

Cihan Yüksel Muslu. *The Ottomans and the Mamluks: Imperial Diplomacy and Warfare in the Islamic World*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014. xii + 376 pages.

Zahit Atçıl

Istanbul Medeniyet University, Department of History
zahit.atcil@medeniyet.edu.tr

Concerning the questions of Ottoman integration into the modern diplomatic networks in the early modern period, *The Ottomans and the Mamluks* deals with Ottoman-Mamluk diplomatic relations and contributes to the field of Ottoman diplomatic history, especially to understanding how the Ottomans used diplomacy as a tool of foreign policy and to what extent diplomacy was a mechanism at which interstate conflicts were highlighted, discussed and resolved through diplomacy as an alternative to warfare. Instead of a diplomatic history overshadowed by political history, it focuses on treating the diplomatic exchange itself as a subject matter with a pursuit of understanding the symbolic and representational aspects of the ceremonies, correspondences, gift exchanges, developing ambassadorial decorum etc. in various cultural contexts.

Cihan Yüksel Muslu tracks the evolution of Ottoman-Mamluk relations from the mid-fourteenth century until 1512. Having an introduction and five chapters and three appendices, the book presents a chronological evolution of the Ottoman-Mamluk relations. Primary concern of the book is to understand the dynamics between the Ottomans and the Mamluks and how it changed over time. Although the Mamluk supreme political power disappeared from the scene in 1517, Muslu does not include last five years of the Mamluks, on the grounds that “a study that would include the final five years would undoubtedly produce a second volume,” (pp. 21-22) because of the intensity of the relations in these years. Besides, the author states that her book serves to depict an alternative picture of Ottoman-Mamluk relations that is undistorted by the weight of the ultimate Ottoman victory. In fact, the Mamluks were the superior and more respected political power compared to the Ottomans from the beginning of the early fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century when the Ottomans began to challenge this superiority.

Muslu introduces her criteria of analysis in the first chapter titled “The Tools of Diplomacy.” Going beyond a dry description of diplomatic exchange, she examines symbolic meanings of each contacts by looking at rulers’ selection of ambassadors, preparation process of letters, preparation and presentation of gifts, the kinds of gifts, reception of ambassadors, courtly decorum, ambassadorial audience, ceremonial processions, banquet offers etc. She gives numerous examples for varieties in every category.

The author pays particular attention to the titles used for Ottoman and Mamluk sultans in narrative sources and diplomatic letters. Muslu shows that the Mamluks paid little attention to the Ottoman principality at early fourteenth century at a time when the Karamanids and the Germiyanids were known as the powerful political entities in Anatolia. The Mamluks used various low-rank titles for the Ottoman sultans such as *al-Majlis al-Samiyy* (His Lofty Seat), *al-Janab al-Munif* (His Exalted Honor), *al-Maqarr al-‘Ali* (His Sublime Residence) or *al-Maqarr al-Karim* (His Noble Residence) and *al-Maqam al-Ashraf* (His Most Noble Station) (See Appendix II, pp. 190-191). The Ottomans in turn respectfully referred to the Mamluk rulers with honorific titles such as *Sultan al-Islam wa-l-Muslimin* (The Sultan of Islam and Muslims), *Malik al-Muluk fi al-‘Alam* (The King of kings in the World), *Hami Sukkan al-Haramayn al-Sharifayn* (The Protector of the Residents in the Two Holy Cities), *Sultan al-Haramayn* (The Sultan of Two Holy Cities) and *Hafiz Bilad Allah* (The Protector of God’s Domain) (p. 90).

In Muslu’s presentation, the balance between the Ottomans and Mamluks persisted for along time by respecting each other’s status and role as Muslim states. Although the Mamluks, who were the first army to stop the Mongol expansion, disliked the Ottomans’ increasing assumption of the role of the defender of Islam against the Crusading forces, they continued to keep peace and cooperate. Especially when a common threat, the Timurids, appeared, the cooperation and exchange between the Ottomans and the Mamluks became firmer. For example, the Mamluk sultan Baybars rejected the Timurid ruler Shahrukh’s offer to furnish *kiswa* (black textile that covers Ka’ba), he acceded Ottoman sultan Murad’s offer to send silk cloth for *mahmal* (litter carrying gifts for Ka’ba). Baybars considered Murad II’s offer less audacious, because he did not foresee a near Ottoman threat and also because sending cloth for *mahmal* was symbolically less ambitious than sending *kiswa* (pp. 98-100). Exchange between two polities was accompanied by the movement of religious scholars from Ottoman lands to the Mamluk lands to acquire access to the centers of learning in Damascus and Cairo. In the second half of the fifteenth century, however, the balance began to change as Mehmed II, endorsed by his conquests and

achievements, challenged the superiority of the Mamluks. In diplomatic correspondence, Mehmed II strongly emphasized his role as *gazi* and defender of Islam. In addition, Mehmed II addressed in one of his letters to the Mamluk Sultan Khushqadam with the title *al-Maqarr al-Karim* (His Noble Residence), as an unusual epithet that had been used up to that time for the Ottoman sultans who had inferior status (pp. 120-124). The period after the reign of Mehmed II (d. 1481) oscillated between the competition to control buffer zones such as the Dulkadirid lands and prudence against the rising Safavid power in Iran. The Mamluk hosting of Ottoman prince Cem Sultan tainted the trust between two polities. Muslu illustrates the transformation of the Ottoman-Mamluk relations in the introduction of the book: while Bayezid I (r. 1389-1402) stated to Mamluk envoy that he considered himself as Barquq's slave (*mamluk*) in 1393, about a century later one of Bayezid II's (r. 1481-1512) men challenged the Mamluk ambassador Amir Janibek that the Ottoman sultan was more worthy of ruling the holy cities in respect to his noble lineage and the Mamluk sultans' slave background (pp. 1-2).

Muslu uses a variety of sources, but more particularly chronicles, collections of diplomatic letters, accounts of travelers. She gives space equally to both Mamluk and Ottoman sources and effectively uses manuscripts and published primary sources. Whenever appropriate, the author masterfully compares their narratives and shows their perspectives and biases. She tries not to adopt unjustifiably the version that represents the Ottoman standpoint or the Mamluk one.

In an 84 page long appendix, she lists all the diplomatic exchange between the Ottomans and the Mamluks starting from June 1366 until August 1512. She elaborates each entry with the dates, the direction of the mission, the purpose and details of the subject discussed or delivered during the ambassadorial meeting (such as announcement of a conquest, congratulation of an accession to the throne or peace negotiations). She also provides, for each entry, full citation info for the sources that mention the diplomatic relation (such as the location in a chronicle, or in any secondary source) or the ones that contain the letter used during the meeting (such as Feridun Bey's *Münşeat*).

Muslu's book presents an invaluable contribution to the field of Ottoman-Mamluk relations and primarily concerns specialists who work Ottoman history, Mamluk history, ideology and diplomatic relations in Islamic middle periods. The author shows how a diplomatic exchange can be studied by examining the sources from both sides. One minor criticism is that the author's usage of the terms "Ottomans" and "Mamluks" appears

ambiguous. Do they refer to the sultans? Or do they include also the sultans' entourage, and bureaucracy that involve in the diplomatic exchange? She mostly focuses on Ottoman and Mamluk sultans in every occasion and pays little attention to the agencies of the pashas, secretaries who most probably participated actively in composing the letters and arranging the diplomatic settings.

**Köstendilli Ali el-Halvetî. *Telvîhât: Bir Osmanlı Şeyhinin Dilinden Tasavvuf.*
Haz. Semih Ceyhan. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2016. 285 sayfa.**

Ömer Sami Uzuner

Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
omer.sami@marmara.edu.tr

Kalden ziyade hâl ile ilişkili olan tasavvuf, satırlardan değil sadırlardan öğrenilip aktarılan, bu yolu talep ve irade edenin, irşad edip yol göstereni takip etmesiyle elde edilen marifet ve hakikatlerdir. Bu yolda elde edilen her türlü tecrübe, salık için önem arz etmektedir. Zira tabi olunan müşid, kendi tecrübesi ve meşrebine göre talibi çeşitli yollardan marifet ve hakikate ulaştırmayı amaçlar. Bu çeşitlilik de tasavvuf sahasının genişliğinin en büyük sebeplerindendir.

Tarihî süreci içinde sürekli genişleyen tasavvuf düşüncesinin mensuplarından birisi de 16. yüzyıl Osmanlı döneminde yaşamış olan Köstendilli Ali el-Halvetî'dir. Künyesinden de anlaşılacağı üzere bir Halveti şeyhi olan Köstendilli Ali Efendi, hususi müşidinin İbn Arabi (ö. 1240/638) olması hasebiyle Ekberi, bâtında Hacı Bektâş-ı Veli'ye (ö. 1271/669) müntesip olmasından dolayı da Bektaşî gelenek içerisinde yer alan bir sufidir. Soyu, Hz. Ömer'e dayanmaktadır. 1589/997 tarihinde vefat ettiği anlaşılan Köstendilli Ali Efendi'nin, halifelerinden Bursalı Şuhûdî Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1612/1021), şeyhinin vefatına kadar üç sene yanında bulunmuş, vefatına yakın bir zamanda ise şeyhinin sözlerini *Telvîhât-ı Sübhâniyye ve Mülhemât-ı Rabbâniyye* isimli eserde bir araya getirmiştir. Köstendilli Ali Efendi'nin tasavvufa dair sözlerinden oluşan bu eser Semih Ceyhan tarafından Arapça metnin tahkiki ve tercümesiyle birlikte neşredilmiştir. Kitap