl and his six sons, including al-Malaṭī (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 3: 40). The *iqtāʿ* was later rescinded by al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā, al-Malaṭī claiming: "We had nothing left." (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 3: 40). It is highly likely that this period of crisis laid the groundwork for his interest in Ottoman patronage and scholarly life of Rūm.

2.3 Legal Schools and Cairene Religiosity from al-Malaṭī's Point of

---

[76] Ḥanafī *faqīh*s and historians Ibn Duqaq, Ibn Iyās, and Ibn Taghrībirdī are the major examples of the scholars of the *awlād al-nās* origin. See (Es-Seyyid 1995)

[77] As was seen in his works, al-Malaṭī wrote treatises on the exegesis of short Quranic surahs and the jurisprudence of worship (*ʿibādāt*) in the classical Islamic disciplines.

[78] Fatih Yahya Ayaz also makes a distinction between the prominent Mamluk-era scholars and the historians of *awlād al-nās* origin in terms of history-writing in the Mamluk period. See (Ayaz 2020, 158, 173).

Al-Sakhāwī emphasizes that al-Malaṭī also received education from non-Ḥanafīs. It is apparent in his works that al-Malaṭī interacted with many Shāfiʿī and Mālikī scholars, especially in Cairo, Tripoli, and the Maghrib. In his *Majmaʿ*, he presents us with a broad spectrum of scholars from all along his route, giving wide coverage to the other *madhhab*s (legal schools), especially to Mālikī judges and scholars in Maghrib. For example, one of the longest biographies in the *Majmaʿ*, which is almost sixteen pages, is about a Sufi scholar named Ibrāhīm al-Tāzī al-Malikī who resided in Oran (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 120). Moreover, throughout the work, we encounter many Shāfiʿī and some Ḥanbalī scholars and students that the author studied with.

Unlike the Shāfiʿī pre-eminence under the Ayyūbids and later the Ottomans' favor of the Ḥanafī legal school, the Mamluk sultans appointed a *qāḍi al-quḍāt* (chief judge) to each of the four *madhhab*s since the reign of Baybars I (r. 1260-1277) (Northrup 1998, 268-69).[79] With the Mongol invasion of the east, Cairo became a sanctuary and intellectual hub for many refugees, including Muslim scholars of diverse backgrounds. The Mamluk sultans, as individuals of pagan birth and slave origin, needed the scholars' support for legitimacy and legal coherence in their domains. Hence, patronage given to scholars and financing the four *madhhab*s of Islam were essential to Mamluk rule in Cairo.[80] While the Shāfiʿī-Ashʿarīs constituted the most powerful scholarly group in Cairo and enjoyed certain privileges in the bureaucracy, this legal pluralism reflected upon the scholar's networks, as it can be seen in al-Malaṭī's case.

We cannot assume that there was no competition among the *madhhab*s. However, al-Malaṭī's works do not show clear signs of such a rivalry. On the contrary, the author gives examples of solidarity among the Rūmī-Ḥanafī scholars in Cairo. However, we do not know whether this solidarity was promoted because of *madhhab*-brotherhood or geographical ties. For instance, the author narrates that Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyajī stood by the Rūmī-Ḥanafī scholar Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā al-Rūmī when he got into trouble at the Mamluk court. Al-Kāfiyajī intervened with the sultan for Aḥmad's release (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 455). Al-Malaṭī, being a Ḥanafī, even sharply criticizes a Mamluk sultan, al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā (r. 1467-1468), for his "fanaticism" (*taʿaṣṣub*) as a Ḥanafī and asks for mercy for the founders of the four *madhhab*s (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 797). He also accuses Jaqmaq of being a fanatic Ḥanafī while criticizing the

---

[79] For a detailed analysis of the Ottoman Ḥanafism, see (Burak 2015).

[80] For a revisionist view on the Ottoman judicial system in Egypt, see (Atçıl 2017).

sultan's punishment of the Shāfiʿī scholar Molla Gūrānī, because of the scholar's trouble with a Ḥanafī colleague. Al-Malaṭī's peaceful attitude to Shāfiʿī, Mālikī and Ḥanbalī scholars can also be interpreted as a critique of the ongoing competition among the *madhhab*s.[81]

2.3.1 Al-Malaṭī on Badr al-Dīn b. Qāḍī Samāwna

One example urges us to problematize al-Malaṭī's doctrinal stance. As a sign of the author's meticulous attention to events in Rūm, his *Nayl* is among the very few Mamluk sources which record the year when the eminent rebellious jurist Badr al-Dīn b. Qāḍī Samāwna (d. 823/1420) was executed by the Ottomans (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 135-136).[82] As one of the key figures in Mamluk-Ottoman intellectual encounters, Badr al-Dīn spent years in Mamluk Cairo before he went to Tabriz and then Adrianople where he was made the *qāḍi al-ʿaskar* by Mūsā Çelebi (d. 816/1413). He even spent some time at the Mamluk court as the tutor of Faraj, son of the sultan Barqūq (r. 1390-99) (Kissling 2012). Despite the years he spent in Cairo, contemporary Mamluk sources remain silent about the controversial shaykh's presence in the city.[83] Nevertheless, his legacy might have been a subject of conversation in scholarly circles, given that al-Malaṭī's *Nayl* describes him as someone who had a great reputation (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 135).

Given the so-called religious antinomianism attributed to Badr al-Dīn in the scholarly literature, the fact that al-Malāṭī, who was a member of a circle dominated by Shāfiʿī *hadith* scholars, mentions Badr al-Dīn by using the titles *ʿālim* and *fāḍil* is interesting in itself. Even more remarkably, the author implies that Badr al-Dīn's execution was a political maneuver, and that the Ottoman ruler executed him out of fear of the shaykh assuming political power.[84] Badr al-Dīn's execution aroused controversy in the lands of Rūm about whether he was executed because of his heretical

---

[81]Anne Broadbridge discusses the role of madhabs in scholarly rivalry for the previous generation of scholars by focusing on al-Maqrīzī, al-ʿAynī and al-ʿAsqalānī (Broadbridge 1999). These scholars were trained in a period described as a golden age by al-Malaṭī.

[82]The year given in the edition 893 H./1487 CE is wrong. Badr al-Dīn was executed in 1420. However, the content removes any doubts as to the identity of the subject mentioned in the text.

[83]For a discussion of the available sources, see (Binbaş 2016, 125) and see (Dadaş 2019, 13).

[84]The author's statement is "*Gharraḳahu Ibn ʿUthman khawfan min al-mulk minhu*". See (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 135).

views or for some other reason (Ocak 2013, 159). For example, a contemporary of al-Malaṭī in Istanbul, the historian Aşıkpaşazāde (d. after 889/1484), takes part in the same discussion by reporting Mawlānā Ḥaydar's *fatwā* on Badr al-Dīn's execution (Aşıkpaşazāde 2014, 160). The *fatwā* alludes to the political reasons instead of the shaykh's heresy by stating that Badr al-Dīn could be executed but his property could not be confiscated. Despite the clearness of the *fatwā*, Aşıkpaşazāde questions whether Badr al-Dīn died as a Muslim or not. Aşıkpaşazāde's answer to the question implies that Badr al-Dīn was a heretic: "Only Allah knows."

Al-Malaṭī's short but thought-provoking remark indicates that, just like Aşıkpaşazāde, he was aware of the debates about the execution and had a certain opinion about the Badr al-Dīn incident or transmitted an already circulating comment in his network. This issue raises questions about Badr al-Dīn's image in fifteenth-century Cairo, and whether he was considered a heretic Sufi, a respected jurist, or both.

It is still widespread in the modern scholarship and public opinion about Badr al-Dīn to pose a paradox between Badr al-Dīn's juristic identity and his so-called heresy.[85] Al-Malaṭī helps us challenge this dichotomy by presenting a positive view on Badr al-Dīn from Cairo. This calls for a closer look into the religiosity of contemporary Cairene scholars who presumably represented a more traditionalist bent in Islam in comparison with their peers in Rūm and the Persianate world. The following part will elaborate on what al-Malaṭī offers regarding the Sufi aspect of his environment.

2.3.2 Sufism

Despite numerous studies, Sufism in Mamluk Egypt is not appreciated enough in modern scholarship.[86] Perhaps as a result of this, there is also very little emphasis on the role of Sufism in the literature about the Mamluk-Ottoman transition. In this part, I will give a brief reflection on the literature and al-Malaṭī's potential

---

[85] For a recent evaluation of the literature about Badr al-Dīn's religious identity, see (Binbaş 2016, 130-133).

[86] Annemarie Schimmel's "Some Glimpses of the Religious Life in Egypt during the Later Mamluk Period" is the earliest work mentioning the role of Sufism in Mamluk Egypt. P.M. Holt contributed to the field with his study on Sufism in the early Mamluk period (Holt 1983). Donald P. Little's notes on the relation between Sufism and politics, and Alexander D. Knysh's study on the intellectual aspect of Mamluk Sufism can be defined as the pivotal works of the field. The abundance of Sufi spaces, such as *khānkāh*s, *ribāṭ*s and *zāwiyah*s in the Mamluk domains form the backbone of many other studies in the field. For a survey of the literature, see (Homerin 2013). Nathan Hofer's study on the Ayyubid and the early Mamluk periods sheds light on the process of popularization of Sufism and its social history in Egypt. See (Hofer 2015).

contribution to it.

Annemarie Schimmel's idea that the Mamluk military elite had no interest in the spiritual aspects of religion has been meticulously problematized by P.M. Holt and Donald P. Little, who argue that Sufism was an intricate part of Mamluk politics (Homerin 2013, 188). There are very limited studies on the Mamluk-based scholars' approach to Sufism. This might partly be related to the simplistic dichotomies of Sufi and jurist that have been rejected in the last thirty years (Homerin 2013, 191).[87] In addition, the scholarship still has a tendency to downplay the role of Sufism in the Arabic-speaking lands. For example, Shahab Ahmed has provided a nuanced view of Islam in what he calls "the Balkans-to-Bengal-Complex.". Countering Arab-centrism, he emphasizes the omnipresence of Sufi thought across the Persianate world, Anatolia, and the Balkans, whereas the Arab South was associated with a more Sharīʿa-minded version of Islam (Ahmed 2015).[88] Although their guardian-ship of the *Sharīʿah* and *Sunnah* overshadowed their Sufi identities, Mamluk-based scholars had complex approaches to Sufism.[89] Indeed, some of the leading scholars of fifteenth century Cairo were also devoted Sufis. An example from al-Malaṭī's network is the leading *hadith* scholar al-Suyūṭī, who not only venerated Ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240), considered a controversial figure in Mamluk Egypt, but also wrote a work praising a Sufi order, the *Shādhiliyya.*[90]

As we have seen in his take on Badr al-Dīn, al-Malaṭī also urges his readers to reassess Mamluk-era scholars. Although his oeuvre is not sufficient to offer a com-prehensive perspective on the religious life of Mamluk scholarly life, it provides us with some crucial examples to problematize the subject. However, it provides us with some crucial examples to problematize the subject. After all, he features his favorite shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyajī not only as a *faqīh* but also as someone who performed miracles (*karāmāt* and *mukāshafāt*) in al-Malaṭī's corpus (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 104).

---

[87]The terms "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" were already delved into by historians such as Cemal Kafadar, Derin Terzioğlu and Tijana Kristic in the cases of Anatolian and Balkan Muslims. See (Kafadar, 1995) and see (Terzioğlu 2013). Alexander Knysh adopted a similarly meticulous approach to reassess such terms as "orthodoxy" and "heresy" in Medieval Islam including the Mamluk period. See (Knysh 1993).

[88]On the other hand, Thomas Bauer's recent study that raises similar questions about pre-modern Islam focuses on the Ayyubid and the Mamluk periods and geographies. See (Bauer 2013).

[89]Alexander Knysh and Khaled El-Rouayheb meticulously discussed Mamluk-based scholars' attitudes to Ibn ʿArabī (d. 1240) and Ibn al-Fāriḍ (d. 632/1235), and the transmission of various Sūfī ideas debated in Cairo. Alexander Knysh is the first one who called attention to the Mamluk scholars' "intellectual concerns and doctrinal disagreements" about Sufism (Knysh, Ibn Arabi, 3). For a more elaborate discussion on the same subject, see (Rouayheb 2015, 235-271, 321-346). A similar discussion has been made by Eric Geoffroy in his study of Sufism in Mamluk Egypt and Syria. See (Geoffroy 1995).

[90]The *Shadhiliyya* is a Sufi *ṭarīqa* which came into existence in North Africa in the thirteenth century. Al-Suyūṭī's work about the order is titled *Taʾyīd al-ḥaqīqat al-ʿaliyya wa tashīd al-ṭarīqat al-Shādhiliyya.* See (Özkan 2010).

How al-Malaṭī narrates a Sufi shaykh's levitation experiences is worth-mentioning for the purposes of this section. The author employs the highest Sufi terms, such as *ghawth* (the helper) and *quṭb* (the axis) for Aḥmad al-Sarasī (d. 860/1456).[91] It is clear in the *Majmaʿ* that al-Sarasī was one of the most influential Sufis in contemporary Cairo. Al-Malaṭī narrates one of his miracles (*karāmāt*) with a reference to the famous Mamluk jurist scholar Ibn al-Humām (d. 861/1457). According to the account, Ibn al-Humām visits Mecca and asks a shaykh who the *quṭb* of the time is. One day at the Ka'ba, the shaykh tells Ibn al-Humām to look above. Ibn al-Humām sees al-Sarasī floating in the air. As soon as he turned to Cairo, Ibn al-Humām found al-Sarasī and went down on his knees. Al-Sarasī told him: "O shaykh Kamāl al-Dīn, keep silent about what you saw from our spiritual states." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 415). Apparently, al-Malaṭī's religiosity was fully inclusive of such *karāmāt* as sitting in the air.[92]

This takes us to the question of what kind of Sufism al-Malaṭī was engaged in. Al-Malaṭī does not reveal his *ṭarīqa* affiliation. As discussed in the previous section, Ibn Iyās tells that al-Malaṭī had a fringe in his hair which might have been a sign of his affiliation with the *Rifāʿiyya*. This possibility is compatible with the fact that the most visible *ṭarīqa* in al-Malaṭī's works is the same Sufi order.[93] In the *Majmaʿ*, there are many occasions where our author describes his subjects as Sufi while he neglects to mention *ṭarīqa* affiliations. However, the *Rifāʿiyya* is visible in at least four biographies (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 76, 149, 414, 539).[94] We know that al-Malaṭī had already become highly interested in asceticism on his way back from al-Andalus to Cairo.[95] If he had one, his *ṭarīqa* affiliation might be found in the missing parts of his works. It is also possible that al-Malaṭī consciously remains silent about his affiliation. According to Ahmet Karamustafa, the *Rifāʿis* were considered a

---

[91]I could not find information about Aḥmad al-Sarasī in other primary sources and modern studies.

[92]Sainthood as a concept was given in the minds of the Mamluk-era scholars, including Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), who is known for his hostility towards Ibn ʿArabī. Many of them practiced Sufism with varying levels. However, some forms of *karāmāt*, such as levitation was unacceptable for some of these scholars who emphasized the primacy of the *Sharīʿah* (Homerin 2013, 193). Thanks to this anecdote, we also see a neglected side of Ibn Humām, who was one of the most influential Ḥanafī jurists in the Mamluk domains. For Ibn al-Humām's biography and his influence on Ḥanafī jurisprudence, see (Koca, 2000).

[93]The *Rifāʿiyya* is a Sufi order which acquired its reputation in the twelfth century. It was founded by Aḥmad al-Rifāʿi. The *ṭarīqa* became widespread in Egypt under the patronage of the Ayyubids. For a detailed account on the order, see (Bosworth 2012).

[94]We see that al-Kāfiyajī also had good relations with the *Rifāʿiyya* members in Cairo (Al-Malaṭī 2011 414). The shaykh was leading the *Shaykhūniyya* complex where many Sufis lived. However, al-Kāfiyajī is another Mamluk-based scholar whose Sufi thought is neglected.

[95]Although the the *Rifāʿiyya* was not widespread in North Africa, Mustafa Tahralı asserts that there was a *Rifāʿī* shaykh in Tunus in the fifteenth century (Tahralı 2008). It is possible that al-Malaṭī met this shaykh on his way. The *Rifāʿiyya* was already widespread in Egypt where al-Malaṭī might have become affiliated with the order. Al-Malaṭī's two daughters passed away for plague on his way back to Cairo. Our scholar expresses his deep sadness for their losses. These losses might also have played a role in his interest in asceticism. (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 2: 122, 146).

threat to Mamluk rule with their close relation to the Mongols and their antinomian behaviors in everyday life (Karamustafa 1994, 51-56). There is no study about the *Rifāʿi*-Mamluk relations in al-Malaṭī's time. However, as a Sufi order known for its ecstatic practices, it is interesting to observe in al-Malaṭī's writings how the order was influential in Cairene *khānkāh*s in the latter half of the fifteenth century.

Al-Malaṭī's relation to Sufism is not independent from his keen interest in dream narratives, and marvelous and unusual (*ʿajāʾib wa gharāʾib* and sometimes *nawādir*) events. His works offer many examples of miraculous events taking place at the court or in the streets of Cairo where the actors are ordinary people. It is also important to remember that he was trained in *taʿbīr* (dream interpretation). He narrated his own dreams and the dreams of various soldiers without adding comments on them (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 295, 403). His father Khalīl also seems to have been occupied with narrating and interpreting *ʿajāʾib wa nawādir*, but unlike al-Malaṭī, he did this for the sultans.[96] With such cases, al-Malaṭī and his father remind us that a sharp distinction between popular beliefs and scholarly piety is unsatisfactory. Indeed, many scholars of the Mamluk period evinced an interest in unusual events and occult subjects. Al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1363), al-Maqrīzī and Ibn Iyās are some of these scholars who had an interest in esoteric knowledge and talismans (Irwin 2003, 18).

Taghrībirdī al-Ḥurūfī al-Nasīmī al-Rūmī's (d. 891/1486) biographical entry provides us with some clues about al-Malaṭī's doctrinal consciousness. Taghrībirdī was a follower of a *Ḥurūfī* sect (*al-ḥurūfiyya al-nasīmiyya*) in Cairo (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 745).[97] According to al-Malaṭī, he went as far as claiming to be the *mahdī* and even to be God. For the latter, al-Malaṭī says, "There is no doubt that he is an infidel." Our scholar encounters Taghrībirdī and discusses the arguments that the latter made to prove he was the *mahdī*. First, al-Malaṭī tries to be patient, believing Taghrībirdī to be a descendant of the Prophet, but he becomes aggressive when it turns out that Taghrībirdī was a Rūmī. Al-Malaṭī narrates that Taghrībirdī was also dreaming to become the "king of Egypt".

A few decades earlier, during the reign of Meḥmed II, a large group of Ḥurufīs had been executed in Edirne with the *fatwā* of the Ottoman *muftī* Fakhr al-Dīn al-ʿAjamī (d. 865/1460) (Baltacı 1995). The execution had a political context in which Ḥurufīs posed a threat to various political cliques. Keeping the different contexts of the two geographies in mind, it is still curious how Taghrībirdī escaped persecution in the Mamluk domains if we accept al-Malaṭī's words as the truth, especially those

---

[96]For example, on one of the occasions when Khalīl went to the court, the sultan Khushqadam asked him: "What have you seen from *ʿajāʾib wa nawādir*?" (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 2: 167).

[97]*Ḥurūfiyya* is a Sufi doctrine based on the mysticism of letters. The name *Ḥurūfī* is given to the followers of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī (d. 796/1394). It is also a messianic movement. See (Mir-Kasimov 2016).

related to Taghrībirdī's political claims. Despite his "heresy", Taghrībirdī was a part of the everyday life in the religious spaces of Cairo as al-Malaṭī says, "Nowadays, he frequently stops by the *Shaykhūniyya*." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 748).[98] Despite the absence of a juristic intervention, the terms that al-Malaṭī uses to either define Taghrībirdī or his influence in public - *Sayyiʾ al-iʿtiqād* (bad creed), *kufr ṣarīḥ* (pure infidelity), *ifsād ʿaqāid al-nās* (damaging the creed of people) - suggest that al-Malaṭī objected to Taghrībirdī's Sufism on *sharʿī* grounds.

In such cases, making comparisons between the Ottomans and the Mamluks in terms of their attitudes to various religious and political movements is thought-provoking. The Mamluk sultanate has been described in scholarship as a more established center of Sunni "orthodoxy", and Mamluk-based scholars as the upholders of Sharīʿa in the fifteenth century, decades before the rise of a well-defined Sunnism in the Ottoman realm. Hence, the Mamluks might be viewed as a historical experience of a Sharīʿa-minded Sunnism prior to the formation of sixteenth-century Ottoman Sharīʿa aware-ness.[99] Hence, such examples as al-Malaṭī's attitude towards Taghrībirdī helps us reconstruct the peculiarities of Ottoman Sunnism, and its similarities to the larger Sunni world, primarily with the Mamluks.

The kind of religious characters al-Malaṭī venerated can tell us more about his religious perspective. In this regard, his long account of his father Khalīl's trip to the court of Jahān Shāh (r. 1439-1467), the Qarāquyunlū ruler, as an envoy provides us with some useful information. One of the direct quotations from Khalīl (*bi khaṭṭ al-wālid*) in the *Rawḍ*, tells the story of Khalīl's return route from Iraq to Egypt:

> "We set out to Baghdād and visited the tombs of the esteemed *imām*s: al-imām ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, may Allāh be pleased with him, the two grand-sons of the prophet Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and Mūsā al-Kāẓim, and the two greatest imāms (*al-imāmayn al-aʿẓamayn*) Abū Ḥanīfa and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; and we also visited al-Sayyid ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Gīlānī and all the other friends of Allāh in Baghdād." (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 211)

The quote gives us a curious mixture of symbolic names for various doctrinal and

---

[98]There is no study about the *Hurūfiyya* in the Mamluk context. According to Hamid Algar, the Mamluk sultan al-Ghawrī's poetry suggests that the sultan had affiliated with the *Hurūfiyya*. See (Algar 2004).

[99]The rising Sharīʿa awareness and emphasis on Sunnism in the Ottoman context was undoubtedly related to global phenomenon of using religion as a tool of state building and centralization in the sixteenth century. Moreover, the Kızılbaş revolts and the Safavid threat in the east also played a role in this process. In this regard, the Ottoman case peculiar. However, as Derin Terzioğlu has observed, the Ottoman "Sunnitization" was a gradual process, and has its roots in the previous centuries (Terzioğlu 2013). Inspired from this perspective, I would argue that the Mamluk case is an important example for comparison.

political conflicts of Islamic history. It seems that al-Malaṭī and his father venerated the *Imām*s following ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661) and his sons. Although they have mostly been associated with Twelver Shiʿism, it is widely known that the Twelve *Imām*s, five of whom were mentioned in the quote, have also been appreciated in Sunnism.[100] This degree of ʿAlid-loyalty might have been a phenomenon that predates the Mongol period in Egypt and Greater Syria. It is also interesting that a Ḥanafī scholar of the fifteenth century calls Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 240/855), the founder of the *Ḥanbalī* school, another "greatest *imām*", making him equal to Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767). This discourse is another reflection of the legal pluralism in the pre-Ottoman Middle East.

Fifteenth-century Mamluk religiosity cannot be analyzed under a unifying title. Al-Malaṭī's works can only give "some glimpses of the religious life" as the title of Schimmel puts forward.[101] His works also give rise to thinking about the religious aspect of Mamluk-Ottoman transition. The leading works on the intellectual aspect of Ottoman-Mamluk interactions focus on jurisprudence and law-making. This focus goes hand in hand with the assumption that the Ottoman conquest of the region contributed to the making of a special type of Ottoman "orthodoxy" and Sharīʿa awareness. As demonstrated by Helen Pfeifer and Guy Burak, jurisprudence was a significant part of the transmission, and the Mamluk influence on Ottoman juristic debates is a fact.[102] On the other hand, al-Malaṭī describes Mamluk Cairo as a world suffused by Sufi ideas. This point might pave the way for future studies on the role of Sufis in the Mamluk-Ottoman transfer.[103]

---

[100]I have not come across any instance where al-Malaṭī expresses hostility against Shiʿism, except for his fierce anger over Ibn Taghrībirdī who allegedly confirms the Fatimid dynasty's claim to be descendant of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 88)

[101]Schimmel's study discussed in the beginning of the section is titled "Some Glimpses of the Religious Life in Egypt during the Later Mamluk Period".

[102]Helen Pfeifer draws a parallel between the rising Ottoman concern with Sunni orthodoxy and the increased Islamic literacy of Ottoman scholars, which was fueled by the scholarly gatherings between Rūmī and Arab scholars in the aftermath of the Ottoman conquest of Mamluk Egypt and Syria (Pfeifer 2014, 134-138). Katharina Ivanyi also argues that the making of Ottoman orthodoxy was related to the conquest in 1517 (Ivanyi 2012, 62). On the other hand, Helen Pfeifer demonstrates that Islamic jurisprudence was only one aspect of the complex encounters between the scholars of the two regions in the sixteenth century. Although Pfeifer does not discuss Sufism, we see that literature and social manners were also practiced and discussed at the table of gatherings between Rūmī and Arab scholars in the post-conquest period. See, (Pfeifer 2015).

[103]Even though it is the jurisprudential identities of the scholars who traveled back and forth across the Ottoman-Mamluk frontier that receives most attention in modern scholarship, some of them were devoted Sufis as well. Mollā Fenārī who wrote extensively on Ibn ʿArabī's mystical monism after returning from Egypt and Shaykh Badr al-Dīn who met his Sufi master Ḥusayn Akhlāṭī in Cairo. Eric Geoffroy's pioneering study of Sufism in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Mamluk lands sheds light on some important aspects of transition between the two regions in terms of Sufism. See (Geoffroy 1995). Another study that emphasizes the Sufi aspect of the Mamluk lands and its transmission to the Ottoman region before the conquest is Cornell Fleischer's work on the mystic letterist ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bisṭāmī (d. 858/1454) who was trained in Mamluk Egypt and Syria before moving to Rūm (Fleischer 20019, 156). Side Emre's work on Ibrāhīm Gulshanī (d. 940/1534) sheds light on the role of Sufism in the post-conquest period of the interactions between Rūm and Egypt. See (Emre 2017).

2.4 Al-Kāfiyajī and the Ottoman Domains

It is Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Ḥanafī al-Kāfiyajī who stands out as the most important turning point in al-Malaṭī's biography. The shaykh is referred to as *Shaykhunā al-ʿallāma ustādh al-ʿālim* in the *Majmaʿ*. Although there is a tendency in some modern studies to define al-Kāfiyajī as Ottoman, he was far from being so.[104] Nevertheless, his career is significant for us to understand the trans-regional patronage relations of the period and also for al-Malaṭī's picture of Ottoman patronage. Therefore, the eminent scholar deserves a separate subtitle. Al-Kāfiyajī does not have a separate biographical vignette in the *Majmaʿ* since this alphabetically arranged book ends with the letter *jīm*. Nevertheless, "the grand shaykh" appears as a reporter or point of reference on many occasions in the work.

Despite Rosenthal's early work on his short treatises on history titled *al-Mukhtaṣar fī ʿilm al-taʾrīkh*, al-Kāfiyajī is still arguably one of the most underrated characters of the fifteenth century Islamic intellectual history (Rosenthal 1968, 136-154).[105] His corpus which is mostly composed of short *risāla*s on different subjects has not been comprehensively studied.[106] In fact, however, al-Kāfiyajī trained some of the star scholars of the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century. His students, such as al-Sakhāwī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī and Zakariyyāʾ al-Anṣārī (d. 926/1520) dominated the scholarly arena even after the Ottoman conquest of Egypt and Syria in 1517 (Fazlıoğlu 2017). It is a justifiably widespread attitude in modern scholarship that the *ʿulamāʾ* who produced the most widely read books have been paid the most scholarly attention. However, we should also note that a pre-modern Muslim scholar's "significance" cannot be solely based on his works. Sometimes, observing a Mamluk-era scholar's influence through his pupils' works and their networks might tell us more about the scholar's position in his age.[107] The present study attempts

---

[104]Some recent studies place Al-Kāfiyajī's texts in the context of the debates about Ottoman intellectual history. For example, see (Alper 2015, 85-101), and (Köksal 2016, 159-169).

[105]Rosenthal's work contains the text and translation of the *Mukhtaṣar fī ʿilm al-taʾrīkh*. See (Rosenthal 1968 136-154).

[106]Some of al-Kāfiyajī's works are best studied in the broader context of Islamic intellectual history in (Markiewicz 2019, 204-215). Markiewicz also makes a nuanced analysis of al-Kāfiyajī's *Mukhtaṣar* in his study on fifteenth-century historiography. See (Markiewicz 2017).

[107]One might even encounter scholars who left behind no written piece of work, nevertheless, became well-known for their ideas discussed during lectures. The most remarkable example of the above-mentioned scholar type from the Mamluk region might be Qārī al-Hidāya (d. 829/1426) who was defined as "Abū Ḥanīfa of his age" by his contemporaries. He did not leave a text that survived until today. The *fatwā*s attributed to him was collected by his student Ibn al-Humām. However, as an authority in jurisprudence,

to approach al- Kāfiyajī with a nuanced perspective.

Born in 1386 in Manisa which was then under the rule of the Saruhan Beglik, Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyajī was one of the most renowned scholars of the late fifteenth century. He was educated in some of the growing intellectual centers in western Anatolia, such as Aydın and Bursa. His intellectual lineage (*silsila*) is not only important for understanding al-Malaṭī, but it also sheds light on some of the most crucial intellectual trends of the age. He was introduced to the Islamic sciences by the prominent Rūmī scholars Ibn Malak (d. 821/1418) in Aydin and Mollā Fanārī in Bursa.[108] Later, he studied rational sciences somewhere in the Persianate world, but we do not know exactly where.[109] Before going to Cairo, where he spent the rest of his life, he had already interacted with different traditions of Islamic learning. As a prominent Ḥanafī jurist, he was appointed to one of the most prestigious *madrasa*s in Cairo, the *Shaykhūniyya*, in 1454 replacing Ibn al-Humām.[110]

Al-Kāfiyajī had a close relationship with the Mamluk court but at the same time, he gained fame in the rest of the Islamic world with his multidisciplinary works. He was an assertive scholar. His claim to have founded new sciences such as *ʿilm al-taʾrīkhʾ* and *ʿilm al-tafsīr* attracted a lot of criticism and increased his reputation (Al-Sakhāwī 1934, 7:261). Al-Sakhāwī reports that al-Kāfiyajī received presents from various Muslim rulers of his age, especially from Meḥmed II. According to al-Sakhāwī, Meḥmed II contacted al-Kāfiyajī more than once. However, the shaykh's Ottoman connections seem to have gone beyond the sultan.

Cihan Yüksel Muslu brings a very interesting letter into attention. The letter was written by an Ottoman soldier to Bāyezīd II or a high-ranking Ottoman officer, telling the story of the soldier's captivity in the Mamluk prisons following the battle

―――――――――――――――――――

Qāri al-Hidāya trained the most prominent members of the next generation of scholars including Ibn al-Humām, Ibn Quṭlūboghā (d. 879/1474). See (Kayapınar 2001). I would like to thank Büşra Sıdıka Kaya for sharing her fruitful comments on this subject.

[108]Aydın was one of the most important centers of intellectual activities in the late fourteenth and the early fifteenth-century Anatolia. Under the patronage of the Aydınoğulları Beglik, scholarly production flourished especially with the translations from the classics of Islamic literature. Despite its location in today's Western Anatolia, the Aydınoğulları was strongly linked with Mamluk Egypt through scholarly interactions. According to Andrew Peacock, there was also a Mamluk influence on the beglik in terms of architecture (Peacock 2019, 166). One local scholar from the Aydınoğulları domain exemplifies this connectedness very well: Hacı Paşa (d. after 827/1424) who was trained in Mamluk Cairo and, according to Sara Nur Yıldız, played a significant role in transmitting the Islamic classics to Rumelia. See (Yıldız 2014).

[109]According to al-Suyūṭī, the scholar went to *Bilād al-ʿAjam wa al-Ṭaṭar*, but he gives no more specific locales. (Al-Suyūtī 1979, 1:117).

[110]I have not come across a detailed information about the *madrasa* and *khānkāh* of *Shaykhūniyya*. However, the complex was certainly a crucial institution for the scholarly interactions between Rūm and Mamluk Egypt. Another prominent Rūmī-Ḥanafī scholar, Akmal al-Dīn al-Bābartī (d. 786/1384), trained some of the famous Rūmī scholars, such as Hacı Paşa, Shaykh Badr al-Dīn and Molla Fenārī in the *Shaykhūniyya*. As we see in the *Majmaʿ*, most of the residents in the complex were still Rūmīs in the late fifteenth century.

between the Mamluk and Ottoman forces in 1486.[111] According to Muslu, the soldier's signature is unrecognizable. Surprisingly, one of the characters mentioned in the document is al-Kāfiyajī who had already died twelve years before the letter was written. After describing his process of captivity in vivid detail, the letter's author tells how his friends in Cairo stood by him and intervened with the *Kātib al-sirr* (the confidential secretary or chief secretary) Ibn Muzhir (d. 893/1487-88) to ameliorate his conditions.[112] At this point, the prisoner states that he had established these intimate connections almost thirty years ago, while he had been a pupil of al-Kāfīyajī in Cairo. As we can see in the *Majmaʿ*, the extremely influential bureaucrat Ibn Muzhir was also a pupil of al-Kāfiyajī (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 193).

The letter adds that a former envoy of the Mamluk sultan to the Ottoman court also helped the soldier by speaking on behalf of him. The remainder of the letter provides intelligence about the logistics of the Mamluk army, and the author's comments on the Mamluk view of the war against the Ottomans.[113] The prisoner hopes for peace between the two sovereigns implying that he was not convinced of an Ottoman victory.[114]

Al-Malaṭī allows us to speculate about who the letter's author was. Although Muslu estimates that the prisoner came to Cairo after the defeat in 1486, she leaves the door open.[115] Iskandar b. Mīkhāl (Mīcāl in the *Majmaʿ*, and Mīkhāʾīl in the *Nayl*) was the Ottoman *Beglerbegi* of Kayseri when he was captured by the Mamluk forces and brought to Cairo in 1489, after he had helped Dhu'l-Qadr Beg Shāhbudāq's fight against the Mamluks.[116] He was from the Mikhāloğulları family which was

---

[111]Muslu introduces and comments on this document in her dissertation. See (Muslu, 2007, 1-2).

[112]Zayn al-Dīn Abū Bakr Ibn Muzhir was a powerful and influential statesman in the late Mamluk period. Just like al-Malaṭī's father Khalīl, he was both a scholar and a bureaucrat in the late Mamluk period. *Kātib al-Sirr* was the highest executive with the duty of composing the governor's letters and documents and of reading incoming mails. The holders of this post were expected to have high linguistic capabilities and erudition in Arabic (Drory 2004). When the office was introduced is a contentious issue among the contemporary authors and the modern Mamluk historians (Northrup 1998, 239).

[113]The name of the *Kātib al-Sirr* and some details about the content of the letter were taken from Muslu's presentation at the Mamluk Studies Conference in Beyrut in 2017. See (School of Mamluk Studies 2017).

[114]Muslu also acknowledges that the prisoner's stand for peace might be a result of the Mamluk officers' demand. Hersekzāde Ahmed Pasha (d. 923/1517), the Ottoman *beglerbegi* of Anatolia, was in a similar situation at the Mamluk court. He was captured probably in the same war and taken to the Mamluk sultan. Al-Malaṭī narrates that the sultan released the pasha and sent him to Istanbul on condition that Hersekzāde would work for establishing peace between the two sovereigns. Hersekzāde could not persuade Bāyezīd II to make peace and sent a letter to Cairo saying that the Ottoman sultan is determined to fight against the Mamluks. See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 462).

[115]Muslu tells that the author of the letter describes how the Mamluk Sultan Qāyitbāy (r. 1468-1496) fell from his horse during the celebrations of the Mamluk victory over the Ottoman forces in the winter of 1486 and how this incident led into chaos in Cairo. However, it is not clear whether this incident happened before the prisoner's arrival in Cairo. See (Muslu 2007, 2).

[116]For Iskandar's captivity and its importance for the political rivalry between the Ottomans and the Mamluks. See (Muslu 2014, 152-3).

one of the most influential *aḳıncı* (raider) clans in the first centuries of the Ottoman Beglik. Iskandar is titled as *Amīr al-umarā* of Ibn ʿUthmān in the *Nayl* and an *Aʿyān* in the *Majmaʿ* (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 150 and 2011, 538). Al-Malaṭī states that he witnessed the day when Iskandar was brought to Cairo as a captive with a group of Ottoman soldiers (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 157). While narrating the events of the year 895 (1489-90), al-Malaṭī reports that Iskandar was transferred from his prison in the *Bāb al-silsila* to the house of the *Kātib al-sirr* Ibn Muzhir, still having been prisoned but to be better preserved (*li yuḥtafaẓ ʿalayhi*), just like in the case of the letter's author (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 184).

It invites suspicion that al-Malaṭī, who voraciously mentions al-Kāfiyajī whenever possible, does not mention Iskandar's affiliation with the shaykh in the *Majmaʿ*. This information might be lacking because, in the *Nayl*, al-Malaṭī promises to give details about Iskandar in his *al-taʾrīkh al-kabīr*, referring to the *Rawḍ* (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 226). Nevertheless, Iskandar's transmission to Ibn Muzhir's house in the approximate date makes an interesting parallel with the content of the letter. If we take Iskandar b. Mīkhāl as the prisoner that Muslu talks about, this information raises some important questions as to a *ghazi* warrior's scholarly background. Given Iskandar's possible training in Cairo, he should be a rare example of the warriors who carried out raids in the Balkans but also received scholarly education.[117]

Even if the prisoner is not Iskandar b. Mīkhāl, both the facts that the letter addresses a high-ranking officer or Bāyezīd II, and that a former envoy of the Mamluk sultan supported him suggest that the letter's author was also a person of status. Shedding light on the social networks between the two regions and "the circulation of individuals" in Muslu's terms, the document might also help us consider al-Kāfiyajī's significance in both capitals. Apparently, his students were not only famous scholars of the age, but also important members of bureaucracy in both the Mamluk and Ottoman courts. Further research might reveal his influential pupils in Timurid, Aqquyunlū and Hafsid courts, too.

The eminent scholar wrote two analogous treatises in Cairo; one for kings: *Sayf al-mulūk wa al-ḥukkām* and the other for jurists: *Sayf al-quḍāt ʿalā al-bughāt*, and dedicated copies of both works to the Ottoman Grand Vizier Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović (d. 879/1474) (Okuyucu 2018, 17). Moreover, Yehoshua Frenkel has demonstrated that Al-Kāfiyajī's student and one of the most productive scholars of pre-modern Islam, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, also dedicated his compilation of prophetic reports on *jihād* (holy war), titled *Arbaʿūn ḥadīthan fī faḍl al-jihād*, to Meḥmed II, not to

---

[117]The only example for scholar-warriors I could find is Ṭurakhānoglu Idrīs Beg (d. after 1511) who Erdem Çıpa refers to as "someone who may have been scholar, rather than a military leader". (Çıpa 2017, 99).

the Mamluk sultan (Frenkel 2011, 111). Interestingly, the Ottoman sultan is called "our great master, the enormous sultan Muḥāmmad b. ʿUthmān" in these *risala*s. The genres of these works make the case even more crucial. Two treatises on political thought and statecraft, and one work about *jihād* produced by the scholars of the same circle in Cairo were dedicated to the Ottoman elite. Furthermore, in his *Ṣāḥibu sayf ʿalā ṣāḥibi ḥayf*, al-Suyūṭī states that his shaykh al-Kāfiyajī sent al-Suyūṭī's works to Anatolia with Rūmī scholars who traveled back and forth between Egypt and Rūm (Özkan 2010).[118]

We do not have evidence concerning whether these scholars were beneficiaries of Ottoman patronage while they were residing in Cairo.[119] However, it seems that some prominent members of Cairene scholarly circles credited the Rūmī sultans, their men of sword and the scholars in the region already before the conquest of Egypt in 1517. This context outlines a background to al-Malaṭī's view of Bāyezīd II in that both al-Kāfiyajī and al-Suyūṭī's connections with the Ottoman ruling elite might have played a role in al-Malaṭī's approach to Ottoman patronage.[120] It is likely that al-Malaṭī was impressed by the fact that two essential names of late fifteenth-century Mamluk scholarship appreciated the intellectual life in the Ottoman lands.

As will be discussed in the following chapter, the Mamluk and Timurid lands maintained their relative superiority over the Ottoman lands throughout most of the fifteenth century in terms of attracting the leading scholars of the age. This approach is supported by the assumption that Mamluk-based scholars who resided in "the intellectual center of the period" did not consider the Ottoman lands as a major center of learning. From a Cairene point of view, they maintained, the Ottomans were not only located on the margins of Islamdom, but they were also on the margins of Islamic learning until the mid-sixteenth century when the Arab lands lost their intellectual superiority over Rūm (Pfeifer 2015, 219-220). Al-Kāfiyajī, al-Suyūṭi and al-Malaṭī together demonstrate that the scholarly interactions in the contemporary Mamluk-Ottoman context went beyond the above-mentioned dichotomy.[121] From

---

[118]For al-Suyūṭī's influence in the Ottoman lands, see (Pfeifer 2014, 131).

[119]In this regard, I will question al-Kāfiyajī's case with further detail below, in the section titled "Ottoman Patronage in the Late Fifteenth Century".

[120]The number of the works in multiple disciplines attributed to al-Suyūṭī ranges from 295 to 1194. These numbers make it understandable that al-Suyūṭī is called a "polymath" by some modern scholars. He is best studied in (Ghersetti and Antonella 2016). Al-Suyūṭī does not have a vignette in the *Majmaʿ* because of the alphabetic order but his father has a biography in the work. Al-Malaṭī demonstrates close association with al-Suyūṭī by calling him *ṣāḥibunā* (our friend). See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 183).

[121]I already mentioned that al-Malaṭī and al-Suyūṭī belonged to the same circles in Cairo. It would be noteworthy that al-Malaṭī demonstrates close association with al-Suyūṭī by calling him *ṣāḥibunā* (our friend). See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 183).

the point of view of those in al-Malaṭī's circle, Ottoman Rumelia was not the Wild West of fifteenth-century Islamic learning. Intellectual life in Ottoman Istanbul, Edirne and Bursa was a subject of conversation in scholarly circles in Mamluk Cairo already in the latter half of the fifteenth century, before the Ottoman conquest in 1517. In the following sections, I will further detail this argument below with additional examples such as al-Sakhāwī and Aḥmad b. ʿUlayf (d. 926/1520). Before elaboration, I would like to discuss the contemporary Ottoman patronage. At this point, we can have a closer look at al-Malaṭī's Rūm and his perspective on Ottoman patronage.

3. AL-MALAṬĪ ON THE OTTOMANS

3.1 Al-Malaṭī and Rūm

There is no consensus about the boundaries of Rūm in historical sources (Kafadar 2017, 46). Approximately two hundred years before al-Malaṭī, another Arabic-speaking scholar by the name of Abū al-Fidā (d. 732/1331) extends the borders of Rūm to Syria in the south and to Armenia in the east (Kafadar 2017, 46).[1] Although al-Malaṭī does not define his own Rūm, he occasionally drops some references to the region that enable us to understand his perspective. Unlike Abū al-Fidā, al-Malaṭī does not consider Malatya, and hence today's Eastern Anatolia, as parts of the lands of Rūm. In the biography of one of his pupils, Ismāʿīl b. Ḥasan al-Malaṭī, the scholar says that the subject of the biography was born in Malatya, then he traveled to Rūm (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 543).

Al-Malaṭī refers to the Qaramānid ruler Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (r. 1423-1461) as *Ṣāḥib bilād al-Rūm, Qūniyya wa Lāranda wa Qaysariyya*, and defines Qaramān as *Bilād al-Rūm al-Awsaṭ* ('the middle land of Rūm'), while he refers to Bāyezīd II as *Malik al-Rūm bi ʿaṣrinā al-ān* ('the king of Rūm in our time').[2] These titles give an idea about al-Malaṭī's conceptualization of the lands of Rūm. Naturally, al-Malaṭī wrote about many Rūmī subjects, especially scholars who were not affiliated with the Ottomans since the Ottomans were still far from establishing their rule over the other Anatolian polities. The abundance of names with the *nisba* "al-Rūmī" in

---

[1] For a detailed assessment of the terms *Rūm* and *Rūmī*, see (Özbaran 2004) and (Kafadar 2017).

[2] The Isfendiyarid ruler Ismāʿīl b. Isfandiyār (d. 883/1479) was another ruler in Rūm in al-Malaṭī's time. Al-Malaṭī refers to him as the king of the lands of Isfandiyār and Kastamonu in Rūm (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 551).

reference to Qarāmānid and Dhu'l-Qadrid subjects can give us a clue about non-Ottoman Rūm in the author's mind (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 112, 209).

Many scholars in Cairo had previously written about the eastern lands of Rūm because of Mamluk diplomatic interest in the region. Furthermore, there was a considerable amount of scholarship exchanged between the two regions (Muslu 2014, 35). However, the variety of the Rūmī characters in the *Majmaʿ* indicates that al-Malaṭī's interest in the region was mostly based on his acquaintances. Since there is no evidence that al-Malaṭī visited the Western provinces of Rūm, we should address the issue of his access to information. In addition to his written sources, which will be discussed in the last section, on some occasions, al-Malaṭī refers to oral sources.

For the purposes of this section, the most intriguing case is that the author bases his comments about Bāyezīd II on his dialogue with an anonymous character whom he refers to as someone reliable (*man athiqu bihi*) (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 213). It is al-Malaṭī's Rūmī shaykhs or pupils who first come to mind as possible candidates for this source.[3] However, his network in the lands of Rūm was not restricted to scholarly circles, as he interacted with soldiers and merchants as well, such as Iskandar b. Mījāl (Mīkhāl) al-Rūmī, who was the governor of Kayseri and taken prisoner by the Mamluk forces in 1490, and the Rūmī merchant Ilyās al-Barghāmī, who purportedly had personal ties to Meḥmed II. Al-Malaṭī met the first one in Cairo and the latter in Tripoli. He comments on their characteristics and describes their social status in the Ottoman realm (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 583, 590).

Another likely interlocutor of al-Malaṭī is Khushgeldī al-Khalīlī (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 4: 219). He was a protégé of Çandarlı Halīl Pasha (d. 857/1453), the Ottoman Grand Vizier who was executed by Meḥmed II. Khushgeldī's real name was Yaʿqūb and he worked as an Ajā (*mudabbir al-dār* in the Mamluk context) in Çandarlı's household.[4] After Çandarlı's execution, Yaʿqūb ended up in Cairo and was employed at various Mamluk household. According to al-Malaṭī, he had access to the highest Ottoman ruling class (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 4: 220). It is quite possible that Yaʿqūb told al-Malaṭī about Ottoman affairs and commented on various "Ottoman" characters at social gatherings in which the author was one of the participants.[5] It is thanks to

---

[3]His Rūmī shaykhs were already introduced in the previous chapter. His Rūmī pupils mentioned in his works are Ismāʿīl b. Ḥasan al-Rūmī, Anʿām al-Rūmī, Uways al-Rūmī, Waṣīf al-Rūmī, and Muḥammad b. Ḥamza al-Rūmī (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 65-67).

[4]This is another remarkable occasion where al-Malaṭī compares the bureaucratic terms in the two regions, as it is done for viziers and the *qādi al-ʿaskar* at different places. I could not find an information about the term *Ajā*. The closest pronunciation in Turkish that come to mind is *Ece*. Gerard Clauson offers possible spellings: *Ece* and *Eke*. See (Clauson 1972, 20, 100). It is understood that the word is used for some kind of a household service as al-Malaṭī offers his own translation as *mudabbir al-dār* (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 4: 220).

[5]The fact that al-Malaṭī describes Yaʿqūb's characteristics with vivid detail supports the assumption that he met the former Ottoman-subject (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 4: 220).

this kind of encounters that al-Malaṭī could report about Çandarlı Halīl's son and the Ottoman *qādi al-ʿaskar* Ibrāhīm Çelebi (d. 1499), using inflated terms when referring to him.[6] By elaborating on the image of an elite person from Rūm he had never met, al-Malaṭī likely sought to elevate his own image, too.

It is noteworthy that our scholar does not mention the name of his informants when presenting specific information about the Ottoman domains. In this regard, his account on ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Kuwayz's (d. 876/1472) trip to Rūm is representative. Ibn al-Kuwayz was a *nāẓir al-khāṣṣ* (chamberlain) in the service of the Mamluk sultan Khushqadam. He goes to Rūm after having trouble in the Mamluk court and meets the Ottoman Grand Vizier Maḥmūd Pasha. Ibn al-Kuwayz introduces himself as a vizier for the Mamluk sultan knowing that the office of the vizier in the Ottoman context was superior than it was in the Mamluks (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 4: 17). He even appears before Meḥmed II; however, another Mamluk émigré at the Ottoman court recognizes him, and it turns out that Ibn al-Kuwayz was not a vizier. Then he is settled in Bursa by Meḥmed II.

Similar to referring to "someone reliable" in the case of Bāyezīd II, al-Malaṭī tells Ibn al-Kuwayz's story by saying "Some of my Rūmī friends told that..." (*dhakara lī baʿḍ aṣḥābī min al-arwām*) at the beginning of the anecdote. At the end of his take of Ibn al-Kuwayz, the author quotes from one his anonymous Rūmī friends by naming him as the reporter (*al-mukhbir*) (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 18):

> "If he [i.e. Ibn al-Kuwayz] told the truth, he would have a strong position in Rūm. Sultan Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān terribly raged at him."

The first sentence of the quotation implies that Meḥmed II offered patronage to the Mamluk bureaucrats, and possibly to the other men of letters, who took refuge in the Ottoman domains, although Ibn al-Kuwayz ruined his own chances. Based on this, we can suggest that one reason for al-Malaṭī's referring to anonymous characters must have been the tension between the Mamluks and the Ottomans. Both in the cases of Bāyezīd and Ibn al-Kuwayz, the subject of discussion is Ottoman patronage. Al-Malaṭī might have wanted to protect his reporters against possible allegations in Cairo.[7] I will further detail the occasions where al-Malaṭī mentions Ottoman patronage, and some other oral sources for him in the last section of the chapter.

---

[6]Ibrāhīm also became the Grand Vizier but al-Malaṭī should have recorded his biography before his Grand Vizierate. For further information about Çandarlı İbrāhīm, see (Aktepe, 1993).

[7]At this point, one might recall the incident mentioned in the introduction, where the Qurʾān reciters were battered by a Mamluk commander simply because they recited the first verses of the *sūrah al-Rūm*.

As was seen in the examples of Ilyās al-Barghāmī, Iskandar al-Mīkhāl, and Khushgeldī al-Khalīlī, al-Malaṭī also had a non-scholarly network of Rūmī associates. While the existing literature on the interactions between the Mamluk domains and the Ottoman heartland is based on the scholarly encounters and diplomatic go-betweens, al-Malaṭī's works indicate that captives, émigrés, and merchants were also connecting one region to the other. If we go back to the earliest Mamluk references to the Ottomans in al-ʿUmarī's (d. 749/1348) *al-Taʿrīf*, we see the same phenomenon of non-scholarly interaction as a source of knowledge about Rūm. While writing about Turkoman begliks in the region, al-ʿUmarī refers to one Anatolian and one Genovese merchants as his oral sources (Peacock 2019, 52). Hence, scholarly gatherings and diplomatic missions were only two parts of the social gatherings where Rūmīs and Arabs met and knew each other. Moreover, non-scholarly and non-diplomatic encounters between Rūm and Egypt predates the Ottoman conquest of the region. This perspective might be useful to reconstruct the strong connectedness in the region.

As Muslu indicates, there was a strong intelligence network between the two regions (Muslu 2014, 26, 46). Some other information that al-Malaṭī gives about Rūm was already circulating in Cairo thanks to the diplomatic envoys and the other individuals of political or military status who traveled back and forth between Rūm and Egypt. Most of the diplomatic and military information that al-Malaṭī gives can be classified in this category. Nevertheless, it is still interesting to think about how al-Malaṭī knew that "both sides claim superiority over the other" just after a battle between the Mamluks and the Ottomans (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 122). He was not content with the publicly circulating rumors.

The circulation of texts should also have played a role in al-Malaṭī's awareness of the knowledge produced in Ottoman domains. His *Nuzhat al-albāb fī mukhtaṣar aʿjab al-ʿujāb* in the *Majmaʿ al-bustān* is based on Maḥmūd b. Qāḍi Manyās' (d. unknown) book on occultism and algebra, the *Aʿjab al-ʿajāʾib*. Maḥmūd b. Qāḍi Manyās was a scholar living in the reign of Murād II and he who wrote several works for him (Özkan 2003). At the beginning of the *Nuzhat*, al-Malaṭī says that the original work was written for the Ottoman sultan Murād b. Bāyezīd.[8] He writes the work to meet the request of Ghawrī's nephew Tūmān Bāy, who would later become the last Mamluk sultan. Al-Malaṭī claims to have translated some "important" parts of the text from Turkish to Arabic and simplified the complex content. The author also states that he not only extracted some sections of the work, but also made additions to the original text (Ayasofya 4793, 152). Such notes indicate that the

---

[8]Al-Malaṭī is mistaken about the lineage of Ottoman dynasty on several occasions. The *Rawḍ* also mentions Murād II as Murād Beg b. Abī Yazīd b. ʿUthmān (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 152).

transfer of knowledge did not only move from Mamluk Egypt and Syria to Rūm, but also in the opposite direction, even if this latter kind of transfer was likely far less significant than the former.[9] Moreover, it also shows the Mamluk elite's interest in Rūmī scholars' works from which al-Malaṭī also learned about the region.[10]

Lastly, prophecies seem to have been another source for al-Malaṭī's knowledge of Rūm. At the end of the biography of Ibrāhīm b. Qaramān (d. 865/1461), one of the rulers in Rūm, al-Malaṭī writes about the origins of the Qaramanid dynasty (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 336). He attributes the following story to some of his friends among the "people of wisdom and knowledge" (*ahl al-faḍl wa al-maʿrifa*). According to what they told to al-Malaṭī, a great seer (*kāhin*) and the head of an Oghuz tribe mentioned the Qaramanids in his prophecy. The name of the *kāhin* is Qorquṭ. What Qorquṭ had prophesized about the dynasty came true. Moreover, according to our scholar, the Qaramanids are descended from Māyundur (Bayındır) who was a commander in the army of Chingiz Khān (d. 624/1227). It is likely that Qorquṭ in this context refers to Dede Qorqut, a Turkish legendary character and narrator of twelve tales which are named after him.[11] Bayındır Khān is one of the main characters in Dede Qorqut's collection of tales.[12] This information suggests that the book of Dede Qorqut was read or listened by some people in fifteenth-century Cairene literary circles.[13] Al-Malaṭī's account is a remarkable example of how literary products of various geographies circulated in Cairo and became sources of information for Cairene scholars to learn about the distant lands.

Al-Malaṭī does not only mention the Ottoman subjects and statesmen that he contacted. He offers information about some of them who ended up in Cairo for pilgrimage, captivity, employment or taking refuge. In addition to the Ottoman sultans, the *Nayl* makes several references to Maḥmūd Pasha (d. 878/1474) (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 6: 350, 7: 107, 78). The *Nayl* also records that a person named Ḳaragöz Pasha fled

---

[9] Unlike the texts circulated between Ottoman Rumelia and the Persianate world, we know very little about the textual transmission between Rūm and Cairo until the sixteenth century. See (Necipoğlu 2019, 42). For the sixteenth century onwards, see (Pfeifer, 2015 228-30).

[10] According to Andrew Peacock, the Mamluk elite became interested in some of the early-fourteenth-century Anatolian Turkish classics in the late fifteenth century. A copy of Aşık Paşa's (d. 733/1332) *Garībnāme* was produced for the Mamluk *Amīr* Yashbak min Mahdī in the late fifteenth century. Moreover, a collection of poems made for the Mamluk sultan Qāyitbāy (r. 1468-1496) includes Gülşehrī's (d. after 717/1317) verses. The library of Qāyitbāy also contained the poems of Yunus Emre and Kaygusuz Abdal. See (Peacock 2019, 186). These are astonishing examples for the present study. Since they are contemporary with al-Malaṭī's works, they suggest that al-Malaṭī was not alone in his keen interest in Rūm.

[11] For a detailed information about Dede Qorqut, see (İz 2012).

[12] It is also interesting to see that the content of the book of Dede Qorqut was transmitted into Egypt with Mongol influence. In the existing copies of the book, Bayındır Khān is a leader of the Oghūz tribe, whereas in al-Malaṭī's version, Bayındır is describes as a commander of Chingiz Khān.

[13] For the influence of the book of Dede Qorqut in the culture of Turkomans in Rūm, see (Kafadar, 1995 131-132).

to Cairo with a group of soldiers in 896 H (1496), and informed the Mamluk sultan that the Ottoman soldiers would attack Egypt (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 424-25).[14]

The *Majmaʿ* provides biographical entries for three Ottoman Grand Viziers: Gedik Aḥmed Pasha (d. 887/1483),[15] Isḥāḳ Pasha (d. 892/1487) and Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha (d. 923/1517). There is also a reference to one Muṣṭafā Pasha, who was likely Ḳoca Muṣṭafā Pasha (d. 918/1512), the Grand Vizier who was executed by Bāyezīd II. The reference is in the biography of Aḥmed Beg al-Muṣṭafāwī who, just like al-Khalilī mentioned above, fled to Egypt after the execution his patron Muṣṭafā Pasha (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 492).[16] Two of the Grand Viziers, namely Isḥāḳ Pasha and Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha ended up in Cairo for pilgrimage and captivity, respectively.[17] Gedik Aḥmed Pasha had never been to Egypt, however, his bravery in the battlefield was known in Cairo. Al-Malaṭī praises his war skills and notes that stories about him are circulating (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 490).

In addition to the Ottoman statesmen, the *Majmaʿ* provides the biographies of some scholars who traveled back and forth between the Ottoman and Mamluk lands. These scholars are Ilyās Shujāʿ al-Dīn al-Rūmī al-Uṣulī, Ilyās al-Murādī al-Rūmī, Ilyās al-Arūsī, Mollā Gūrānī, Inʿām Çelebi al-Rūmī and Tāze al-Rūmī al-Ḥanafī (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 470, 590, 592, 600, 730). Al-Malaṭī also mentions the names of two prominent Ottoman scholars: Mollā Yegān (d. 1865/461) and Mollā Khusrev (d. 884/1480) in various biographies (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 455, 600).

As already mentioned in the various pages of this thesis, the most featured characteristic of al-Malaṭī's works is the author's emphasis on Ottoman patronage. Ibn al-Kuwayz's story discussed in the context of al-Malaṭī's sources is only one occasion where our scholar pays tribute to patronage of the Ottoman sultans. Before providing concrete examples of this phenomenon, let us first discuss Ottoman patronage in the fifteenth century. and its place in the larger context of the Islamic world.

---

[14]I could not find detailed information about Karagöz Pasha. It is likely that he was the Ottoman *Beglerbegi* of Anatolia. He was also the sponsor of Ahmed Paşa Camii in Kütahya. See (Altun 1989).

[15]Ahmed Pasha's name is written as " *Aḥmad Guzel*" in the edition (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 490). His name is spelt "*Aḥmad Gedik*" in the manuscript (Alexandria B800, 148).

[16]Al-Malaṭī says that the Mamluk sultan granted a good *iqtaʿ* to Aḥmed Beg (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 492).

[17]Isḥāḳ Pasha became the Grand Vizier twice (1469-72 and 1481-82) (DİA 2000). I could not find an information about his pilgrimage. According to al-Malaṭī, he met the Mamluk sultan in Cairo and went back to Rūm through Damascus. He was a wise and virtuous man. Al-Malaṭī also gives the date of Isḥāḳ's pilgrimage, but the date is unrecognizable. Our scholar gives additional information about Ottoman bureaucracy in Isḥāḳ's biography by saying "The Ottomans have four pashas all of whom are viziers.". See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 536). Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha, on the other hand, was a captive in Cairo. His story will be given a special focus below.

3.2 Ottoman Patronage in the Late Fifteenth Century

As was stated in the introduction, Ottoman patronage is one of the key issues of the present thesis. In this part, the trans-regional aspect of the fifteenth-century Ottoman patronage will be given special emphasis. In the fifteenth century, the Ottoman lands gradually became one of the established centers of Islamic learning. Parallel to the patronage offered to the scholars from the other regions of the Islamicate world, their reputation as patrons of *ʿilm* spread across the rest of Islamdom including the Timurid and the Mamluk lands. Although most of the scholars moving to Rūm were from the Persianate world, Ottoman patronage had a considerable prestige in the Arab lands. Besides, al-Malaṭī's description of Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović reveals that the Ottoman Grand viziers also played a role in the making of a positive image of Ottoman patronage in the Mamluk lands.

3.2.1 The Sultans

> "... Then I set out to Crimea and met Mawlānā Sharaf al-Dīn Shāriḥ al-Manār, a scholar from there; and he passed away in 847 H. (1443-44) in Adrianople. Our lord Sultan al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Jaqmaq—may God eternalize his reign! — invited him to Damascus. The scholar departed for Damascus, but al-Malik Murād b. ʿOthmān did not let him go and kept him in Adrianople until the scholar—may he rest in peace! — died."

Shihāb al-Dīn b. ʿArabshāh (d. 854/1450), a scholar and man of letters who served several dynasties and traveled across Mongolia, Khorasan, Crimea, Anatolia, and Greater Syria, ended up in Cairo in 1436. He became acquainted with many a celebrated scholar of the time, such as Ibn Taghribirdī, al-Sakhāwī, and transmitted his observations about his journey in writing and through conversations.[18] In his two-

---

[18]Both Ibn Taghrībirdī and al-Sakhāwī state that they met Ibn ʿArabshāh in Cairo and Ibn ʿArabshāh transmitted his manuscripts to them. See (Ibn Taghrībirdī 1984, 139), and see (al-Sakhāwī 1934, 1:130).

page long autobiography found in Ibn Taghribirdī's biographical dictionary, titled *Al-Manhal al-ṣāfī*, Ibn ʿArabshāh tells the story of a scholar in Crimea who received an invitation from the Mamluk sultan but was prevented from leaving Adrianople by the Ottoman sultan, Murād II (r. 1421-44, 1446-51) (Ibn Taghrībirdī 1984, 142). Although the Mamluks and the Ottomans enjoyed a positive relationship throughout the reign of Murād II,[19] the Ottoman ruler seems to have intervened with the scholars' travel to the Mamluk lands. The Ottoman sultan in the early years of the 1440s was passionate about becoming a great patron of the arts and sciences, just like his counterparts all over the Mediterranean and the Persianate world.

Alongside the Ottomans there were many centers of patronage in fifteenth-century Islamdom, including several other principalities in Rumelia, the Timurid and the Aqquyunlū courts in the western Iran and Transoxiana, and the Mamluks in the Arabic-speaking lands.[20] Khurasān and Transoxiana became centers of cultural fluorescence in the reigns of the Timurid rulers Shāhrukh (r. 1405-1447), Abū Saʿīd (r. 1451-1469) and Ḥusayn Bayqara (r. 1470-1506) (Atçıl 2016, 320). As discussed in the previous chapter, the Mamluk lands had also become home to many scholars from across the Islamicate world since the beginning of the Mongol invasions. Located in the former Christian lands, the Ottoman lands were not always attractive for Muslims scholars trained in the more established centers of Islamic learning in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.[21] The Ottomans' attempt to create a flourishing learning center in Rūm was interrupted by the Battle of Ankara in 1402. However, throughout the rest of the fifteenth century, we see a gradual increase in the scholarly movement into the Ottoman lands for a number of reasons.

According to Abdurrahman Atçıl, the number of scholars who moved around in the Ottoman lands increased in the fifteenth century primarily for three reasons: the increase in the number of the institutions where these scholars could be employed, the relative political stability in the Ottoman lands in regard to its eastern counterparts, and the state formation which demanded scholarly services in the latter half of the

[19]Murād II paid respect to the Mamluk court and sought recognition as the earlier Ottoman rulers also did. See (Muslu 2014, 28).

[20]For a survey of the patronage in the Ottoman lands and the other begliks, see (Uzunçarşılı 1969, 209-224, 259-262).

[21]The inward mobility to the Ottoman lands already started in fourteenth century. However, it is hard to observe a loyal relation between the scholars and the Ottoman sultans. The scholars like Muḥammad b. Jazarī and Mollā Fenārī had connections outside the Ottoman domains. Both scholars came to the Ottoman lands and worked for Bāyezīd I (r. 1389-1403). The first one considered himself equal to the Ottoman sultan, and he never returned after being taken to Samarkand by Timur in 1402. Mollā Fenārī left the Ottoman domains and served the Qaramanid Beglik for a while after having a conflict with the Ottoman ruler. He also spent some time teaching in Cairo with the Mamluk sultan's request. These examples indicate that the scholars had alternatives around the Islamicate world, hence had no attachment to specific courts. See (Atçıl 2017, 42-43). When the scholarly mobility in the fourteenth and the early fifteenth century is taken into consideration, we see that the Ottoman Beglik was certainly not the best option for Muslim scholars who tended to choose the Mamluk and the Timurid courts.

century (Atçıl 2016, 316-319). Thanks to these factors, we see a gradually increasing inward mobility to the Ottoman lands while, at the same time, the expanding Ottoman enterprise in scholarly activities also led to an increase in the number of the locally educated scholars in the region. This process reflects the origins of what Atçıl calls "the self-sustaining learning system" which would assume its final shape in the mid-sixteenth century.

Just like that of his grandson Bāyezīd II, Murād's reign has also been overshadowed by the reign of Meḥmed II in terms of intellectual flourishment in the Ottoman lands.[22] In fact, the reign of Murād II was a period of translation from Islamic classics and was a threshold for the development of Ottoman historical writing (Öztürk 2000, 9). Murād also offered patronage to a great many scholars from across the Islamicate world. Sirāj al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, ʿAlī ʿAjamī (d. 869/1455), Fakhr al-Dīn al-ʿAjamī (d. 864/1460 or 872/1468), Muḥammad Bazzāzī (d. 827/1424) and Mollā Gūrānī are some of the scholars who came to Rūm and enjoyed Murād II's patronage (Atçıl 2017, 34). We also see a significant increase in the investment in building *madrasas* in the reign of Murād II, parallel to the scholarly movement into the Ottoman lands (Atçıl 2017, 31). This cultural investment was not independent of ideology. Their humiliating defeat against the Timurids led the Ottomans to embrace the post-Mongol model of legitimacy, which brings an emphasis on their dynastic roots in the Oghuz lineage (Atçıl 2017, 26). Hence, Murād offered patronage for several historical pieces ascribing to his family Oghuz connections (Kafadar 2019, 83),[23] and tried to become a prominent Muslim patron, as was seen in such examples as his intervention to Shāriḥ al-Manār's move to Damascus.

Aspiring to establish a form of universal rule and a centralized bureaucracy for his empire, Meḥmed II needed the best scholars for service. To this end, he invited many scholars to his realm. Fatḥ Allāh Shirwānī (d. 890/1486), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 897/1492), Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawwānī (d. 907/1502) (Atçıl 2017, 64) were those who rejected Meḥmed's offer.[24] Despite these rejections, during the reign of Meḥmed II, the Ottoman lands became a competitive member of the high learning centers of Islamdom. Musannifek (d. 875/1470), Quṭb al-Dīn al-ʿAjamī (d. 902/1497), and Shukr Allāh Shirwānī (d. unknown) are well-known examples of scholars who accepted Meḥmed's patronage and moved to Rumelia from the Per-

---

[22]For an assessment of the intellectual life in Murād II's reign, see (Azamat, 1996).

[23]The prominent reflections of Oghuzism during the reign of Murād II can be found in *Bahjat al-tawārīkh* by Şükrullāh of Amasya and *Taʾrīkh-i Āl-i Selçuk*, in which lore about Oghuz Khān is embedded, by Yazıcızāde ʿAli (Kafadar 2019, 82, 83).

[24]Al-Kāfiyajī was probably among those who rejected Meḥmed's invitation. We know that the scholar received gifts from the sultan as discussed in the previous chapter.

sianate world (Atçıl 2017, 66-67). However, the most important turning point in Meḥmed II's image-making as a patron was ʿAlī Kuşçu's (d. 879/1474) arrival to the Ottoman lands. ʿAlī Kuşçu was an astronomer trained in the Timurid lands and he joined Meḥmed's service after rejecting Timurid and Aqquyunlū patronage (Atçıl 2017, 65-66). Geographically, Meḥmed's patronage extended to the west. As Gülru Necipoğlu shows in her seminal article, unlike his Mamluk, Aqquyunlū and Timurid counterparts, Meḥmed II offered patronage to some artists and architects from Italy.[25]

Aḥmad al-Bakirjī al-Ḥanafī's (d. 880/1476) biography in the *Majmaʿ* indicates that Meḥmed II's patronage also attracted al-Malaṭī's attention. Al-Bakirjī was an influential *muftī* and Sufi in Diyār Bakr and Aleppo in the reign of the Aqquyunlū ruler Uzūn Ḥasan (r. 1452-1478) (*Ḥasan al-ṭawīl* in most of the Mamluk sources). Al-Bakirjī was sent by Ḥasan to Meḥmed II as an intermediary after the battle at Otlukbeli in 1473. Al-Malaṭī dedicates one-third of al-Bakirjī's half-page biography to the scholar's encounter with Meḥmed II. "Ibn ʿUthmān regarded him with great respect" al-Malaṭī says (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 479). Moreover, the Ottoman sultan praises al-Bakirjī by saying, "Do not think that I exalted you out of respect to the one who sent you [i.e. Uzūn Ḥasan], I exalted you only for your ʿ*ilm* and virtue". How this dialogue between Meḥmed II and a scholar from Aqquyunlū realm reached Cairo is interesting. Even if the dialogue is fictitious, how it finds an echo in al-Malaṭī gives us a clue about the image of Meḥmed II as patron in Cairo.

The scholars' flow to the Ottoman lands continued during the reign of Bāyezīd II. Müeyyedzāde ʿAbdurraḥmān (d. 921/1516), ʿAlī Shirāzī (d. unknown), Ḥāfız-ı ʿAcem (d. 957/1551), Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Awwal (a.k.a Saçlı Emir / d. 963/1556), Yūsuf Shirāzī (d. unknown), and Mollā ʿArab (d. 896/1491) are the best-known beneficiaries of Bāyezīd's patronage after coming to the Ottoman lands from the outside world (Atçıl, 2017, 111). The rise of the Shiʿite Safavids in the east played a crucial role in these Sunnī scholars' move to Rūm, except for Mollā ʿArab who came from the Mamluk lands (Atçıl, 2017, 111).

For the purposes of the present thesis, the most intriguing aspect of Bāyezīd II's patronage reached beyond the Ottoman lands, especially to the Hijāz. Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad al-Ḥasan al-Samhūdī (d. 914/1509), was a Shafiʿī scholar who resided in Mecca.[26] As al-Samhūdī dedicated his *Idrākāt al-waraqāt* to Bāyezīd II, he expressed his wish that the sultan continue patronizing him and

---

[25] According to Necipoğlu, Meḥmed sought services from Italian artists via visible diplomatic channels. See (Necipoğlu 2012, 4, 30).

[26] For al-Samhūdī's biography and works, see (Krenkow 2012).

his four nephews (Taşkömür 2019, 369, 401). Another Hijāzī scholar and poet who was a beneficiary of Bāyezīd II's patronage was Aḥmad b. Ḥusayn b al-ʿUlayf (d. 926/1520). Ibn al-ʿUlayf wrote a history of the Ottoman dynasty titled *al-Durr al-manẓūm fī manākib sulṭān Bāyazīd malik al-Rūm* for Bāyezīd II.[27] The scholar also sent his work to the sultan and was remunerated in return (Oumar 2010, 10-14). These connections with the Hijāzi scholars were most probably established through the Ottoman subjects who went on pilgrimage.

The reign of Bāyezīd was also a period of significant changes in patterns of patronage inside the Ottoman domains. Bāyezīd's father Meḥmed II had implemented highly controversial policies on endowment lands (*waqf*) in the last decade of his reign. Legal privileges, along with endowments in the Ottoman lands and in the rest of the Islamicate world, granted various social groups, especially scholars, financial autonomy, making them less dependent on the political elite. Meḥmed declared a significant number of endowments to have been illegally established, confiscated them, and reissued their revenues as timar (Atçıl 2017, 67). (Here the crucial ref is İnalcık.) In the first years of his reign, Bāyezid II reversed his father's policy on endowments and enjoyed a great political support from scholars and Sufis. Even some scholars who had left the Ottoman lands in Meḥmed's reign, such as Fenārīzāde Aḥmed Pasha and ʿAbduraḥmān b. ʿAli b. Müeyyed returned to the port for Bāyezīd's patronage (Muslu 2013, 56). Further, he also generously granted privileges to some Sufi groups that were marginalized in the reign of Meḥmed II.[28] We will get back to this issue and its relevance to Bāyezīd II's image in the following parts of the thesis.

3.2.2 The Grand Vizier's Patronage

While discussing Ottoman patronage in the late fifteenth century, we should also mention the Grand Viziers. Emine Fetvacı, in her extensive study on patronage relations at the Ottoman court in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, calls attention to the "plurality of agents" in the process of the manuscript production at

---

[27]Ibn al-ʿUlayf and his work are studied by Saad F. Oumar in an MA Thesis titled Ahmed bin el-Hüseyin bin Muhammed bin el-Uleyf'in Kitâbü'd-Dürri'l-Manzum fî Menâkıbi's-Sultân Bâyezid Melikü'r-Rum Adlı Eserinin Çeviri ve Değerlendirmesi. See (Oumar 2010).

[28]For a detailed account of Bāyezīd's beneficence to Sufis, especially to the *Khalwatī* and the *Bayrāmī* orders, see (Karataş 2016, 83-84) and (Karataş 2011, 92, 117-118).

the Ottoman court. Fetvacı argues that the works produced in the Ottoman court reflected the political agendas and interests of not only the sultan or members of the royal household, but also that of high bureaucrats and courtiers (Fetvacı 2005, 9). I believe that this important intervention made by Fetvacı in the context of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is quite useful, and even more applicable when analyzing patronage relations at the Ottoman court in the mid and the late fifteenth century. The Ottoman sultans in the latter half of the century were probably not the single patrons, but the most powerful ones. While developing this argument, my analysis will focus on one major example: Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović, the famous Ottoman Grand Vizier (1456-68 and 1472-74), and his relation to Cairo. Discussing what literary patronage meant in the case of Maḥmūd's Grand Vizierate for Meḥmed II is also useful for the debates about the image of Bāyezīd II.

Meḥmed II's centralizing tendencies resulted in a significant modification in the existing power relations in the Ottoman. His policies attempted to create a highly centralized bureaucratic apparatus. One of the sultan's aims was subjugating the influential families of Turco-Muslim origins, such as Çandarlı family, Evrenosogulları, Mikhālogulları and Ṭurakhānogulları. These families were perceived to be a threat to Ottoman power as alternative loci of power and authority especially in the empire's frontiers.[29] Their legitimacy came from being active participants in *ghazā* or from constituting an essential part of the nascent bureaucracy. Indeed, they played key roles in territorial expansion of the beglik. Meḥmed, who was not satisfied with being the *primus inter pares* in his state, attempted to substitute administrators who hailed from these families with administrators of *kul* or "slave" status. Some of these *kul* administrators were recruited from among Christian war captives, while others were levied from the Christian subject population through the child levy known as *devşirme.* Severed of their ties with their original families and communities, and converted into Islam, administrators of *kul* status were expected to be loyal only to the sultan himself.

Meḥmed II's policy to substitute powerful Turco-Muslim families in the imperial administration with *kul* administrators did not materialize overnight. To build a bureaucratic empire, he needed an alternative educated class. After the execution of Çandarlı Halīl Pasha and the removal of Zaganos Meḥmed Pasha (d. 869/1464), Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović became the Grand Vizier in 1453. However, the transition to this more absolutist mode of government and the undermining of the power of "notable" families was not as thorough or radical as the traditional scholarship has assumed. As Heath Lowry has shown, seven of the twelve Grand Viziers of non-

---

[29]A detailed analysis of this process can be found in (Kafadar 1995, 143-150).

Muslim-origin between 1453 and 1516 were members of the former Byzantine and Balkan aristocracies (Lowry 2003, 115, 120-122). Maḥmūd Pasha, Gedik Aḥmed Pasha, Mesīḥ Pasha (d. 906/1501), Hadım ʿAli Pasha (d. 916/1511) and Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha (d. 923/1517) were some of these viziers from the Balkan and the Byzantine nobility. These noble viziers contributed to the extension of the empire by putting their networks in the Christian world in the service to the Ottoman sultans (Lowry 2003, 118). On the other hand, Lowry, who interprets this phenomenon as an indicator of Ottoman syncretism, does not go into detail as to how different these noble Grand Viziers were than the others in terms of their political influence and literary patronage.

Angelović was the most influential member of this group of noble viziers.[30] Based on the data Lowry has provided and looking at Maḥmūd Pasha's network, it can be said that the Pasha was not a passive slave of the sultan, rather he was an influential power holder in the nascent empire thanks to his network inside and outside the Ottoman lands. His seventeen years in Grand Vizierate was the longest one in Ottoman history. During his position, he contributed to Meḥmed II's war making and diplomacy with his noble family networks.[31] Maḥmūd Pasha was dismissed from the office of Grand Vizier in 1468, probably because of his initiatives on the policies towards the eastern lands; the Aqquyunlū, Dhu'l-Qadrids and Qaramān. In 1472, and he was recalled as Grand Vizier (Stavrides 2001, 165). He was executed by Meḥmed II in 1474. Angelović's execution gives clue about the tension between the sultan and the Grand Vizier. Gian Maria Angielolle (d. 1525), a Venetian traveler in the port, reported that the sultan feared that Maḥmūd Pasha had gained too much power, especially among the soldiers[32]:

> "The Grand Turk feared the pasha because he was a man of great authority and well-liked by the soldiers. The reason of the execution was

---

[30] Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović and his patronage network is best studied in Stavrides 2001. Angelović was born into a Serbian aristocratic family in the early 1420s. Despite the conflicting stories about his ethnic origin, all the sources agree that he was coming from the Byzantine-Serbian nobility. It is unlikely that he was captured in the regular *devşirme* levy. Firstly, Maḥmūd Pasha came from an urban aristocratic origin while the levy normally included the Christian rural population. Moreover, at the time when he is estimated to have been captured, Serbia was not integrated to the Ottoman territories. See (Stavrides 2001, 75, 109)

[31] He had participated the conquest of Istanbul after which he became the Grand Vizier. The Serbian campaign, the conquests of Morea, Bosnia and Trebizond were some of the campaigns in which Meḥmed II highly benefited from his noble networks. For instance, before the fall of Trebizond in 1461, the deputy of the emperor of Trebizond who the Ottomans had to negotiate with was no one other than Maḥmūd Pasha's maternal cousin George Amerutsez. See (Lowry 2003, 123).

[32] The execution of Maḥmūd Pasha had repercussions in public as well. The positive image of the pasha was a result of his charisma among the army and exhaustion from Meḥmed II's harsh policies. The pasha was believed to be innocent and became a saintly figure in the popular culture. The anonymous *Menākıb-ı Maḥmūd Paşa-yı Velī* became a popular tool of criticizing Meḥmed II. See (Tekindağ 2003)

jealousy, more than anything else." (Stavrides 2001, 77).

The poets and scholars who were under the patronage of Maḥmūd Pasha included many, but most prominently Enverī (d. unknown), Şükrullāh (d. unkown), Ḥamīdī (d. unkown), Saruca Kemal (d. after 894/1489), Mollā Iyāṣ (d. 910/1505), Musannifek, Karamānī Meḥmed who would later become the Grand Vizier (1477-1481) and Ṭursun Beg (d. after 885/1481) (Stavrides 2001, 294-301). The general characteristic of the works related to Maḥmūd Pasha is that they tend to describe the pasha as an antagonist of Meḥmed II. Enverī's *Düsturnāme* is one example of this phenomenon. Bearing the title "The Book of *Düsturnāme*, in the Name of Maḥmūd Pasha the Great", *Düsturnāme* is an epic composed of three sections and one of the sections is related to *ghazā* of Umur Beg (d. 748/1348), the fourteenth century ruler of the Aydınid principality. The fact that the pasha commissioned an epic about a person whose beglik was a serious rival of the Ottomans is interesting in and of itself. The sections dedicated to "Meḥmed II" and "Maḥmūd Pasha" are almost equal in length. Most importantly, according to Enverī, the underlying reason behind Meḥmed II's conquests was Maḥmūd Pasha's intelligent tactics. While he describes the unsuccessful siege of the castle of Yençe, Enverī charges Meḥmed II with preventing Maḥmūd Pasha to capture the castle (Enveri 2012, XXXIX).

Dedicated to Bāyezīd II, Ṭursun Beg's chronicle titled *Taʾrīkh-i Ebü'l-fetḥ* brings Maḥmūd Pasha and Bāyezīd II together by depicting the first one as the ideal Grand Vizier, and the latter as the ideal ruler. Ṭursun Beg's *Taʾrīkh* is another source reflecting the discomfort after Meḥmed's reign. All the virtues that Ṭursun Beg attributes to Bāyezīd II are the reversed policies of Meḥmed II (İnalcık and Murphey 1978, 23-24). The important aspect of Ṭursun's *Taʾrīkh* for the purpose of our discussion is that the content of the work suggests that the legacy of Maḥmūd Pasha was still visible in the reign of Bāyezīd II. Although Ṭursun Beg depicts Bāyezīd II and Maḥmūd Pasha to be in great harmony, Maḥmūd Pasha's legacy and the other Grand Viziers' networks undoubtedly challenged Bāyezīd II's monopoly over patronage.

In the previous chapter, we already mentioned that al-Kāfiyajī dedicates his *Sayf al-mulūk* and *Sayf al-qudāt* to the vizier of the age (*āsaf al-zamān*) al-Amīr Mahmūd Beg and begs for mercy.[33] We do not know how the possible connection between

---

[33]Hüseyin Yılmaz, in his *Caliphate Redefined*, classifies Ottoman literature on political thought as a product of the Sufi mindset. He also argues that, unlike the Ottoman trend, Mamluk political literature was jurisprudence-oriented, emphasizing the legal responsibilities of the caliph (Yılmaz 2018, 7, 38). Yılmaz does not discuss al-Kāfiyajī in his book. However, al-Kāfiyajī's political treatise *Sayf al-mulūk wa al-hukkām* goes beyond this dichotomy, in that it is based on the moralistic aspects of the caliphate. He wrote a separate treatise for judges, entitled *Sayf al-qudāt*, which might be interpreted as an attempt to abstract rulers from the legal sphere. According to al-Kāfiyajī, in order for a sultan to adjudicate in legal

al-Kāfiyajī and Maḥmūd Pasha was established. Maḥmūd Pasha was already a well-known figure in the diplomatic circles of Cairo probably because of his active involvement in the Aqquyunlū and Qaramānid politics.[34] It is also plausible that Maḥmūd Pasha was the one who contacted al-Kāfiyajī on behalf of Meḥmed II. Gülru Necipoğlu shows that Maḥmuḍ Pasha and his diplomatic network in the west played an important role in Meḥmed II's contact with the Italian artists (Necipoğlu 2012, 2-3). The contacts with Italian artists were mostly established trough gifts exchanged by the envoys (Necipoğlu 2012, 3). The Grand Vizier might have played a similar role in the case of al-Kāfiyajī through the intense diplomatic exchanges between Egypt and Rūm.

Al-Malaṭī refers to Maḥmūd Pasha several times in the *Nayl* and *Rawḍ*. After telling that Maḥmūd was executed because of an issue pertaining to Meḥmed II's Aqquyunlū campaign, al-Malaṭī speaks highly of the Grand Vizier:

> "Maḥmūd was a glorious, chivalrous, brave, prudent, knowledgeable, generous, wise, and modest vizier. He was leading the *jihād* and he enabled his king to achieve what he [i.e. Meḥmed II] desired. He ended up becoming the Grand Vizier of Ibn ʿUthmān. He became very famous and his reputation grew day by day. He became truly magnificent. He has several monuments in *Rūm*.
>
> . . . His lord regretted his execution afterwards. . . He [i.e. Maḥmūd] wrote good verses in Turkish." (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 107, 108)

Though al-Malaṭī does not state that Maḥmūd's patronage extended to Cairo and to his shaykh, the qualities that he attributed to the Grand Vizier are exceptional when compared to the other elite personalities in his works. It is also noteworthy that al-Malaṭī mentions the Grand Vizier as "Maḥmūd Shāh" on two occasions, indicating that the pasha had a very powerful image in Cairo (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 78, 107). Even if al-Kāfiyajī was a beneficiary of Maḥmūd's patronage, al-Malaṭī is not supposed to have noted this while writing in Cairo because of the delicate balance between politics and patronage. One should remember that he does not even

---

matters, he must be qualified as a judge (El-Kafiyeci 2018, 22-27). The context of the works requires further study. Although we do not have any evidence that the *Sayf al-mulūk* addresses the Ottoman audience, its exceptional content might suggest the Ottoman context in favor of Maḥmūd Pasha. Himmet Taşkömür calls for caution in attributing al-Kāfiyajī's dedications to Maḥmūd Pasha for two reasons. First, the terminology used in the dedications, which is the language of the Mamluk chancery, allows for the possibility that the works might not have been dedicated to the Ottoman grand vizier. Second, al-Kāfiyajī's jurisprudential works were copied for his personal library. Hence, the dedications might have been added by someone else (Taşkömür 2019, 402).

[34]Al-Kāfiyajī's student al-Sakhāwī, in his *Wajīz al-kalām,* describes the peace negotiations between Uzūn Ḥasan and Meḥmed II with an emphasis on the role of Maḥmūd Pasha Angelović.

mention the names of his informers regarding the situation in the Ottoman domains. For a person of al-Kāfiyajī's status, any relation to the Ottomans was abusable in the Mamluk lands in the last decades of the fifteenth century. Approximately two decades after al-Kāfiyajī died, Saʿad Allāh b. Maḥmūd, the Ḥanafī judge of Malatya, was executed by the governor of the city. According to al-Malaṭī, the underlying reason behind the execution was the judge's personal problems with the governor. However, the governor wrote to the Mamluk sultan that Saʿad was in cahoots with the Ottomans (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 101).

Grand Viziers of noble origin continued to assume considerable power in the reign of Bāyezīd II. Bāyezīd II's grand viziers of aristocratic background were Mesīḥ Aḥmed Pasha, Hersekzāde and Hadım ʿAlī Pasha. Especially, the Grand Vizier Hadım ʿAlī Pasha asserted a dominance in the rule of the empire and the struggle among Bāyezīd's sons for the throne (Atçıl 2017, 86). In this regard, it is also noteworthy that the Ottoman grand viziers who find an echo in al-Malaṭī's works are the noble ones, such as Maḥmūd Pasha and Gedik Aḥmed Pasha.[35] We do not know enough about the patronage networks of the noble Grand Viziers. Nevertheless, the example of Maḥmūd Pasha's patronage and his connections beyond the Ottoman borders suggest that another reason behind Bāyezīd II's above-mentioned investment in patronage might be suppressing the influence of the Grand Viziers.

3.3 Bāyezīd II as a Scholar King: Al-Malaṭī on Ottoman Dynasty

> "I met someone who reported that Bāyezīd had studied (*qaraʾa*) the sciences (*ʿulūm*) and read the *Sharh al-mawāqif*, *al-maqāmāt*, and *muqaddimāt* of literary works." (Al-Sakhāwī 1934, 11: 148)

In his *al-Ḍawʾ al-lāmiʿa*, the eminent Mamluk-based scholar al-Sakhāwī lists some of the books read (or studied) by the Ottoman sultan. Indeed, the copies of the works mentioned by al-Sakhāwī are listed in the inventory of Bāyezīd II's personal library

---

[35]Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha, another noble origin vizier, has the most elaborate biography in the *Majmaʿ*. It goes without saying that al-Malaṭī's special interest in Hersekzāde was a result of his captivity in Cairo before his Grand Vizierate. See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 462-464).

which has recently been published.[36] This reference demonstrates that Bāyezīd II's reputation among the elites of Cairo was not solely based on the ups and downs in Mamluk-Ottoman diplomatic relations. The sultan seems to have been known as a generous patron of the sciences and a scholar king also in the Mamluk realm thanks to scholarly mobility between the two regions.[37] As a member of the same scholarly community, al-Malaṭī's focus on Ottoman patronage, and more specifically on Bāyezīd II, in the *Majma'* is stronger than al-Sakhāwī's short reference to the same phenomenon and the sultan. Bāyezīd's biographical entry in the *Majma'* suggests that al-Malaṭī penned the entry before he received the patronage of al-Ghawrī between 1512-1514. This is both because Bāyezīd was alive while al-Malaṭī was writing the entry, and because the Ottoman sultan's patronage was elevated. In this section, I give a comparative analysis of the relevant parts in the *Majma'* using the author's *Nayl al-amal* and Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī's *Inbā' al-ghumr fī abnā' al-'umr*. My aim is to explore how al-Malaṭī utilized his biographical dictionary to reflect his dissatisfaction with the patronage extended to scholars in the Mamluk domains at the time.

3.3.1 The Dynasty

Bāyezīd II's entry also includes al-Malaṭī's reflection on the previous Ottoman rulers. The biography begins with a quotation from Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbā' al-ghumr fī abnā' al-'umr*: "It is said that their [i.e. the Ottomans'] origin is from the Arabs of Ḥijāz."[38] (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 209). Using a passive verb that indicates the weakness of the statement, both Ibn Ḥajar and al-Malaṭī seem to have rejected this idea. Despite all the glorifying discourse upon the Ottoman dynasty, it is noticeable that al-Malaṭī does not refer to their genealogy to confer legitimacy on the dynasty. However, eulogists of the Ottoman dynasty during Bāyezīd II's reign were still experimenting

---

[36]The *Sharh al-mawāqif* is a famous *kalām* (rational theology) work written by al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413). Six copies are listed in Atūfī's library inventory. (Atçıl 2019, 367-387). *Maqāmāt* and *muqaddimāt* can be classified as literary genres. Bāyezīd II's library catalogue lists al-Ḥarīrī's *al-Maqāmāt* and Zamakhsharī's *Muqaddimāt al-adab* (Qutbuddin 2019, 607-634). Persian and Turkish translations of Zamakhsharī's work also appear in the inventory. (Csirkés 2019, 687).

[37]For a meticulous analysis of the ideological approaches to Bāyezīd II in the scholarship, see Kafadar 2019, 81.

[38]The author's statement is "*Yuqālu anna aṣl mulūk al-Rūm banī 'Uthmān hāulā'i min 'arab al-Ḥijāz*". Ibn Ḥajar constructs a narrative of the Ottomans while he records the years Murād I (d. 796/1389) and Bāyezīd I (d. 805/1403) died. See (Al-'Asqalānī 1967-76, 1:105, 159).

with forging a genealogy going back to Oghuz Khān.[39]

One might think that the Mamluk sultans' slave origins made it meaningless for a Mamluk scholar to refer to a legendary genealogy as a tool of legitimacy for a dynasty.[40] However, as we discussed in the previous chapter, al-Malaṭī mentions the connection of Qaramanid dynasty to the Oghuz tribe with a reference to Dede Qorqut (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 336). Al-Malaṭī even says, "Their reign dates back to the times before Islam...Their nobility is illustrious." Another version of the tales of Dede Qorqut which includes Qorqut's prophecy concerning the Ottomans appears in Yazıcızāde's *Taʾrīkh-i Āl-i Selçuk* (Kafadar 1995, 178n). Apparently, this version of the tales did not reach Cairo in al-Malaṭī's time, unlike the version concerning the Qaramanids who had been Mamluk vassals for decades.

Although al-Malaṭī does not elaborate on the nobility of the Ottomans, Bāyezīd's royal background versus his Mamluk counterparts' slave origins was an issue in the Mamluk-Ottoman conflicts between 1485 and 1491. In 1485, an Ottoman official at Bāyezīd's court insulted the Mamluk envoy Jānibeg by implying that the Ottoman sultan was a more legitimate sultan to rule the holy cities than the Mamluk sultan Qāyitbāy who was of slave origin (Muslu 2014, 134-6). The Ottoman historians Ṭursun Beg and Ibn Kemāl (d. 940/1534) also had a similar attitude denigrating the Mamluk sultan Qāyitbāy's slave origin (Muslu 2014, 150). Hence, al-Malaṭī's chronological account of the history of the dynasty and his emphasis on the dynasty's splendor extended over time might be interpreted as a eulogy of the Ottomans in and of itself.

The genealogical lineage of the Ottoman dynasty given in Bāyezīd's biography is also derived from Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. The lineage given by al-Malaṭī is as follows: "Abū Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. Murād b. Abī Yazīd b. Murād b. Ordakhān b. ʿAlī Ardan b. ʿUthmān b. Salmān b. ʿUthmān b. Tughrūl" (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 209).[41] An additional ʿUthmān and one ʿAlī who do not exist in the correct lineage are noticeable. Moreover, Meḥmed I does not exist in the lineage; however, his short biography is given in its place in Bāyezīd II's entry.[42] However, al-Malaṭī does

---

[39] For an analysis of Oghusizm during the reign of Bāyezīd II, see (Kafadar 2019, 82-83). In addition to the contemporary Ottoman literature on the dynastic genealogy, Bāyezīd himself named his children Ḳorḳūd and İlaldı, which are traditional Oghuz names.

[40] Hereditary nobility was not completely insignificant for the Mamluks. For a detailed assessment, see (Levanoni 2009).

[41] The debates over the Ottoman dynastic lineage lie beyond the scope of this study. For a detailed assessment of the Ottoman dynastic genealogy, see (Imber, 1987).

[42] Meḥmed I is mentioned as *Kirishjī* (*Kirişçi*) in some Mamluk sources, including al-Malaṭī's *Nayl* (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 4: 92, 93). However, in the manuscript of the *Majmaʿ*, al-Malaṭī mentions the ruler as (*Kidisjī*) twice (Alexandria B800, 59). For the usage of the title *Kirişçi*, see (İnalcık 2003).

not merely transmit the information given by Ibn Ḥajar, but he also elaborates on the biographies of the rulers and adds the short biographies of Murād II, Meḥmed II, and Bāyezīd II.[43] While narrating the reigns of the Ottoman rulers, the main focus of al-Malaṭī is on two aspects of the dynasty: the Ottomans' involvement in *jihād* and *ghazā*, and their investment in scholars. The author further discusses the origins of the names, such as Tughrūl, ʿUthmāncik, Ardan and Orkhān, basing his arguments on information he obtained from his Turkish-speaking shaykhs (*ashyākhī al-ʿārifūn bi lughat al-Turk*).[44] These references not only illustrate al-Malaṭī's keen interest in the dynasty but also exemplify instances when the Ottomans were the subject of conversation in scholarly circles in Mamluk Cairo.

Al-Malaṭī describes an Ottoman ruler, Ardan ʿAlī, who does not exist in the correct lineage, between Osman I (r. 1302-1324) and Orhan (r. 1324-1362).[45] The character of Ardan ʿAlī derives from Ibn Ḥajar's *Inbāʾ al-ghumr*. While recording the date of Murād I (d. 791/1389, but 796/1393 in al-Malaṭī's record) in the *Nayl*, al-Malaṭī makes a direct quotation from Ibn Ḥajar's short comment on Ardan ʿAlī in his *Inbāʾ* (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 2: 350). However, in the *Majmaʿ*, our scholar goes beyond the information in the *Inbāʾ* and portrays the character as the ancestor of Ottoman patronage (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 211). According to al-Malaṭī, Ardan ʿAlī was different from his predecessors in that he became civilized (*taḥaddara*), and he was the first Ottoman ruler to develop intimacy with scholars, implying that this was a defining characteristic for the dynasty. He loved not only the scholars but also *al-ṣulaḥāʾ* (those who are virtuous, probably Sufis in this context). Al-Malaṭī further reports that ʿAlī built Sufi lodges (*ziwāya* and *khawānik*) in Bursa, his successors followed his path, and they even got ahead of him in patronage. This difference between ʿAlī's image in the *Majmaʿ* and the *Nayl* once again suggests that al-Malaṭī decided to further emphasize Ottoman patronage in his biographical dictionary.

---

[43]The author states that the detailed biographies of Meḥmed I (*Kidisjī*) Murād II, Meḥmed II, and Cem will be given under the letters *kef, mīm* and *jīm*, which are, however, missing from the existing copy (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 212).

[44]As stated in his biography, al-Malaṭī spoke Turkish. This reference to the Turkish-speaking shaykhs might be considered as using their authority as a base for his arguments. According to al-Malaṭī, the name *Tughrūl* (Ertughrul) comes from *tughrī bōl* meaning *ṭarīq mustaqīm* (the correct path), and *Orkhān* is originally is a misreading of *Ordakhān*. Al-Malaṭī further says that *Orda* means the residence (*manzil*) of the sultan. He further states that the suffix "*cik*" at the end of ʿUthmāncik is for minimization (*taṣgīr*). Lastly, according to our scholar, Ardan of ʿAlī Ardan is a misreading of *ardam* which means wisdom. See (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 213). The role of Turkish language in Mamluk capital is another big issue. Although Arabic was used for the official and scholarly purposes, many Turkophone rulers spoke Turkish and supported Turkish literature. The rulers offered patronage to authors from Anatolia and the Golden Horde. From the late fourteenth century onwards original works in Qipchaq Turkish started to be composed in Egypt. See (Peacock 2019, 149, 181, 185, 187).

[45]For Ibn Ḥajar's version of the lineage and his sources, see (İnalcık 1948, 189-195).

70

Figure 3.1

Ardan ʿAlī in the *Majmaʿ* (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 210-211)	Ardan ʿAlī in the *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* (Al-ʿAsqalānī 1967-76, 1: 105)
فقام مقام عثمان جق هذا بل أربى علي عليه في الغزو والجهاد وفتح البلاد حتى استولى على عامة البلاد التي تلي الخليج القسطنطيني وزادت شهرته وذكره وعظم ملكه وفخم أمره واتّسعت مملكته بزيادة على أبيه وجده وأردن علي هذا فاق على من تقدّمه بأنه تبلد وتحضّر حضارة تامة وصحب العلماء وقرّبهم وأدناهم وأحبهم وأحب الفضائل وقرّب الصلحاء أيضا وأعمر الزوايا والخوانك بيرصا وهو أوّل من بني عثمان قرّب العلماء وأنشأ العماير ثمّ تبعه من جاء بعده من بنيه وأربو عليه ولا زال على خير وغزو حتى مات	وقام ابنه أردن علي مقامه فأربى على أبيه في الجهاد وقرّب العلماء والصلحاء وعمّر الخوانك والزوايا ثمّ مات فقام ابنه أردخان

3.3.1.1 Ibn Ḥajar and his impact on al-Malaṭī's corpus

The *Inbāʾ al-ghumr* appears to be the most frequent written source of reference in the *Majmaʿ*. As previously discussed in the part about al-Malaṭī's environment, its author Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, who was one of the most influential and prolific scholars of the fifteenth century, was a close associate of al-Malaṭī's f ather.[46] His *Inbāʾ al-ghumr fī abnāʾ al-ʿumr* is also among the first Mamluk narrative sources attaching importance to the Ottomans. Ibn Ḥajar had another relevance to the Ottomans. When Murād II launched a campaign in the Balkans, the Qaramanid ruler Ibrāhīm attacked the Ottoman lands from the east. As a result of this unexpected offensive, Murād II asked for the Mamluk sultan Jaqmaq's permission to wage war against the Qaramanids. Five Mamluk-based scholars issued *fatwā*s for the Ottomans to fight against another Muslim polity. One of these scholars was our Ibn Ḥajar (Muslu 2014, 106).[47]

---

[46] For Ibn Ḥajar's biography and his influence in Islamic intellectual history, see (Kandemir 1999).

[47] An elaborate discussion on the authenticity of the *fatwā*s can be found in (Boyacıoğlu 2001). Al-Malaṭī does not mention the *fatwā*. Despite his problematic relations both with the Ottomans and the Mamluks, the Qaramanid ruler Ibrāhīm is mentioned quite positively in al-Malaṭī's works. See (Al-Malaṭī 2002,

Ibn Ḥajar was also one of the sources of a famous anecdote about the Ottomans told by Ibn Bahadūr (d. unknown) in his *Waqaiʿ Turkmān*. Bāyezīd I's campaigns in the Balkans were appreciated by the Mamluk sultan Barqūq (r. 1390-1399) (Muslu 2014, 23). After a while, Barqūq started to become concerned about the Ottoman ruler's growing reputation in the Muslim world. Based on Ibn Ḥajar's account, Ibn Bahadūr narrates, "He [i.e. Barqūq] said, 'I am not afraid of Timur because everyone will help me against him. Rather, I am afraid of Ibn ʿUthmān, I [i.e. Ibn Ḥajar] heard Ibn Khaldūn saying. He [i.e. Barqūq] repeatedly said, 'for the ruler of Egypt there was no fear except from Ibn ʿUthmān.'" (Muslu 2014, 23).[48] Referring to Ibn Ḥajar, al-Malaṭī narrates the same anecdote by changing Bāyezīd I with Murād I (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 2: 362).

However, al-Malaṭī makes another significant addition to the relevant part:

> "Our father was telling us, referring to his own father who attributed the following to al-Ẓāhir Barqūq's close associates, 'Some astrologers prophesied that a person named Abū Yazīd and titled Yıldırım from the lineage of Ibn ʿUthmān will take possession of the domains of Egypt. When Murād died and Bāyezīd ascended the throne, al-Ẓāhir became increasingly anxious about his reign. They still bring up this matter repeatedly.'"[49] (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 2: 362)

We should remember that Bāyezīd I had indeed attacked the zone of Mamluk influence in Anatolia and captured Malatya, our scholar's birthplace, in 1399, and took control of the city for a short period of time (Göğebakan 2003).[50] This event must have had a role in the making of this prophecy. Nevertheless, al-Malaṭī certainly did not give this account simply to mention his father's memory. This prophecy gives us a valuable clue about al-Malaṭī's perspective on the ongoing political turmoil in the Eastern Mediterranean. The context of this narrative will be revealed in the following section.

Both his family connection to the shaykh and Ibn Ḥajar's key role in learning about the Ottomans in Cairo made al-Malaṭī especially interested in his work. Al-Malaṭī

6:193) and (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 336). This might be a result of his father's connection to the Qaramanids.

[48]The translation of the passage belongs to Muslu. Al-Maqrīzī, in his *al-Durar al-ʿUqūd*, also tells the anecdote referring to a Mamluk envoy who was previously sent to Bursa in 1392. See (Muslu 2014, 285n).

[49]The context reveals that the last sentence of the quote belongs to al-Malaṭī's father.

[50]Bāyezīd I's intention to conquer Egypt contains a reference to a work written at the Ottoman court, Aḥmedī's (d. 815/1413) *İskendarnāme*. According to Aḥmedī, after having heard of Barqūq's death, Bāyezīd I proclaims: "Egypt is mine!." See (Muslu 2014, 84).

studied the work thoroughly, and even made a copy of the *Inbāʾ*.[51] Our scholar made notes on the margins of the manuscript. Some of his notes presents additional information about the Ottomans, referring, for instance, to the arrival of Murād II's Hungarian war captives to Cairo in 1444, which was disregarded by Ibn Ḥajar (Tadayoshi 2006, 31).

3.3.2 Bāyezīd II as a Scholar

Recent scholarship has finally begun to reevaluate the legacy of Bāyezīd II.[52] For the longest time, scholars contrasted this sultan with his father Meḥmed II and his son Selīm I in terms of their attitudes to war-making. Bāyezīd was characterized as a peace-loving sultan in contrast to his father and his son, who were known for their expansionist policies.[53] Bāyezīd's reputation for piety also played a role in the making of his image as a weak sultan (Muslu 2013, 51-57). Bāyezīd II's attitude to the arts and sciences has been another basis for comparison between him and his father Meḥmed II. The former has been overshadowed by the reign of his father in terms of intellectual flourishment and the continuities between their intellectual investments have not been appreciated enough (Kafadar 2019, 82). Al-Malaṭī challenges both perspectives about the sultan's image as a passive ruler and as a sultan who was dismissive of learning, especially the latter one. Unlike the prevailing idea in Turkish popular culture and old-school scholarship that makes an analogy between Prince Cem and his father Meḥmed II in terms of their intellectual and artistic interests, al-Malaṭī draws a parallel between Bāyezīd II and Meḥmed II. Al-Malaṭī even considers that Bāyezīd overtook Meḥmed II in his intellectual capacity and patronage.

First, at the beginning of the biography al-Malaṭī refers to Bāyezīd II as "*Al-Sulṭān al-Ghāzī al-Muʿẓam al-Mufakhkham Giyāth al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān al-Aʿẓam Nāṣir al-Dīn and Muʿīnuhu Abu al-Maʿālī b. ʿUthmān al-Adirnāī al-Rūmī al-Ḥanafī*." (Al-

---

[51]The manuscript of the *Inbāʾ* MS Ahmet III 2941/2 housed at the Topkapı Palace Library was executed by al-Malaṭī. For an analysis of some parts of the manuscript, see (Tadayoshi, 2006). The author of the article makes a meticulous analysis of al-Malaṭī's method of writing history.

[52]For an overview of the debates about Bāyezīd II's image and their critique, see (Kafadar 2019, 79-83). The major political events in his reign can be found in (Tansel 2017).

[53]Cihan Yüksel Muslu challenges this dichotomy in her thorough examination on the role of the Mamluk campaign in Bāyezīd's image making. See (Muslu 2013).

Malaṭī 2011, 209).[54] Employing highly prestigious royal titulature, al-Malaṭī defines Bāyezīd II as the protector and warrior of Islam with dignifying titles.[55] What makes this prologue to Bāyezīd II's biography interesting is that the author does not introduce any other ruler in the *Majmaʿ* like this, including the two Mamluk sultans he mentions, Ashraf Aynāl (r. 1453-1461) and Timurbughā (r. 1467-1468). Both Mamluk sultans' *nisba*s are given with an emphasis on the territories they ruled, with very few eulogistic titles.[56]

The titles used by al-Malaṭī are of great importance since they have concrete political connotations in fifteenth-century Islamdom. context. Muslu clearly shows that the honorific titles used in the letters exchanged between the Mamluk and Ottoman courts were almost another battlefield. The Ottoman sultans were addressed with lower titles by the Mamluk sultans until the reign of Bāyezīd II. Meḥmed II was the first Ottoman ruler who became dissatisfied with such titles and addressed the Mamluk sultan with the title of *al-Maqarr al-Karīm* (His Noble Residence) instead of a higher one like *al-Maqām al-Sharīf* (His Noble Station), which had been commonly used by the Ottomans to address the Mamluk court until then (Muslu 2014, 114-20). During the reign of Bāyezīd, the struggle over the titles continued. On one occasion, Bāyezīd addresses the Mamluk sultan al-Ghawrī with the title *al-Ḥaḍra al-ʿAliyya* (His Sublime Excellency), whereas al-Ghawrī replies with the lower-ranking title, *al-Majlis al-ʿĀli* (The Sublime Seat) (Muslu 2014, 162-3). Nevertheless, Bāyezīd achieved the highest ranks of appellations in the following years (Muslu 2014, 157). Hence, the prestigious titulature used by al-Malaṭī reflects a political attitude about the existing diplomatic relations.

Al-Malaṭī refers to Bāyezīd as *Yıldırım* (the Thunderbolt) on some occasions (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 209, 591, and al-Malaṭī 2002, 5: 458). At the very beginning of the sultan's biography, al-Malaṭī notes that he is known as *Yıldırım*. The title *Yıldırım* has been widely associated with Bāyezīd I. At first sight, this reference might suggest that al-Malaṭī confused the two rulers in the written sources that he examined,

---

[54]It is also possible to see Bāyezīd as *Ṣāḥib Amasya* in the *Nayl*, referring to his years as a prince in Amasya. See (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 5: 15, 458)

[55]Al-Samhūdī, the Hijāzi scholar of the late Mamluk period, uses even more prestigious titles for Bāyezīd II: "Sultan of Islam and the Muslims, and Beacon of the Islamic Sultans" (*Sulṭān al-Islām wa al-muslimīn, ʿalam al-salāṭīn al-Islām*), as well as "Master of the Dominions of Rūm and the Islamic States" (*Ṣāḥib al-mamālīk al-Rāmiyya wa al-duwal al-Islāmiyya*). See (Taşkömür, 2019, 396).

[56]For example, Sayf al-Dīn Aynāl is referred to as "*Al-ʿAlāʾī al-Ẓahīrī thumma al-Nāṣir Abū al-Naṣr Sayf al-Dīn Ṣāḥib al-Diyār al-Miṣriyya wa al-Bilād al-Ḥijaziyya wa al-Shāmiyya*", and al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā is mentioned as "*Al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Abū Saʿīd Sayf al-Dīn al-Rūmī al-Ḥanafī Ṣāḥib al-Diyār al-Miṣriyya wa al-Aqṭār al-Ḥijāziyya*" (Al-Malaṭī, 2011, 626 and 782). Al-Malaṭī makes no mention of the other Mamluk sultans who were in power when he was executing his work, al-Qāyitbāy (r. 1468-1469), al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (r. 1496-1498), Abū Saʿīd Qānisawh (r. 1498-1500), and Qānisawh al-Ghawrī (r. 1501-1516) since the work ends with the latter *jīm*. We also do not see similarly praising comments on these sultans in the *Rawḍ* and the *Nayl*.

which is quite natural in the context of the late fifteenth century. However, it is more likely that this usage goes beyond a simple confusion since al-Malaṭī was well aware that Bāyezīd I also held the title (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 2: 298, 392). Our scholar's attribution of the title to Bāyezīd II might be related to the prophecy that al-Malaṭī had heard from his father, namely that an Ottoman ruler named Abū Yazīd Yıldırım will conquer Egypt. Given his pro-Ottoman tendencies, al-Malaṭī was probably expecting the prophecy to come true, and thus referred to Bāyezīd II as such.

Indeed, towards the end of the biography, al-Malaṭī makes an interesting statement: "It is said that he [i.e. Bāyezīd] will conquer a lot from this kingdom. God knows best.". Since Bāyezīd's forces were repeatedly defeated by the Mamluks between 1485 and 1491, al-Malaṭī's statement might be interpreted as a wish.[57] The biography ends with an invocation that uses an allusive vocabulary, asking for the continuation of the principals of Bāyezīd's rule (*qawāʿid dawlatihi*) and his rule over Islam and the Muslims (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 215).[58]

In a major part of the biography al-Malaṭī places great emphasis on how well Bāyezīd II was trained by his father:

"The subject of the biography was born in Adrianople in 843 (1439/40). He grew up under the auspices of his father [i.e. Meḥmed II] in affluence, in the highest esteem and magnificence and receiving great attention. He memorized the Qur'ān and was trained in horsemanship (*furūsiyya*) and its varieties. Then he embarked on the study of the sciences (*ʿulūm*), his father exerting himself in his education. I have even heard that he [i.e. Bāyezīd] studied all the sciences (*jamīʿ al-funūn*) and became more knowledgeable than his father. Someone reliable has told me that he [i.e. Bāyezīd] ranked among the greatest scholars.

As is their custom, his father appointed him as the governor of Amasya, because he was the eldest son. He also appointed great *vazīr*s with experience and wisdom to educate and train him. His father exalted him and loved him since his childhood, mainly because he was zealous in acquiring knowledge and reading the Qur'ān with seriousness and dignity." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 213)

---

[57]It is clear that al-Malaṭī wrote the entry after some military conflicts between the two empires occurred.

[58]Despite the author's sentences, we still need to be cautious about defining al-Malaṭī as pro-Ottoman. Al-Malaṭī remains completely neutral about the conflict between 1485-1486 in his narrative of the war given in the biography of Hersekzāde Aḥmed Pasha. However, writing in a neutral way in Cairo can also be interpreted as a clear support for the Ottomans. We should also remember that al-Malaṭī wrote his text in an extended period, hence the work might include contradictory statements.

Al-Malaṭī implies that Meḥmed II was also trained in the sciences, though his son overtook him by becoming a full-fledged scholar. Doing so and describing the training process of an Ottoman prince in detail, the author might have intended to make his readers draw a comparison between the Ottoman and the Mamluk educational systems. Especially when he states that the Ottoman sultan was not only trained in *furūsiyya*, which was an essential tradition for the Mamluk elite, but also in the sciences, al-Malaṭī may have been criticizing the Mamluk sultans' intellectual background. At this point, one might recall al-Malaṭī's abovementioned critique of al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā's fanatic Ḥanafism. The Mamluk sultan believes that his oppression of Shāfiʿīs will endear him to God. Al-Malaṭī interprets the sultan's attitude as a sign of his lack of experience and knowledge (*min ʿadam durbatihi*) (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 797).

Al-Malaṭī was also aware of Bāyezīd's brothers Muṣṭafā and Cem (*Jumjuma*) and mentioned their fight for the throne.[59] He quotes a dialogue between Meḥmed II and his son Muṣṭafā (d. 879/1474), who died young:

> "One day, their father told Muṣṭafā, praising Bāyezīd: 'Look! He read such-and-such books.' The sultan was implying that Muṣṭafā does not have an interest in *ʿilm*, unlike his brother. Muṣṭafā replied: 'Then he [i.e. Bāyezīd] deserves to be the judge (*qāḍī*) of Bursa, not the sultan.' However, Muṣṭafā did not live long and died while his father was alive. His story will be mentioned in the letter of *mīm* if God wills it." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 213)

Muṣṭafā's allusive answer to his father is utilized by al-Malaṭī to describe Bāyezīd II as a sultan who was capable of being a judge in Bursa. Describing Bāyezīd as a potential judge is highly compatible with his shaykh al-Kāfiyajī's approach developed in his *Sayf al-ḥukkām*. Al-Kāfiyajī proposes that sultans need to be trained as judges to adjudge in legal matters (El-Kafiyeci 2018, 28). Al-Malaṭī might have been influenced by his shaykh's formulation of ideal rulership, and thus depicts Bāyezīd as such.

---

[59] Al-Malaṭī states that Cem ended up in Cairo; however, he promises to give Cem's biography in the letter *jīm* which ends before Cem's biography (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 212). It is possible to observe Cem's journey in Egypt in the *Nayl* (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 294, 295, 300, 331, 319). The struggle between the two brothers lies beyond the scope of this thesis. However, we should raise some points to clarify al-Malaṭī's attachment to Bāyezīd. Despite Cem's long visit in Cairo, al-Malaṭī tends to rely on pro-Bāyezīd versions of narratives. For instance, he states in the *Nayl* that Bāyezīd was Meḥmed II's heir apparent, which was not the real case (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 292). Our scholar might have heard this from a supporter of Bāyezīd who ended up in Cairo. Further, al-Malaṭī tells how Bāyezīd did his best to persuade Cem of a peaceful solution (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 214). For a summary of the struggle between Cem and Bāyezīd, and its influence in literary culture, see (Kafadar 1995, 147-148). Al-Malaṭī mentions another person who came from Aleppo and claimed to be the son of Meḥmed II from a concubine. His claim could not be confirmed. Nevertheless, the Mamluk sultan showed hospitality to him (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 160).

The author continues with Bāyezīd's enthronement:

> "Some of the soldiers ('askar) supported his brother Jumjuma and some others were in favor of him [i.e. Bāyezīd] because of his knowledge, wisdom, and seniority. Those who were against Bāyezīd regarded his knowledge among the reasons of their opposition and said: 'If he ascends to the throne, he will ignore everybody except his class (abnāʾ al-jins) of jurisprudents (fuqahāʾ) and students of ʿilm (talaba)'.
>
> He gives lectures and delivers the Friday sermon." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 214-215)

According to the author, Bāyezīd's patronage was so exceptional that soldiers were concerned that the scholars outweighed them in power. The sultan was not an ordinary patron. Since Bāyezīd belonged to the ʿulamāʾ class, his patronage went beyond simple favor. Al-Malaṭī might have acquired this information from the Rūmīs in Cairo, but he presents it in a way that casts Ottoman rule as a kind of utopia for scholars.

This takes us to the question why al-Malaṭī placed such an emphasis on the Ottoman sultan's scholarly character. We are familiar with Bāyezīd's image as a saint in the contemporary Ottoman sources. As mentioned briefly above, Meḥmed II implemented controversial policies such as confiscating waqfs to speed up the process of centralization. His policies attracted fierce criticism in contemporary literature, especially after Bāyezīd assumed power.[60] The public dissatisfaction with Meḥmed's policies led Bāyezīd to embody a different type of ruler. His reinstitution of the confiscated properties created a tremendous impression in such narratives as Aşıkpaşazāde's and Ibn Kemāl's histories which describe Bāyezīd as a generous and just ruler since he returned the endowments to their owners (Atçıl 2017, 91-92).[61] One of the beneficiaries of this new implementation was the Sufis, especially the Khalwatī order. Thanks to his close relation to these groups, the sultan enjoyed a saintly reputation and was titled Velī (friend of God) (Muslu 2013, 56).

On the other hand, the sultan's scholarly image is not as visible as his saintly reputation in the Ottoman sources. Unlike his father, Bāyezīd interfered less with the scholarly affairs (Atçıl 2017, 98). This policy went hand in hand with his humble

---

[60] For the criticism came in the reign of Meḥmed II, see (Yerasimos 1993, 9-12). For a detailed analysis on how the dissatisfaction with Meḥmed's reign pawed the way for Bāyezīd's positive image in the Ottoman literature, see (Muslu 2013, 54-58), (Kafadar 2019, 81), and (Atçıl 2017, 51, 67-68, 91-92).

[61] For Müyyedzāde ʿAbdurraḥmān's similar comments on the sultan, see (Atçıl 2017, 92).

attitude towards the scholars.[62] In 1503, Alvise Gritti (d. 1534), the natural son of the Venetian bailo to Constantinople during Bāyezīd's reign, described the sultan as someone who "continuously studies theology and astral sciences and is highly educated in cosmography." (Kafadar 2019, 82). The sixteenth-century historian Muṣṭafā Cenābī (d. 999/1590) also referred to the sultan's attachment to books and learning (Kafadar 2019, 102n). A. Tunç Şen and Cornell H. Fleischer's article about Bāyezīd's celestial interest as reflected in the inventory of the palace library reveals some aspects of the sultan's engagement in scholarly activities. Their study shows that Bāyezīd was not only a patron but also a student of the science of the stars. The sultan also invited Mīrim Çelebi (d. 931/1525) to the court to study "mathematical sciences" (*al-ʿulūm al-riyāḍiyya*) with him (Şen and Fleischer 2019, 770).

Given that al-Malaṭī relies on Rūmīs while depicting the Ottoman sultan in this manner, his emphasis on Bāyezīd II's scholarly identity is undoubtedly valuable for Ottoman history. However, it goes without saying that al-Malaṭī's comments cannot be taken at face value. Even though al-Malaṭī was in touch with various Ottoman subjects from whom he learned about Bāyezīd II's reign, the available Ottoman sources do not provide sufficient information about the sultan's scholarly image. At this point, it would be meaningful to turn our attention to the Mamluk context to further explore al-Malaṭī's method of describing Bāyezīd II.

The relation between al-Malaṭī's take of Bāyezīd II and various contemporary ideas of sovereignty in the Islamicate world lies beyond the scope of this study.[63] However, it is important to mention the possible influence of the Mamluk sultan al-Ghawrī in al-Malaṭī's formulation of rulership in the case of Bāyezīd II. Al-Ghawrī's reign (1501-1516) corresponds to the last decade of Bāyezīd II's reign. The Mamluk sultan is well-known for his learned gatherings (*majālis*) and for his generous patronage of literary activities and numerous translations from Persian into Arabic and Turkish (Markiewicz 2019, 108).[64]

---

[62] In the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries, some scholars acquired significant positions in the nascent Ottoman scholarly institutions. Thanks to this phenomenon, some scholars enjoyed a high self-confidence. For instance, a scholar named Hatibzāde did not bow to Bāyezīd II in a celebratory event. When Hatibzāde was criticized for his behavior, he replied, "That a scholar of Hatibzāde's caliber should go to him [i.e. Bāyezīd II] is enough of an honor for him; he is satisfied with that much respect." (Atçıl 2017, 114).

[63] Since the prominent characters of the present thesis are the late fifteenth-century Ottoman and Mamluk rulers and the subjects, the most relevant work to this thesis in the field of political thought is Christopher Markiewicz's extensive study on Idris Bidlisi's scholarly journey which also includes his visits to the courts of Bāyezīd II and al-Ghawrī. See (Markiewicz 2019, 106-108, 240-285).

[64] Al-Malaṭī's *Majmaʿ al-busṭān* is only one source of al-Ghawrī's learned gatherings. There are various contemporary works written to praise al-Ghawrī's gatherings and his generous patronage. See (Markiewicz 2019, 106-109). Christian Mauder has a dissertation on al-Ghawrī's courtly patronage. See (Mauder 2017).

As Doris Behrens-Abouseif has stated, al-Ghawrī, "worked carefully at constructing his image as poet and scholar and a patron of the secular arts, pursuing the kind of princely image that was cultivated by the Timurid, Safavid, and Ottoman princes, but was unfamiliar in the culture of the Mamluk court. Moreover, there is an undeniable Iranian flair to al-Ghawrī's cultural life, which is evident in his entourage of *aʿjam* and his preoccupation with the Shāhnāmah." (Behrens-Abouseif 2002, 84-85). Al-Ghawrī's courtly culture was Persian-oriented. His patronage for Persian and Turkish-speaking émigrés created hostility among many local scholars towards the sultan (Irwin 2008, 37-39). In the midst of the opposition from local scholars and the financial crisis that hit the last decades of the Mamluk rule, the works produced under the patronage of al-Ghawrī legitimized the sultan's rule by depicting him as a pious and scholarly man (Irwin 2008, 49).

The importance of being a learned sultan also had repercussions on the narratives about the Mamluk-Ottoman conflict. One of the works describing al-Ghawrī's literary sessions is Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī's *Nafāʾis al-Majālis al-Sulṭānīyya* which records the *majālis* in 1505. According to the *Nafāʾis*, in one of the sessions at al-Ghawrī's court, the Mamluk envoy Jānibeg's visit to Bāyezīd II's court during the reign of the previous Mamluk sultan Qāyitbāy became the topic of conversation. As mentioned above, a high-ranking Ottoman official had questioned the Mamluk rulers' right to rule the holy cities of Mecca and Medina with a reference to the Mamluk rulers' slave origins. In al-Ḥusaynī's version of the narrative, Jānibeg's response to this critique is noteworthy: "The nobility of a person depends upon knowledge and comportment (*adab*), not lineage and descent." (Irwin 2008, 46).

Al-Malaṭī must have written Bāyezīd II's biographical entry before he benefited from al-Ghawrī's patronage. Our scholar might have been among the scholars who were critical of al-Ghawrī's choices of patronage, and hence he might have depicted Bāyezīd II as an alternative scholar-king, challenging al-Ghawrī's image. Even if he did not intend to criticize al-Ghawrī, it is still plausible to consider the Mamluk sultan's self-representation that relies on learning and sovereignty as a source of inspiration for al-Malaṭī's depiction of Bāyezīd II as a scholar king.

We mentioned al-Malaṭī's possible Ottoman sources in the first section of this chapter. Now that al-Malaṭī presents a detailed view of the state of affairs in the reign of Bāyezīd II, we should also discuss how he might have learned about the sultan and why Ottoman patronage looms so large in his work.

As stated above, at least some parts of al-Malaṭī's comments on Bāyezīd II seem to be based on conversations. The author might have acquired information about the Ottomans from his dialogues with multiple Rūmī scholars, merchants, and states-

men who ended up in Cairo for different reasons. One of al-Malaṭī's sources was al-Kāfiyajī, who had an extensive network in Rūm. Moreover, the author drops a reference to Bāyezīd's elimination of "injustices" (*maẓālim*) committed in Meḥmed II's reign (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 214).[65] This insider's knowledge of Ottoman political affairs corroborates the assumption that al-Malaṭī became acquainted with Ottoman subjects who were aware of the reactions against Meḥmed II's harsh policies. A possible source might also be someone whom al-Malaṭī did not meet in person. Hersekzāde Ahmed Pasha, the Ottoman *beglerbegi* of Anatolia who would later become the Grand Vizier, was captured by Mamluk forces, and taken to Cairo in 1486. The pasha had conversations with the Mamluk sultan (Muslu 2014, 142).[66] We do not know the details of their dialogues, but Hersekzāde's comments on Bāyezīd might have spread across Cairo.

It is hard to determine the identity of the person who is referred to as "someone reliable", given the abundance of Rūmīs in the biographical dictionary. However, if we take a closer look at the *Majmaʿ*, one person stands out to as a possible source of information: Tāze al-Rūmī al-Ḥanafī who came to Cairo for several times (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 730).[67] Tāze was a scholar of the rational sciences (*al-ʿulūm al-ʿaqliyya*) and stayed in the *Shaykhūniyya* complex in Cairo, which had previously been headed by al-Kāfiyajī. Al-Malaṭī describes him as a relative of Mollā ʿArab (d. 901/1496), a famous scholar trained in Cairo who later served Bāyezīd II as *shaykh al-Islām*.[68] It is understood that al-Malaṭī made friends with Tāze and learned a lot from him. I presented these possibilities to point out the importance of informal networks of knowledge in the period. Aside from these speculations, a full discussion of how knowledge was transmitted between the two regions should be the subject of further studies.

On the other hand, Ottoman patronage was not the only aspect of the dynasty that found an echo in Cairo. In the biography of Bāyezīd II, al-Malaṭī also tells an anecdote about the notorious practice of royal fratricide in the Ottoman lands:

"One day, their father [i.e. Meḥmed II] fell sick and it was rumored that

---

[65]Ṭursun Beg and Ibn Kemāl make similar comments on Bāyezīd II's elimination of injustices by describing him as the upholder of *sharīʿa* (Muslu 2013, 56-57).

[66]For Hersekzāde's captivity in the *Majmaʿ*, see (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 462-464). The *beglerbegi* is defined as the *amīr al-umarā* of Kütahya.

[67]I could not find any information about the scholar in other contemporary sources.

[68]Mollā ʿArab, who was a native of Aleppo, was a very influential scholar in the Ottoman domains during the reign of Bāyezīd II. For the present thesis, the most intriguing aspect of his life is that he strongly opposed Bāyezīd II's intention to attack the Mamluks. See (Muslu 2014, 144).

he died. After this rumor spread, Muṣṭafā attacked Bāyezīd's place and attempted to kill him. Bāyezīd learned this attack beforehand and went into hiding. Their father received the news of Muṣṭafā's attempt to kill his brother and reprimanded him harshly by saying, 'Let us say I am dead. How can you kill your brother?'. Muṣṭafā replied, 'Just like how our lord killed his own brother' and silenced his father." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 213)

Al-Malaṭī might have heard about this story from the propaganda at the Mamluk court. However, it is also possible that those who traveled back and forth between the two regions might have told the "dark side" of the dynasty.

3.3.3   Al-Malaṭī's Criticism about the Mamluk Rule

Another reason for al-Malaṭī's attitude about Ottoman patronage might be his dissatisfaction with several issues in the Mamluk lands, including the availability of patronage. Some parts of the *Majmaʿ* and the *Nayl* shed light on al-Malaṭī's main concerns. The author is fiercely critical of the scholars' dependency on statesmen. He compares the power of judges in the eighth and ninth centuries of the Hijra. While narrating the events of 778 H. (1376/77), he reports that the *qāḍi al-qudāt* (the chief judge) Burhān b. Jumāʿ summoned the *dawādār* (a high scribal position in the Mamluk chancery) Aqtemur and harshly reprimanded him. The *dawādār* was afraid of Burhān b. Jumāʿ. Al-Malaṭī asks, "Does a *qāḍi al-qudāt* in our time dare to summon a slave of *al-Atabak* Uzbak, let alone his *dawādār*?"[69]

When it comes to the ninth century of the Hijra, the author describes the *qāḍi al-qudāt* as a no-name figure (*ism lā musammā lahu*), not taken seriously by anyone (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 2: 48). However, eighth-century judges were like Abū Yūsuf who was "the real *qāḍi al-qudāt* of Islam".[70] As is put by the author: "I have so much to say about this matter, however, this compendium does not have enough space for my words."

---

[69]The name that al-Malaṭī chose to exemplify his critiques further reveals his pro-Ottoman attitude. The *Atabak* Uzbak was the Mamluk commanders who led the Mamluk troops against the Ottomans between 1486 and 1490. See (Muslu 2014, 139, 143).

[70]Abū Yūsūf was a prominent jurist and one of the founders of the Ḥanafī school. He was designated as the first *qāḍi al-qudāt* in Islamic history. See (Schacht 2012).

Al-Malaṭī not only expresses his opinions in the first-person singular but also gives voice to one scholar whose biography was compiled in the *Majmaʿ*. Ibrāhīm al-Karakī (d. 1469) was the *imām* in Qāyitbāy's (r. 1468-1496) court. Being so close to the Mamluk sultan, he could still favor the Ottomans over the Mamluks for one reason:

> "When it was rumored that Ibn ʿUthmān was planning to attack this region to achieve dominance in Egypt, I heard him [i.e. Ibrāhīm al-Karakī] say, 'We do not worry if there is truth in this rumor. Rather, we should be cheerful about it. If the Ottomans come here, they admire us and strengthen our positions because of their sympathy (*maḥabba*) for scholars (*ahl al-ʿilm*). We can only worry about them. Here (by saying "them") he refers to the sultan and the Turks." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 70)

The author instrumentalized several biographies to express his anger against the Mamluk sultans' attitude to scholars. The biography of Mollā Gūrānī (d. 893/1488), the famous scholar who was trained in the Mamluk realm and then served Murād II, Meḥmed II, and Bāyezīd II, clearly reflects al-Malaṭī's anger. He expresses his opinion by saying, "It was a big mistake that al-Ẓāhir (referring to Jaqmaq) displaced such a person from Egypt. There is no power and no strength except with God. If he had stayed in Egypt, he would still have been present and available here. His existence would have offered great benefit in our time." (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 470). Al-Malaṭī greatly admires Gūrānī and dedicates six pages to his biography. This famous Shāfiʿī scholar of Cairo was jailed by the Mamluk sultan after clashing with another scholar named Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Nuʿmānī, a descendant of the founder of the Ḥanafī school, Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 767).[71] While criticizing Jaqmaq for Gūrānī's case in the *Rawḍ*, al-Malaṭī accuses the former sultan, and more generally the Turks, of being unjust by saying, "Following the Turks' custom, al-Ẓāhir's legal decisions prioritized firstcomers, not the ones who told the truth.".[72] Although Jaqmaq had already died when al-Malaṭī was writing the *Rawḍ*, however, the ethnic group that he sharply criticized was still in power.

After this incident, Gūrānī left Cairo and entered the service of Murād II and changed his *madhhab* from Shāfiʿī to Ḥanafī (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 468).[73] He ended up being one of the tutors of Meḥmed II and served as *qāḍi al-ʿaskar* in his reign. He

---

[71]Gūrānī claims that Ḥamīd al-Dīn is not a descendant of Abū Ḥanīfa. See (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 1: 183).

[72]The author's statement is "*Al-Daʿwā ʿindahu li man sabaqa lā li man ṣadaqa*" (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 184).

[73]For a detailed analysis on Gūrānī's move to the Ottoman court and his connection to the Mamluk scholarly circles, see (Pfeifer 2014, 44).

was designated as the *muftī* of Istanbul (later became the office of *shaykh al-Islām*) by Bāyezīd II (Walsh 2012). Gūrānī was also a key figure in Mamluk-Ottoman interactions. He was the writer of the victory announcement of Constantinople sent to the Mamluk sultan (Muslu 2014, 111). Together with his fellow and disciple Mollā ʿArab, Gūrānī played an active role in conciliating the tension between the two sovereigns in the reign of Bāyezīd II.[74] After reporting that Gūrānī became *qāḍi al-ʿaskar* in the Rūm, al-Malaṭī emphasizes that the hierarchical position of the *qāḍi al-ʿaskar* in Rūm is higher than that of the *qāḍi al-quḍāt* in the Mamluk realm, intending to clarify his point about how the Ottoman sultans appreciated Gūrānī's knowledge (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 466).[75]

Al-Malaṭī's reflections on Gūrānī also exemplify the dynamic content of his works. At first sight, he makes us consider that the *Rawḍ* is his essential work by naming it *taʾrīkhunā al-kabīr* and presenting the *Majmaʿ* as a dictionary for the first one. A comparison between the *Rawḍ* and the *Majmaʿ* shows that al-Malaṭī's interest in Ottoman patronage grew while he was composing the latter work. The three-page biography of Gūrānī given in the *Rawḍ* increased to six pages in the *Majmaʿ*. The author's comments on Gūrānī's new position in the Ottoman capital and the part in which he relates how Meḥmed II and Bāyezīd II esteemed this scholar do not exist in the *Rawḍ*. Similarly, Ibrāhīm al-Karakī's positive statement about a possible Ottoman intervention in Egypt does not exist in the *Rawḍ*. The last example of the same phenomenon is al-Malaṭī's changing attitude towards the reign of al-Ẓāhir Timurbughā. As discussed above, al-Malaṭī criticized the former sultan's oppression of Shāfiʿī scholars in the *Majmaʿ*. While the author dedicates half a page to the discussion of the same sultan's humility towards the scholars (*ahl al-ʿilm*) in the *Rawḍ*, he does not include such details in Timurbughā's biography in the *Majmaʿ*. These modifications suggest that al-Malaṭī instrumentalized his biographical dictionary to reflect his dissatisfaction with Mamluk patronage.

Remarkably, our scholar praised Ottoman patronage even when giving voice to a scholar who was not happy with Ottoman patronage: Ilyās Shujāʿ al-Dīn al-Rūmī. Ilyās had been a tutor of Bāyezīd II when he was a prince in Amasya. He left Rūm

---

[74]Despite the troubles that he had with the Mamluk rule, Muslu indicates that Gūrānī and some other members of Ottoman scholarly elite who were trained in Mamluk Egypt and Syria led a peace faction during Bāyezīd's conflict with the Mamluk ruler. For example, when an anonymous Ottoman official assaulted the Mamluk ambassador Jānibeg by insulting the Mamluk sultan, Gūrānī intervened and said to the official: "Don't speak about the rulers of Egypt, you dishonor yourself." (Muslu 2014, 132). The Mamluk side also had a peace faction similar to that of the Ottomans. After reporting that the Mamluk sultan Khūshqadam died in 1467, al-Malaṭī notes that the sultan had been condemned for his hostility toward the Ottomans (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 6: 280).

[75]Al-Malaṭī also provides some poems that al-Gūrānī wrote for Murād II and Meḥmed II (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 469). Al-Gūrānī maintained his contact with some Mamluk-based scholars such as Burhān al-Dīn al-Biqāʿī and exchanged poems with him. Al-Sakhāwī also describes his poems written for the Ottoman elite (Pfeifer 2014, 44). Apparently, al-Gūrānī's letters to the Mamluk lands aroused interest in scholarly circles and various biographers copied his poems written for the Ottoman sultans.

and went to Cairo after getting angry with Bāyezīd (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 591). Bāyezīd had promised him the office of *qādi al-ʿaskar* in case he ascends to the throne. After his enthronement, Bāyezīd appointed someone else instead of Ilyās, who ended up being employed in the *madrasa* of Ibn Muzhir in Cairo. At this point, al-Malaṭī tries to legitimize the Ottoman sultan's decision: "He [i.e. Bāyezīd II] was determined to direct him to the positions of teaching. However, this could not occur since he departed for Cairo. He [i.e. Ilyās] did not want a position outside of jurisdiction. The sultan did not give him the position because of his harsh temperament.". The function of Ilyās' story in al-Malaṭī's narrative might be pointing out the good condition of Rūmī scholars. A scholar had the luxury to regard a position with disfavor.

In the previous chapter, we gave some examples of al-Malaṭī's close dialogue with his shaykh al-Kāfiyajī about political affairs. It is unlikely that al-Malaṭī's attitude about the Mamluk and the Ottoman rulers was independent of al-Kāfiyajī's life and al-Malaṭī's conversations with him. Al-Kāfiyajī's relations to Mamluk court were far from being stable. Al-Malāti implies that in the early days of the reign of Qāyitbāy, al-Kāfiyajī had some problems with the sultan who appointed al-Kāfiyajī's rival al-Karakī as the *imām* of the court (Al-Malaṭī 2011, 70). Further, in 876 H. (1471-72), Qāyitbāy asked al-Kāfiyajī and several other scholars to issue a *fatwā* on an issue pertaining to the former sultan Ẓāhir Jaqmaq's endowment. Al-Kāfiyajī opposed the other scholars whose *fatwā*s were compatible with the sultan's request. This situation led to a dispute between the sultan and the shaykh, as a result of which the shaykh ended up saying, "I give a *fatwā* based (only) on the *sharīʿa*." (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 11). Al-Malaṭī also reports some instances in which al-Kāfiyajī faced financial challenges regarding the administration of the *Shaykhūniyya*. For example, in 874 H. (1469), the stipend (*murattab*) of the *Shaykhūniyya* was rescinded and al-Kāfiyajī had a hard time to fund the residents of the *khānkāh* (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 209).[76]

Al-Malaṭī also had trouble with the implementation of the laws in the Mamluk domains. After reporting a crisis over the appointment of the governor (*nāʾib*) of Hama in 1465, our scholar assumed a pessimistic tone about the Mamluk legislation. He writes, "The rules of the domains of Egypt disappeared with the removal of the royal law (*qawāʿid al-mulūkiyya*)" (Al-Malaṭī 2014, 3: 47). Thinking about this critique about the *qawāʿid* together with al-Kāfiyajī's problems with Qāyitbāy over a juristic issue reveals the context in which al-Malaṭī asked for the continuation of

---

[76]The *Shaykhūniyya* as a Rūmī space in Cairo was probably a home to social gatherings where the Mamluk rule was criticized and Ottoman patronage was praised. We should remember that Tāze al-Rūmī also stayed in the *Shaykhūniyya*.

the principals of Bāyezīd's rule (*qawāʿid dawlatihi*). This also explains his emphasis on the jurisprudential aspect of Bāyezīd's scholarly image, which we do not see in the Ottoman sources, such as being eligible to become the *qādi* of Bursa.[77]

Lastly, the Ottomans' image as warriors of Islam had a role in al-Malaṭī's conceptualization of their rule. When the tension between the Mamluks and the Ottomans were escalating, al-Malaṭī reports, "We got the news that Ibn ʿUthmān, the king of Rūm, launched a great campaign of *ghazā* (*ghazwa ʿaẓīma*)." (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 7: 387).[78] The Ottomans always promulgated their *ghāzi* image in their letters sent to the Mamluk court (Muslu 2014, 65). This image and the Ottomans' fights against "infidels" were soft spots that appealed to many Mamluk-era scholars.[79] Al-Malaṭī was also attentive to this characteristic of the Ottomans, as can be seen in his emphasis on the phenomenon in his history of the dynasty. Similarly, al-Malaṭī might have thought that Bāyezīd played a heroic role in the events surrounding the fall of al-Andalus in 1492. In the midst of the Mamluk-Ottoman conflicts in southern Anatolia, al-Malaṭī reports that two envoys of the ruler of Muslim Spain entered Cairo in 892 H. (1488) and the envoys say that they are on their way to present the letter of their sultan and the scholars of their region to Ibn ʿUthmān to seek his help against the Franks (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 129). This event must have brought enormous prestige to the Ottomans among Cairene scholars, including al-Malaṭī, who personally observed the decline of Muslim Spain.[80]

Al-Malaṭī's fierce criticism of late fifteenth-century Mamluk patronage might have reflected a widespread attitude in Cairene scholarly circles, the discussion of which requires further study. Considering the quotations from various sources and the discussion presented above, it can be hypothesized that al-Malaṭī sought patronage outside the Mamluk realm. Al-Malaṭī might have been aware of the cases of al-Samhūdī and Ibn al-ʿUlayf, who resided in the Hijāz and received Bāyezīd's financial favors. The sultan's patronage for scholars who lived outside the Ottoman domains might have encouraged al-Malaṭī to seek his patronage. If we connect his shaykh al-Kāfiyajī's relationship with the Ottoman court and the author's comments on the

---

[77]The Mamluk sultans were also criticized at the Ottoman court for the legal problems in the Mamluk lands. According to Aşıkpaşazāde, Meḥmed II said to a Mamluk envoy "Isn't it regrettable that someone who is ignorant of law (*qānūn*) and etiquette (*qāʿide*) rules on a throne and in a land such as Egypt's?" The translation of the quote belongs to Muslu. See (Muslu 2014, 121). For a similar example, see (Kavak 2020, 15). Meḥmed thought that he was more capable to rule Egypt. Since he also said this to a Mamluk envoy, al-Malaṭī might have been aware of the Ottoman sultans' self-confidence in legislation.

[78]The year of the event is 889 H. (1484). Hence, the campaign should be the sieges of Kilia and Akkerman in 1484. Al-Malaṭī's report also has an emphasis on the Ottoman sultan lead his army in person.

[79]The Mamluk rulers also appreciated their *ghazā* activities in the diplomatic correspondences. See for instance, (Muslu 2014, 113).

[80]The most intriguing aspect of this report is that al-Tadmurī, the editor of the *Nayl*, notes that he could not find information about the arrival of the envoys in any other Mamluk source. (Al-Malaṭī 2002, 8: 129n).

Ottoman sultans, this assumption might be corroborated. Indeed, the Ottomans became more and more active in Mamluk politics at the turn of the fifteenth century. Al-Malaṭī's personal network in the lands of Rūm might also partly explain the author's praise for the Ottomans. Based on the evidence discussed in this chapter, the *Majmaʿ* can be regarded as an example of how Ottoman patronage extended to Cairo in the late fifteenth century.

4.   CONCLUSION

The present study examines a neglected late Mamluk scholar and historian ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ b. Khalīl b. Shāhīn al-Malaṭī with a special focus on the image of the Ottomans and their patronage in his historical works and biographical dictionary. To date, there has been no comprehensive analysis of his works; nor has there been much discussion of the scholar's relation to the Ottoman domains. The present thesis attempts to introduce al-Malaṭī and his oeuvre, contextualize his historical works in terms of their genres and political mindset, and explore the author's perspective on the Ottomans, also searching for how he learned about the Rūmī sultans. Hence, the fist chapter was an attempt to discuss how we can incorporate al-Malaṭī into the existing scholarship and what our scholar tells us about the complex interactions between the Mamluk and the Ottoman domains.

The second chapter of the study reveals that al-Malaṭī's works, among many other things, were tools of self-representation. His historical works, namely the *Rawḍ*, and the *Nayl* are useful sources for a variety of subjects as well as for the study of historical geography and social imagination in the late fifteenth century. With their highly personalized content, they also shed light on the concepts of the self in late medieval Islam. Similarly, his biographical dictionary, the *Majmaʿ*, includes biographies from a vast geographical swath and reflects the author's view of himself, diplomacy, and learning. Both local politics and the changing power relations in the larger Eastern Mediterranean shaped al-Malaṭī's viewpoint on the individuals around him. These works reveal how entangled politics and everyday life were in pre-modern Islamic societies. Moreover, the chapter examines our scholar's intellectual environment with a discussion of religious life around him.

Providing a detailed account of al-Malaṭī's network, the second chapter is also a prologue to his interests in the Ottoman lands. His close relationship with al-Kāfiyajī, and al-Suyūṭī partially explains the positive image of Ottoman patronage in his works. The cases of al-Kāfiyajī, al-Suyūṭī and al-Malaṭī altogether should urge us to reassess the boundaries of late fifteenth-century Ottoman patronage and the image of Ottoman scholarly life in Mamluk Cairo and Syria.

The third chapter began with a closer look at al-Malaṭī's network in Rūm and the ways in which he learned about political and scholarly careers in the Ottoman lands. In addition to the intense diplomatic relations between Cairo and Istanbul, informal networks between these two regions played a significant role in al-Malaṭī's description of Ottoman patronage. By informal networks here, we mean al-Malaṭī's encounters with various scholars, merchants, émigrés, and captives from the Ottoman lands outside the formal channels of diplomacy and scholarly activities. Elaborating on the last part of the second chapter, the third chapter contextualized al-Malaṭī's view on the Ottoman domains. The Ottoman sultans, especially Bāyezīd II, stands out as great patrons of the sciences in Malaṭī's biographical dictionary. The chapter further reveals al-Malaṭī's pro-Ottoman attitude in the Mamluk-Ottoman diplomatic conflict in the diplomatic sphere. Examining all three works of our scholar, we can conclude that he was not satisfied with the available patronage in Mamluk Cairo. Possibly he continued to think this way until he became affiliated with the Mamluk sultan al-Ghawrī's court between 1512 and 1514. Moreover, Bāyezīd II was a full-fledged scholar in the eyes of al-Malaṭī. A careful evaluation of the literature about Bāyezīd II's image and the context of the *Majmaʿ* suggests that al-Ghawrī's self-fashioning as a scholar king might also have played a role in al-Malaṭī's conceptualization of the Ottoman sultan.

Of course, al-Malaṭī's comments on the Ottomans cannot be taken at face value. We should also question and contextualize the notion of a decline in Mamluk patronage and the author's depiction of the previous century as a golden age for Mamluk scholars and institutions. We should be distinctly careful with defining the role of the Ottomans as patrons of Muslim scholars in this period. They never monopolized patronage of Islamic learning. We need further studies that will examine the late-fifteenth century Cairene scholars' relations with the Ottoman, Timurid, Aqquyunlū and Ḥafsid courts and take a closer look at the social and economic circumstances in the Mamluk realm, in order to better evaluate the cases of scholars like al-Malaṭī. All results at this stage can only be of preliminary character, since further studies are needed to compare a wide range of Mamluk sources in terms of their attitudes towards Ottoman patronage. Overall, al-Malaṭī's works are a good illustration of how non-scholarly and non-diplomatic gatherings functioned in transmitting knowledge in late medieval Islam, and of how the Ottoman and the Mamluk realms were interconnected through complex social, political and intellectual networks in the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources;

Al-Malaṭī, ᶜAbd al-bāsit b. Khalīl (d. 920/1514). 1988. *Ghāyat al-Sūl fī Sīrat al-Rasūl*. Edited by Muḥammad Kamāl al-Dīn 'Izz al-Dīn 'Alī. Beirut: 'Ālam al-kutub.

———. 2011. *Al-Majmaᶜ al-Mufannan bi al-Muᶜjam al-Muᶜanwan*. Edited by ᶜAbd al-Allah Muḥammad al-Kandarī. 2 vols. Beirut: Dar al-bashāir al-Islāmiyya.

———. 2014. *Kitāb al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim fī Ḥawādith al-'Umr wa al-Tarājim*. Edited by ᶜUmar ᶜAbd al-Salām al-Tadmurī. 4 vols. Beirut: al-Maktabat al-ᶜAṣriyya.

———. *Nayl al-Amal fī Zayl al-Duwal*. Edited by ᶜUmar ᶜAbd al-Salām al-Tadmurī. 9 vols. Beirut: al-Maktabat al-ᶜAṣriyya.

———. "Al-Majmaᶜ al-Mufannan bi-al-Muᶜjam al-Muᶜanwan." The Municipal Library of Alexandria, B800.

———. "Al-Risala fī al-Taʾrīkh." Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, 2322.

———. "Kitāb al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim fī Ḥawādith al-'Umr wa al-Tarājim." The Vatican Library, Ar. 728-729.

———. "Al-Majmaᶜ al-Busṭān al-Nawrī Lī Ḥaḍrat Mawlānā Sulṭān al-Ghawrī." Ayasofya Collection in the Süleymaniye Library, 4793.

———. "Nayl al-Amal fī Zayl al-Duwal." The Bodleian Library, 285.

———. "Sharh Qānuncha." Veliyyüddin Efendi Collection. Veliyüddin Efendi Collection in the Beyazıt Library, 2510.

Al-Sakhāwī, Muḥammad b. ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 902/1497). 1353. *Al-Ḍawʾ al-Lāmiᶜa li Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsiᶜa*. 12 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Qudsī.

———. 1995. *Wajīz al-Kalām fī Dhayl 'alā Duwal al-Islām*. Edited by Bashār 'Awād Ma'rūf. Beirut: Muʾassat al-Risāla.

Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān. 1979. *Bughyat al-Wuᶜāt fī Ṭabaqāt al-Lughawiyyīn wa al-Nuḥāt*. Edited by Muḥammad Abu al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Vol. 7. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.

Al-Ẓāhirī, Ghars al-Dīn Khalīl b. Shāhīn (d. 873/1468). 1993. *Kitāb al-Ishārāt fī ᶜilm al-ᶜibārāt*. Edited by Sayyid Kasrawī Ḥasan. Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-ᶜilmiyyah.

Al-ᶜAsqalānī, Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449). 1967. *Inbāʾ al-Ghumr fī Abnāʾ al-ᶜUmr*. Edited by 'Abd al-Muᶜīd Khān. 9 vols. Hyderabad: Maṭbuᶜāt Dāʾirat al-Maᶜārif al-ᶜUthmāniyya.

Aşıkpaşazade. 2003. *Osmanoğulları'nın tarihi*. Edited by Kemal Yavuz and M. A. Yekta Saraç. Anatolia 3. İstanbul: K Kitaplığı.

Bağdatlı, İsmail Paşa. 1951. *Hadiyyat al- ᶜĀrifīn Asmāʾ al-Muallifīn wa Āthār al-Muṣannifīn*. Vol. 1. c. (842, 164 sütun).; Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Çelebi, Hacı Halife Mustafa b. Abdullah Katib (d. 1067/1656). 1971. *Keşfü'z-zunûn an esâmi'l-kütüb ve'l-fünûn*. 2 vols.; Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

El-Kafiyeci, Muhyiddin. 2018. *Seyfü'l-müluk: Seyfü'l-kudāt: Kafiyeci'nin siyasetnameleri: inceleme, eleştirmeli metin, çeviri*. Edited by Nail Okuyucu.

Enverî. 2012. *Düstûrnâme-i Enverî (19 - 22. kitaplar): (Osmanlı tarihi) (1299 - 1465); giriş, özet ve değerlendirme, metin, dizin, tıpkıbasım*. Edited by Necdet Öztürk. 2. baskı. Çamlıca Basım Yayın 118. İstanbul: Çamlıca.

Ibn al-Ḥimṣī, Shahāb al-Dīn (d. 934/1528). 2005. *Ḥawādith al-Zamān wa Wafayāt al-Shuyūkh wa al-Aqrān*. Edited by ᶜUmar ᶜAbd al-Salām al-Tadmurī. 3 vols. Beirut: al-Maktabat al-ᶜAṣriyya.

Ibn Iyās, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (d. 928/1522). 1395. *Badāʾiᶜ al-Ẓuhūr fī Waqāʾiᶜ al-Duhūr*. Edited by Muḥammad Muṣṭafā. 4 vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Ibn Shāhīn, Khalīl (d. 873/1468). 1993. *Kitāb Zubdat Kashf al-Mamālik wa Bayān al-Ṭuruq wa al-Masālik*. Edited by Fuat Sezgin. Beirut: Institute for the History of Arabic- Islamic Science at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University.

Ibn Taghribirdī, Yūsuf (d. 874/1470). 1984. *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfī wa al-Mustawfī Baᶜda al-Wāfī*. Edited by Nabīl Muḥammad ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz. 13 vols. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ᶜĀmma liʾl-Kitāb.

Öztürk, Necdet, ed. 2000. *Anonim Osmanlı Kroniği, 1299-1512.* İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.

Tursun Beg. 1978. *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror.* Edited by Halil İnalcık and Rhoads Murphey. Monograph Series - American Research Institute in Turkey; No. 1. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica.

Secondary Sources;

'Inan, 'A. M. 1970. "Riwāya Miṣriya 'an al-Maghrīb wa al-Anadalus." *Revista Del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islámicos*, 95–111.

'Uthmān Hāshim, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. 1957. *Al-Adab al-Jūghrāfī al- 'Arabī.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. Al-Idāra al-thaqāfiyya fī jāmiᶜat al-duwal al- 'Arabiyya.

Aḥmad, Aḥmad Ramaḍān. 2007. *Al-Riḥla Wa al-Raḥḥāla al-Muslimūn.* Jeddah: Dār al-bayān al- 'Arabī.

Ahmed, Shahab. 2017. What Is Islam?: The Importance of Being Islamic. Princeton University Press.

Aktepe, M. Münir. 1993. "ÇANDARLI İBRÂHİM PAŞA." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/candarli-ibrahim-pasa--karahalil-oglu.

Alper, Ömer Mahir. 2015. *Osmanlı Felsefesi: Seçme Metinler.* İslam Felsefesi 20. İstanbul: Klasik.

Al-Tikriti, Nabil. 2005. "The Hajj as Justifiable Self-Exile: Şehzade Korkud's *Wasīlat al-a.(h)bāb* (915–916/1509–1510)." *Al-Masaq* 17 (1): 125–46.

Altun, Ara. 1989. "AHMED PAŞA CAMİİ." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ahmed-pasa-camii-kutahya.

Al-Wahaibi, Khalid Khalfan Nasser. 1992. "The Contribution of 'Abd Al-Bāsiṭ to Mamluk Historiography: A Critical Edition of Parts of His Unpublished Work, Nayl Al-Amal." M. Litt Thesis, the University of Edinburgh.

Massoud, Sami G. 2007. *The Chronicles and Annalistic Sources of the Early Mamluk Circassian Period.* Leiden: Brill.

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. 2017. "Memlükler'den Osmanlılar'a Geçişte Mısır'da Adlî Teşkilât ve Hukuk (922-931/1517-1525)." *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 38 (December): 89–121. https://doi.org/10.26570/isad.347710.

———. 2017. *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2019. "The Kalām (Rational Theology) Section in the Palace Library Inventory." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 367–88. Brill.

Ayalon, D. 2012. "Awlād Al-Nās." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Ayaz, Fatih Yahya. 2020. "Memlükler Dönemi (648-923/1250-1517) Tarih ve Tabakât Eserlerine Dair." *İslam Tetkikleri Dergisi* 10 (1): 147–79. https://doi.org/10.26650/iuitd.2020.678998.

———. 2020. *Memlükler'de Tarih ve Tarihçiler.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Azamat, Nihat. 1996. "2. Murad Devri Kültür Hayatı." PhD dissertation, İstanbul: Marmara University.

Bacharach, Jere L. 1975. "Circassian Mamluk Historians and Their Quantitative Economic Data." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 12: 75. https://doi.org/10.2307/40000010

Baltacı, Cahit. 1995. "FAHREDDÎN-i ACEMÎ." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/fahreddin-i-acemi.

Banister, Mustafa. 2014. "'Naught Remains to the Caliph but His Title': Revisiting Abbasid Authority in Mamluk Cairo." *Mamlūk Studies Review* XVIII: 219–45.

Bauer, Thomas. 2011. *Die Kultur Der Ambiguität: Eine Andere Geschichte Des Islams.* 1. Aufl. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.

Behrens-Abouseif, Doris. 2002. "Sultan Al-Ghawri and the Arts." *Mamluk Studies Review* 6: 69–75.

Binbaş, İlker Evrim. 2014. "A Damascene Eyewitness to the Battle of Nicopolis: Shams al-Din Ibn al-Jazari (d. 833/1429)." In *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204-1453: Crusade, Religion and Trade Between Latins, Greeks, and Turks*, edited by Mike Carr and Nikolaos G Chrissis. Vol. 5. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

———. 2016. *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yazdī and the Islamicate Republic of Letters*. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bosworth, C.E. 2012. "Rifāʿiyya." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

BOYACIOĞLU, Ramazan. 2001. "Osmanoğullarının Karamanoğlu İbrahim Bey Aleyhine Aldığı Fetvalar." *Pax Ottomana Studies in Memoriam Prof. Dr. Nejat Göyünç, Ed. Kemal Çiçek, Haarlem-Ankara, Sota-Yeni Türkiye Yayınları*, 641–57.

Broadbridge, Anne F. 1999. "Academic Rivalry and the Patronage System: Al-Maqrizi, al-Ayni and Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 3: 85–107.

Brunschvig, Robert. 2001. *Deux récits de voyage inédits en Afrique du Nord au XVe siècle*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.

Burak, Guy. 2015. *The Second Formation of Islamic Law: The Hanafi School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Caferov, Yaşar. 2010. "Seyyid Alî Es-Sâbit Er-Rifâî ve Kisve-i Ma'rifî Adlı Risalesi." *TASAVVUF*, no. 25: 145–95.

Chamberlain, Michael. 1995. *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press.

Chalyan-Daffner, Kristine. 2013. "NATURAL DISASTERS IN MAMLŪK EGYPT (1250–1517): PERCEPTIONS, INTERPETATIONS AND HUMAN

RESPONSES." PhD dissertation, Heidelberg: RUPERTO CAROLA HEIDELBERG UNIVERSITY.

Çıpa, H. Erdem. 2017. *The Making of Selim: Succession, Legitimacy, and Memory in the Early Modern Ottoman World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Clauson, G. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Studia Uralo-Altaica, v. 1. Clarendon Press.

Conermann, Stephan, and Gül Şen, eds. 2016. *The Mamluk-Ottoman Transition: Continuity and Change in Egypt and Bilād al-Shām in the Sixteenth Century*. 1st ed. Vol. 2. Ottoman Studies / Osmanistische Studien. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Csirkés, Ferenc. 2019. "Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language under Bayezid II." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 673–733. Brill.

Dadaş, Mustafa Bülent. 2018. *Şeyh Bedreddin: Bir Osmanlı Fakihi*. Birinci basım. İSAM yayınları 202. Üsküdar, İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM).

Dankoff, Robert. 2016. "Evliya Çelebi." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam: Three*, edited by edited by Marc Gaborieau, Gudrun Krämer, John Abdallah Nawas, Everett K. Rowson, Kate Fleet, and Denis Matringe, 3rd ed. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Della Vida, G. Levi. 1933. "Il Regno Di Granata Nel 1465-66 Nei Ricordi Di Un Viaggiatore Egiziano." *Al-Andalus*, no. 1: 307–34.

Drory, Joseph. 2004. "Founding a New Mamlaka: Some Remarks Concerning Safed and the Organization of the Region in the Mamluk Period." In *the Mamluks in Egyptian and Syrian Politics and Society*, edited by Michael Winter and Amalia Levanoni, 181–96. The Medieval Mediterranean, v. 51. Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill.

Durmuş, İsmail. 2013. "Zebîdî, Muhammed Murtazâ." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/zebidi-muhammed-murtaza.

Emre, Side. 2017. *Ibrahim-i Gulshani and the Khalwati-Gulshani Order: Power Brokers in Ottoman Egypt*. Leiden: Brill.

Endress, Gerhard, and Abdou Filali-Ansary, eds. 2006. *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopaedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World*. Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Science, v. 61. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Erdem, Hakan. 2017. "Gebze Üzerinden İtalya," December 10, 2017. https://www2.karar.com/yazarlar/hakan-erdem/gebze-uzerinden-italya-5658.

———. 2018. "II. Bayezid: Türkçe Kelimelerle, Açık ve Anlaşılır Yazın." *Karar Gazetesi*, March 18, 2018. https://www2.karar.com/yazarlar/hakan-erdem/ii-bayezid-turkce-kelimelerle-acik-ve-anlasilir-yazin-6483.

Erünsal, İsmail E. 2008. *Osmanlı Vakıf Kütüphaneleri: Tarihî Gelişimi ve Organizasyonu*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VII Dizi, Sayı 235. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Es-Seyyid, Seyyid Muhammed. 1995. "Evlādüᶜn-Nās." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/evladun-nas.

Fazlıoğlu, İhsan. n.d. "Muhyiddîn Kâfiyecî." İslam Düşünce Atlası. https://www.islamdusunceatlasi.org.

Fetvacı, Emine Fatma. 2005. "Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage, 1566--1617." PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

Fleischer, Cornell H. 2019. "Learning and Sovereignty in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 155–60. Brill.

———, and Kaya Şahin. 2019. "On the Works of a Historical Nature in the Bayezid II Library Inventory." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, edited by Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, 569–96. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004402508_018

Frenkel, Yehoshua. 2011. "Jihād in the Medieval Mediterranean Sea." In *Crossroads between Latin Europe and the Near East: Corollaries of the Frankish Presence in the Eastern Mediterranean (12th - 14th Centuries) ; [... Conference Entitled "The Eastern Mediterranean between Christian Europe and the Muslim Near East (11th to 13th Centuries)" Held by the Orient-Institut Beirut/Istanbul in Istanbul in May 2007 ...]*, edited by Stefan Leder, 103–25. Istanbuler Texte Und Studien 24. Würzburg: Ergon-Verl.

———. 2018. "Mamlûk Historiography Revisited: Narratological Perspectives in Damascene Chronicles." In *Mamluk Historiography Revisited: Narratological Perspectives*, edited by Stephan Conermann, 9–33. Mamluk Studies, volume 15. Göttingen, Germany: V&R Unipress, Bonn University Press.

Gaulmier, J., and T. Fahd. 2012. "Ibn S̲h̲āhīn Al-Ẓāhirī." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Gardiner, Noah. 2019. "Books on Occult Sciences." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, edited by Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, 735–65. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004402508_024.

Geoffroy, Eric. 1995. *Le soufisme en Égypte et en Syrie sous les derniers Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans: orientations spirituelles et enjeux culturels.* Damas: Institut français d'études arabes de Damas.

Gharaibeh, Mohammad. 2018. "The Sociology of Narrative Structures in Biographical Dictionaries: The Ad-Durar al-Kāmina of Ibn Hag̃ar al-ᶜAsqalanī a Case Study." In *Mamluk Historiography Revisited: Narratological Perspectives*, edited by Stephan Conermann, 33–57. Mamluk Studies, volume 15. Göttingen, Germany: V&R Unipress, Bonn University Press.

Ghersetti, Antonella, ed. 2017. *Al-Suyūṭī, a Polymath of the Mamlūk Period: Proceedings of the Themed Day of the First Conference of the School of Mamlūk Studies (Ca' Foscari University, Venice, June 23, 2014).* Islamic History and Civilization, volume 138. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Göğebakan, Göknur. 2003. "Malatya." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/malatya#1.

Guo, Li. 1997. "Mamluk Historiographic Studies: The State of the Art." *Mamlūk Studies Review* I: 15-43.

———. 2001. "Al-Biqaᶜi's Chronicle." In *the Historiography of Islamic Egypt, c.950-1800*, edited by Hugh Kennedy, 121–48. The Medieval Mediterranean, v. 31. Leiden Boston: Brill.

———. 2005. "Tales of a Medieval Cairene Harem: Domestic Life in al-Biqāʿī's Autobiographical Chronicle." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 9: 101–21.

Hanna, Nelly. 2003. *In Praise of Books: A Cultural History of Cairo's Middle Class, Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century.* Syracuse University Press.

Har-El, Shai. 1995. *Struggle for Domination in the Middle East: The Ottoman-Mamluk War, 1485-91.* The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, v. 4. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill.

Ḥasan, Zakī Muḥammad. 2008. *Al-Raḥḥāla al-Muslimūn fī al-ʿUṣur al-Wusṭā.* Beirut: Dār al-rāʾid al- ʿArabī.

Hirschler, Konrad. 2013. *The Written Word in the Medieval Arabic Lands: A Social and Cultural History of Reading Practices.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

———. 2013. "Studying Mamluk Historiography: From Source-Criticism to the Cultural Turn." In *Ubi Sumus? Quo Vademus? Mamluk Studies - State of the Art*, 159–86. Mamluk Studies 3. Göttingen: V & R Unipress, Bonn Univ. Press.

Hofer, Nathan. 2015. *The Popularisation of Sufism in Ayyubid and Mamluk Egypt, 1173-1325.* Edinburgh University Press.

Holt, P. M. 1983. "An Early Source on Shaykh Khaḍir Al-Mihrānī." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46 (1): 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00077430.

Homerin, Th. Emil. 2013. "Sufism in Mamluk Studies:A Review of the Scholarship in the Field." In *Ubi Sumus? Quo Vademus? Mamluk Studies - State of the Art*, edited by Stephan Conermann, 187–211. Mamluk Studies 3. Göttingen: V & R Unipress, Bonn Univ. Press.

Imber, Colin. 1987. "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth." *Turcica*, no. 19: 7–27.

İnalcık, Halil. 2003. "Mehmed I." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/mehmed-i.

İnalcık, Şevkiye. 1948. "İbn Hacer'de Osmanlılar'a Dair Haberler." *Ankara University the Journal of the Faculty of Languages and History-Geography*, no. 4: 189–95.

Irwin, Robert. 2008. "The Political Thinking of the 'Virtuous Ruler,' Qānṣūh al-Ghawri (MSR XII. 1, 2008)."

———. 2018. "Mamluk Literature (MSR VII.1, 2003)."

Ivanyi, Katharina Anna. 2012. "VIRTUE, PIETY AND THE LAW: A STUDY OF BIRGIVI MEHMED EFENDI'S AL-TARIQA AL-MUHAMMADIYYA." PhD dissertation, Princeton University.

İz, Fahir. 2012. "Dede Ḳorḳut." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Johansen, Baber. 1988. *The Islamic law on land tax and rent: the peasants' loss of property rights as interpreted in the Hanafite legal literature of the Mamluk and Ottoman periods.* Vol. X, 143 s.; London: Croom Helm.

Kadi, Wadad. 2006. "Biographical Dictionaries as the Scholars' Alternative History of the Muslim Community." In *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopaedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World*, edited by Gerhard Endress and Abdou Filali-Ansary, 23–75. Islamic Philosophy, Theology, and Science, v. 61. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Kafadar, Cemal. 1995. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State.* Nachdr. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press.

———. 2012. "Sohbete Çelebi, Çelebiye Mecmua." In *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları VII Mecmua: Osmanlı Edebiyatının Kırkambarı*, edited by Hatice Aynur, 43–53. Turkuaz.

———. 2017. *Kendine ait bir Roma: Diyar-ı Rum'da kültürel coğrafya ve kimlik üzerine.* İstanbul: Metis.

———. 2019. "Between Amasya and Istanbul: Bayezid II, His Librarian, and the Textual Turn of the Late Fifteenth Century." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 79–153. Brill.

Kandemir, M. Yaşar. 1999. "İbn Hacer El-Askalânî." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ibn-hacer-el-askalani.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. 2006. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Middle Period 1200-1550*. Oxford: One world.

Karatas, Hasan. 2011. "The City as a Historical Actor: The Urbanization and Ottomanization of the Halvetiye Sufi Order by the City of Amasya in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." PhD dissertation, UC Berkeley.

———. 2016. "A Shaykh, a Prince, and a Sack of Corn:" In *Living in the Ottoman Realm*, edited by Christine Isom-Verhaaren and Kent F. Schull, 79–90. Empire and Identity, 13th to 20th Centuries. Indiana University Press.

Kavak, Özgür. 2020. *Sultan, Ordu ve Reaya II. Bayezid'e Sunulan Müellifi Meçhul Siyasetname: (inceleme, tercüme, metin)*. Siyaseti Yeniden Düşünmek. İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları.

Kaya, Büşra S. 2019. "XV. Yüzyıl Memlük Kahire'sinin Entelektüel Kadınları." *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* 24 (46): 0–0. https://doi.org/10.20519/divan.614147.

Kayapınar, Hüseyin. 2001. "KĀRİÜLHİDÂYE." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/kariulhidaye.

Kissling, H. J. 2012. "Badr Al-Dīn b. Ḳāḍī Samāwnā." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Knysh, Alexander D. 1999. *Ibn ᶜArabi in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam*. SUNY Series in Islam. Albany: State University of New York Press.

———. 1993. "'ORTHODOXY' AND 'HERESY' IN MEDIEVAL ISLAM: AN ESSAY IN REASSESSMENT." *The Muslim World* 83 (1): 48–67.

Koby, Yosef. 2017. "Usages of Kinship Terminology during the Mamluk Sultanate and the Notion of the Mamlūk Family." In, edited by Yuval Ben-Bassat and Amalia Levanoni, 16–75. Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts.

———. 2009. "Mamluks of Jewish Origin in the Mamluk Sultanate." https://doi.org/10.6082/JHG8-MS92.

Koca, Ferhat. 2000. "İBNÜ'l-HÜMÂM." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ibnul-humam.

Kortantamer, Samira. 1994. "MEMLÜK TARİHÇİLİGİNDE BİR ÜSLUP UNSURU: EL-' ACAiB VEL-GARAiB." *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, no. IX: 69–87.

Köksal, Âsım Cüneyd. 2016. *Fıkıh ve Siyaset: Osmanlılarda Siyâset-i Şer'iyye*. Birinci Basım. İslâm Medeniyeti Araştırmaları Dizisi 18. İstanbul: Klasik.

Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad, Seda Çakmakcıoğlu Şan, and Mehmet Fuad Köprülü. 2014. *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar*. 1. basım. Külliyat, Mehmet Fuad Köprülü. [MFK külliyat ed. Seda Çakmakcıoğlu Şan]; 4. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

———. 2015. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Kuruluşu: Ekler "Osmanlı İmparatorluğununEetnik Kökeni" ve "Kayı Kabilesi Hakkında Notlar."*

Krenkow, F. 1987. "Al-Samhūdī." In, edited by M. Th Houtsman, T.W Arnold, R. Basset, and R. Hartmann, 1st. ed. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill.

Leder, Stefan, ed. 2011. *Crossroads between Latin Europe and the Near East: Corollaries of the Frankish Presence in the Eastern Mediterranean (12th - 14th Centuries) ; [... Conference Entitled "The Eastern Mediterranean between Christian Europe and the Muslim Near East (11th to 13th Centuries)" Held by the Orient-Institut Beirut/Istanbul in Istanbul in May 2007 ...]*. Istanbuler Texte Und Studien 24. Würzburg: Ergon-Verl.

Levanoni, Amalia. 1994. "The Mamluk Conception of the Sultanate." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (03): 373–92. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743800060694.

———. 2018. "Lachrymose Behavior in Mamluk Chronicles: A Narratological Technique." In *Mamluk Historiography Revisited – Narratological Perspectives*, edited by Stephan Conermann, 1st ed., 91–102. Göttingen: V&R Unipress.

Little, Donald P. 1983. "RELIGION UNDER THE MAMLUKS." *The Muslim World* 73 (3–4): 165–81.

———. 1976. "Al-Safadī as Biographer of His Contemporaries." In *Essays on Islamic Civilization: Presented to Niyazi Berkes*, edited by Niyazi Berkes and Donald Presgrave Little. Leiden: Brill.

Loiseau, Julien. 2019. "Ibn Shāhīn Al- Ẓāhirī." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*, edited by Marc Gaborieau, Gudrun Krämer, John Abdallah Nawas, Everett K. Rowson, Kate Fleet, and Denis Matringe, 3rd ed. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Lory, P. 2012. "S̲h̲ād̲h̲iliyya." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Lowry, Heath W. 2003. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State.* SUNY Series in the Social and Economic History of the Middle East. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Markiewicz, Christopher. 2017. "History as Science: The Fifteenth-Century Debate In Arabic and Persian." *Journal of Early Modern History* 21 (3): 216–40.

———. 2019. *The Crisis of Kingship in Late Medieval Islam: Persian Emigres and the Making of Ottoman Sovereignty.* 1st ed. Cambridge University Press.

———. 2019. "Books on the Secretarial Arts and Literary Prose." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, edited by Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, 657–72. BRILL.

Martel-Thoumian, Bernadette. 2004. "La Mort Volontaire: Le Traitement Du Suicide et Du Suicidé Dans Les Chroniques Mamloukes Tardives." *Annales Islamologiques* 38: 405–35.

Matas, Alvarez de Morales Ruiz Camilo. 2014. "Abd Al-Bāsiṭ Visita El Reino de Granada." *Revista Del Centro De Estudios Históricos De Granada Y Su Reino*, no. 26: 87–92.

Mauder, Christian. 2015. "Herrschaftsbegründung Durch Handlung." *Das Mittelalter* 20 (1): 29–46.

———. 2017. "In the Sultan's Salon: Learning, Religion and Rulership at the Mamluk Court of Qāniṣawh al-Ghawrī (r. 1501–1516)." PhD dissertation, University of Göttingen.

McGill Team. 2019. "Astronomical and Other Mathematical Sciences." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2*

Vols), edited by Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, 823–55. BRILL.

Midilli, Muhammet Enes. 2020. "Ulemânın Memlük Coğrafyasına Yönelmesi ve Memlükler Döneminde Kahire İlim Kurumları." *İslam Tetkikleri Dergisi* 10 (1): 389–412.

Mir-Kasimov, Orkhan. 2019. "Ḥurūfiyya." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*, edited by Marc Gaborieau, Gudrun Krämer, John Abdallah Nawas, Everett K. Rowson, Kate Fleet, and Denis Matringe, 3rd ed. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Muhanna, Elias I. 2011. "The Sultan's New Clothes: Ottoman–Mamluk Gift Exchange in The Fifteenth Century." In *Muqarnas, Volume 27*, edited by Gülru Necipoğlu and Karen Leal, 189–208. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004185111.i-448.52.

Mujani, Wan Kamal, and Noor Inayah Yaakub. 2013. "Al-Maqrizi (d.1442) and Abd Al-Basit (d.1514) and Their Accounts on the Economy of Egypt."

———. 2006. *Economic Decline of the Circassian Mamluks in Egypt (872-922/1468-1517)*. The University of Manchester (United Kingdom).

Muslu, Cihan Yüksel. 2007. "Ottoman-Mamluk Relations: Diplomacy and Perceptions." PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

———. 2013. "Ottoman-Mamluk Relations and the Complex Image of Bāyezīd II." In *Conquête ottomane de l'Égypte (1517): arrière-plan, impact, échos*, edited by Benjamin Lellouch and Nicolas Michel, 51–79. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

———. 2013. "Attempting to Understand the Language of Diplomacy between the Ottomans and the Mamluks." Edited by György Hazai. *Archivum Ottomanicum*, no. 30: 247–69.

———. 2014. *The Ottomans and the Mamluks: Imperial Diplomacy and Warfare in the Islamic World*. Library of Ottoman Studies 36. London: I.B. Tauris.

———. 2017. "The Impact of Time on Ottoman-Mamluk Relations." YouTube video. From a presentation made at the fourth conference of the SMS. Posted by School of Mamluk Studies on September 15th. https://youtu.be/aq-5fwcXgxo

———. 2017. "Nomadic Borders of Ottoman Provinces during the Mamluk-Ottoman Imperial Transition." In *The Mamluk-Ottoman Transition: Continuity and Change in Egypt and Bilād al-Shām in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Stephan Conermann and Gül Şen. Ottoman Studies / Osmanistische Studien, Band 2. Göttingen: V&R unipress, Bonn University Press.

———. 2019. "Patterns of Mobility between Ottoman and Mamluk Lands." In *The Mamluk Sultanate from the Perspective of Regional and World History: Economic, Social and Cultural Development in an Era of Increasing International Interaction and Competition*, edited by Reuven Amitai and Stephan Conermann, 391–431. Mamluk Studies, volume 17. Göttingen: V&R unipress, Bonn University Press.

Necipoğlu, Gülru, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, eds. 2019. *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4)*. 2 vols. Studies and Sources in Islamic Art and Architecture, volume XIV. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. 2012. "VISUAL COSMOPOLITANISM AND CREATIVE TRANSLATION: ARTISTIC CONVERSATIONS WITH RENAISSANCE ITALY IN MEHMED II'S CONSTANTINOPLE." *Muqarnas Online* 29 (1): 1–81.

Northrup, Linda S. 1998. "The Baḥrī Mamluk Sultanate (1250-1390)." In *the Cambridge History of Egypt.*, edited by Carl F Petry and M. W Daly, 245–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1998. *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of Al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678-689 A.H./1279-1290 A.D.)*. Freiburger Islamstudien, Bd. 18. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. 1998. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler: 15.-17. Yüzyıllar*. Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 60. Beşiktaş, İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.

Oumar, Saad F. 2010. "Ahmed Bin El-Hüseyin Bin Muhammed Bin El-Uleyf'in Kitâbü'd-Dürri'l-Manzum Fî Menâkıbi's-Sultân Bâyezid Melikü'r-Rum Adlı Eserinin Çeviri ve Değerlendirmesi." MA Thesis, Ege Üniversitesi.

Özaydın, Abdülkerim. 1988. "ABDÜLBÂSIT El-MALATÎ." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/abdulbasit-el-malati.

Özbaran, Salih. 2004. *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.-17. Yüzyıllarda Rûm, Rûm Aidiyet ve Imgeleri.* 1. basım. Tarih ve Coğrafya Dizisi 29.

Özkan, Mustafa. 2003. "MANYASOĞLU MAHMUD." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/manyasoglu-mahmud.

Peacock, Andrew A.C.S. 2019. *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia.* Cambridge University Press.

Petry, Carl F, and M. W Daly, eds. 1998. *The Cambridge History of Egypt.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1993. "Scholastic Stasis in Medieval Islam Reconsidered: Mamluk Patronage in Cairo." *Poetics Today* 14 (2): 323.

Pfeifer, Helen. 2014. "To Gather Together: Cultural Encounters in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Literary Salons." PhD dissertation, Princeton University.

———. 2015. "ENCOUNTER AFTER THE CONQUEST: SCHOLARLY GATHERINGS IN 16TH-CENTURY OTTOMAN DAMASCUS." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 47 (2): 219–39.

Qutbuddin, Tahera. 2019. "Books on Arabic Philology and Literature: A Teaching Collection Focused on Religious Learning and The State Chancery." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 607–34. Brill.

Richardson, Kristina. 2016. "The Evolving Biographical Legacy of Two Late Mamluk Ḥanbalī Judges." In *History and Society during the Mamluk Period (1250–1517): Studies of the Annemarie Schimmel Institute for Advanced Study II*, edited by Stephan Conermann, 1st ed., 29–50. Göttingen: V&R Unipress. https://doi.org/10.14220/9783737006200.

Robinson, Chase F. 2003. *Islamic Historiography.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthal, Franz. 1968. *A History of Muslim Historiography.* Leiden, E.J.: Brill.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled. 2015. *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107337657.

Sartain, Elizabeth Mary. 1975. "Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūtī. Vol. 2: al-Taḥadduth biniᶜmat allah." London: Cambridge Univ.

Schacht, J. 2012. "Abū Yūsuf." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Shafir, Nir. 2020. "Reading Modernity in (and out) of the Ottoman Empire." *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 7 (1): 64. https://doi.org/10.2979/jottturstuass.7.1.20.

Strathern, Alan. 2018. "Global Early Modernity and the Problem of What Came Before." *Past & Present* 238 (suppl_13): 317–44. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gty027.

Şen, A Tunç, and Cornell H Fleischer. 2019. "Books on Astrology, Astronomical Tables, And Almanacs in the Library Inventory of Bayezid II." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 767–821. Brill.

Şen, Ahmet Tunç. 2017. "Reading the Stars at the Ottoman Court: Bāyezīd II (r. *Arabica* 64 (3–4): 557–608.

Stavrides, Theoharis. 2001. *The Sultan of Vezirs: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelović (1453-1474).* Vol. 24. Brill.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. 1997. "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia." *Modern Asian Studies* 31 (3): 735–62.

Tadayoshi, Kikuchi. 2006. "An Analysis of 'Abd al-Bāsiṭ al-Ḥanafī al-Malaṭī's Descriptions of the Year 848: On the Process of Writing History in the Late Fifteenth Century." *Mamlūk Studies Review* 1 (10): 29–54.

Tahralı, Mustafa. 2008. "RİFÂİYYE." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi.* TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/rifaiyye.

Tansel, Selâhattin, and Dil Atatürk Kültür ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu (Turkey). 2017. *Sultan II. Bâyezit'in siyasî hayatı.*

Taşkömür, Himmet. 2019. "Books on Islamic Jurisprudence, Schools of Law, and Biographies of Imams from the Hanafi School." In *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4) (2 Vols)*, 389–422. Brill.

Tekindağ, Şehabeddin. 1961. *Berkuk Devrinde Memlûk Sultanlığı (XIV. Yüzyıl Mısır Tarihine Dair Bir Araştırma).* İstanbul.

———. 1967. "Bayezid Devrinde Çukurova'da Nüfûz Mücadelesi: İlk Osmanlı-Memlûklu Savaşları (1485-1491)." *TTK Belleten*, no. 123: 345–73.

———. 1973. "Mısır ve Suriye'de Yazılmış Arabça Eserlerin Osmanlı Tarihi Bakımından Önemleri." In *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, 25-29 Eylül 1970*, II:534–42. Ankara.

———. 2003. "MAHMUD PAŞA." In *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi. https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/mahmud-pasa.

Terzioğlu, Derin. 2007. "Bir Tercüme ve Bir İntihal Vakası: Ya Da İbn Teymiyye'nin Siyāsetü'ş-Şer'iyye'sini Osmanlıcaya Kim (Ler), Nasıl Aktardı?" *Journal of Turkish Studies: Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 31 (2): 247–75.

———. 2013. "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization." *Turcica*, no. 44: 301–38.

Uluçay, M. Çağatay. 2001. *Padişahların Kadınları ve Kızları.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Uzunçarşılı, Ismail Hakki. 1969. "Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları: Seri 8."

Walsh, J.R. 2012. "Gūrānī." In *Encyclopedia of Islam.*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W.P. Heinrichs, 2nd. ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill. http://www.credoreference.com/book/brillislam.

Winter, Michael, ed. 1992. *Egyptian Society under Ottoman Rule 1517–1798.* London: Routledge.

———. 1998. "The Re-Emergence of the Mamluks Following the Ottoman Conquest." In *the Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*, edited by Ulrich Haarman and Thomas Phillip, 87–107. Cambridge University Press.

Wollina, Torsten. 2014. "News and Rumor - Local Sources of Knowledge about the World." In *Everything Is on the Move: The Mamluk Empire as a Node in (Trans) Regional Networks*, edited by Stephan Conermann. Mamluk Studies 7. Göttingen: V & R Unipress, Bonn Univ. Press.

———. 2014. *Zwanzig Jahre Alltag: Lebens-, Welt- Und Selbstbild Im Journal des Aḥmad Ibn Ṭawq*. Mamluk Studies, volume 8. Göttingen: V&R Unipress: Bonn University Press.

Yerasimos, Stéphanos. 1993. *Konstantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri: La Fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie Dans Les Traditions Turques*. İstanbul: Iletişim Yayınları.

Yıldız, Sara Nur. 2014. "From Cairo to Ayasuluk: Hacı Paşa and the Transmission of Islamic Learning to Western Anatolia in the Late Fourteenth Century." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 25 (3): 263–97.

Yılmaz, Hüseyin. 2018. *Caliphate Redefined: The Mystical Turn in Ottoman Political Thought*. Princeton University Press.