Irish Church Quarterly

The Case of Prince Djem: A Curious Episode in European History

Author(s): George Viviliers Jourdan

Source: *The Irish Church Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 32 (Oct., 1915), pp. 298-312

Published by: [Irish Church Quarterly](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30067535>

Accessed: 26/05/2014 11:58

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Irish Church Quarterly is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE CASE OF PRINCE DJEM: A CURIOUS EPISODE IN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

ON the death, in 1481, of Mahomet II., the great Sultan who had taken Constantinople, two of his sons came into prominence, Bajazet and Djem. Their characters were very different: the elder, Bajazet, loved ease and pleasure, Djem, on the other hand, enjoyed hunting and led a strenuous life. As neither was in Constantinople when the Sultan Mahomet died, the Vizir Achmed, a man of great military skill and sagacity, proclaimed Bajazet Sultan. Djem, however, had a strong following amongst the Turkish people and the janissaries. Moreover, he considered himself the rightful heir to the Caliphate, because he had been born after his father had ascended the throne. He therefore gathered an army in Bithynia, with the object of asserting his rights. Giving Djem no time to strengthen his cause or reinforce his army, the Vizir threw an army of Thracian soldiers across the Propontis into Asia and scattered the forces of the Prince, who thereupon withdrew for safety, first to Jerusalem, and afterwards to Sultan Kaibai in Egypt.

A little later, Djem, with the assistance of one of the Caramanian princes whom Mahomet II. had defrauded of their patrimony, resolved again to try the hazard of a battle. Once more he suffered defeat and was forced to flee. Fearing lest he should fall into the hands of his brother, with whose cruel, treacherous nature he was well acquainted, he despatched messengers to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, whose headquarters were at Rhodes, entreating them to give him a secure refuge from the fury of Bajazet. His envoys found it no easy task to perform their mission, on account of the watch which the Sultan had set to prevent this very enterprise. At length, having discovered a small boat

in a hut on the Cilician coast, they sailed to Rhodes, and prevailed on the Grand-Master, Pierre d'Aubusson, and the Council of Knights, to send their fleet to take Djem off the coast. They came at an opportune moment, for Prince Djem, hard pressed by his brother's soldiers, had ridden at full gallop to the shore and embarked on a vessel that he had previously hired as a safeguard against capture.¹

The Knights received the fugitive prince with royal honours. To them Djem explained that he did not deny Bajazet's right to inheritance, but that that prince had only a right to possess the dominions their father had held before he became Sultan. His appeal for aid against his brother, however, merely elicited the reply that the Knights would have to consult the Pope and Christian Princes on the matter, and that meanwhile Djem would find a safer asylum in France. Accompanied by Pierre d'Aubusson, and some of the Knights, he sailed from Rhodes on 1st September, 1482.

For some time previously, Bajazet had been seeking peace with the Knights. Accordingly, a treaty was now drawn up and agreed to, in which no mention of Prince Djem occurred. It was followed by a private compact in accordance with which the Sultan begged Pierre d'Aubusson "to keep, care for, and protect him (Prince Djem), beneath your wings, that his passion for war may die away." Bajazet promised that money should be furnished "suitable for the expenses of a prince and royal brother." The amount fixed upon was forty-five thousand ducats payable yearly on 1st August.² From this time to the end of his life, Djem became a captive, valuable as a menace to the aspirations of his brother and a source of emolument to those who held him prisoner.

¹ See the extracts from Caoursin's narrative in *Burchard's Diary*, translated and edited by Dr. A. H. Mathew, vol. i., p. 386.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 393-8.

The diplomatic correspondence of this period contains frequent references to the Turkish captive, and from these we learn that eager attempts were made by Venice, the Pope, and the Kings of France, Hungary, and Naples, each in turn, to gain possession of him. Djem, nevertheless, remained an inmate of the Chateau de Bourg Neuf, under the charge of Guy de Blanchefort, a nephew of d'Aubusson, until 1489, when the Knights, with the consent of King Charles VIII., handed him over to Pope Innocent.³ This important transaction did not take place without an exchange of considerable advantages. On the one side, the terms of the compact were that the Prince should be given "for his personal safety" a bodyguard of Knights of Rhodes, that the Pope should receive in future the annual pension of 45,000 ducats for the Prince's maintenance, and, moreover, that the Pope should undertake to pay a fine of 10,000 ducats if he handed Djem over to any other monarch without the consent of the King of France. On the other side, the Knights were to receive certain rights and immunities; Pierre d'Aubusson was to be elevated to the Cardinalate; and, for the satisfaction of King Charles, Pope Innocent promised to confer another Cardinal's hat on the Archbishop of Bordeaux, and also to put obstacles in the way of the proposed marriage of Alain d'Albret with the heiress of Brittany.⁴

Djem was, at this time, about thirty-five years of age, tall, stoutly built, and healthy. His keen blue eyes were shaded by heavy black brows which almost met above his aquiline nose. He had a small chin, small ears, thick neck, chestnut-brown complexion, and hardly any beard. His manner of speaking was serious and dignified, but when he was angry, his voice became shrill and his eyes flashed. He was always reserved and

³ Heidenheimer, in *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte*, v. (1882), p. 513.

⁴ Pastor, *History of the Popes*, trans. by Antrobus, London, 1898, vol. v., p. 298.

proud, and never forgot, under any circumstances, that he was a Prince of the House of Ottoman and a faithful follower of the Prophet Mahomet. An Italian envoy at the Papal Court remarked the resemblance Djem bore to his father, the Sultan Mahomet II.⁵

It was on 13th March, 1489, that Prince Djem entered Rome. Members of the households of the Cardinals, the foreign envoys, the President of the Senate, Franceschetto Cibó (the Pope's son), and a numerous throng of the Roman populace, came to the gates to meet him. A common prophecy of the time had asserted that the Sultan would one day come to Rome and reside in the Vatican. The Romans felt, with a mixture of joy and relief, as they gazed on the procession, that this was evidently the fulfilment of that forecast.

Probably by now Djem entertained little hope that his request for help to obtain what he considered justice for himself would have any prosperous issue, for, on the day after that on which he had entered Rome, when he came face to face with the Head of the Christian Church, he bore himself proudly, stalking into the conclave like the Sultan he claimed to be. And, though he had been carefully instructed as to the reverence and humility he should display in the presence of the Pope, Djem to the amazement of the beholders, and the manifest anger of Innocent, having given a scarcely perceptible inclination of the head, walked up the steps of the papal throne and kissed the Pope's right shoulder. Through an interpreter, he then addressed a few words to Innocent, saying that he thanked God for having been permitted to see him, and that when the Pope should have granted him a private audience he would have things to tell him which would be to the advantage of Christendom. This probably related to an offer made by Djem that, if he obtained the Caliphate by Christian aid, he would withdraw the Turks from Europe, and even surrender Constantinople.

⁵ Ep. of Matteo Bosso, in *Burchard's Diary*, i. 381-2.

Pope Innocent had long entertained the idea of a crusade against the Turkish power, which was always threatening Hungary on the one side, and Italy on the other. Now that he had got into his hands a claimant to the Turkish throne the way seemed clear, and accordingly, in May, 1489, he propounded his scheme. Although the Christian princes and their accredited representatives approved of his suggestions they made no serious effort to act upon them. The opportunity, therefore, of conducting the crusade advantageously was allowed to pass away.

That Bajazet recognized that the possession of his brother by a Christian power constituted a very grave danger to himself is evident from the efforts made, at his instigation, during 1489-1490, to poison or assassinate Prince Djem.⁶ Even when the final blow to Innocent's hopes of a crusade was administered by the re-opening of the violent quarrel between the Emperor Maximilian and King Charles VIII., Bajazet felt so little secure that he sent envoys to Rome with presents, and a letter in which he offered to the Pope the same conditions as he had arranged with the Knights of Rhodes. His envoy delivered to Innocent the pension for Djem's safe custody, and promised, on his master's behalf, that Bajazet would refrain from attacking the Adriatic coasts.

The bargain thus entered into by the Pope with the Sultan was not, even in those days when much that was unseemly passed uncensured, regarded as in accordance with the honour of the Holy See. But, it has been pointed out, the Pope may be reasonably justified, in this particular, by the unwillingness of the majority of the Christian princes to assist him in the crusade he had proposed to them, and by the urgent need of guarding Christendom from any further depredations of the Grand Turk. Yet even Dr. Pastor has to confess frankly that this and subsequent dealings between the Vatican and

⁶ Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, London, 1901, vol. iv., p. 154f.

the Porte introduced an undesirable element into the foreign policy of the Papacy.

For Djem the years of captivity went by not unpleasantly. He had as much hunting as he wished, and peaceful luxury. The Pope maintained him royally at great expense. Still, it was not the kind of life Djem desired; he had vast ambitions, and had pleaded with the Christians to aid him in fulfilling them: they had replied by keeping him a prisoner for their own ends. Though Innocent's plan for a crusade had fallen through, Djem did not cease to figure in the diplomatic correspondence of that time.⁷ Nor did the death of Pope Innocent in 1492 bring any notable change in the circumstances of the Turkish prince.

Towards the end of 1494, when Charles VIII. had reached Florence in the prosecution of his expedition into Italy, the negotiations between Pope Alexander VI. and the Sultan took on a most offensive aspect. Alexander, terrified at the prospect of the French invasion, which seemed likely to involve his deposition from the Papacy, had applied to Bajazet, in the month of May, for aid for Naples, and in the month of June for pecuniary assistance for himself, in order to resist the advance of the French forces.

The papal envoy, Giorgio Bocciardo, entrusted with this mission, was intercepted on the return journey by Giovanni della Rovere, near Ancona. Giovanni was the brother of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, afterwards Pope Julius II., who had become the political opponent of Alexander, and was now with the French monarch. Accordingly, Giovanni della Rovere detained for his own use the 40,000 ducats which the envoys were carrying to the Pope, but he sent the documents found in their possession to his brother at Florence. Cardinal Giuliano and the Cardinal of Gurk had them published in Latin.

⁷ *Burchard's Diary*, App. 37.

This famous correspondence consists of (1) a document in Latin which purports to be the Instructions given by Pope Alexander VI., in June, 1494, to Giorgio Bocciardo, his envoy to the Sultan Bajazet; (2) four epistles from Bajazet to Alexander, dated 18th September, originally written in Turkish, but now existing only in a Latin translation, and (3) another epistle from the Sultan to the Pope, of a personal and private character, dated 12th September, originally written in Italian. In the printed copies of these papers,⁸ they are prefaced by a statement that the Cardinal of Gurk (Raymond Perraud) had made them public, and an attestation of Giorgio Bocciardo at Sinigaglia, countersigned by a notary public at Florence, regarding the authenticity of (1). Concerning (2), the same notary public bears witness that the attestations of the translators, the Greek Lascaris, the Bishop of Famagosta, and one Marcellus of Constantinople, Secretary to the Prince of Salerno, were made in his presence. The notary public also states, in reference to (3), that the copy published was such as he himself had made from the original "which was written in Italian, with Latin letters, on oblong paper after the Turkish fashion, and had affixed to it at the top the golden seal of the Grand Turk, and at the foot the black."

The documents have a peculiar interest of their own, and form a curiosity in diplomatic records, but their historical value depends upon (1) and (3), that is to say, on what appears to be Alexander's Instructions to Bocciardo, and the private reply of Bajazet.

We will take the documents in the order given in the printed copies.

The "Instructiones" bid Bocciardo inform Bajazet that the King of France, assisted by the States of Milan,

⁸They are given in L. Thuasne, *Johannis Burchardi . . . . Diarium*, Paris, 1884, vol. ii., pp. 202-210, and in W. Roscoe, *Leo X.*, Liverpool, 1805, vol. i., App. xli.

Burgundy, Brittany, Normandy, and other nations, is about to come to Italy for the purpose of

"tearing out of our hands Djem-Sultan, and obtaining possession of the Kingdom of Naples . . . and not only will he hasten that he may seize the said Djem-Sultan and secure a Kingdom, but also that he may be able to cross over into Greece and wage war against the territories of your Highness, which ought to be known to your Majesty. They even say that a fleet under Djem-Sultan will be sent into Turkey."

Bocciardo is to demand the annual pension of 40,000 ducats due "the last day of November next," inasmuch as Alexander needs money to make preparations to resist the advance of the French.

"If the French should be victorious, your Majesty would suffer great injury, both by their seizing Djem-Sultan, and by the expedition that would follow, in the which they would have the assistance against your Highness, of the Spanish, English, Hungarians, Poles, Bohemians, and the Emperor Maximilian, who are all powerful princes."⁹

As the forces arrayed against him would be too great for him to hope for victory, it would be prudent if the Sultan could prevail on Venice (at that time the friend of Bajazet, but indifferent to the policy of the other Italian States) to join the side of Naples in opposing the French, thereby helping to destroy the possibility of an invasion of the Turkish dominions.

Alexander furthermore instructs his envoy to secure from Bajazet, in return for the safe custody of Djem and the benefits he would derive from the efforts of the Italian States against the French, an undertaking that he would refrain from attacking Hungary, or any other parts of Christendom, especially Croatia, Ragusa, etc.

Each of the four epistles in (2) bears date, "Given in the Court of Our Sultanic Authority at Constantinople in the 1494 year from the Nativity of the Prophet Jesus, on the 18th day of September."

⁹ Alexander evidently knew how to terrify the Sultan!

The greetings are couched in language we should not have expected from the Head of the Moslem world to the Head of the Christian : " The Sultan Bajazet Khan, by the Grace of God, Greatest King and Emperor of both Continents of Asia and Europe, to the Excellent Father and Lord of the Christians Alexander, by Divine Providence, Most Worthy Pontiff of the Roman Church."

The first epistle relates that Giorgio Bocciardo had come and faithfully delivered the message committed to him by the Pope; that the Sultan for his part was pleased to send what Alexander desired, and for the execution of this business he was despatching with Bocciardo a trusty servant Cassimen.

The second letter declares that Bajazet had in return confided to Bocciardo certain verbal replies to the Pope and wished " thy Pontiffship " to give credence to the words Bocciardo had to utter.

The third letter sets forth that the Sultan was despatching his faithful servant Cassimen to Alexander with letters, and with instructions to present himself before " thy Gloriosity," whom he requests to send the envoy back again " to my Highness."

The fourth epistle, which exhibits to us a rather startling illustration of the curious commingling of religious interests which then prevailed in Europe, announces that the Sultan had recommended to the consideration of the late Pope Niccoló Cibó, Archbishop of Arles,

" who, from the time of the late Supreme Pontiff up to this present day, has laboured in the cause of peace and friendship, and has always served, and is still serving, both sides with the greatest fidelity." For this reason, " we begged the Supreme Pontiff to make him a Cardinal, and he granted our petition, but the Archbishop could not then take his place, as the custom required. Meanwhile, the Pontiff died, so the matter remains unsettled. Accordingly, we now write and entreat thy Magnitude, on account of the friendship and peace between us, that thy Pontiffship will fulfil what is necessary and make him a Cardinal fully, and we will look on it as a most gracious act towards ourselves."

But the private epistle, that which was written in Italian and was translated into Latin by the notary public (Philippus de Patriarchis), contains the most amazing statements of all in this strange correspondence :

“ The Sultan Bajazet Khan, son of the Sultan Mahomet, by the Grace of God, Emperor of Asia, Europe, and the Maritime Shore, to the Father and Lord of all Christians, by Divine Providence, Pope Alexander the Sixth, Worthy Pontiff of the Roman Church . . . . [Bocciardo] has related to me, among other things, that the King of France intends to get possession of Djem our brother, who is in the hands of your Potency. This is greatly against our desire, and from it would come very considerable loss to your Magnitude, and all Christians would suffer injury. Consequently, we have expressed our thoughts to the afore-mentioned Giorgio,¹⁰ that it might make for the peace, benefit, and honour of your Potency, as well as for my contentment, if you would cause the said Djem, our brother, who is liable to death and is in the hands of your Magnitude, altogether to die. It would be life to him, a serviceable thing to your Potency, most conducive to peacefulness, and most pleasant to me. If your Magnitude were disposed to satisfy me in this particular, as you may, in your discretion, think well of doing, it ought (for your Potency's ease of mind and my satisfaction) to be effected as quickly as possible, and according to the method that your Magnitude thinks best, that the said Djem should be removed from the troubles of this world, and his soul transferred to another life, where it will have more perfect rest. If your Potency will have this accomplished and will consign his body to us at some place on this side of the sea, we, the Sultan Bajazet above-mentioned, promise, in whatever place your Magnitude may be pleased to appoint, the sum of 300,000 ducats, with which you may buy estates for your children, the which 300,000 ducats we will cause to be delivered to him whom your Magnitude may authorize before the said body shall have been given and delivered by your men to mine.”

Bajazet further undertakes to offer no injury to any Christian people or State, either by land or sea, except such as do hurt to himself or his subjects. He then proceeds,

“ And for the greater satisfaction of your Magnitude, so that you may be in no doubt concerning all those promises I have made above, I have sworn and affirmed, in the presence of the

¹⁰ “Idcirco una cum prae-fato Georgio cogitare coepimus.”

afore-mentioned Giorgio, by the True God Whom I adore, and upon our Gospels, to keep them all to their completion, without any failure or deficiency. And for the still greater security of your Magnitude, so that there may not remain the slightest doubt in your mind, but that you may be absolutely certain, I, the above-mentioned Sultan Bajazet Khan, swear by the True God, who created Heaven and Earth, and all the things therein, in whom we believe and whom we adore, that, for the accomplishment of what I have asked above, I do promise, by the said oath, to observe all the things which are contained above and in no way ever to act against or to oppose your Magnitude. Written at Constantinople in Our Palace, according to the Coming of Christ, the 12th day of September, 1494."

On the publication of this correspondence, Christendom professed to be profoundly shocked. And, indeed, that the Sultan should have imagined the Head of the Christian Church capable of the deliberate assassination of a captive prince was very deplorable. But, in spite of the just horror which such a proposition excites in us to-day, we may, in all fairness, question if a good deal of the pious outcry in the fifteenth century were not a mere political device adopted in order the more surely to effect a political design. If the Borgia Pope and his family differed in any way from their Italian neighbours and contemporaries, it was rather in the degree and extent than in the character of their shortcomings. Other Italian princes besides the Borgia employed assassination as part of their political methods of administration. Other Italian States besides the Papal States were in sinister communication with the Turkish Porte. Yet, Alexander was not merely an Italian prince, he was the Head of the Christian Church. And, at the very time when devout and thoughtful Christians believed the whole ecclesiastical system badly in need of reform, the spectacle of a Christian Pontiff debasing himself to become the paid tool, for a criminal purpose, of a heathen monarch horrified all Christendom. No more damaging accusation, in truth, could then have been made against Alexander than that of carrying on an abominable correspondence with the

arch-enemy of the Christian faith, in order to attain a political end. Later on, the Pope asserted that the entire affair was concocted by Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere through personal enmity. His own actions are against the veracity of such a plea. For, a few years after the disclosure, he became reconciled to Giovanni della Rovere, to whom most of all he owed his defamation, and Bocciardo, whose attestation of the documents persuaded contemporaries regarding the genuineness of these papers, appears to have been early restored to the service of the Pope. These facts are important, for, if there was any forgery at all, those two men must have either performed it, or connived at the performance of it, at Sinigaglia. The charge of forgery, it has been conclusively shown,¹¹ cannot be laid against the Cardinal della Rovere or Cardinal Perraud.

As might easily be imagined, apologists for Alexander have been at great pains to cast discredit upon this correspondence. Even Ranke long ago used all available proofs to show the spurious nature of its composition: its disagreement with the Turkish authorities as to the name of the Sultan's envoy; the improbability of a Turk dating a letter "from the Nativity of the Prophet Jesus"; and the unusual description of the Koran as "our Gospels."

It is hard to see now what room there can be for doubt. Dr. Heidenheimer in 1882,¹² and Bishop Creighton some years later,¹³ brought together an overwhelming sufficiency of evidence in support of the authenticity of the documents, and effectually disposed of the arguments of M. Brosch, as well as those of Ranke and Du Bulais. The only additional item furnished by Dr. Pastor to the information on the subject serves to render this decision

¹¹ Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy*, iv. 348.

¹² *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte*, v. (1882), pp. 511-573.

¹³ *Hist. of the Papacy*, iv. 345-350.

more sure,¹⁴ and yet he speaks as if there were grave reasons for doubt remaining. Even if there were, the least that could be said is that which Gregorovius declared, viz., that whatever question might arise regarding the verbal authenticity of the papers, there could be none concerning the substance of them. For such a moderate judgement, and we are convinced it is much less than the evidence warrants, the testimony of the Ventian archives is incontestable.¹⁵

But there is a further particular which supplies an indirect proof of the authenticity of the correspondence, one which, in our opinion, makes doubt impossible. The death of Prince Djem was strangely in accordance with the wishes of his cruel brother. For a few weeks longer he remained in his honourable captivity at Rome. King Charles, having marched from Florence upon Rome, gained possession of him and withdrew him thence in January, 1495, to take part in the Neapolitan campaign. He did not prove to be of much service to the designs of the French King upon the Turkish empire, for he died three days after the invading army entered Naples. Some have maintained that he was poisoned at the instance of Pope Alexander. Among Turkish writers there seems a general belief that he was poisoned, and one of them asserts that the deed was done by an emissary of Bajazet. Bembo, in his concise way, remarks simply, "*Capuam ubi rex venit, Giemes, quem Roma secum abduxerat, in morbum incidit, cujus sustinere vim non potuit.*"¹⁶

We do not think it can be satisfactorily proved that Alexander planned the death of Prince Djem by poisoning, although grave suspicions will remain that possibly

¹⁴ Ep. of the Marquese F. Gonzaga to the Sultan, referred to by Pastor, *op. cit.*, v. 430.

¹⁵ Consult v. Lamansky, *Secrets d'Etat de Venise*, S. Petersbourg, 1884.

¹⁶ *Rerum Venetarum Historiae* (*Opere*, Venezia, 1729, i. 37).

Caesar Borgia, before his escape from the French camp, had found some means of having a slow poison administered to the Turkish Prince.¹⁷ The death of the Prince following so quickly upon Bajazet's suggestion, the chagrin of the Borgia at losing a valuable captive, the goodly sum of money promised on oath for his dead body, are circumstances which hang very well together and justify the suspicions of foul play. But an additional circumstance strengthens such a conclusion: Burchard states that Djem died in consequence of something in his food disagreeing with him, and that his dead body was returned to Bajazet, who received it with every mark of respect, and is said to have paid over a large sum of money for obtaining it.¹⁸ Papal representatives accompanied the body to Constantinople. All these facts taken together establish a strong case. There is sufficient ground for suspecting Alexander and his son of being concerned in the death of the Prince. But we are convinced that these later facts put the authenticity of the correspondence captured by Giovanni della Rovere at Ancona beyond question.

Nowhere is there to be found a more complete illustration of the pitifully low level that Christian morals had reached in that age. The treachery of the Christian Knight d'Aubusson, the callous selfishness of the

¹⁷ See A. H. Mathew, *Life and Times of Rodrigo Borgia, Pope Alexander VI.*, London, 1912, pp. 401-6.

¹⁸ Thuasne, *Joh. Burchardi . . . Diarium*, p. 242: "Ex esu sive potu nature sue non convenienti ex consueto, vita functus est, cujus cadaver deinde ad instantiam et preces Magni Turci, eidem Magno Turco cum tota defuncti familia missum est, qui propterea magnam pecuniarum summam dicitur persolvisse seu donasse, ac familiam ipsam in gratiam recepit." The opinion of Bishop Creighton, that the death of Djem was probably the result of the undermining of his constitution by so many years of captivity and his being then suddenly exposed to the rigours of a winter campaign, is not admissible. Djem, in his captivity, had ample opportunity of exercise, and the winter of 1494-5 seems not to have been severe.

Christian Princes, the degrading bargain of the Christian Pope with the Sultan, and the deplorable circumstances surrounding the death of Djem and the delivery of his body to the brother who had so often tried to effect his assassination, reveal the incredible baseness of the Christians into whose hands the unfortunate Mohammedan Prince had fallen.

G. V. JOURDAN.