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This first volume of *The Cambridge History of Turkey* considers the transition period from the arrival of the Turks in Anatolia to the collapse of the Byzantine Empire and the creation of an Ottoman Empire with its imperial capital of Istanbul. The first four chapters examine various aspects of the political history of the period: the history of Byzantium, the Mongol period in Anatolia, the Turkish advance into Europe and the rise of the Turkish states, including that of the Ottomans. The following four chapters deal with various aspects of the social and economic life of the period, focusing on the military, the economy, art and architecture, and the cultural and religious milieu of this world of transition from Byzantium to Ottoman Empire.

The defeat in August 1071 of the Byzantine emperor Romanos Diogenes by the Turkomans at the battle of Malazgirt (Manzikert) is taken as a turning point in the history of Anatolia and the Byzantine Empire. From this time the Byzantines were unable to stem the flow of the Turks into Anatolia and the slow process of Turkification had begun. But it was not a battle of conquest, as both Julian Chrysostomides (p. 10) and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (p. 356) point out in this volume. The Seljuk ruler Alp Arslan was intending not to conquer Anatolia, but rather to move against Syria and Egypt. This was not the first Turkish appearance in the region and Byzantine Anatolia had already been weakened before the battle of Malazgirt by many years of Turkoman raiding.

In the same way as 1071 has become a seminal (and useful) date for historians, so too has the date of 1453 when the Byzantine capital, Constantinople, fell to the Ottoman ruler Mehmed II and the Byzantine Empire ceased to exist. This date has been taken to symbolise the beginning of the imperial power of the Ottoman Empire, the creation of an imperial capital and the commencement of true Ottoman might. It was not, of course, quite like that. The Byzantine Empire had been crumbling slowly for a considerable period well before 1453, and by that date had been reduced merely to the capital and a small strip of territory around it. The city had undergone Ottoman sieges before, under
Bayezid I in the 1390s and again under Murad II in 1422. Its conquest, however, created shockwaves across the western world. Many believed it presaged the arrival of the Turks in Rome itself, and the extirpation of the Christian faith. For the Ottomans, the capture of the capital of the Byzantine Empire was symbolically significant. Further, the location of the city, controlling the crossing between east and west, and the waterway between north and south, between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, made it economically and strategically important for a state which had territory in both Asia and Europe. Its fall did not, however, represent any sudden or dramatic departure from Turkish policy but was a continuation in the development of the Ottoman state in line with the fall of Byzantine cities before it, such as Thessalonike in 1430.

Both 1071 and 1453, therefore, are dates whose significance as crucial moments in history is overplayed. They are, however, convenient signifiers of periods of change and transformation in directions of events in history and as such make useful starting and end points for this volume.

One date that is largely ignored by the periodisation of this volume is the turn of the fourteenth century, taken as the notional starting point of the Ottoman state. This has certain advantages. It does not overplay history in favour of the ultimate winners, the Ottomans, and thus tries to avoid seeing history backwards when outcomes are known. The Ottomans tend to dominate studies of the later part of this period, as a result of the fact that they came out on top. But, as Rudi Paul Lindner points out, there was no way that this could have been foreseen in 1300 (Lindner, p. 102), or, one might add, in 1402 after the devastating defeat at the battle of Ankara when Ottoman forces were crushed by Timur and the Ottoman state plunged into a period of internecine warfare. The ignoring of 1300 as a turning point date also allows a greater appreciation of this period as one of slow transformation marked by fluidity and fusion rather than in stark terms of collisions and sudden change. This is a period in which the region passes from an Orthodox, Byzantine empire to an Ottoman, Muslim one. It is characterised by gradual assimilation, adaptation and absorption and is marked by a high degree of flexibility and fusion of cultures. Such fusion is evident in the intellectual world of the period, the literature, art and architecture, and in the make-up of the Turkish states.

This was a world of intellectual mobility, dynamism and cosmopolitanism, as is clearly to be seen in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak’s discussion of the intellectual and cultural aspects of the period (chapter 9). Intellectuals and ideas were drawn from outside the region into the courts of the new Turkish states. What was to develop from this fusion of Central Asian, Middle Eastern and Byzantine elements was a distinctly Turkish intellectual world expressed in a Turkish
which was to become the Ottoman language of the empire. ‘The intellectual world of medieval Turkey’, as Ocak notes, ‘created the bases of the intellectual performance of the Ottoman Empire for centuries to come’ (Ocak, p. 422).

Such fusion of diverse elements is reflected also in art and architecture, the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth being a period of significant transformation in Turkish art and architecture which shows the continuation of Rum Seljuk influences in central and eastern Anatolia while, particularly in western Anatolia, there was a considerable departure from tradition, drawing on diverse sources including late Byzantine, Timurid and Mamluk art (Crane, p. 266). But there was also a mix, with Seljuk-influenced buildings appearing in the west and innovative ones being built in the central regions (Crane, p. 279).

This amalgamation of different influences is clearly evident in the make-up of Ottoman society. As Pál Fodor demonstrates, the early Ottoman military organisation was an amalgam of Turkoman, Seljuk, Ilkhanid and Byzantine elements (p. 192), with a considerable contribution from the Byzantines, the Venetians and the Genoese to the development of the Ottoman navy (Fodor, p. 224). Despite the general view that the Turks were not seafarers, they in fact took early, and successfully, to the water.

Flexibility and the ability to adopt, absorb and use outside sources was a significant factor in Turkish success, particular in that of the Ottomans. One of the elements accounting for the Ottomans’ development of ‘one of the best war machines of the age’ was that ‘they had the necessary ability and readiness to accommodate foreign technologies and experts and to take part in international trade and transfer of knowledge and weapons’ (Fodor, p. 226). This ability to utilise foreigners and benefit from outside expertise is also evident in Turkish economic practice (Fleet, p. 258).

One of the problems facing research on the economy, and indeed on most aspects of the period, is the lack of sources (Ocak, p. 353, Fleet, pp. 228–9). This has resulted in a dearth of research in many areas, or the establishment of views which need to be reassessed. Thus, for example, the idea that the Turks lacked economic motivation or acumen, although now firmly under attack, has yet finally to be put to rest. Historians have often portrayed the period from 1071 to the fall of Constantinople as one of destruction. It is certainly the case that there was much devastation inflicted on the region by a variety of forces: the crusaders, the Turkomans, the Mongols, the Mamluks and Timur. But this does not mean, and could not logically mean for Anatolia over the whole four-hundred-year period, blanket and continuous devastation. The Mongols, as Charles Melville points out, have often come out of the history of Anatolia
rather badly (Melville, p. 51). Either overlooked in a seamless progression from Seljuk to Ottoman, or viewed as a brief preamble to Ottoman history, they have frequently failed to feature large for historians of Turkish Anatolia. For historians of the Ilkhans, their Anatolian phase has often not featured at all. As Melville argues, there needs to be more work on assessing the Mongol contribution to the history of Anatolia, and on what impact Mongol practices had on the development of Turkish, in particular Ottoman, government, on the extent to which the Ilkhans simply adopted the Seljuk practices they found in place and what elements they introduced from their steppe background. Ilkhan financial practices did affect the development of administration under the Ottomans who adopted accounting methods from them and imitated their coins.

More research is also needed on the organisation and functioning of the medreses, research into which is only in its initial phase (Ocak, p. 412), on Shi’ism in Anatolia and on the role of conversion and apostasy, an area in which emotive rather than objective history has been influential (Ocak, p. 403). The Turkish presence in Europe is another area where emotive response has far too often warped historical analysis. Despite the attitude that the Turks ‘came last and consequently, when the nation-states were set up, had to go first’ (Kiel, p. 138), Machiel Kiel demonstrates that contacts between the various Turkic peoples and the Balkans go back at least as far as the settlement of the Slavs (Kiel, p. 138). It is odd that the Ottomans, who were established on European soil from the mid-fourteenth century, should have been so vehemently rejected as a European power when, in Kiel’s estimation, ‘the land to the East of the line from Nikopol (Nikopolis, Niğbolu) on the Danube to Kavala on the Aegean, and most of the southern half of Macedonia was, until 1912, at least as “Turkish” as most of Anatolia’ (Kiel, p. 156). Destruction of Ottoman monuments in the Balkans has been a concrete expression of the rewriting of the history of the region in the twentieth century which has so coloured and distorted research.

The history of this period has frequently been viewed through the mirror of the modern age. The rise of Turkish power in Anatolia and the Balkans has been interpreted by many historians in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries under the all-powerful shadow of the nation-state which has so often sought to model history in its own image. British historians have been befogged by the miasma of philhellenism, Balkan historians intellectually trammelled by the Ottoman yoke which for many lay heavily across both their lands and their mental outlooks, Turkish historians ensnared in the requirements of ‘Turkishness’. On many occasions views have been adopted ‘as the result either of conscious
prejudice or of innocent superficiality of conviction’, in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak’s phrase, referring specifically to the assessment of the Turks who arrived in Anatolia as primitive, adopted by older-generation western historians (Ocak, p. 400). It is to be hoped that this volume will contribute to a clearer conception of the period and that it will encourage the conduct of research outside the constriction of the political requirements of any particular age.

The period 1071–1453, thus, is one in which much stays the same, much changes slowly, and much emerges new from a chrysalis-like fusion of cultures. By 1453 the world of Anatolia and much of the Balkans had become a Turkish, Muslim one, and the world of Byzantium was gone.
The defeat of the Byzantine army by the Seljuk Turks at the battle of Malazgirt (Manzikert) in 1071 ushered in a period of military decline, which, despite its fluctuations, culminated with the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453. This event brought to an end an empire, which, despite the ethnic, linguistic and religious varieties existing within its borders, in essence had maintained its Graeco-Roman and Christian culture and tradition.\(^1\)

Originally the eastern half (\textit{pars orientalis}) of the Roman Empire, Byzantium had throughout its existence to defend its territories against forces that rose in the east, west and north. As a result of the migrations of the Germanic tribes, the western half was lost to the empire by the end of the fifth century, despite the subsequent attempts by Justinian I (527–65) to re-conquer these territories. Yet, as long as the empire held on to Asia Minor, its wealthiest province after Egypt in terms of men and resources, it had the possibility of reasserting itself, first against the Persians and later against the Arabs, despite the loss of North Africa, Egypt, Syria and Palestine.

The migrations of various tribes from Asia brought additional pressure to bear on the empire’s northern frontiers. Of these, the most serious in this period were those of the Slavs, the Bulgars of Turkic origin, and the half-Slavicised Sarmatian peoples, namely the Serbs and Croats. Slav pressure on the northern frontier was resolved by a political decision. Unable militarily to contain them beyond the Danube frontier and put an end to their attacks, the Byzantines settled the Slavs in depopulated areas of the empire, including Asia Minor,\(^2\) as they did with the Armenians.\(^3\) Both these solutions proved to be

\(^1\) For the ethnography of Byzantine Asia Minor, see S. Vryonis, \textit{The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century} (Berkeley, Calif., 1971), pp. 42–68.


The Byzantine Empire: eleventh to fifteenth century

economically and militarily to the empire’s advantage. On the other hand, the defeat of the Avars in Pannonia by Charlemagne’s son Pippin in 796 made it possible for the Bulgars to move westward and become a major threat to the empire.

The Arab pressure brought to bear on the eastern frontier led to the reorganisation of the provinces, known as the ‘theme system’, which involved settling troops (themes) in districts under the administration and the supreme authority of a strategos (general), who combined both military and civil authority and was directly responsible to the emperor. This system, which was developed and extended to territories as they were reincorporated within the frontiers of the empire, not only played a part in the recruitment of a loyal army but in addition protected the existence of a free peasantry which contributed both militarily and economically, and enabled the empire to ward off its enemies both in the Balkans and in the east. 4 Similarly, the problems created in the north, first by the migratory Slav and later Bulgar peoples, were checked to some extent by the use of military force coupled with diplomacy entailing both religious and cultural influence.

By the eighth century the Byzantine Empire had successfully defended Constantinople against the Arabs and the Slavs, and consolidated its rule in Asia Minor. By the middle of the ninth century it had made such a remarkable recovery that it was able to take the offensive in all directions, in the west, in the Balkans and in the east. Following a series of military victories, the Byzantines began by the tenth century to penetrate well into Arab territory, thus initiating a period of expansion on all fronts, including the recapture of the islands of Crete (961) and Cyprus (965). These military achievements reached their apogee in the reign of Basil II (976–1025). In southern Italy, Calabria and Apulia were once more under the firm control of the empire, while in the north, with the conquest of Bulgaria, its frontiers extended to the Danube and the Drava. In the east, with the annexation of Ani and later of Vaspurkan, ceded to the empire by its king who was unable to defend his lands against the incursions of the Turks, the empire’s frontiers extended eastward of Lake Van and beyond the Euphrates. 5 At the close of Basil II’s reign in 1025 the Byzantine

---

Empire had emerged as the dominant power in the eastern Mediterranean, and succeeded in drawing within its sphere of influence the Slavs of the Balkans and Russia.

These achievements could not have been accomplished without a degree of continuity in the policies of the emperors who had ruled the empire during this period, nor without a well-structured political, military and economic organisation. The years that immediately followed Basil II’s death were not entirely devoid of success, but as time went on the lack of a leadership capable of assessing and responding to military and social problems aggravated the situation. The position deteriorated further with the clash between the civil aristocracy in the court of Constantinople and the large landowners of Asia Minor who had provided military leadership but had also profited economically from the eastern expansion. Their drive to absorb both the land and the free small landholders after Basil II’s death remained unchecked. In addition, the centralisation initiated under Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55) weakened both the military and naval structures of the empire, for these changes not only affected the economic welfare of the state owing to the loss of revenue from taxation, but also deprived the state of its soldiers.6

In addition to the internal difficulties, the empire had as a result of its expansion to face new forces along its frontiers. The most formidable of these were the Normans in the west, the Pechenegs in the north and the Seljuks in the east, the last two being of Turkic origin. The Pechenegs were not unknown to the Byzantines, for they had succeeded in establishing a working relation with them for a long time and used them to control the Russians, Magyars and Bulgars, as becomes clear from the advice given by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (905–59) to his son Romanos:

So long as the emperor of the Romans is at peace with the Pechenegs, neither Russians nor Turks can come upon the Roman dominions by force of arms, nor can they exact from the Romans large and inflated sums in money and goods for the price of peace . . . To the Bulgarians also the emperor of the Romans will appear more formidable, and can impose on them the need for tranquillity, if he is at peace with the Pechenegs.7

This situation was fundamentally altered after Basil II’s death (1025). The annexation of Bulgaria exposed the empire to the Pecheneg raids, which

left devastation in their wake. Despite periodic agreements, such accords did not last long and the Pechenegs remained a constant threat. Far more destructive, however, proved to be the Uzes, another nomadic Turkic tribe which crossed the Danube in 1065 and reached Thessalonike, penetrating into Greece, ravaging the countryside and killing the inhabitants. In Asia Minor a new foe appeared on the scene, the Seljuk Turks, who proved to be even more formidable. The annexation of Armenia during the reigns of Basil II and Constantine IX Monomachos exposed the empire to Seljuk incursions. These coincided with the social and economic changes taking place within the empire that were to affect its military potential. Michael Psellus’s discerning remark, put in the mouth of Isakios I Komnenos, that ‘imperialist policy . . . could not be effected without much expenditure of money and men, as well as sufficient reserve’ was confirmed by subsequent events, for Constantine IX’s decision to disband the thematic armies of Iberia and Mesopotamia, and to impose taxation in place of military service, forced large sections of the population to desert to the enemy. The running down of the theme system in this particular case was not a one-off decision but a policy which was applied to the rest of the empire and resulted in the undermining of the social and economic structures upon which its military and naval strength was based. The resulting vacuum in the defence sector was filled by the large-scale recruitment of foreign mercenaries, with specific taxes being raised for this purpose. These measures not only were a drain on the treasury, but also aggravated the situation by provoking armed rebellions at a time when cities and countryside were devastated by enemy attacks.

13 Ahweiler, Mer, pp. 151, 159–63.
15 In 1054 Artze, a major commercial centre, was razed to the ground by Ertuğrul: Attaleiates, Historia, p. 148; Skylitzes, Synopsis Historiarum, pp. 451–3; Matthew of Edessa,
In 1068, during the minority of Michael VII Doukas, the son of Constantine X Doukas (1059–67), Romanos Diogenes, a professional soldier, was chosen as emperor. The need for a military man to counter enemy attacks was apparent at least to the dowager empress, Eudocia, whose choice he was. The newly appointed emperor, a member of the military party, hurriedly collected a motley army, mainly consisting of Pechenegs, Uzes, Normans and Franks, each contingent obeying the orders of its own leader. At a crucial stage he split his forces, sending a contingent of his most experienced soldiers to invest Chliat (Ahlat) on Lake Van. But above all, it was the betrayal of Andronikos Doukas, Michael’s cousin and son of the caesar, John Doukas, who spread false rumours during the engagement that Diogenes had been defeated, which undermined the whole venture. This led to a large section of the Uzes changing sides and joining their fellow Turks, while the Franks, under Roussel of Bailleul, and the Armenians, resentful of Byzantine religious pressure, fled the camp. Andronikos Doukas, most probably with a view to ousting Diogenes, withdrew from the battlefield and headed with his army to Constantinople. The result was the Byzantine defeat and the capture of Diogenes. The Turkish sultan, Alp Arslan (1063–72), seems at this stage not to have been interested in proceeding with the conquest of Anatolia, his main concern being to move his forces against Syria and Egypt. He therefore treated Diogenes honourably and agreed to release him on condition that the Byzantines paid an annual tribute and provided military help. But the powers in Constantinople, primarily John Doukas, rejected the agreement, the empress was removed to a nunnery and Michael VII was proclaimed sole emperor (1071–8).

In response, Diogenes sought Alp Arslan’s help to regain his throne. Defeated,
he was blinded despite the assurances given him to the contrary, and died soon after.\textsuperscript{23} Using Diogenes’s death as an excuse, Alp Arslan directed his forces against Asia Minor, the defences of which had already been eroded by the incursions and pillaging of the independent Turkish bands (Turkomans) during the preceding decades.\textsuperscript{24} These events unfolding in the east had their counterpart in the west. The same year that witnessed the disaster of Malazgirt (Manzikert) also saw the fall of Bari, the last Byzantine possession, to the Normans under Robert Guiscard, whose target became the imperial possessions on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, and ultimately Constantinople. Similarly, the Byzantines lost ground in the Balkans where they suffered repeated insurrections.\textsuperscript{25} But above all, what eroded the remaining strength of the empire from within were the various rebellions of both pretenders and foreign mercenaries, such, for example, as that of Roussel of Bailleul who revolted in the name of John Doukas.\textsuperscript{26} In order to suppress these rebellions the Byzantine government had to call in Turkish mercenaries, thus aggravating the situation further and inadvertently assisting the Turkish expansion into Byzantine territory.\textsuperscript{27} By 1180 the Sultanate of Rum (based on Roman territory) had arisen on Byzantine soil, extending from Cilicia to the Hellespont, thus bringing to a close the imperial presence in the heart of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{28}

The dynasty of the Komnenoi and their successors, 1081–1204

Meanwhile, a series of insurrections brought to power first Nikephoros III Botaneiates in 1078 and, three years later, Alexios I Komnenos, who found ‘an empire surrounded on all sides by barbarians’ and a depleted treasury.\textsuperscript{29}
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His immediate task was to introduce reforms which gathered civil authority and military power in the hands of an officer, the katepano, in charge of a region, and in addition to bring in further tax impositions to build up the army. In a climate of rivalries and rebellions Alexios strengthened his position by extensive land grants and titles to his family and partisans, a policy that often elicited criticism. This solution, though perhaps inevitable, was indeed a double-edged sword, for while it strengthened his authority, at the same time it encouraged separatist elements. In addition, it further undermined the agrarian structures that up to the early eleventh century had been responsible for the economic and military strength of the empire. An astute politician, Alexios tried to resolve the immense problems facing him by having recourse to both diplomacy and war. He opened negotiations with Pope Gregory VII and the German emperor, and secured the naval support of Venice during Robert Guiscard’s blockade of Dyrrachium (Durazzo). Although in 1082 Venetian help was bought at a high price, for it involved granting them extensive quarters and commercial privileges which in the long run were to prove detrimental to the empire, nevertheless for the time being the Norman defeat gave them a respite, particularly when the Slavs in the Balkans took advantage of the Norman invasion to assert their independence.

The pressure from the western front, but above all the continuous lack of resources in both cash and manpower, forced Alexios to concentrate on recovering coastal territories, realising that any attempt to regain lands within the heart of Anatolia, fragmented by the constant devastating raids of the Turkomans and parcelled out among the Turkish beys, would have necessitated a considerable military force that was an impossibility in the present

30 Anna Komnene, Alexiade, iii, xiv, pp. 144, 154–5, 186 (Sewter, pp. 437, 445); Ahrweiler, Mer, pp. 222–5.
31 Gautier, ‘Diatribes de Jean l’Oxite’, pp. 28–9, 40–43; Zonaras, Epitome Historiarum, iii, pp. 766–7, about Alexios I: ‘he performed his functions not as public or state ones, and he considered himself not a ruler, but a lord, conceiving and calling the empire his own house . . .’
32 For the decline of the Byzantine navy in this period see Ahrweiler, Mer, pp. 179–84.
circumstances, a problem, in fact, that remained unresolved also under his successors. The loss of Asia Minor, the richest province of the empire in both men and resources, inevitably deprived the rulers of any possibility of reclaiming the lost territories through concerted campaigns. All that Alexios could do for the moment was to give instructions to the governors of towns, along both the Black Sea and Paphlagonia, bypassed by the Turks, to remain at their post and defend their areas, a policy which in certain cases, for example Trebizond (Trabzon), proved successful. These measures, further strengthened and developed by Alexios’s successors, led to the revival of the theme system. At the head of each theme, either land or maritime, there was a governor, now called dux, with both military and civil functions. These administrative areas, however, were in size a mere shadow of their predecessors.

Alexios’s immediate concern was the recovery of the territories adjacent to the coast of the Propontis from marauding Turks, who, at the time established in Nicaea (Iznik), then under Süleyman (1077/8–86), raided the countryside of Bithynia as far as Damalis on the Bosphorus. Though Alexios did succeed in relieving these areas and pushing the Turks further inland, he had no other alternative but to conclude an armistice with Süleyman. This was not a long-term solution, for at the sultan’s death his domains were divided among the emirs he had left in charge, one of them being Çaka (Tzachas), who, some years earlier, had been taken prisoner in one of the Turkish raids and presented to Emperor Nicephoros Botaneiates (1078–81), who honoured him with the title nobelissimus. However, having lost his position on the accession of Alexios Komnenos, Çaka set out on a venture of creating his own state and assuming the title of emperor. Taking advantage of the attacks of the Pechenegs in the outskirts of Constantinople in 1090–1, he succeeded with the help of a local Greek in building a navy and seizing islands and towns fringing the coast, including Mitylene and Chios. Once Alexios had resolved the problem of the Pechenegs with the help of the Cumans, another nomadic tribe, which

34 Anna Komnene, Alexiade, i, p. 131 (Sewter, p. 125).
37 Anna Komnene, Alexiade, i, iii, p. 138 (Sewter, pp. 129–30).
decimated them at the battle of Levounion, he turned his attention to Çaka and the rebuilding of the imperial navy. The ships the emperor had at his disposal could not match those commanded by Çaka and any attempt to tackle him at sea remained unsuccessful. The problem was finally resolved when Alexios entered into an alliance with Çaka’s son-in-law, Küç Arslan I (1092–1107), who supposedly eliminated him after a banquet. Meanwhile, Alexios had succeeded in rebuilding the navy which dealt successfully with the insurrections of Crete and Cyprus.

These successes coincided with the launching by Urban II at the Council of Clermont (1095) of the first crusade for the liberation of the Holy Land from the Muslims. The outcome was that, instead of the western mercenaries the emperor had appealed for, and had used in the past, he had to face the arrival of multitudes of unarmed pilgrims or armed contingents that added to the already existing pressures. The demand made on logistics, involving transport, provisioning and policing the crowds, often undisciplined and destructive, was immense. Nevertheless, Alexios succeeded in controlling the situation, demanding an oath from the leaders that whatever areas they conquered which had once belonged to the Roman Empire would be restored to Byzantium. His insistence on this oath has been interpreted by some modern historians as a ploy to turn the crusaders into his vassals. However, using a western convention was the only way available to him of exerting control over the crusaders who presented a potential threat. In return, he promised to assist them in their march, providing them with essential supplies and guides. This co-operation reached its climax with the capture of Nicaea (İznil) and the
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43 Chalandon, Essai, pp. 155 ff. On this see also D. C. Munro, ‘Did the Emperor Alexius I Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza 1095?’, American Historical Review 27 (1922), 731–3; Riley-Smith, First Crusade, pp. 12 ff. For Alexios’s need for mercenaries see Anna Komnene, Alexiade, ii, vii, p. 105 (Sewter, p. 22).
45 He was prepared to accept a modified oath, as in the case of Raymond of St Gilles: R. Hill (ed. and tr.), Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum (London, 1962), vi, p. 13.
By the time the crusaders had reached Antioch, however, the complications had increased. Stephen of Blois’s desertion and his report to the emperor at Philomelion (Akşehir) that the crusaders were facing complete collapse, in addition to the rumours that Turkish forces were trying to overtake the emperor before he could reach Antioch, left Alexius with no alternative but to beat a retreat. At this moment the safety of the empire was paramount. Henceforth, thanks to Bohemond of Antioch’s manipulations, any possibility of co-operation had ended. His subsequent attack on the empire and his final defeat at Dyrrachium (Durazzo), followed by his submission, albeit nominal, in September 1108 under the treaty of Devol, enhanced the prestige of Alexios who now turned his attention to the Balkans. Aware of Hungary’s importance as a political factor in both the Balkans and the Adriatic, he had arranged the marriage of his son and heir, John, to a Hungarian princess (1104), an alliance that consolidated Byzantine–Hungarian relations at least during his reign. But above all, Alexios succeeded in strengthening imperial authority and recovering some lost territory. The frontier in the Balkans extended as far as Belgrade in the north, to Scodra (Shkodra) in the south, including Kotor, Dubrovnik and Ragusa, and in the north-east it followed the river Danube to the Black Sea. In the south in Asia Minor the frontier stretched from the river Meander (Büyük Menderes) to Philomelion (Akşehir) as far as Ancyra (Ankara) and then veered to the east along the Black Sea as far as Trapezous (Trebizond, Trabzon). It was this legacy that Alexios left to his successors at his death in 1118.

His son, John II (1118–43), considered by Niketas Choniates as the greatest of the Komnenoi, continued his father’s policies with determination and prudence. The main problems he had to face in the west, particularly in the early part of his reign, were his relations with Hungary and its rising influence in the Balkans and the Adriatic. In the east the recovery of lands in Anatolia from the Turks, the Armenians in Cilicia, the Norman principality of Antioch and its links with Sicily occupied him throughout his reign. His decision, on the advice of his finance counsellor, to run down on grounds of economy the
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fleet that his father had reorganised was a serious mistake. This ‘ill-advised policy or penny-pinching’, as Choniates notes, resulted in the control of the seas passing into the hands of the pirates.\footnote{Choniates, \textit{Historia}, 1, pp. 54–5 (Magoulias, pp. 32–3); Ahrweiler, \textit{Mer}, p. 230.}

In addition to these problems, a fresh horde of Pechenegs crossed the Danube in 1122 and pillaged imperial lands as far south as Thrace and Macedonia, although they then suffered a crushing defeat by the Byzantine army. Following his father’s policy John settled those Pechenegs who survived the battle on imperial lands and drafted them into the Byzantine army. This event put an end once and for all to their marauding activities.\footnote{John Kinnamos, \textit{Ioannis Cinnami Epitome Rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum}, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), p. 281; translated by C. M. Brand as \textit{Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus} (New York, 1976), p. 210; Tafel and Thomas, \textit{Urkunden}, 1, no. 43, p. 96; Pozza and Ravegnani, \textit{Trattati}, no. 3, pp. 51–6.}

John, however, failed to extricate himself from the extensive commercial privileges granted to the Venetians by his father in 1082 which were strangling the Byzantine economy. Forced by gunboat diplomacy involving attacks on Corfu, Kephalonia, Lesbos (Mitylene), Chios and Rhodes, and with his naval force reduced, he had no alternative but to renew and extend their privileges in 1126.\footnote{Müller, \textit{Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll’Oriente} (Florence, 1879), pp. 43–5; F. Miklosich and I. Müller, \textit{Acta et diplomata graeca medi eti acvi sacra et profana}, vol. III (Vienna, 1865), no. 3, pp. 9 ff.}

Unable to free himself from Venetian economic dominance in the empire, he tried to encourage the Pisans by renewing in 1136 the more limited privileges his father had once granted them,\footnote{Ahrweiler, \textit{Mer}, pp. 227–8; H. Glykatzi-Ahrweiler, ‘Les fortresses construites en Asie Mineure face à l’invasion seldjoucide’, \textit{Akten des internationalen Byzantinisten Kongresses} (Munich, 1958), pp. 182–9; Vryonis, \textit{Decline}, pp. 116–18.} though at the time Pisa could hardly compete with Venice. On the other hand, as a counterpoise to Norman expansion under Roger II of Sicily, who had united Sicily and Apulia under his rule and had crowned himself emperor in 1130, John sought a rapprochement with the German rulers and the papacy.

Following his successful encounter with Hungary over Serbia around 1130, John was finally able to turn his attention to the east. He conducted campaigns against the Turks in Bithynia, Pamphylia, Phrygia, Galatia and Paphlagonia and constructed fortresses to stem the Turkish expansion.\footnote{Kinnamos, \textit{Epitome}, pp. 5 ff. (Brand, pp. 14 ff.); Ahrweiler, \textit{Mer}, pp. 227–8; H. Glykatzi-Ahrweiler, ‘Les fortresses construites en Asie Mineure face à l’invasion seldjoucide’, \textit{Akten des internationalen Byzantinisten Kongresses} (Munich, 1958), pp. 182–9; Vryonis, \textit{Decline}, pp. 116–18.} His objective was the recovery of Antioch, then under the regency of Jocelin I of Courtenay. Judging that the Sultanate of Rum was at the time going through internal disensions, the emperor moved his forces against the Danşmends of Malatya (Melitene), which he defeated in 1135. The road to Syria, however,
was barred by the kingdom of Lesser Armenia, established in Cilicia sometime around 1071 by refugees from Armenia proper fleeing before the Turks.\(^{55}\) Since that time, Lesser Armenia had extended its territory at the expense of Byzantium and had established good relations with the Latin rulers in the east. In the spring of 1137 John moved his forces to capture Tarsus, Adana and Mamistra (Misis) in quick succession. By August he had reached Antioch which surrendered after a short siege. Raymond of Poitiers, husband of Constance of Antioch, daughter of Bohemond II, swore allegiance to the emperor and recognised the suzerainty of the empire. A year later John made a solemn entry into Antioch. This victory was short lived. The Latins withdrew their support and the emperor had no alternative but to leave Antioch. Whether he was planning to establish for his son Manuel, as Kinnamos states, a frontier principality consisting of Attaleia (Antalya), Antioch and Cyprus which would have provided more effective defence is difficult to tell.\(^{56}\) At any rate, contrary to the perception of the west that accepting the status quo would best serve the interests of his people,\(^{57}\) John, as he wrote to King Fulk of Jerusalem, had no intention of relinquishing his aim of taking control of Antioch and extending his authority to the south.\(^{58}\) These designs, however, were never fulfilled for he died in the spring of 1143. His third son and successor, Manuel I (1143–80), continued his plans and those of his grandfather, though his approach differed in conformity with the changing circumstances.

The developments in the west and in particular the Norman expansion in the Mediterranean forced Manuel to strengthen his alliance with the German king, Conrad III (1138–52), whose sister-in-law, Bertha of Sulzbach, he married in compliance with his father’s earlier arrangements. These projects of co-operation between the two rulers were placed in jeopardy by the second crusade, sparked off by the capture of Edessa by the Muslims in 1144. This undertaking brought together not only the French and Norman kings, Louis VII (1137–80) and Roger II of Sicily (1130–54), but also Conrad, thus depriving Manuel of his ally in the west. The very aims of the crusade of strengthening the Latin principalities, including Antioch, ran counter to Manuel’s aspirations of bringing them under at least nominal imperial authority and putting an end to the hostilities. In fact at the time Raymond of Antioch,
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\(^{58}\) Kinnamos, Epitome, pp. 16, 23 (Brand, pp. 22, 25); Magdalino, Manuel, pp. 36–7.
far from seeking co-operation, was harassing Cilician cities subject to the Romans.\(^{59}\)

While Manuel was dealing with the passage of the crusaders, a task wrought with difficulties similar to those confronted by his grandfather Alexios I with the first crusade,\(^{60}\) Roger’s objective was to attack the empire and capture Constantinople.\(^{61}\) In April 1147 he seized Corfu, Thebes and Corinth, the last two being the wealthiest silk-manufacturing cities of Greece.\(^{62}\) The Norman hostilities inevitably diverted Manuel’s attention from east to west. As the leader of a Mediterranean power, Manuel had no alternative but to defend its interests both in Sicily and in southern Italy. With the help of Venice he succeeded in recapturing Corfu. In appreciation of their services Manuel renewed the Venetian privileges in 1147 and a year later extended their quarters.\(^{63}\) However, his lengthy confrontation with the Normans not only proved too costly for the imperial resources but also went counter to the interests of the Venetians who proceeded to mend their relations with the Normans.\(^{64}\) The situation was further complicated by Roger’s stirring up of the Hungarians and Serbs against the empire. Conrad’s death in February 1152 undermined the plan for a concerted Italian campaign. The new German king, Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–90), unlike his predecessor, never concluded an agreement with Manuel. Apart from the political interests, what acerbated the situation was Frederick’s claims to imperial sovereignty which carried with it universal dimensions, a concept which ran counter to Byzantine tenets. As a result of these complications Manuel’s Italian campaign, far from being successful, had ended with the Byzantine defeat at Brindisi in 1156 and the loss of the conquered territory. The emperor had no alternative but to come to terms with Roger’s successor, William I (1154–66), through the mediation of Pope Hadrian IV in 1158.\(^{65}\) The same year saw the culmination of Manuel’s policy towards the Latin

---

60 Manuel I’s letters to Pope Eugenius III (1145–51), stipulating the same conditions which Alexios had set out: V. Grumel, ‘Au seuil de la deuxième croisade. Deux lettres de Manuel Commène au Pape’, *Études Byzantines* 3 (1945), 143–67; cf. Lemerle’s criticisms in ‘Byzance et la croisade’, p. 605 n. 2.
61 According to Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and tr. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948), pp. 12–15, 26–7, 58–9, Roger’s plans were thwarted by the French knights and Conrad III; see also Magdalino, Manuel, pp. 49–51.
principalities when Byzantine suzerainty was recognised by both Reynald of Antioch and King Baldwin of Jerusalem.  

Manuel’s relations with Venice, on the other hand, deteriorated, and as a counterpoise Manuel concluded alliances with both Pisa and Genoa, though these two city-states could hardly redress the balance. In addition, the growing Genoese commercial activity proved an irritant to the Venetians to the extent that in 1162, with the complicity of the Pisans, they attacked and destroyed the Genoese headquarters. Refusing to pay indemnities to the Genoese, and to subscribe to his Italian policy, as Manuel insisted, the Venetians were expelled from the empire and their property confiscated in 1171, while the Genoese privileges were extended. In retaliation, the Venetians launched an attack and pillaged the Aegean islands, but failed to hold on to Chios, chased by the Byzantine fleet as far as Cape Malea. With the Byzantine fleet unable to proceed any further, it became clear that only through diplomacy could the hostility be resolved, particularly as Venice had concluded an alliance with Barbarossa against Ancona in 1173, and an agreement in 1175 with William II of Sicily (1166–89), who recognised Venetian commercial activities in the Adriatic. The Veneto-Byzantine negotiations were concluded in 1179 with the renewal of the Venetian privileges, the release of prisoners, the restitution of sequestered property and the promise of reimbursement of damages inflicted on them in 1171. Yet, the Venetians do not seem to have hastened to return to Constantinople. Whether this was a consequence of Manuel’s prevarication in paying damages, or their reluctance to return, is difficult to tell. However, the insoluble problem, despite the progress made by the Komnenoi, remained Asia Minor. The very nature of the conquest, with its multifarious elements devoid of a single authority able to impose control and establish law and order, brought upheaval and desolation. Though Byzantium had secured the coastal areas from the Black Sea in the north as far as Laodikeia (Denizli) in the south and had reconquered the western part of the Anatolian plateau as far as Amorion (Hisar near Emirdağ), the forays for
plunder into Byzantine territory, particularly by the Turkomans, continued unabated, despite the existing agreements.\textsuperscript{73} The only respite in some cases came as a result of fortifications, built for example in Chliara (Kirkağaç), Pergamon (Bergama) and Atramyttion (Edremit), thus enabling the return of the population to pursue, as Choniates puts it, ‘the good things of civilized life’.\textsuperscript{74}

In 1175 came the break between Constantinople and Ikonion (Konya) that led to Manuel’s expedition against Kılıç Arslan II (1156–92) the following year and his defeat at Myriokephalon – a defeat that the emperor himself considered comparable to that of Malazgirt (Manzikert) a century earlier.\textsuperscript{75} It soon became clear that the grandiose plans Manuel had embraced both in the west and east as a response to external circumstances could not be fully realised, for Byzantium at the time simply lacked the resources. As a consequence the alliances and agreements based on largesse entered into, in particular, with his eastern foes could not be maintained without military might to enforce them. The recruitment of mercenaries, both foreign and native, was not only a great burden to the exchequer but often resulted in the plunder and devastation of the provinces.\textsuperscript{76}

These weaknesses became apparent on Manuel’s death in 1180 when his son, Alexios II, a minor, ascended the throne under the tutelage of his mother, Mary of Antioch. The interplay of a number of factors – resentment against the Latins, whose dominant position was more apparent under the regency, the power of the landed families, the abuse of tax-collectors and the poverty of the majority – led to a palace revolution, which spread to the people and brought to power Andronikos I Komnenos, Manuel’s cousin, unleashing in these earlier stages a massacre of the Latins (1182).\textsuperscript{77} A year later, having eliminated both Alexios and his mother, Andronikos was proclaimed emperor (1183–5).

A man full of contradictions, both brutal and humane, Andronikos introduced reforms and enforced the laws against abuse of power by the landed magnates, the sale of offices and the rapacity of tax-collectors, thus restoring a
measure of prosperity to the provinces. On the other hand, his ruthless character and irrational suspicions turned his rule into a reign of terror, thus ultimately alienating the powerful landed aristocracy on whose co-operation the defence of the empire rested. His external policy equally antagonised the western powers. The agreements that Manuel I had secured with so much effort were in tatters: Hungary occupied Dalmatia and parts of Croatia and Sirmium; the Serbs declared their independence and expanded their territory at the expense of Byzantium; while the Normans, having occupied Corfu (Kerkyra), Kephalonia and Zakynthos, sailed to Thessalonike which they sacked.

This external and internal disintegration led to the downfall of Andronikos and the Komnenian dynasty. The new occupant of the throne, Isakios II Angelos (1185–95), failed to deal with the developments in the Balkans and in particular Bulgaria, whose ruler, Asen, was crowned emperor of Bulgaria by the newly established archbishop of Trnovo in 1187. On the other hand, the Byzantines succeeded in ousting the Normans from Thessalonike and in coming to an agreement with Hungary. But the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (Salah al-Din) in 1187 and the launching of the third crusade in 1189 created fresh problems for the Byzantines. Of the leaders, Richard Lionheart and Philip II Augustus chose to sail to the east, while Frederick I Barbarossa opted for the land route through Asia Minor. To safeguard his passage he came to an understanding with both the Byzantines and the Seljuk ruler, Kılıç Arslan II, through whose lands he was to pass on his way to Jerusalem. This aroused Byzantine suspicions and led Isakios II to renew the alliance with Saladin made by Andronikos I. However, despite Frederick’s occupation of the Byzantine city of Philippopolis (Filibe, Plovdiv) and the verbal hostility between the two rulers which might have resulted in a German attack on Constantinople, a treaty was concluded in 1190 with the Byzantines promising the necessary provisioning in both victuals and transport. This venture not only failed to lead to the capture of Jerusalem, but proved detrimental to Byzantium when Richard Lionheart captured Cyprus, which was to remain in western hands.

79 Eustathios of Thessalonike, Espugnazione, pp. 64 ff.; Choniates, Historia, pp. 296 ff. (Magoulias, pp. 164 ff.).
82 Choniates, Historia, p. 418 (Magoulias, p. 229).
The internal abuses, the extortions of tax-collectors, the sale of offices and the extravagant expenditure seem to have continued unabated. Nor did the situation improve under Isakios II’s brother Alexios III Angelos who ousted him in 1195. On the contrary, the dissension within the imperial family led to the final stages of the disintegration. The appeal by Isakios and his son Alexios to Philip of Swabia, whose brother had married Isakios’s daughter, began a chain of events which under Venice’s direction were to divert the fourth crusade from Egypt, first to Zara and then to Constantinople. These coincidences, underpinned by commercial interests, resulted in the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders and the division of the imperial lands among them. The idea had been contemplated in the past, but as the possibility of a successful colonisation in Palestine and Syria grew more remote, the capture of Constantinople became a reality.

In July 1203 Alexios IV was crowned co-emperor when Isakios was restored to his throne but he was unable to fulfil his promises to the crusaders and make the necessary exorbitant payments. This led to the crusaders and Venice drawing up a treaty proposing the partition of the empire among themselves. This was put into practice when the people rebelled against Alexios IV for having subjected them to the Latins and brought Alexios V Doukas to the throne. On 13 April 1204 Constantinople fell to the crusaders, who unleashed a massacre, pillage and sheer wanton destruction that lasted for three days. This destruction spread also to the provinces.

Latin rule and the Byzantine Empire in exile, 1204–61

Following the capture of Constantinople a new political order had to be established. The leader who proved instrumental in implementing the agreement and manipulating the election of the emperor was Enrico Dandolo, the doge of Venice. Bypassing Boniface of Montferrat, the most eligible candidate,
given his ability and Byzantine connections, Dandolo, with Venetian interests in mind, engineered the election of Count Baldwin of Flanders.\footnote{88 Choniates, Historia, p. 596 (Magoulias, p. 328).} With the exception of the doge all other crusaders had to swear an oath of fealty to the emperor.\footnote{89 Tafel and Thomas, Urkunden, i, pp. 447–9.} According to this agreement one-quarter of all imperial territory together with five-eighths of the capital were to be assigned to the emperor; one-quarter of the remaining territory, in addition to the remaining three-eighths of Constantinople, were granted to the Venetians.\footnote{90 D. Jacoby, 'The Venetian Government and Administration in Latin Constantinople in 1204–61: a State within a State', in Quarta Crociata. Venezia – Bisanzio – Impero Latino, eds. G. Ortali, G. Revegnani and P. Schreiner (Venice, 2006), pp. 19 ff.; Jacoby, 'The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople', pp. 160–8; Ch. Maltezou, 'Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli (scali marittimi)', Études et documents 15 (1978), 30–61.} The remainder of the territories was apportioned as fiefs to the knights. Apart from five-eighths of the capital, Baldwin received land in Thrace and in the north-west region of Asia Minor, his kingdom thus straddling the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. Boniface, displeased with the areas allocated to him, seized Thessalonike and established a kingdom there, and then set out to conquer Boeotia, Attica and the Peloponnese, granting suzerainty to various French leaders, who were to owe allegiance to him as king, and not to the emperor.\footnote{91 For the Latin principalities see A. Bon, La Morée franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d’Achaïe (1205–1430), 2 vols. (Paris, 1969).} Venice, aware of its military incapability to impose its rule on such an extensive area, relinquished the territories of Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia and the Peloponnese granted to it by the treaty, and restricted its rule to the two ports of Coron (Korone) and Modon (Methone) in the south-western tip of the Peloponnese. These were referred to as ‘the right eye of Venice’, for they controlled the routes to the Adriatic and southern Mediterranean.\footnote{92 J. Chrysostomides, Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Documents for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries (Camberley, 1995) (hereafter MP), no. 26, p. 55, line 9: ‘sunt oculus dexter Venetiarum’.} Venice also occupied other islands in the Ionian and the Aegean and bought Crete from Boniface of Montferrat. Of all the participants in the fourth crusade, Venice alone was gradually to establish a maritime empire in the eastern Mediterranean which was to last until the early years of the eighteenth century, in contrast to the transient presence of the rest of the crusaders.

As a result of the destruction of the central authority of Constantinople, three states arose competing for the political succession of Byzantium. Michael Angelos, with his capital at Arta, established his authority over Epirus, Acarnania and Aetolia as an independent political entity in opposition to the kingdom...
of Thessalonike, to the Venetians in the Adriatic and to the Slavs in the north. Shortly before the capture of the city the brothers Alexios and David Komnenos, grandsons of Andronikos I Komnenos, took possession of Trebizond (Trabzon). David went on subsequently to seize Sinope (Sinop) and extend his rule to Paphlagonia and the Pontic Heraclea. In Asia Minor a large section of the population, who had sought refuge there, rallied round Theodore Laskaris, a son-in-law of Alexios III Angelos. The Latin advance into Asia Minor against Laskaris was halted by the revolt of the Byzantine magnates of Thrace, whose offer of co-operation had been rejected by both Boniface and Baldwin. In the ensuing bloody revolt they called in the Bulgarian tsar, Kalojan, who invaded with his Cumans and defeated the crusaders near Adrianople (Edirne). Baldwin was taken prisoner and later died in captivity; a number of Frankish knights lost their lives, among them Louis of Blois, the claimant to Nicaea (İznil).  

While the crusaders directed their interest to the European part of the territories, Theodore Laskaris established his rule in Nicaea and went on to reintroduce the imperial structures of both secular and ecclesiastical administration. Michael Autoreianos, a scholar, was elected patriarch of Constantinople in 1208 and proceeded to crown Laskaris emperor. Thus Nicaea was eventually to emerge as the legal and official Byzantine Empire in exile and as such it challenged the authority of the Latin rule in Constantinople.  

Henry of Flanders, Baldwin’s brother and successor, in contrast to earlier policy, adopted a conciliatory approach towards the Greeks and won a number of the Greek magnates to his rule. Though he opened hostilities against Nicaea, he was once more forced by the Bulgarian threat to conclude a two-year armistice with Theodore Laskaris in the spring of 1207. This gave Theodore a respite to concentrate on the task of imposing his authority on the centrifugal elements that sought to establish independent principalities. One such rebel was Theodore Mangaphas who seized Philadelphia (Alaşehir), while Sabbas Asidenos captured the town of Sampson, near Miletus (Balat).  

Manuel Mavro zomes, in co-operation with Keyhüsrev I (1204–10), the Seljuk leader, tried
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to establish himself in the Meander valley. In this case, according to Choniates, Theodore Laskaris came to an agreement with Keyhüsrev and granted him a portion of the territory which included Chonai (Honas) and Phrygian Laodikeia (Denizli).\(^97\) Despite these agreements, the Turks, intent on capturing the coastal regions, took advantage of the upheavals and seized a number of fortresses, including Attaleia (Antalya).\(^98\) In addition, at the mediation of Venice, Keyhüsrev entered into a secret alliance with Henry in 1209,\(^99\) and tried to elicit support among the Byzantines by championing the cause of Alexios III Angelos, Theodore’s father-in-law, who had returned from the west and had taken refuge with the sultan. Hostilities continued round Antioch on the Meander with losses for the Nicaeans, but the sultan’s defeat and death in 1211 removed for the time being the pressure on the eastern front, thus giving Theodore the opportunity to turn his attentions to the Latins. After the Byzantine victory on the Rhyndakos (Orhaneli) river in that year, Henry moved on to Pergamon (Bergama) and Nymphaion (Nif, now Kemalpaşazade). However, subsequent hostilities and skirmishes between the two forces proved both indecisive and draining, and in 1214 a treaty was concluded at Nymphaion between the two empires.\(^100\) Relations between Nicaea and Constantinople remained friendly after Henry’s death and in 1216 Theodore married Henry’s niece as his third wife. Three years later, Theodore renewed the former extensive trade privileges to the Venetians operating in the empire of Nicaea.\(^101\)

The peaceful relations with the Latins left Theodore free to tackle the empire of Trebizond which owed allegiance to the Latin emperor of Constantinople. In that year Theodore annexed all their lands west of Sinope (Sinop), including Herakleia (Ereğli) and Amastris (Amasra).\(^102\) This provoked the Seljuk ruler, Keykavus I (1210–20). He attacked Trebizond (Trabzon), seized Sinope (1215–16), captured Alexios Komnenos and reinstalled him on the throne of Trebizond as his vassal. With Sinope as their naval base, the Seljuks were gradually to develop into an important maritime element in the Black Sea.\(^103\)
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During this period Epirus under Michael I Angelos (1204–15) grew in importance, but it was under his half-brother and successor, Theodore Angelos (1215–24), that conflict broke out between the two Byzantine states.\textsuperscript{104} By then, Theodore Angelos had captured Peter of Courtenay, the newly elect emperor of Constantinople, Henry’s successor, on his way to Constantinople, and had turned his attention to the kingdom of Thessalonike, which, since the death of Boniface of Monferrat in his campaign against the Bulgars in 1207, had lost its vitality and direction. In addition, the return of the crusaders to the west and the lack of support since Henry’s death in 1216 had undermined the Latin empire’s ability to survive. Towards the end of 1224, after a long-drawn-out siege, the city capitulated.\textsuperscript{105} Theodore Angelos now controlled an extensive part of the territory of the old empire, which gave him the justification to style himself ‘Emperor of the Romans’, and assume the three imperial family names of Angelos, Doukas and Komnenos, thus challenging the Nicaean pre-eminence.

In Nicaea, Theodore I Laskaris bequeathed the crown to his son-in-law John III Doukas Vatatzes (1222–54). This unleashed a rebellion by Theodore’s brothers supported by the Latins, who also in 1228 sought an alliance with the Seljuks against Vatatzes. The attempt to overthrow him failed, and as a result of his victory by both land and sea the Latin lands in Asia Minor passed under Byzantine dominion, with the exception of the coast opposite Constantinople and the territory round Nicomedia (Izmit). Vatatzes was now able to strengthen and expand the fleet, originally organised by Theodore I, and to extend Byzantine control over the Aegean islands lying between Greece and Asia Minor. He harassed Latin shipping moving towards Constantinople, and along the coast of Thrace.\textsuperscript{106} His naval capability inevitably could not compete at this stage with the Venetian fleet, whose primary aim though seems to have been the control of the sea routes that would promote their mercantile activities. By then the Venetians had established links with the Frankish Levant, and had concluded treaties with Keyhüsrev I, which gave them access to Attaleia (Antalya), indispensable for their commercial activities with Egypt. In addition, under his successor, Keykavus I, by then in control of Sinope (Sinop), they secured a further agreement and, of major importance, access to the Black Sea region under the agreement renewed with Keykubad I

\textsuperscript{104} For Epirus in general see D. M. Nicol, The Despotate of Epirus (Oxford, 1957).
\textsuperscript{106} Choniates, Historia, p. 638 (Magoulias, p. 350); Akropolites, Opera, i, § 22, p. 36 (Macrides, p. 166); Ahrweiler, Mer, pp. 304–5, 311–16.
These commercial successes would eventually be extended as far as Crimea, and would involve other western merchants, including Pisans, Amalfitans and Genoese after the Veneto-Genoese treaty in 1232.

This mercantile prosperity could hardly stem the gradual political deterioration and fragmentation of Latin rule, which inevitably weakened their hold on the conquered lands. The realization of this among the occupied Greeks is illustrated by the appeal made by the population of Adrianople (Edirne) to Vatatzes in 1225 to take possession of the city. Nicaea’s pre-eminence, however, was challenged by Theodore Angelos who by now ruled not only the kingdom of Thessalonike but also parts of Thrace and had entered into an alliance with Ivan Asen II of Bulgaria (1218–41) against Vatatzes. Theodore moved against Adrianople, forcing Vatatzes to withdraw. His success spurred him on to focus his attention on Constantinople. In this, he was stopped by his ally, Ivan Asen, whose aspirations to create a Bulgaro-Byzantine empire with its capital in Constantinople went counter to Theodore’s plans. Theodore dissolved the agreements and turned against his former ally, but, defeated in 1230, he was taken prisoner. His domains in Epirus, Thessaly and Thessalonike passed to his brother Manuel, though his recent acquisitions in Thrace, Macedonia and part of Albania were incorporated into Asen’s kingdom. Asen, in addition, supplanted Greek influence in Serbia. The capture of Constantinople, however, eluded Asen despite the various and ever-changing alliances and diplomatic manoeuvrings. After his death in 1241, and the Mongol invasion in 1243, which affected both the Balkans and the Turkish emirates in Asia Minor, Bulgaria was out of the contest for the capture of Constantinople, thus leaving Nicaea as the sole contender.

The friendly relations and commercial exchanges established between Nicaea and the Seljuks during the Mongol invasion were of short duration. In 1243 the Mongols defeated the Seljuks, whose control was fractured, resulting in the emergence of various beyliks including those of Aydin and Menteşe on the western coast of Anatolia. Hostilities resumed once the Mongol threat had receded. From 1250 onwards, Vatatzes undertook a number of expeditions

---

109 Akropolites, Opera, i, § 24, p. 38 (Macrides, pp. 171–2).
111 On the two emirates see Lemerle, L’émirat, pp. 10 ff. On their relations with the Venetians see E. A. Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415) (Venice, 1983).
to hold back Turkoman and Seljuk encroachment along the frontier. This situation continued under his successors. A partial remedy, following the long-established Byzantine tradition, was to settle the troublesome and destructive Cumans along the frontier regions in the Meander valley as well as in Macedonia and Thrace in order to strengthen the defences, and gradually assimilate them into a sedentary way of life. During his long reign Vatatzes succeeded in doubling the size of the empire of Nicaea. He had laid strong economic and social foundations and against all odds he had emerged from all the competing forces as the statesman poised to capture the city and restore the Byzantine Empire. This did not, in fact, take place under him or his son, Theodore II Laskaris (1254–8), or his grandson John IV Laskaris (1258–9), but under the usurper Michael VIII Palaeologos (1259–82), who went on to establish his own dynasty by eliminating the Laskarids.

A resourceful statesman, Michael was able to defeat the triple anti-Nicaean coalition, formed by Frederick II’s son Manfred of Sicily, Michael of Epirus and William of Villehardouin of Achaia, at the battle of Pelagonia (1259). As a result of this resounding defeat, their newly found ally, the Serbian king, Uroš, had to withdraw from the recently occupied Macedonian cities. The way was now open for the capture of the city. To neutralise any possible resistance by the Venetians, Michael negotiated with the Genoese rivals, and signed a treaty at Nymphaeum (Nymphaion) in March 1261. In accordance with this treaty, in return for extensive commercial privileges enjoyed in the past by the Venetians, the Genoese were to provide naval aid to the empire. As it turned out, this proved unnecessary. Constantinople was captured by Michael’s commander, Alexios Strategopoulos, who, while reconnoitring in its vicinity, found the city defenceless with the greater part of the Frankish garrison having sailed with the Venetian fleet into the Black Sea against the island of Daphnousion.

---
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The last phase, 1261–1453

For Michael Palaeologos, the capture of Constantinople was the first step towards the restoration of the rest of the empire. This inevitably brought him into conflict with the Bulgars and the Mongols over Thrace and Macedonia, the Despotate of Epirus with its claims on Thessaly, the Latins in the Peloponnese and the Aegean islands. With the capture of Constantinople, the empire’s position was transformed from a provincial state into a power with an important role in Mediterranean politics, and hence needing to neutralise its enemies in the west through diplomatic means, for the restoration of its former lands could not be achieved militarily given its financial situation. The main obstacle to Michael’s plans of restoration was the Sicilian kingdom, which assumed the role of protector of the Latins in Greece, first under Manfred of Hohenstaufen (1258–66) and later under Charles of Anjou (1265–85), the brother of the king of France. In order to counteract Manfred’s plans Michael entered into negotiations with the papacy. Though Urban IV (1261–4) had at first given his support to the Franks in the Peloponnese and had excommunicated the Genoese for their co-operation with Michael, his objection to the house of the Hohenstaufen prevented him from forming an alliance between Sicily and the papacy. In fact, the pope later actively supported Charles of Anjou in taking over the kingdom of Sicily. Taking advantage of this situation Michael VIII approached the papacy with the offer of the union of the two churches, those of Rome and Constantinople. The time was important, for though Michael had earlier been successful in the Peloponnese, the situation had now been reversed and the empire had to fight on three fronts. As his allies the Genoese had been defeated by the Venetians in the Gulf of Nauplia in the spring of 1263, Michael was forced to end his alliance with Genoa and begin negotiations with Venice in 1265 with the aim of renewing and extending the privileges they had once enjoyed under the Komnenoi. But, as the Venetians were slow to ratify the treaty, Michael renewed his agreements in 1267 with the Genoese, who by then had established their dominance in the Black Sea. In addition he granted them quarters in Galata, a suburb in Constantinople, which was to develop into an important commercial base.

119 The treaty was in fact ratified in 1268: Miklosich and Müller, Acta et diplomata, iii, pp. 76 ff.; Tafel and Thomas, Urkunden, iii, pp. 66–77.

120 Pachymeres, Relations historiques, ii, v, pp. 535–7. For the expansion of the Genoese see S. Pascu (ed.), Genoveci la Marea Neagră în secolele XIII–XIV. I Genovesi ner Mar Nero durante i secoli XIII e XIV (Bucharest, 1977); Balard, Romanie génovise, i, pp. 50 ff.
without a navy to give him mastery of the seas it was impossible to defend the

city.\textsuperscript{121}

The victory of Charles of Anjou at the battle of Benevento in 1266 renewed
Latin aspirations for the recapture of Constantinople and a pact was signed
a year later on 27 May 1267 with the ousted Latin emperor, Baldwin II, in
the presence of the pope. Shortly thereafter Charles intervened in Greece
and took over Manfred’s possessions in Epirus with the support of William II
Villehardouin, who placed himself under his protection. Charles widened his
circle of allies against Byzantium by entering into alliance with both Serbs and
Bulgars. To counteract this pressure, Michael VIII reopened negotiations with
Pope Clement IV on the question of the unification of the two churches. On
Clement’s death in 1268 he turned to the king of France, Louis IX, Charles’s
brother, whose ambition was to liberate the Holy Land rather than to recapture
Constantinople. Charles’s participation in his brother’s crusade against Tunisia
lifted the immediate western pressure off Byzantium. In order to counteract
hostilities from Serbs, Bulgarians and the Seljuks, Michael entered into a series
of agreements with the Hungarians, the Tatars of the Golden Horde and
the Mamluks of Egypt. In addition, negotiations with Rome, resumed after
Gregory X’s installation in 1271 in the hope that the papacy would put a check
on Charles of Anjou’s ambitions against Byzantium, led Michael to conclude
the union of the two churches at the Council of Lyons on 6 July 1274, despite
strong opposition from the majority of the Byzantine clergy and people.\textsuperscript{122}

This union, however, was not to last.

The new political situation gave Michael the opportunity to resume his
activities aimed at the reconquest of the territories in Greece. Though he
failed in Thessaly he succeeded in parts of the Peloponnese and in Arcadia,
and with the help of the Italian Licario he captured Euboea and a number of
the Aegean islands, excluding Naxos and Andros, thus establishing a naval
presence in the area and clearing the archipelago of piracy.\textsuperscript{123} The fall of the
Angevins in Sicily, instigated by Michael in 1282, put an end to their hopes of
recapturing Constantinople.\textsuperscript{124} On the other hand, his western political
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orientation, perhaps imposed on him by the circumstances of the time, as it had been on Manuel I, led to the neglect of the Asiatic lands, which had remained faithful to the Laskarids. In the early stages of Michael’s assuming power the population of Bithynia, in collaboration with the army, rebelled against him.  

Opposition to his rule spread also in the aftermath of the ecclesiastical union with Rome. As a result of heavy taxation, depletion of agricultural manpower (recruited to fight in his western campaigns), the dissatisfaction of the population and the upheavals brought about by the enemy attacks, what remained of Byzantine Asia Minor thirty years after the reconquest of Constantinople were some isolated fortresses, which controlled the coast from the Black Sea along the Aegean to the Mediterranean, the rest having fallen to the Turkomans. At the same time, what was to prove a more formidable enemy, the Ottoman Turks, settled in the region of Sangarios (Sakarya) and made their appearance on the coast of Bithynia. The disintegration of life, the wanton destruction of the towns by the enemy both in the Balkans and in the east, the sale of the inhabitants into slavery, famine and plague, and the stream of refugees to Constantinople, exacerbated the situation. This was the legacy that Michael VIII left to his son Andronikos at his death in 1282, a situation which worsened with the passage of time.

Under strong economic pressure Andronikos II (1282–1328) followed a policy of conciliation towards the west, the Serbs and the Bulgars through a series of marriage alliances that succeeded in stemming their advance for a time. Unwittingly he sided with Genoa against Venice in the conflict that broke out between the two maritime powers in 1296. Abandoned by the Genoese, who concluded peace with the Venetians three years later, Byzantium had ultimately to give in to Venetian demands for compensation and on 4 October 1302 renewed the commercial privileges granted to them in 1277. Faced with these financial burdens and the ever-deteriorating economic conditions, loss of revenue from tax exemptions and abuse of office, Andronikos resorted to reducing both the army and navy and was forced to rely entirely on foreign mercenaries in order to stem the Turkish advance. He first negotiated with

125 Pachymeres, Relations historiques, 1, iii, pp. 259–71.
130 Gregoras, Historia, ii, pp. 174–6, 223.
the Alans, allowing them to settle in the empire as soldiers, but, defeated by the Turks in their first encounter, they began to pillage Byzantine lands. Later, the highly experienced Catalan Grand Company of mercenaries, under Roger de Flor, at the time out of employment, offered their services to the emperor, who accepted their terms and in addition showered Roger with titles in order to incorporate him within the Byzantine administrative structure. In 1304 in their first encounter with the Turks, who were then besieging Philadelphia (Alaşehir), the Catalans were successful, thus proving once again what a small but well-trained and cohesive army could achieve. But relying on an alien independent mercenary army, dissatisfied with irregular pay, proved a risky solution. Soon thereafter the Catalans began attacking and pillaging the Byzantine countryside. Persuaded to move to the European section during the winter of that year, they returned in the spring to continue pillaging and transporting Turks from Asia to Thrace, despite the presence of the Byzantine navy. Far from ameliorating the situation, the assassination of Roger de Flor (1305) in fact worsened it. To avenge their leader’s death the Catalans moved into Thrace and in conjunction with Alans and Turks continued their plunder, resulting in famine in the capital during the winter of 1306/7. They later headed to Thessaly, defeated the Franks, and took over Thebes and Athens, thus establishing a Catalan principality.

During these turbulent events, the Byzantines, as a result of their victory at Pelagonia in 1259, had succeeded in securing the fortresses of Monembasia, Mane, Geraki and Mystras, and despite periodic defeats went on gradually to consolidate and expand their possessions, ultimately developing into a quasi-independent state which will later be referred to as the Despotate of the Morea. Given the distance of these possessions from Constantinople and the precarious nature of communications by sea as a result of piracy, governors in charge

131 Pachymeres, Relations historiques, iv, xiii, pp. 668–9.
132 Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, pp. 136–47.
of these areas, although originally appointed annually under Andronikos II, were later given extended tenure. Owing to the circumstances, which required speed and continuity of decision making, they were on occasion to act without consulting Constantinople, though not to act in a manner contrary to imperial policy.  

In the Balkans, the Bulgars, taking advantage of this turbulent situation, extended their dominion along the coast of the Black Sea, capturing fortresses and seaports, among them Mesembria and Anchialos, victories confirmed by the Byzantino-Bulgarian treaty of 1307.  

In the west, Philip of Tarentum seized Dyrrachium, while Charles of Valois, aspiring to the crown of Constantinople, entered into an agreement with Venice, Charles II of Anjou, king of Naples, and Pope Clement V. This alliance was further strengthened by Charles of Valois allying himself with the king of Serbia, and with members of the Byzantine nobility. As a result of this expedition, Theobald of Cepoy, Charles of Valois’s representative, received an oath of fealty from the Catalan Company. But it was Venice that derived real profit from this expedition. Its fleet had cleared the Aegean of piracy, while its subjects, the Cornaro of Crete, had captured Karpathos.

Hardly were these difficulties out of the way than the empire was plunged into a civil war between Andronikos II and his grandson Andronikos III (1328–41). For a brief period a modus vivendi was established, which was to be disturbed by the death of Andronikos III, and the fresh conflict that broke out between the regency, headed by Anna of Savoy in the name of her young son, John V (1341–91), and John Kantakouzenos, Grand Domestic, who put himself forward as a rival emperor. To cover part of the costs of these military preparations the empress was forced to raise a loan of 30,000 ducats, placing part of the crown jewels as surety.

In the ensuing clash and ever-changing alliances, the Serbian ruler Dušan first sided with Kantakouzenos, but, alarmed at his successes in Thessaly, he swiftly jettisoned him and entered into an agreement with the regency in Constantinople. To counteract this new threat, Kantakouzenos turned to his old ally Umur, the emir of Aydin, and with his help was able

---

136 In 1290 Florent de Hainault, prince of Achaia, refused to have the treaty confirmed by the governor, for he had reservations over the worth of a treaty signed by an official who exercised authority on an annual basis only: J. Smit (ed.), The Chronicle of the Morea (London, 1904, repr. 1976), lines 8691–4, 2708–14, 8731–75.
137 Pachymeres, Relations historiques, iv, xiii, pp. 688–91; Dölger, Regesten, no. 2303.
138 Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, i, pp. 48–53.
139 See Thiriet, Romanie, p. 158 n. 2.
to change the course of the civil war in his favour. At the beginning of 1343 Kantakouzenos moved into Thrace, extensively devastated by the pillaging of his allies.\textsuperscript{141} Meanwhile, the political conflict led to a social convulsion in Thessalonike with the Zealot revolt, which established the city’s independence from Constantinople from 1342 to 1349.\textsuperscript{142}

Meanwhile, the western confederacy under the auspices of Pope Clement VI, formed in response to Anna of Savoy’s appeals to the west against Kantakouzenos, which also entailed the prospects once again of the union of the two churches, included Venice, Cyprus, Naples, Genoa and the Hospitallers. The aim of the expedition was not to become involved in the Byzantine civil war but to stem the growing power of Aydın and its piratical activities in the Aegean.\textsuperscript{143} In 1344 the crusading force partially occupied Smyrna (İzmir) with the result that the war with Umur dragged on for years. Unable to secure his support, Kantakouzenos, after consultation with Umur, approached in 1346 a more formidable ally, the Ottoman Sultan Orhan (c.1324–62) to whom he gave his daughter Theodora in marriage.\textsuperscript{144} As a result of this help, he established his authority over the whole of Thrace, and went on to crown himself emperor with the aim of securing Constantinople. To counteract his progress, Empress Anna negotiated with the leader of Saruhan (a beylik on the Aegean coast in western Anatolia). The agreement misfired, for, instead of attacking Kantakouzenos, their force of 6,000 men invaded Bulgaria and plundered and devastated Thrace including the vicinity of Constantinople. The empress had soon to give up the struggle and recognise her opponent as Emperor John VI (1347–54). Her son John V married Kantakouzenos’s younger daughter, Helena, thus legitimising his father-in-law’s position. The conclusion of the civil war also put an end to the Zealot rebellion and Thessalonike returned to central government control. Yet, the economic state of the empire was in tatters. Thrace, the most fertile area left still in its possession, following social upheavals and Turkish devastation had turned into a desert.\textsuperscript{145}


\textsuperscript{145} Gregoras, Historia, ii, p. 683; Kantakouzenos, Historiarum, ii, pp. 302 ff.
The power that profited most from the Byzantine civil war was Serbia. Under Stefan Dušan (1331–55), the Serbs had extended their dominion to Epirus and Macedonia, with the result that their possessions now stretched from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, and from the Adriatic to the Aegean coast. Constantinople itself, however, eluded them for they possessed no fleet and all attempts to involve Venice in their plans failed. On the contrary both maritime powers tried to derive some profit from the civil war and in 1346 the Genoese recaptured the island of Chios, which was to remain an important trading base until the mid-sixteenth century. Equally impotent at sea were the Byzantines whose fleet, built under Andronikos III in reaction to the Turkish activities, was allowed to decline, despite its successes. Faced with the aggressive attitude of the Genoese and anxious to assert the empire’s commercial activities, Kantakouzenos set out to construct a navy in 1347–8 despite the difficulties in recruiting experienced crews. The immediate Genoese response was to set the arsenal of Constantinople on fire and to lay siege to the city in order to pursue their attacks on the maritime towns on the Pontus and the Propontis. This attack put an end, as Gregoras admits, ‘to the empire’s hopes of deriving any profit from the commercial activity of Constantinople.’ This event, in addition to the extensive privileges granted to both Venice and Genoa, which controlled almost all aspects of Byzantine commercial life, made any recovery impossible. Though active, it was to remain limited and subordinate to the extensive Latin activities.

In these pressing circumstances the Veneto-Genoese antagonism came as a relief to the Byzantines, forcing the Genoese to direct their activities against their rivals who aimed at breaking their monopoly of the Black Sea trade. In the ensuing confrontation, Venice allied with Peter IV of Aragon, joined at a later stage by Kantakouzenos. The naval confrontation in 1352 was indecisive and the

150 Gregoras, Historia, ii, p. 841.
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war dragged on until 1355, when peace was signed. Meanwhile, Kantakouzenos, left to rely on his own resources, was forced to make peace with the Genoese and recognise their demands, particularly as they had by now entered into an agreement with Orhan. In response to this move the Venetians came to an understanding with John V who, relegated to a minor position by his father-in-law, took the opportunity to rebel against him in November 1354. The Venetians offered John V a loan of 20,000 ducats on the understanding that he would hand over the island of Tenedos as collateral. This agreement did not materialise. Nevertheless John V opened hostilities against his brother-in-law Matthew Kantakouzenos, then governor of Adrianople (Edirne) and the surrounding area. The city opened its gates and welcomed in the legitimate emperor, while Matthew retired to the citadel. He was rescued by his father who arrived with his Turkish troops to recover the lost areas and punish the culprits by unleashing his soldiers to plunder ferociously. To salvage the situation John V appealed to the Bulgars and Serbs, receiving from Stefan Dušan a cavalry division of 4,000 men, while Orhan provided Kantakouzenos with a contingent under his son, Süleyman. The defeat of John V’s forces led Kantakouzenos to the decision to set aside the legitimate emperor and declare his own son Matthew co-emperor. But his triumph was short lived. Turkish assistance had its complications. Not only did it alienate the majority of the population, who now sided with the legitimate emperor, but the Ottomans themselves were far from being satisfied with providing soldiery, or looting and plundering the countryside. They were now seeking to establish themselves in the European section of what was left of the empire. In 1352 they took possession of Tzympe near Callipolis (Gallipoli, Gelibolu), and two years later in March 1354 Orhan’s son, Süleyman, occupied Callipolis despite Kantakouzenos’s pleas for its return.

John V soon seized the ascendancy and, with the help of the Genoese, he was able to recover his throne, forcing his father-in-law to abdicate and enter a monastery. But their relations seem to have remained amicable. Kantakouzenos spent the rest of his days in writing up his history and in taking part in theological discussions and political decisions. His son Manuel Kantakouzenos continued to rule the Byzantine Peloponnese successfully, and at his

154 Kantakouzenos, Historiarum, iii, pp. 242 ff.
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death he was succeeded for a brief period by his brother Matthew. In 1382 the governance passed to John V’s youngest son, Theodore I Palaeologos. With Süleyman’s occupation of Callipolis (Gelibolu) a systematic Turkish advance began in Thrace. The capture of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka) in 1361, and subsequently that of Adrianople (Edirne), ushered in the methodical occupation of the Balkans, consolidated under Murad I (1362–89) by an effective policy of colonisation. Faced with the Turkish advance Bulgaria was forced to submit, resulting in a confrontation with both Hungary and Byzantium, in the course of which the Byzantines occupied Anchialos on the coast of the Black Sea. This, however, was a small consolation. John V’s appeal to Rome had no response. He turned to Hungary, journeying to Buda in 1366, but there too disappointment awaited him. Louis I of Hungary, like the papacy, demanded conversion to the Catholic faith prior to military help. On his way home John V was detained by the Bulgarians, and it was only through the assistance of his cousin Amadeo of Savoy, the Green Count, who had arrived with a small crusading army, that he was liberated. Amadeo seized Callipolis (Gelibolu), and attacked the Bulgarians, forcing them to free the emperor and return both Mesembria and Sozopolis on the Black Sea to the Byzantines.

But in order to confront the Ottomans a greater force was needed which could only come from the west, for since the death of Stefan Dušan and the fragmentation of the Serbs no power was left in the Balkans to face the Turks. It was imperative, therefore, to secure western help. This meant appealing to Rome, as Michael VIII had done in the past, and indeed as John V had done in 1355, with the offer of union of the two churches. On this occasion Amadeo persuaded the emperor to travel to Rome to make his confession of faith in the hope that this would lead to military assistance. The majority of the clergy and the people seem to have been against the idea, and despite Kantakouzenos’s insistence that any attempt at the union of the two churches had to be conducted through an ecumenical council, John V left for Rome, where he made his personal confession of faith in 1369. In so far as military assistance to Byzantium was concerned it was an utter failure. On his way back

---
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John V, weighed down by debts, offered the sale of Tenedos to the Venetians.\textsuperscript{162} Owing to its geographical position at the entrance of the Hellespont, Tenedos controlled the shipping to the Black Sea. Described by the Venetians as ‘la chiave dello stretto’, the key to the straits, it was in consequence much prized by them.\textsuperscript{163} The deal, however, was postponed, but given Genoese commercial interests in the region, and particularly in Caffa, the island was to become a bone of contention between the Venetians and the Genoese a few years later.

The external political pressures brought to bear by the Ottoman advance into the Balkans and the defeat of the Serbs at the battle of Çirmen on the Maritsa (Mericç) river in 1371 were further increased by the dynastic conflicts which were to shake the empire once more for the following two decades. In 1373 John V’s eldest son and co-emperor, Andronikos IV, and Savcı, Murad’s son, revolted against their respective fathers. They were both captured, but Andronikos survived his punishment and was imprisoned. His place in the succession was taken by his brother, Manuel II, who reigned as co-emperor until 1376. In that year Andronikos staged his second revolt, instigated by the Genoese to prevent the cession of Tenedos to the Venetians agreed by John V in return for the crown jewels and the establishment of a joint Veneto-Byzantine rule on the island.\textsuperscript{164} Before the Genoese had time to occupy the island the Venetians had annexed it, thus unleashing the Chioggia War between the two maritime cities which was to last until the treaty of Turin in August 1381. The treaty stipulated the demilitarisation and evacuation of the island, and that the inhabitants be dispersed to the Venetian colonies. Despite repeated pleas by the Byzantines Tenedos was never returned to them but Venice continued to use it as a commercial base.\textsuperscript{165}

Having overthrown his father and brother with Turkish help, Andronikos ruled until 1379. In that summer John V and Manuel II, with Turkish and


Venetian assistance, recaptured the city. In the arrangement concluded in 1381–2 Andronikos IV was recognised as the legitimate heir and Manuel, apparently against his father’s wishes, moved to Thessalonike where he had earlier been governor. There he attempted to pursue an independent course of action and, in opposition to his father’s policy of appeasement towards the Ottomans, opened hostilities against them. At first successful, Manuel was to lose the city to the Turks after a four-year siege in 1387 and was forced to submit to Murad I. After Andronikos’s third rebellion and subsequent death, Manuel was faced with a fresh dynastic rebellion by John VII, Andronikos’s son, who had been excluded from his inheritance as a result of his father’s final revolt. With the assistance of the Turks and the Genoese, John VII seized Constantinople in 1390, but had to flee when Manuel regained the city with the help of the Hospitallers. On his father’s death in 1391 Manuel succeeded to the throne.

These early years were undoubtedly the most humiliating period of Manuel’s life, as his letters and Dialogues indicate. As a vassal of the Turks he had earlier had to participate with his father in the campaigns of Murad against other Turkish beyliks, but most unbearable were the two campaigns conducted by Bayezid I (1389–1402) in Asia Minor in 1390 and 1391, one of which was against the Byzantine city of Philadelphia (Alaşehir). Manuel was forced to witness atrocities and suffer hardships and indignities. But what he found intolerable was, as he wrote, the thought that he ‘had to fight along with those and on behalf of those whose every increase in strength lessens our own strength’.

The more prosperous part of what was left of the empire at the time was the Byzantine Peloponnese. Despite the vicissitudes of the civil war between John V and John VI Kantakouzenos, and periodic clashes with the principality of Achaia, the province under Manuel Kantakouzenos prospered. In co-operation with the principality of Achaia and the Venetians, Manuel was
able to stem the ravages of the Catalan–Turkish aggression. In 1376, an event occurred which was to prove momentous for the fortunes of the Peloponnese. In that year the princess of Achaia, Queen Joanna I of Naples (1341–82), anxious to protect her domains threatened by the Albanians and the Turks, entered into an agreement with the Hospitallers of Rhodes placing the principality under their protection for a period of five years. Sometime later, in mid-1378 the Hospitallers hired two companies of Navarrese and Gascon mercenaries for eight months. This assignment provided the Navarrese with the opportunity to settle in Greece where they were to become a major source of disruption for the Byzantine province.

After the expiration of their contract the Navarrese offered their services to Neri Acciaiuoli, the lord of Corinth, who, taking advantage of the internal conflict in the Catalan duchies, was able to secure Megara and soon after Thebes and Livadia. Soon, however, the Navarrese went on the rampage, attacking the Acciaiuoli estates and vandalising the area. These destructive activities, features of an undisciplined mercenary army, were soon to be transformed into a drive for the conquest of the principality of Achaia, which they achieved. The overthrow of Queen Joanna I by Charles III of Durazzo indirectly furthered their fortunes, for they immediately swore allegiance to the new prince of Achaia, Jacques de Baux, and their three leaders were recognised as baillies and captains of the principality. Of the three leaders of the Navarrese Company of mercenaries, Pierre de Saint Superan was to emerge as vicar general of the principality of Achaia, whereupon he put into motion his plans for expansion into Byzantine territory. This coincided with the death of Manuel Kantakouzenos in April 1380, and the rebellion of the archons (individuals who wielded authority) against the central authority of the Palaeologoi. Though Manuel’s brother, Matthew, assumed authority he lacked his brother’s ability to impose his will on the archons, whose centrifugal tendencies
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in the earlier stages of Manuel’s rule had proved so destructive to the province.\textsuperscript{177}

It was to deal with this situation that Theodore I Palaeologos, John V’s youngest son, was despatched to the Peloponnese to restore order. He was to rule the Despotate from 1382 to 1407. His first task was to establish a degree of co-operation with his neighbours, Venice and Neri Acciaiuoli. The more important of the two were the Venetians, for though their domains in the Peloponnese were limited to Coron and Modon, their influence was felt over the whole peninsula. Although the Navarrese had already signed treaties with both, their relations with Neri rested on shaky grounds, for their expansionist policies went counter to his ambitions to conquer the remaining Catalan duchies of Neopatras and Athens.

The first signs of a concerted policy between Neri and Theodore, who married the former’s elder daughter, are seen in the attempts both made between 1383 and 1384 to draw Venice into an alliance to stem the Turkish piratical attacks.\textsuperscript{178} These attempts failed and they had to rely on their own resources. The alliance was extended to include Theodore’s brother Manuel II, then ruling Thessalonike and fighting a defensive war against the Turks.\textsuperscript{179} However, despite a contingent of a hundred cavalry sent by Manuel II from Thessalonike and the small amount of military help given him by Neri, Theodore failed to subdue the rebels. Relying on Navarrese support, they turned down all his attempts at reconciliation.\textsuperscript{180} In addition, the renewal of the Veneto-Navarrese treaty in 1387\textsuperscript{181} further weakened his position. This situation lasted until the capture of Thessalonike by the Turks in that year, and his brother’s submission to Murad.

This disastrous event, together with the Turkish expansion into Serbia, Albania and central Greece, inevitably affected the rulers of both Thessaly and Epirus who were siphoned into the Ottoman sphere of influence.\textsuperscript{182} Theodore had no other alternative but to steer towards a rapprochement with the Turks, possibly through the mediation of his brother Manuel, when he presented himself in Prousa (Bursa) in the summer of 1387.\textsuperscript{183} At any rate when Murad’s
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commander Evrenos made his appearance in the Peloponnese in the early days of September of that year, he had come there as an ally at Theodore’s invitation.\textsuperscript{184} On his march to the south, Evrenos plundered parts of Thessaly and Albania, devastated areas of Achaia, and attacked and pillaged the territories of Coron and Modon.\textsuperscript{185}

A rapprochement with Murad offered also Neri Acciaiuoli important advantages. It put an end to the Turkish incursions against his possessions while Evrenos’s armies dealt with his arch-enemies, the Navarrese. He was thus left free to press on with the conquest of the Catalan possessions and on 2 May 1388 he captured the Acropolis of Athens.\textsuperscript{186} But the advantages Theodore reaped from the Turkish assistance, enabling him to break the opposition of his rebels, recover towns and fortresses from the Navarrese and consolidate his hold on the country, also had drawbacks. Evrenos's soldiery, who lived on pillage, spread destruction on their march through the Peloponnese, the Greek peasants bearing the full brunt of it. It soon became clear that the help given was a doubled-edged sword. In fact, the Turkish advance into the Morea had presented Evrenos with the opportunity of holding on to the captured territory and this new development left Theodore in a worse plight than before. In the summer of 1388 he visited Murad in Bursa. He was well received by the sultan and allowed to retain his lands,\textsuperscript{187} becoming Murad’s vassal, as his father and brother had before him. Emboldened by the sultan’s support, Theodore even clashed with the Venetians over the cities of Argos and Nauplia, sold to them by Marie d’Enghien.\textsuperscript{188}

The Byzantine–Turkish co-operation came to an end with the death of Murad I at the battle of Kosovo Polje (Kosyphopedion) in 1389. The degree of freedom enjoyed by the Christian vassals in the reign of Murad I gave way to a rigid policy of centralisation under his successor, Bayezid I (1389–1402), who saw a vassal’s function as serving purely Ottoman interests. He backed Andronikos IV’s son John VII’s attempt to oust his grandfather and assume
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authority in Constantinople, though the attempt failed. Soon afterwards there were rumours in Thessalonike and Constantinople that the sultan was building ships, and that he intended placing Manuel II in charge of this force which ostensibly was directed against Sinop, although the Venetians suspected that its true aim was their possessions of Negroponte (Euboea) and Crete. Their fears were increased when, by 1393, Bayezid had annexed the beyliks of Aydin and Menteşe, subdued Karaman, subjugated Bulgaria and directed attacks against the Christian territories in the Aegean, Chios, Lesbos and Rhodes. Acquiring a foothold in the Peloponnese would not only have facilitated the eventual conquest of the province, but enabled him to launch a two-pronged attack on the Aegean islands. In the winter of 1393/4, after a meeting at Serres with his vassals, who included the Serbian princes and the Palaeologoi, Bayezid marched into central Greece, capturing the county of Salona (Amphissa), the last Catalan possession. On receiving the news of Timur’s advance into Syria, he veered north and laid siege to Constantinople, a siege that was to last for six years. At the same time, another army, especially recruited in Thrace and well equipped, was dispatched to the Peloponnese with orders ‘to spare nothing’.

During these desperate times, Manuel renewed his appeal to the west for help. He found a willing listener in King Sigismund, for with the conquest of Bulgaria, Hungary’s independence was also threatened by the Ottomans. Sigismund’s call for a crusade was answered by a number of European powers, particularly France. The venture ended in disaster at the battle of Nikopolis in 1396, Sigismund barely escaping with his life. The Turkish victory inevitably made the situation worse. In 1397 the Turks under Yakub Paşa invaded the peninsula, devastated the city of Argos and took its people into captivity.

The Venetian tragedy of Argos brought the realisation home to Theodore that in future he might not be able to defend his domains, although he had put up a valiant resistance at Leontarion on 21 June, forcing Yakub to beat a retreat.
Soon after that, the Turks besieged Corinth, leaving Theodore with no other option but to offer the castellany to the Hospitallers.\footnote{Manuel II Palaeologos, \emph{Funeral Oration}, pp. 167–3; Loenertz, ‘Pour l’histoire du Péloponèse’, pp. 254–7.} The move was of momentous importance for the fortunes of the Despotate, for the presence of the Knights in the area had an immediate effect: Corinth was spared from destruction and Navarrese incursions into Byzantine territory came to an abrupt halt. However, the renewed Turkish attack in 1399 and early 1400 compelled Theodore sometime early in the latter year to accept the new offer made by the Hospitallers to buy up the whole of the Despotate. There is no doubt that with the resumption of Turkish hostilities the Knights were anxious to strengthen their defensive position. The Hospitallers’ offer came at the right moment, and in fact fitted Theodore’s plans to use them as a lever to dislodge the Turks from the Morea, but always with the intention of reclaiming his possessions from the Knights once the Turkish danger had been removed.\footnote{Manuel II Palaeologos, \emph{Funeral Oration}, pp. 161–7.} However, the transactions did not proceed as anticipated. The inhabitants of Mistra rebelled, and Theodore had no alternative but to begin negotiations for the retrocession. On the other hand, his negotiations with the Hospitallers induced Bayezid to offer a truce, with the sole condition that the Hospitallers withdrew from the Peloponnese.\footnote{Manuel II Palaeologos, \emph{Funeral Oration}, pp. 205–7; Chalkokondyles, \emph{Historiarum}, pp. 97–8.}

Meanwhile, in 1399 the emperor renewed his appeal to the west for military help. France responded by sending Jean le Meingre, Maréchal Boucicaut with a small military contingent. His successes, even if limited, proved that a well-trained army could achieve much. He therefore advised the emperor to travel to Europe and personally appeal to the rulers. Having first reconciled with his nephew John VII, Andronikos VI’s son, whom he left in charge of the city, Manuel, accompanied by Boucicaut, set out on 10 December 1399 for his journey, which was to take him to Italy, France and England. John VII, too, like his uncle in the past, would make a number of attempts at a reconciliation with Bayezid, which would prove fruitless. Manuel remained in Europe until 1403 but, despite all the promises, adequate help was never realised.\footnote{For Manuel II’s journey see J. W. Barker, \emph{Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): a Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship} (New Brunswick, 1969), pp. 122 ff.; Donald M. Nicol, ‘A Byzantine Emperor in England: Manuel II’s Visit to London in 1400–1401’, \emph{University of Birmingham Historical Journal}, 12, 2 (1971), 204–25, repr. in Nicol, \emph{Byzantium: its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World} (Aldershot, 1972).} Aid came in a more or less accidental way from a different quarter – from Timur.
As a result of the defeat of the Ottomans by Timur at the battle of Ankara on 28 July 1402, the Ottoman state broke up. Aydın, Saruhan, Teke and Menteşe recovered their independence while the remaining part of the Ottoman state was competed for by Bayezid’s sons. The eldest, Süleyman, escaped to the European section, and signed a treaty in 1403 with Byzantium, the Serbian despot Stefan Lazarević and the Christian powers, including Venice and Genoa.\(^{200}\) As a result of the treaty, Thessalonike and a considerable territory in Chalkidike and the littoral of the Thermaic Gulf, all the land from Panidos on the Sea of Marmora to Constantinople and north to Mesembria on the Black Sea coast were restored to the empire. In addition, the status of vassal state and the yearly tribute were cancelled. In Anatolia Mehmed and İsa fought for control. Both, however, lost out to Süleyman who took Bursa in 1404. Süleyman in turn was to fall to another brother, Musa, who defeated and killed him in 1411. Byzantium was faced with a new threat. The sacred war against the Christians was openly taken up again.\(^{201}\) The Turkish armies attacked Thessalonike\(^{202}\) and overran Thrace, Thessaly and Serbia – places that had been ceded by Süleyman – and Musa’s envoy, İbrahim Paşa, was sent to Constantinople to claim the tribute which had been abolished since 1402.\(^{203}\) Meanwhile, Venice had concluded a treaty with Musa to safeguard its territories in Albania, Greece and the Aegean.\(^{204}\) Manuel was left to fend for himself. In July 1413 the situation changed once more, this time with the defeat and overthrow of Musa by another of Bayezid’s sons, Mehmed (1413–21). Despite occasional Turkish raids, Mehmed I conducted a policy of peaceful co-existence, with both the Byzantines and the Serbs.\(^{205}\) This was to last for almost nine years.

During this period, Manuel II’s aim was to consolidate his possessions in the Morea, as he had done earlier after the death of his brother Theodore I in 1407, during the minority of his own son Theodore II, who succeeded his uncle. After the peace treaty with Mehmed I, Manuel returned to the Morea in
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1415 via Thessalonike where his son Andronikos had now succeeded his uncle John VII. His main task in the Morea was to construct the defensive wall of Hexamillion across the isthmus of Corinth, a project in which Theodore had tried for years to involve the Venetians without success.\textsuperscript{206} Despite objections from some large landowners, the majority of the population, including the Albanians who led a nomadic existence and consequently felt more vulnerable to Turkish incursions, offered their labour or materials to ensure that the wall was speedily completed to provide safety to the inhabitants. Its completion, however, did not apparently please the sultan, though originally he seems to have given his consent.\textsuperscript{207} Aware of Mehmed’s attitude and the possibility that he might try to destroy the wall, Venice ordered its castellans of Coron and Modon to give every assistance to the emperor in the event of a Turkish assault on the Hexamillion.\textsuperscript{208}

This was an ominous sign. Soon after, freed from his campaign against Karaman, Mehmed turned his attention to the Aegean, ravaged the islands and attacked Venetian merchant shipping on its way from the Black Sea to Negroponte. Manuel II’s proposal for a concerted policy was never taken up, not even after the Turkish raids on the island which carried away 1,500 people into slavery.\textsuperscript{209} The Veneto-Turkish confrontation ended with the defeat of Mehmed’s navy off Gelibolu on 29 May 1416, followed by a treaty signed three years later.\textsuperscript{210}

For the Byzantines the situation deteriorated further with Mehmed’s death and the accession of his son Murad II (1421–44, 1446–51), who followed an aggressive policy reminiscent of that of his grandfather, Bayezid I. Manuel II’s elder son and co-emperor, John VIII, then in charge of the government, tried to use a Turkish pretender, Mustafa, who in 1416 had claimed to be a son of Bayezid I. Contrary to Manuel II’s advice to come to an understanding with Murad II, John opted to support Mustafa in his bid for the Ottoman throne. The attempt failed. Mustafa was captured and put to death.\textsuperscript{211}
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afterwards, Murad laid siege to Constantinople, but its walls proved invincible, for the cannons at the sultan’s disposal, supposedly German, proved ineffective. Faced with a new rival, his young brother, another Mustafa, Murad was forced to withdraw. 212

Though he had failed with Constantinople, Murad kept up the pressure. In the spring of 1423 his armies, under Turahan, invaded the Peloponnese, stormed the fortifications, destroyed the wall of Hexamillion and devastated the area. 213 Some months later the Byzantines succeeded in signing a peace treaty, according to which they became once more tributaries to the Turks. Despite the invasion, the Peloponnese showed tenacity to survive. The political continuity, maintained by Manuel II during the minority of his son Theodore II, and later by John VIII and Constantine IX, had given the Despotate new vigour. With the exception of the Venetian colonies, the rest of the Peloponnese was thus unified under Byzantine rule, despite Murad’s attack and the devastation of 1446; it was to survive until after the fall of Constantinople. 214

Ottoman pressure on both land and sea, however, remained relentless. Even the Hospitallers in Rhodes felt the impact and sought refuge in Venetian protection. In the summer of 1423 they offered Rhodes to the Signoria in exchange for territories of equal value, either in Negroponte or in the Peloponnese. 215 This proposal was never realised. Rhodes remained in Hospitaller hands until 1522. But in the same year Manuel’s third son, Despot Andronikos, then ruling Thessalonike, decided to hand over the city to the Venetians. 216 Such a solution was inevitably unacceptable to the sultan. Despite the prolonged diplomatic missions and the willingness of the Venetians to reach a compromise or even support a pretender, the attempt failed. On 29 March 1430 the city was captured. 217

With the capture of Thessalonike, the pressures on Constantinople increased. John VIII seems to have believed that salvation could come only from the west, to be accomplished through the union of the two churches – a

212 Sphrantzes, Cronaca, x, p. 22 § 2; xi, pp. 22–3 §§ 1–3 (Philippides, pp. 27–8); Chalkokondyles, Historiarum, pp. 231–3.
213 Sphrantzes, Cronaca, xii, p. 24 § 1 (Philippides, p. 28); Chalkokondyles, Historiarum, pp. 238–9.
214 Zakythinos, Le despotat, i, pp. 204 ff.
215 8.vi.1423: Thiriet, Régestes, ii, no. 1886, p. 204.
solution that in the past had been sought, unsuccessfully, by his predecessors Michael VIII and John V. Conditions looked promising. In contrast to the earlier position when any agreement presupposed the prior recognition of papal ecclesiastical supremacy, now, as a result of the western conciliar movement and the Council of Constance (1414), any decision concerning the union fell under the jurisdiction of the council, to which the pope had to adhere. This raised the hopes of the Byzantines that the doctrinal, ecclesiastical and liturgical differences between the two churches would be discussed at a council, as they had always insisted, on equal terms, and not dictated by the pope. Despite Manuel’s advice for caution concerning the union,\(^{218}\) John went ahead with his plan. On 24 November 1437 he travelled to the west with a large delegation. After protracted theological discussions and disputes, the proclamation of the union of the churches was issued in Florence on 6 July 1439.\(^{219}\) Instead of the much-hoped for help from the west against the Ottomans, the union, as Manuel II had predicted, brought internal dissension, and in addition alienated the Byzantines from the rest of the Orthodox world, in particular Russia.

After concluding agreements with Serbia, Hungary and Karaman, Murad II abdicated, leaving the throne to his young son Mehmed II. He returned almost immediately, however, to lead the Ottoman armies against the last combined, but inadequately prepared and non-coordinated, attempt of the Christian forces against the Ottomans under Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini. This force was defeated on 10 November 1444 at Varna. Two years later, once more back on the throne, Murad carried out attacks into the Peloponnese. His artillery destroyed the wall of Hexamillion, rebuilt only a few years before, and took 60,000 people into captivity,\(^{220}\) reducing the Despotate to a vassal state, and at the same time putting an end to the idea of a united independent Greek Despotate of the Morea under John VIII’s brother, Constantine. On the death of John, Constantine XI was crowned emperor in the Peloponnese on 6 January 1449, and two months later he arrived in Constantinople. Despite his ability, courage and tenacity he could not have saved the city. Constantinople lay like an island in the midst of an Ottoman ocean. The new sultan, Mehmed II (1444–6, 1446–51), was determined to succeed where his father had failed. An astute and outstanding tactician, he began his preparations by building the fortress of Rumeli Hisari on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus, by means of

\(^{218}\) Sphrantzes, Cronaca, xxiii, p. 82 §§ 5–7 (Philippides, p. 50).
\(^{220}\) Doukas, Historia Byzantina, xxxiii. pp. 222–3; 19.x.1447: Iorga, Notes et extraits, iii, p. 221.
which he encircled the city and kept control on the movements of ships. On hearing the news of this undertaking, the people in Constantinople knew that the end of the city had come.\textsuperscript{221}

Constantine XI’s appeals to the west produced some help but not enough to stem Ottoman progress. The west had no co-ordinated strategy against the Turkish advance. Each country viewed the question of Constantinople from the viewpoint of its own interests and ambitions, and success was therefore impossible. It remained up to individuals, primarily Venetians and Genoese, to make the last stand.\textsuperscript{222} The fortifications of Constantinople had in the past protected the city, but could not withstand the new artillery, built by the Hungarian Orban who, unable to sell his cannon in Constantinople, had crossed to the other side and offered it to the Ottomans.\textsuperscript{223} As Kritoboulos wrote, this ‘cannon decided the whole issue’.\textsuperscript{224} The city fell on 29 May 1453, followed by a three-day pillage and its accompanying destruction.\textsuperscript{225} Thus closed the history of an empire that had lasted more than a thousand years.

The pacification of Anatolia took four hundred years finally to be established, and this was brought about by the ability of the Ottoman Turks to impose their authority. The destruction and suffering that occurred in those intervening years, as a result of the vacuum of centralised political power, are documented by Byzantine historians, contemporary to the events. Though, inevitably, their narrative centres on the political, social and economic devastation brought about by the Turkic tribes, there are glimpses of strong relations developing between the two peoples, divided by language, religion and customs. As early as John II Komnenos’s reign, Choniates reports that the Christians inhabiting the islets of Lake Pousgouse (Beyşehir Gölü) became friends with the Turks of Konya, allied with them and ‘looked upon the Romans as their enemies. Thus custom’, as Choniates observes, ‘reinforced by time is stronger than race and religion.’\textsuperscript{226}

\begin{multicols}{2}
\textsuperscript{222} Besides the Byzantine historians on the conquest of the city, see also the eye-witness account of Nicolò Barbaro, \textit{Giornale dell’assedio di Costantinopoli 1453}, ed. E. Cornet (Vienna, 1856), tr. by J. R. Jones as \textit{Diary of the Siege of Constantinople} (New York, 1969).
\textsuperscript{223} Chalkokondyles, \textit{Historiarum}, p. 385.
\textsuperscript{225} In addition to the primary sources, see also S. Runciman, \textit{The Fall of Constantinople 1453} (Cambridge, 1961; repr. 1965); R. Browning, ‘A Note on the Capture of Constantinople’, \textit{Byzantion} 22 (1952), 379–86.
\end{multicols}
On another social level, offering an example of co-existence and assimilation in the opposite direction are the Axouchs – a family which held a distinguished position in the political life of the empire under the Komnenoi. The first Axouch, a Turkish boy, was given as a present to Alexios I following the peaceful surrender of Nicaea (İzmir) in June 1097 and the exchange of gifts between the emperor and the Turks. The young Axouch and John II, then both ten years old, were brought up together in the palace and became inseparable friends. Subsequently Axouch rose to the high position of grand domestic; his son Alexios, ‘an energetic man expert in military science, with a tongue as sharp as his mind and dignified in appearance’, acted as protostrator under Manuel I.\textsuperscript{227}

This ‘co-existence’, even as enemies, seems at times to have led the Byzantines to try to assess and acknowledge their opponents’ strengths. An example of this is Manuel II Palaeologos’s evaluation of the Ottoman success, in an attempt to identify Turkish strengths vis-à-vis Byzantine weaknesses. From his personal experience he considered that their achievement on the battlefield stemmed from the fact that not only were the Turkish army more numerous, but also, and more importantly, ‘they were brave, experienced in warfare, well-trained . . . gradually over a long period of time to bear the hardships and pains . . . when others would not have remained even in a friendly country producing all good things’.\textsuperscript{228}

This self-evaluation and rational exploration, reflected also in Manuel’s \textit{Dialogues with a Muterriz},\textsuperscript{229} derive from that long tradition of the classical world, for which Byzantium acted not only as a repository but also as an appreciative guardian of its inestimable value, to be transmitted to the west shortly before and after the fall of Constantinople. The question arises as to what extent this civilisation influenced the new power, the Ottomans, that rose on what had been the Byzantine Empire. To what extent can it be said that ‘the new society (Turkic-Muslim) differed from those of Asiatic steppe and of the Islamic Middle East because it arose in a Byzantine milieu’?\textsuperscript{230}

\textsuperscript{228} Manuel II Palaeologos, \textit{Funeral Oration}, pp. 158–9.
\textsuperscript{229} Trapp, \textit{Dialoge}, p. 5, the word deriving, as the editor notes, from the Arabic \textit{mudarris}.
\textsuperscript{230} Vryonis, \textit{Decline}, p. 1.
The period of Mongol rule in Anatolia, that is, roughly the century between the battle of Kösedağ in 1243 and the collapse of the Ilkhanid regime in the 1340s, if mentioned at all, is generally treated only as a brief preamble to the rise of the Ottomans. Even then, as in the nationalist histories of Russia and China, Mongol rule is seen as an unwelcome interlude that wrecked the country and left no formative traces. Rather, traditional Ottoman Turkish history arises seamlessly out of the history of the Seljuks of Rum, the principal, though latterly only notional, rulers of central Anatolia between their victory over the Byzantines at Malazgirt (Manzikert) in 1071 and their obscure demise in the early fourteenth century. By this time, one of the beyliks that was later the kernel of the Ottoman state was already in existence, among numerous others. According to Kafesoğlu, for example, this beylik ‘on the western frontier of the Seljuk state (sic), with regard to its moral fibre and organization, acquired many values from Seljuk Turkishness’ and ‘kept Anatolia as a Turkish motherland’.¹ At the other end of the spectrum, comparisons have been drawn between the formation and development of the Mongol and Ottoman empires, with no reference at all to the Mongols in Anatolia.²

Others have been ready to examine in more detail late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Anatolian society, in which the Ilkhanate was the dominant power. Numismatists in particular have recently taken another look at the traditional view, and have emphasised the continuity of Ottoman from Ilkhanid

---


practices. Yet here too, interest in the Mongols arises solely in connection with the circumstances in which the Ottoman state emerged. It is difficult, with hindsight, to look at the Mongol period without regard to later Turkish history.

Just as the historians of Turkey impose their own vision on Anatolian affairs, so the historians of the Ilkhanate (primarily an Iranian regime, in a geographical sense at least) have tended to ignore the situation in Anatolia unless it impinged directly on events at the ārd (Mongol court). Rum has been dubbed the Mongol ‘Wild West’: a land of opportunity, perhaps, only loosely under central control, and even a province where the ‘unprecedented mildness’ of the Mongol regime has been noted. To evaluate such views, we should treat the affairs of Anatolia as part of the larger Ilkhanid state. This underwent various phases of development, which furthermore had similar corollaries in other provinces of the Ilkhanate too, such as Fars and Khurasan.

It is important to recall that the Ilkhanid regime was centred in Azerbaijan in north-west Iran, orientated east rather than west, and essentially uninterested in the border regions with Byzantium. Mongol relations with the Christian west remained on the whole cordial; of far more concern were the borders in south-east Anatolia, with Mamluk Syria, and in the north with the Golden Horde.

The territories of Mongol Rum were not contiguous with those of modern Turkey in Asia Minor. To the north, hugging the eastern Black Sea coast, the Christian kingdom of Trebizond (Trabzon) maintained its independence until after the fall of Byzantium. East of Erzurum was the province of Greater Armenia, including the important summer quarters at Aladağ, scene of the coronation of several Ilkhans. Lesser Armenia (Cilicia) continued to cling to a separate existence south of the Taurus mountains throughout the period, while further east Diyar Bekr (Diyarbakır) was a separate governorship and remained culturally and politically more bound up with the Arab lands of


Upper Mesopotamia. These regions come only briefly into focus in the story of Ilkhanid Anatolia. The Turkicisation of the southern peripheries of Rum was nevertheless one of the long-term results of the Mongol invasions and of the changes that they brought with them in the ethnic composition of the population, in the form of semi-nomadic Turkoman pastoralists who in time came to exercise political power throughout the region.\(^5\)

The successors of Chinggis Han

The orderly succession of Chinggis Han’s son Ögedei in 1229 ensured that his remarkable victories would not be wasted. Almost immediately, Ögedei began the process of consolidating and extending the Mongol conquests in the west (which had not affected Anatolia directly), sending his general Chormaghun to subdue the fugitive Harezmşah Celaleddin Mingbarni. His disruptive exploits in the region round Lake Van no doubt helped to draw the Mongols towards Seljuk territory: a possibility that the sultan, Alaeddin Keykubad (1220–37), had anxiously anticipated in his exchanges with Celaleddin’s envoys.\(^6\)

Chormaghun is reported to have pillaged the country around Sivas in 1232, but he soon withdrew to the Mughan plain; the Mongols were preoccupied at this time with subduing Georgia. A more diplomatic approach came from the Great Han in 1236, inviting the Seljuk sultan to submit. Keykubad agreed but soon afterwards died. His successor, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II (1247–53), acquiesced, but by the time a military governor (basqaq) from the Han arrived, Ögedei himself was dead and the Mongol general Baiju had annihilated the Seljuk army at Kösedag, on Friday 26 June 1243.\(^7\) Mongol dominion in Anatolia was now a military reality, not just a diplomatic nicety.

Throughout the territories they encountered, the Mongols either accepted the submission of the existing regime or replaced it with direct rule. Ögedei’s summonses had gone out to other rulers whose lands had not been affected by the first wave of Mongol invasions, particularly in southern Iran, where
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local dynasties (often Turkish atabegates) controlled Fars, Yazd, Kirman and elsewhere. Their very number well illustrates the fragmentation of the former Seljuk Empire to which the Mongols fell heir.

The situation in Anatolia was complicated by the fact that the Seljuks had now suffered military defeat, despite having submitted in principle. Baiju was probably acting on the orders of Batu Han, son of Jochi, in order to acquire additional territories on his own account, taking advantage of the death of Ögedei in 1241 and the incapacity of his commander Chormaghun. Anatolia thus came initially under the aegis of the Mongols of the Deşti-Kıpçak, later popularly known as the Golden Horde, and only more loosely under the distant authority of Qaraqorum.

The survival of the Seljuk sultanate was due to the statesmanship of the vezir, Mühezzibeddin, who negotiated surrender on terms that at least ensured its continuation under Mongol suzerainty, if at a cost. This was made up in cash and kind, largely in the form of animals, to be paid annually to the Mongols’ envoys (ilchi); some reports estimate the tribute at 400,000 dinars. Shortly afterwards, a follow-up embassy to Batu confirmed Sultan Keyhüsrev II as governor on his behalf, with the titles Nizamü’l-mülk and Salah al-‘alam.

The reign of Keyhüsrev coincided with the long interregnum before the succession of Gûyük son of Ögedei as Great Han in 1246. In the next decade, preoccupied with their own difficulties, the Mongols did little more than confirm or reconfirm the status of a sequence of would-be sultans, as well as their officials. The Mongols were masters at exploiting the divisions that now emerged, such as had long been endemic in the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional Seljuk state.

Keyhüsrev’s death in 1246 left three sons who were, disastrously, all minors and thus quickly under the influence of different factions at court. The new vezir, Şemseddin Isfahanli, installed the eldest son, ızzeddin Keykavus II (aged eleven) on the throne, flanked by his younger brothers. The vezir also married ızzeddin’s mother, the daughter of a Greek priest.

---

Anatolia under the Mongols

Keyhüsrev had previously intended to send the middle son, Rükneddin, to the Great Han and eventually, after several summonses, he was sent to attend the *quriltay* (assembly) to elect Gıyık in August 1246. In Qaraqorum, Gıyık appointed Eljigidei to be his representative in the west, responsible for Anatolia, Georgia, Armenia, Aleppo and Mosul, so that the local rulers would be directly answerable to him for their tribute (that is, Batu’s agents would be bypassed). We thus see Gıyık attempting to assert his authority over this outlying part of the empire. He ordered Rükneddin to be installed as sultan of Rum (as Kılıç Arslan IV) in place of his elder brother ˙Izzeddin: partly, perhaps, to undermine the regime installed with the blessing of Batu Han. Gıyık gave Rükneddin the daughter of the general Eljigidei and the support of his army. Eljigidei seems to have got no further than Khurasan, but Rükneddin returned with a Mongol force 2,000 strong to assert his claims.

Despite the divisions between those looking to the Byzantines and the pro-Mongol faction, whose orientation is expressed in a new coinage minted at Sivas in 646/1248, the Seljuk officials’ first reaction to Gıyık’s decree was an attempt to maintain the unity of the sultanate. In practice, however, the rivalry between ˙Izzeddin and Rükneddin (and more importantly, their supporters) could only be resolved by force, and at a skirmish near Aksaray (Aqsaray), Rükneddin was defeated and captured, on 14 June 1249. Thereafter, if not before, a compromise was reached, that all three brothers were to rule jointly. The Han’s envoys were involved in all these deliberations.

A formal division of territory, if not authority, probably preceded the decision to try joint rule. On the return of the embassy to Gıyık, Konya, Aksaray, Ankara, Antalya and the west were allocated to ˙Izzeddin and Kayseri, Sivas, Malatya, Erzincan and Erzurum to Rükneddin. Alaeddin, the youngest brother, was given sufficient estates from the crown lands (*amlak al-khassa*) for his

---


needs. This was the first of many similar divisions, and an arrangement typical of Mongol government in other provinces of the Ilkhanate. Ultimately, it became consolidated into a geopolitical reality that endured until the Ottoman expansion of the early sixteenth century united the western and eastern Anatolian lands.

The joint rule of the brothers evidently worked well until the death of Karatay, Izzeddin’s right-hand man, in November 1254. By this time Gûyük had died and Möngke son of Tolui had been elected Great Han (July 1251), thanks to Batu Han’s support. This could only increase Batu’s control over the empire’s western territories, although the actual demarcation of authority between Batu and Möngke’s representative, Arghun Aqa, is not clear.

The same pattern of events was now repeated, as a series of Mongol envoys summoned Izzeddin in person to Möngke’s court. It was eventually decided to send the youngest brother, Alaeddin, son of the Georgian princess Tamara. All sources agree that Alaeddin was treacherously murdered in the course of this mission, though accounts differ as to the timing; at any rate, a group of emirs accompanying the embassy on behalf of Izzeddin had succeeded in negotiating his confirmation as sultan, when news arrived of his resistance to Baiju (see below), whereupon, the rival party urged the claims of Rûkneddin. Möngke’s solution, later to be applied by Hülegü, was another formal division of the sultanate.

Meanwhile, in the absence of Alaeddin’s embassy, the two elder brothers quickly fell out. A second, more serious confrontation took place and Rûkneddin was again defeated. This time, despite another showy reconciliation, he was imprisoned, first in Amasya and later, allegedly as a result of the wretched climate there, transferred to Burghlu (Uluborlu) in the south-western frontier region (uç).

If the administration of the sultanate remained largely intact in this first phase of Mongol sovereignty, it was inevitably vitiated by the divisions of

16 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyûa, pp. 604, 608 (Houtsma, pp. 275, 277); Ibn al-‘Ibri, Ta’rikh mukhtasar al-duwal, p. 263.
18 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyûa, pp. 615–16 (Houtsma, pp. 282–3); Ibn al-‘Ibri, Ta’rikh mukhtasar al-duwal, p. 264; Aqsara’i, Musamarat, p. 40; Anon., Tarih-i Al-i Saljuq, p. 97; Cahen, La Turquie, p. 239.
authority among the Seljuk princes and their advisers, and by the readiness of ambitious officials to resort directly to the ordu for advancement. Such missions had another purpose: to petition against the increasing burden of Mongol demands. Kadi İzzeddin Razi, in his second vezirate (1250–6), was sufficiently alarmed by the importunities of Baiju and other noyans (commanders) to send the emir-dad (chief of justice), Fahreddin Ali, to Qaraqorum with lavish presents and a petition. Alaeddin’s embassy to Möngke also had as one of its objectives to complain of the destruction being caused by Baiju, which according to the Mamluk historian Baibars al-Mansuri was particularly associated with a devastating raid distinct from the invasions of 1243 and 1256. Fahreddin Ali’s mission, returning via Baiju, received some assurances and thereafter the ilchis were willing to reduce their demands.19

After his success (which is not reflected in any surviving coin issues), İzzeddin received embassies from neighbouring rulers, both Christian and Muslim, notably the Caliph. Some semblance of recovery may have been anticipated, when Baiju unexpectedly moved once more into Anatolia in force, on the orders of Möngke Han, to make room in the Mughan plain for Hülégü’s troops.

The formation of the Ilkhanate under Hülégü

Möngke’s despatch of his brother Hülégü to consolidate the western conquests inaugurated a new phase of Mongol rule. At first, given the concord between the Jochids and the Toluids, Baiju’s migration into Anatolia might have strengthened the Golden Horde’s connections with the province. Before long, however, a chain of events brought Anatolia under the jurisdiction of the Ilkhanid regime, opportunistically established by Hülégü after the death of Möngke in 1259.

Initially, Baiju merely requested pasturelands, but Sultan İzzeddin rashly determined to resist him. He was possibly justified by the seeming violation of the Mongols’ agreements as to the nature and extent of their demands on the province. The vezir, Kadi İzzeddin, advocated cihad (jihad) against the Mongols, while Sultan İzzeddin perhaps refused Baiju’s request for winter quarters in the belief that his forces were actually fleeing from Hülégü. Finally, the two sides met near Aksaray on 15 October 1256 and the Seljuk forces

19 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya, pp. 617–18 (Houtsma, pp. 283–4); Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, pp. 26, 29 (under 655/1257). For other embassies, see also Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 97 (to Batu), 100 (to Möngke); Aqsara’i, Musamarat, p. 41 (to Güyük and Möngke); Cahen, La Turquie, pp. 238, 240; cf. Jackson, William of Rubruck, p. 247.
were defeated, in part as a result of the defection of their commander, Arslan Doğmuş.\textsuperscript{20} The sultan fled first to Konya, then to Antalya and so on to İznik (Nicaea).

Baiju was deflected from his intention of sacking Konya by heavy cash payments and, according to Ef láki, by the sanctity of the city protected by the famous Sufi Celaleddin Rumi and the tomb of his father. Baiju’s wife may also have interceded for the city. Nevertheless, the fortifications were dismantled. The blessing of a very mild winter saved the province from exactions that it could not support. Baiju made his winter quarters near Aksaray and established military governors (\textit{shihnagan}) in the town. After the flight of İzzeddin, his brother Rûkneddin Kılıç Arslan, always recognised as sultan by the Mongol authorities, was freed from his confinement in Uluborlu and officially installed in Konya on 6 March 1257.\textsuperscript{21}

This was only a temporary resolution of the situation. In the spring, Hülegü received Baiju in Hamadan and called him to account for his actions since replacing Chormaghun. He was then sent back to prepare his forces for the coming attack on Baghdad.\textsuperscript{22} When İzzeddin heard Baiju had left the province, he returned and entered Konya (2 May 1257), accompanied by Byzantine troops.\textsuperscript{23} Some time thereafter, Rûkneddin also resorted to Hülegü, who was again in Hamadan in the autumn and received the sultan graciously, with a 	extit{yarlīgh} (decree) bestowing on him the sultanate throughout the country. Back in Erzincan, the rivalry between the two brothers continued. It was apparently at this stage, late in 1257, that the embassy to Möngke Han, originally led by Alaeddin, returned, leading to a division of Seljuk territory, but under the single vezirate of Baba Tuğrāi.\textsuperscript{24} Coins minted in Sivas by Rûkneddin, in Şavval and Zilkade 655/October–November 1257, reflect his reinstatement, but the antagonism persisted and even intensified. İzzeddin had considerable success in reoccupying central Anatolia, and was able to seize Tokat, seat of Sultan Rûkneddin’s chief supporter, Muineddin Süleyman, of whom we will shortly


\textsuperscript{23} Ibn Bibi, \textit{Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya}, pp. 626–7 (Houtsma, p. 290); Anon., \textit{Tariikh-i Al-i Saljuq}, p. 98; Aqsara’i, \textit{Musamarat}, p. 49, says he had 3,000 troops, but cf. S. Vryonis, \textit{The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century} (Berkeley, 1971), p. 234.
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hear more. Defeated at first, Muı̈neddin resorted to the ordu for reinforcements. These, under the command of Alı̈ncak Noyan, installed Rükneddin at Niksar. Rival issues of coinage in Sivas on a monthly basis in the first half of 656/1258 appear to confirm the broad sequence of these events given by Ibn Bibi, although all other sources date Alı̈ncak’s intervention only after Hülegü’s Syrian campaign, a version that otherwise has much to recommend it.25

It is not surprising that Hülegü considered it necessary to enforce the division established by Möngke. After the capture of Baghdad, he summoned the two brothers to an audience near Tabriz in August 1258. On the intercession of his chief wife, Dokuz Hatun, Hülegü pardoned ˙Izzeddin for resisting Baiju’s advance into Anatolia, and confirmed him as ruler of the region from Kayseri down to the coast at Antalya, with Konya as capital. Rükneddin had the former Danışmend region from Sivas to Sinop and Samsun, with the capital at Tokat or Kayseri. As important was the appointment of officials to the two princes. A coin issued for Rükneddin in Sivas in Ramazan 656/September 1258 confirms the settlement.26

The two sultans remained with Hülegü until his invasion of Syria, no doubt to ensure the tranquillity of Anatolia, which was on his flank. They returned to their own territories after the capture of Aleppo in February 1260. Even now, however, the division of rule was neither final nor prolonged. The new administration attempted to extract the debts and tribute owed to the central government. ˙Izzeddin, in Konya, resisted and Alı̈ncak Noyan was sent after him. The sultan again fled west, this time to Byzantium and ultimately to permanent exile under the protection of Möngke Temür, ruler of the Golden Horde.27 In the interval, he started negotiations with the Mamluk sultan, Baibars. On 13 August 1261, Rükneddin was at last installed by the Mongols in Konya as sole sultan; this effectively marked the end of aspirations for it to be an independent sultanate.28

26 Rashid al-Din, Jamiʿ al-tawarikh, p. 1023; Aqsaraʾi, Musamarat, pp. 66–2; Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 98–9; Ibn al-ʿIbri, Taʿrikh mukhtasar al-duwal, p. 278 (allocations reversed); Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-ʿalaʾiyya, p. 632 (Houtsma, p. 394); Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, p. 47; Rudi Paul Lindner, personal communication (coin).
More had been resolved than the long-running Seljuk succession crisis. In the first place, Anatolia was now subject to the control of the Ilkhans in Iran rather than the Golden Horde in the Caucasus. The change was accompanied by a new financial dependency. While in Tabriz, the two sultans had been obliged to incur massive debts to the Mongol treasury to equip themselves for Hülegü’s Syrian campaign. These were to be repaid by an annual sum (mukataa) of 20 tuman of cash, 3,000 gold bars, 1,000 horses and mules and 500 rugs and satin textiles. The vezir, Baba Tuğra, also acquired debts that his estate was unable to meet when he died soon afterwards. His dues were added to the sultans’ repayments. Furthermore, the Mongols appointed an official to ensure the payment of these obligations, thus entering more directly into the affairs of the province. The first of these agents, backed by the authority of ilchis sent by the ordu, was Taceddin Mutez, son of a former envoy to the Seljuks from Celimeddin Harezmşah. It was his efforts to raise the sums due from Sultan İzzeddin that set off the sequence of events leading to his flight to Byzantium. Taceddin acquired Kastamonu (formerly held by Baba Tuğra) as his personal landholding, and the revenues of Aksaray and Develi were included within the tax estimates for Kastamonu to ensure that he had sufficient resources from which to recoup Tuğra’s bad debts. Taceddin, although a Mongol agent, soon became remarkably integrated into the local elite.

The continued striking of coins at a variety of mints in the name of Rûkneddin must be associated with the need to produce tribute for the Ilkhanid court, rather than any claim to independence by the sultan. Issues from Antalya, Konya and Lu’lu’a (Lulon), from 660/1262 onwards, however, would also have underlined the unification of the sultanate after years of division. As elsewhere in the peripheral provinces of the Ilkhanate, coins were not minted in the name of the ruling Ilkhan until much later.

The reunification of the sultanate also saw the consolidation of the chief offices of state. Rûkneddin was assisted by Muineddin Süleyman, son of the former vezir Mühezzibeddin. Muineddin became Pervane (the sultan’s right-hand

29 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala‘iyya, pp. 633–4 (Houtsma, p. 295); Aqsara‘i, Musamarat, pp. 62–3, 73.
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man) after Baiju’s second invasion in 1256 and continued to enjoy his confidence. In his efforts to undermine ˙Izzeddin’s independence of the Mongols, the Pervane invited Fahreddin Ali, former emir-dad and naibüs-saltana (na’ib al-saltana, sultan’s deputy) to ˙Izzeddin, to become vezir, a post he held with only one interruption for nearly thirty years. Both officials had travelled more than once to the Mongol courts and were viewed with trust, and both knew on which side their bread was buttered. Fahreddin’s landholdings included Karahisar and his children acquired Kütahya, Sandıklı, Gorgorum (Ararim) and Akşehir, the basis for the later emirate of Afyon (Karahisar), while the Pervane gained Tokat, Amasya, Nişar and later on, Sinop as essentially autonomous territories.31 Fahreddin was responsible for the Persianisation of the financial accounts, which had probably been kept in Arabic until this point because of their essentially mathematical notation. Nevertheless, this underlines the Iranian character of the provincial administration under the Ilkhans.

Whether the Mongols had a much increased physical presence in Rum is difficult to assess. Baiju’s arrival in 1256 was a large-scale movement of people: he came with his troops, animals, women and children. It is less obvious in what numbers they stayed. Many doubtless accompanied him on the Baghdad campaign. At some stage soon afterwards, Baiju was eliminated, but evidently not before being put in command of the right wing of the forces mustering to invade Syria. Given his association with the Jochids, he was surely a victim of the hostility already developing after the fall of Baghdad among the rival components of the Mongol army, which led to a mass migration of the Golden Horde’s troops into Mamluk territory in 1262. Mamluk sources say that Baiju became a Muslim and was removed when Hülegü had become aware of his reluctance to join the attack on Baghdad.32 His descendants continued to play a role in Rum, most notoriously his grandson Süleмуş, who fled to Mamluk territory with his brother Qutqutu in the reign of Ghazan.33


33 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-’ala’iyya, p. 625 (Houtsma, p. 289 (Besutai)); Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 113, 205 (Qutqutu, Süleмуş); Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tawarikh, pp. 210, 1025–6; P. Jackson, ‘Bayju’, Encyclopaedia Iranica, iv, pp. 1–2; Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, p. 160 n. 13; cf. Cahen, La Turquie, p. 252.
More generally, it is not clear to what extent the Mongols maintained troops permanently in the province. When Alıncak was sent to deal with Sultan Izzeddin, he brought his army from Erzincan, and spent the winter of 1260–1 in the Karahöyük area near Akşehir. After the consolidation of the regime of Sultan Rükneddin, Nabşı is named as the main commander, with summer quarters near Kirşehir; he is still mentioned as an officer in Rum up to the summer of 1276. His son Baltu later rebelled in the time of Ghazan Han (see below).  

Initially, at least, Mongol troops were perhaps present only in small numbers, and scattered in their pasturelands, as in the summer of 1262, when a Karamanid uprising was dealt with by the Seljuk army alone. When Prince Ejei assembled a force of approximately 10,000 troops for a raid on northern Syria in October 1271, it consisted of contingents of 1,000 under Iqbal (or Aqbal) son of Baiju and others, and 3,000 under Nabşı, whom Ejei picked up locally, in addition to the 3,000 he brought with him. These figures suggest that, at this time, the largest units in Rum were hazaras (1,000s) rather than tumans (10,000s). For many years, Seljuk forces under the sultan or other leading officers were apparently sufficient to undertake military operations. Otherwise, Mongol reinforcements were sent as required from bases further east. It is likely that their numbers increased only as their involvement in the province deepened.

Unlike some other regions they conquered, central Anatolia was conducive to a permanent Mongol presence. Geographically and climatically, the province formed a continuum with Azerbaijan and Arran and suited the Mongols' transhumant lifestyle, providing the steppe vegetation and high pastures needed to support their alternation between winter and summer quarters. Aladağ, north of Lake Van, in particular, was a favourite summer retreat for the Ilkhanid court and several rulers were crowned there.

Whether backed up by a considerable military force or not, the divisions in the existing ruling elites, as in Georgia, Fars and Kirman, made it easy for the Mongols to divide and rule, and intervene in local affairs as arbitrers of dispute. The chance soon arose once more in Anatolia. The Seljuk state, though retaining government, could only operate by the sanction of the Ilkhan.

35 Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 71–2.
36 Al-Yunini, Dhayl, ii, pp. 457, 467.
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The career of the Pervane, always closely associated with the Mongol camp, represents the outcome of this trend. His success is inseparable from the demise of the sultanate, which was effectively bypassed when Hülegü appointed him governor at the end of his reign. Having already orchestrated the flight of İzzeddin, he now engineered the execution of Sultan Rûkneddin, probably shortly after Hülegü’s death in 1265; the abbreviator of Ibn Bibi’s chronicle gives the date as 9 February 1266, but coins exist for the new sultan already in 663/1265. With the connivance of the Mongol commander, Nabşı, the Pervane installed instead Rûkneddin’s four-year-old son, Gıyaseddin, as Keyhüsrev III.39

Eflaki portrays Celaleddin Rumi’s jealousy over the sultan’s favour towards a rival Şeyh as the cause of Rûkneddin’s fate; more importantly, he recognises that this was the end of the Seljuk sultanate.40 The Pervane’s willingness to eliminate Rûkneddin, by now in his twenties, throws a certain light on his interest in the fiction of Seljuk legitimacy, and the extent of his personal ambition in serving the Mongols. This question came to a head in the next reign, at a time when the wider importance of the province brought it more closely to the attention of the Ilkhanid government.

The integration of Rum into the Ilkhanate at the expense of the Golden Horde created a new set of relationships between the regional powers. Most significantly, Hülegü’s invasion of Syria opened up a war zone that remained active for the next half-century and made Mamluk territory a place of refuge for Anatolian dissidents. Sultan İzzeddin’s brief contacts with the Mamluks provide an early example of this. Shared trading interests and a common hostility to the Ilkhans encouraged a commercial and diplomatic axis to develop between Egypt and the Deşti-Kıpcak, which to operate was forced to rely on the sea route through the Bosphorus and thus on Byzantine goodwill. As the Byzantines had to regulate their own relations with the Mongols, both in Crimea and Anatolia, such co-operation was not always forthcoming. The imprisonment of Sultan İzzeddin after taking refuge with his former comrade, Michael VIII Palaeologus, in 1261 is a case in point, though the actions inspired either by himself or by his entourage inflamed what was already a diplomatically awkward situation.41 On the whole, the Mongols’

40 Eflaki, Manaqib al-‘arifin, i, pp. 146–7.
41 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya, pp. 636–9 (Houtsma, pp. 297–8); Aqsara’i, Musamarat, p. 75; Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, pp. 93–4; Pachymeres, Relations, I, pp. 300–8; cf. P. Thorau, The Lion of Egypt: Sultan Baybars I and the Near East in the Thirteenth Century,
relations with Byzantium were friendly, and before their conversion to Islam perhaps even more so than those of the Seljuks before them; in both cases, it was the intervening Turkomans, resistant to central control, who generated instability and provoked military confrontation. This was as true of the western borders as of those with Syria.

If the Mamluks represented the greatest external threat to Mongol dominion in Anatolia, the Turkomans provided a permanent source of internal disruption. This had already been demonstrated on the eve of Baiju’s first invasion, in the uprising of Baba Resul in 1239–40, and they continued to take advantage of the dissensions within the Seljuk sultanate and of the Mongols’ imperfect grip on the province. Initially, Turkoman unrest could be linked with pretence of loyalist support for Seljuk legitimacy. The Turkoman chief of Denizli (Ladik), Mehmed Bey, initially a supporter of Sultan İzzeddin, was eliminated in 1262, after refusing to present himself to Hülegü. As a result, Mongol control was extended right up to the Byzantine borders. Around the same time, Seljuk forces achieved some success in pacifying the region occupied by the Karmanids, who had attacked Konya; as a result, many Turkomans fled to Syria. Subsequent succession crises, or interruptions in strong central government, continued to provide a pretext for the Turkomans to fish in troubled waters, and relentlessly to establish their autonomy in the peripheries of the central plateau.

The threat posed by the combination of Mamluk and Turkoman power was first fulfilled in the reign of Abaqa and was directly responsible for the fall of the Pervane and the ever-tightening grasp of the Mongols on the province.

Abaqa Han and the end of the Pervane, 1265–82

In so far as he strove to maintain the style and even substance of Seljuk rule, the Pervane can be said to have continued to represent the Seljuks while dominating the new puppet sultan, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III. The early years of his government seem to have been peaceful: that is, if no news is good news.

42 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya, pp. 583–4 (Houtsma, pp. 263–4); Cahen, La Turquie, p. 229.
Ostensibly nothing had changed, though Aqsara’i records the introduction of a new allocation of the taxes of Rum into four categories – *yavit* (?yunit, horses), *na’lbaha* (army expenses), *mal-i yam* (courier service) and *mal-i buzurg* (central treasury) – which suggests a reorganisation of the finances of the province, increasingly geared towards the needs of the Mongol forces. The first decade of the child sultan’s rule saw a great continuity in the main offices of state. The Pervane, of course, held the reins of power and Fahreddin Ali retained the vezirate. Taceddin Mutez continued to represent the interests of the *ordu*.44

These men dominate political life for some time to come. They are all found together in a cameo scene in Celaleddin Rumi’s *medrese* (school) in Konya, where they are given a virtuoso performance. While eager to court Rumi’s blessing, however, they were less enthusiastic about his followers, whom only Rumi himself could keep under control.45

It is in this period that there occurred the late cultural florescence within the Seljuk sultanate, under the Pervane’s auspices. Many of these officials, like those of the previous generation, such as Kadi İzzeddin and Celaleddin Karatay, undertook pious works in and around Konya and elsewhere: among them, the Atabekiyye of Arslan Doğmuş, the Pervane’s *medrese* in Kayseri, his *hanekah* (dervish lodge) in Tokat and his *han* (caravansary) on the route to Sivas, and the *medrese* built by Taceddin Mutez in Aksaray, together with his *hanekahs*, hospitals and *ribats* (fortified posts, caravansaries) throughout Anatolia.46 This swansong of the Seljuks was also the last phase of the pre-eminence of Konya. Although it was still the seat of the Seljuk state and of the *naibüs-saltana*, Eminüddin Mikail, the centre of gravity was already moving further east, to Kayseri and the pasturelands located between these cities. The Pervane’s own association with Tokat and the former Danişmend territory, nearer to the Mongol court, also necessarily reduced Konya to something of a backwater, a trend emphasised first by the development of Sivas and later by the threat of the Turkomans. The building work of Fahreddin Ali neatly encapsulates this process, as his pious foundations move progressively eastwards, from his *han* at İshaklı (1249), to *medreses* at Akşehir (1250), Konya (mosque, 1258), Kayseri (1267) and Sivas (1271). With the passing of this generation, architectural patronage

greatly declined, their successors having neither the prestige nor the resources to commission work on such a scale.47

Eflaki’s hagiography, and Celaleddin’s work itself, is rich in allusions to the religious situation in Anatolia at this period, with its references to Christians, dervishes of various hues, and to the Mongols’ own attitudes to Islam. One incident, involving the murder of a Mongol soldier, which led to the flight of Hüsameddin Bicar, the subaşı (commander, government agent) of Harput, and his son Bahadır to Mamluk territory in the summer of 1276, suggests that Islam was slow to make progress among the Mongol troops enduring the hardships of military service, camped away from the main centres of population.48

Hüsameddin Bicar was also allegedly involved in the murder near Erzincan in 1276 of the Armenian bishop, Mar Sarkis, who was apparently inciting Abaqa against the Muslims. The Ilkhans’ Muslim subjects still suffered real or imagined dangers, whether from the hostility of the Mongols themselves or from the machinations of the newly confident Christians. The Pervane was implicated in both murders, possibly already anticipating Sultan Baibars’s future protection.49

The later careers of Bicar and Bahadır were typical of many émigrés to Egypt: they were well received and became part of the Mamluk establishment, before dying within a year of each other, in 1281–2.50 They were part of a stream of refugees from Ilkhanid territory at this time, due to the rapid escalation of the conflict that had been initiated by Hülegü.

Simmering hostility to Mongol rule, combined with the attraction of the impressive state-building achievements of the Mamluk sultan Baibars, generated a crisis that darkened the seemingly rosy Seljuk sunset. It is unclear whether increasing Mongol interference in Anatolia was the cause or the result of Baibars’s invasions. The Pervane is usually blamed for the Mamluk intervention, but hostility to the Mongols was certainly widespread among the leading officials of the rump Seljuk government and it is not certain whether the Pervane was orchestrating or merely responding to this sentiment, which he was unable anyway to control. Another view might be that the Pervane’s

49 Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, pp. 455–6; Ibn Shaddad, Ta’rikh, p. 169 (February 1277, sic); Aqsara’i, Musamarat, p. 100.
50 Al-Yunini, Dhayl, iv, pp. 107, 168.
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fall was one of the objectives of the various conspirators, among whom there was otherwise little unity of purpose.

Baibars, too, had his own ambitions, and a desire for security on his northern borders; his belligerence also enhanced his image as protector of Islam against the pagan Mongols. The upshot was the only significant confrontation between the two powers on Anatolian soil, at the battle of Elbistan on 16 April 1277.

This produced an upheaval in the internal affairs of Rum, and a permanent extension of Ilkhanid administration into the province, not least to secure their control over a regime that could not be relied upon for loyal resistance to the Ilkhan’s enemies. The ability of the Mamluks to project their power into the heart of Anatolia established a precedent and a warning; it also encouraged the view of the Mamluk sultanate as a source of support for Anatolian dissidents. Mamluk interests in the region endured and indeed expanded until the eve of the Ottoman conquests in the sixteenth century. Remarkably, however, the Seljuk sultanate itself continued to survive under Ilkhanid protection. Perhaps the Mongols realised that it served a purpose as a focus for local loyalties. In view of the persistent divisions within the Seljuk house, support for different members of the family remained a useful device for ensuring that such local loyalties did not again become strong enough to threaten Mongol rule.

The build-up to Baibars’s invasion is described in great detail in the Mamluk chronicles, which are also valuable for the light they shed on the internal affairs of Rum. By at least 1268, the Mongol command seems to have devolved on to Samağar Noyan, in conjunction with Ejei (Ajai), Abaqa’s brother and the first of many Chinggisid princes to form a close association with the province. As noted earlier, Ejei brought 3,000 troops with him in 1271 for a raid on northern Syria.

Shortly after this action, Samağar and the Pervane entered into diplomatic contact with Baibars, a correspondence that rapidly developed into a treacherous collusion between the Pervane and the Mamluk sultan. In the course of this, the Pervane made frequent visits to Abaqa’s ordu, where he schemed against Ejei, whom he saw as a threat to his own independence of action. Ejei was eventually recalled and some of his supporters executed, in September 1275, though he himself survived into the reign of Arghun. His descendants reappear in Anatolian affairs, as we shall see.

51 Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, pp. 157–78.
Samağar Noyan too was replaced by a new commander, Tuqu son of Ilge Noyan, the Celayir, as is witnessed by his signature in 1274 on an annex to the vakıf document of Nureddin b. Caca at Akşehir, previously guaranteed by Samağar in 1272. Tuqu’s appointment did not remove the pressure of Mongol demands on the Pervane, for he had instructions to review the taxes in the province, and as a result of a tour of the region, he forwarded large sums back to the central treasury.\textsuperscript{54}

Tuqu was instrumental in the restoration to favour of Fahreddin Ali, who had been dismissed from the vezirate after the start of the Pervane’s reign. His offence was to have responded sympathetically to correspondence from his former master, Sultan İzzeddin, now in uncomfortable exile in Crimea. Since there was little (at least in the sympathetic account of Ibn Bibi) to suggest that the correspondence was treasonable, this was evidently a pretext. The family of Ibn Hatir were particularly prominent in the manoeuvring against him, but whether this implies the formation of pro- and anti-Mamluk factions, rather than simple internal jealousies, is not clear. Fahreddin slowly resumed some of his functions before going to the ordu to seek reinstatement. This was granted, and his sons returned to their commands in Ladik, Khunas and Develikarahisar on payment of substantial annual tribute, including 2,000 balish (ingots of silver) and 700 horses.\textsuperscript{55}

In June 1276, the Pervane and Fahreddin accompanied Sultan Gıyaseddin’s sister, Selçuk Hatun, to the ordu as a bride for Abaqa. It is not certain that he married her, but she is named as one of the wives of Arghun, who evidently inherited her from his father. Whether or not this was at Abaqa’s instigation, it was consistent with the Ilkhanid policy of forming marriage ties with the provincial rulers in their Iranian territories.\textsuperscript{56}

Two months later, the Pervane returned from the ordu with a large force under the command of Toda’un, the grandfather of Emir Çoban, who later played an important role in Anatolia. The army sent by Abaqa seems also to have been accompanied, at least initially, by one of his younger brothers. This

\textsuperscript{54} Rogers, ‘Recent Work’, pp. 145–6; Ibn Shaddad, Ta’rikh, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya, pp. 661–2 (Houtsma, p. 310); Aqṣara’i, Musamarat, p. 100; Ibn Shaddad, Ta’rikh, pp. 153–4; Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, p. 147; al-Yunini, Dhayl, iii, p. 165; Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tawarikh, p. 1152; cf. Lambton, Continuity and Change, pp. 271–88.
force had first to deal with the revolt of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, the beyler-beyi, who either on his own initiative or with the Pervane’s approval, colluded openly with the Mamluks while the Pervane was at court. Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu had taken the young sultan to his ikta at Niğde and despatched his brother Ziyaüddin Mahmud Hatiroğlu to get help from Baibars, accompanied by relatives of most of the leading Seljuk officials, who were thus constrained to do as Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu wished. These ‘defectors’ arrived in Syria in July 1276; when news arrived in October of the execution of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, Baibars detained the hostages, who were not released until after his death. After the defeat and trial of Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu, the Mongols retired to their winter quarters at Delice and Kırşehir.57

The following spring, 1277, they congregated at Kayseri before moving to meet the Mamluk advance on Elbistan. Qutu, the grandson of Baiju, who had wintered near Niğde, failed to appear, suggesting a continuing disaffection with the Ilkhanid regime among the former partisans of the Golden Horde. The ensuing battle, in which the Seljuk forces played only a limited role, proved to be a triumph of Mamluk military training and organisation and the Mongols were routed, leaving Baibars’s way to Kayseri open. Having sat on the Seljuk throne and been acknowledged on the coinage and in the Friday sermon on 22 April 1277, Baibars headed for home. He was disappointed in the Pervane’s failure to live up to his promises and anxious to avoid being caught by a larger Mongol force under Abaqa himself, which had set off immediately on news of the defeat. Baibars took with him numerous defectors from Seljuk Rum, who were no doubt well aware that troubled times lay ahead. Very few Mongols were reported as captured; most, including the commanders, Tuqu, Uruqtu and Toda’un, were killed.58

Defeat by the Mamluks and the repeated failure of the Ilkhans to avenge this and other humiliations must have undermined their authority in Anatolia and had negative effects on their rule in the province, such as distrust of the local officials and the need to recoup their military losses by financial extortion. Nevertheless, it was the Turkomans who posed the greatest threat to the stability of Mongol rule, not the supporters of the old regime.

57 Ibn Bibi, Al-Awamir al-’ala’iyya, pp. 666–9 (Houtsma, pp. 314–16); Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 103–6, 108; Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, p. 102; Ibn Shaddad, Ta’rikh, pp. 161–2, 163–5; Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, pp. 147–8; al-Yunini, Dhayl, iii, p. 170.
Even before the Mamluk intervention, Şerefeddin Mesud Hatiroğlu had encouraged the Karamanids to assert their independence; attempts to subdue them had to be postponed until after Baibars’s withdrawal. Seeing Konya almost abandoned by the leading officials, to meet the Mamluk threat, the Turkomans seized their chance. A young man nicknamed Cimri, claiming to be a son (which one, varies) of the former sultan İzzeddin Keykavus, was brought to the attention of the Karamanid chief, Mehmed Bey. Thus armed with a spurious legitimacy, the Karamanids marched on Konya, took control of the city and killed the naibüs-saltana, Eminüddin Mikail (May 1277). Cimri was sworn in as sultan and the famous order was given that government decrees should only be in Turkish. Mehmed Bey was made vezir and the Turkomans chiefs all given appointments. The citadel, which had held out, was won over by ‘40,000 oaths’. Mehmed Bey sought the hand of Rükneddin’s daughter for his protégé.59

Abaqa’s rapid arrival on the scene after the defeat at Elbistan revealed his determination to reassert his authority. Both the sultan and Fahreddin Ali hastened to pay their homage, as did the Pervane. The latter’s actions, however, had made his fate inevitable; the question of his role in the murder of Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan was also brought up against him. Nevertheless, his execution in Aladağ in September 1277 left a void in the government of Rum, a void that entailed a closer Mongol supervision of the province.

On his withdrawal, Abaqa appointed his brother Kongurtay to overall command; his first task was to restore order ‘up to the shore of the western sea’. As Kongurtay advanced, Cimri fled to the western uc, whereupon the Mongols harried the Karamanids in the region round Larende (Karaman) and Ermenek and ultimately killed Mehmed Bey, his brothers and cousin, in October 1277. The troops then retired to winter quarters in Kazova near Tokat.

The following spring, 1278, Fahreddin Ali, anxious to regain his territorial possessions without the inevitable damage that would have been caused by the Mongol forces, secured Kongurtay’s permission to act on his own. Together with the Seljuk sultan, he attacked Cimri near his base at Karahisar. Ibn Bibi reports the dubious loyalty of the Seljuk troops, and observes that the Turks of the Germiyan beylik of western Anatolia, despite their superficial appearance of loyalty to the Mongol regime, never acted to honour their agreements. Nevertheless, on this occasion they supported the operations and captured

Cimri, who was flayed alive (10 June 1278). As a result, the Turkomans were pacified.  

Events were soon to show that this effort of suppression was only partly successful. From this time on, the Turkomans were a permanent threat to Mongol rule and encroached on the territories under central control.  

Tuqu and Toda’un, killed at the battle of Elbistan, were replaced with Kuhurgai and the former commander, Sama˘gar Noyan, who provided an element of continuity in the Mongols’ military presence in Rum. He is mentioned as a representative (naib) of the regime and commander of a tuman until the reign of Arghun; as in other such cases, his descendants maintained an enduring association with the province. However, it was Kuhurgai who was more active in the new arrangements.  

Alongside the military measures taken to restore order, Abaqa despatched his chief minister, the sahib-i divan, Şemseddin Cüveyni (Juvaini) to regulate the affairs of Rum. At winter quarters in Kazova in 1277–8, while actions were continuing against the Turkomans, Cüveyni sent despatches round the disturbed areas such as Kastamonu, Sinop and the uc, eradicating irregularities, setting reasonable tax assessments and restoring confidence. As the repayments on the debts incurred by Baba Tu˘grai, as well as the capital sums and interest demanded by the Mongol ortaq (commercial partnerships) from the agents of the Divan had become excessive and unpayable, Cüveyni removed this burden from the Seljuk sultanate’s finances and instead added Erzincan and its dependencies to the other inj¨u (crown) lands directly under Mongol administration, in a legal (şer‘i) transfer. Cüveyni also introduced the characteristic Mongol commercial tax, the tamgha, into the province. These moves taken together show a desire for greater incorporation of Anatolia into the Ilkhanid fiscal regime, accompanied by a reduction in the responsibilities and scope of the local Seljuk administration.

Cüveyni had already become involved in Rum in 1272, founding the Çifte Minare Medresesi in Sivas. The inscriptions, which mention neither Abaqa  

---
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nor the Seljuk sultan, betray Cüveyni’s private initiative and probably private interest alert to the need to develop this important nodal point in the regional trade network. 64

All power of decision now lay with the ordu, as did the appointment of officials. In 1280, Mücireddin Muhammad arrived from court to administer the Mongol injü (crown) lands and tax farms of the province (mukattaat-i amval-i mamalik) on behalf of the central Divan. He took this office over from his father, Taceddin Mutez, who had died in 1274, along with many others of the old guard. 65 A new era was beginning, and one in which the affairs of Rum would soon be caught up in the turmoil at the heart of the Ilkhanate. The Seljuk sultanate was again affected by these divisions. The loyalist tinge of Cimri’s ‘revolt’, however opportunistic, showed that the Seljuk name could still attract a following. The Mongols could try to harness this sentiment as well as the Turkomans.

The relative success of the pretender Cimri may have encouraged an attempt by a genuine claimant, whom Ibn Bibi calls the ‘heir apparent’ (vali ‘ahd). Sultan İzzeddin, who had fled to Byzantium in 1261, was rescued from incarceration by Batu Han’s grandson, Möngke Temür, who welcomed him and gave him Urbai Hatun, a daughter of Berke Han, in marriage. He then enjoyed a cheerless exile in Crimea. This suggests the Golden Horde had not entirely abandoned its interest in Anatolian affairs. In 1280, on his deathbed, İzzeddin encouraged his oldest son, Mesud, to take up his inheritance, but Mesud was not so keen to take on his father’s widow, Urbai Hatun. His desire to escape from her is light-heartedly given as one of his motives for leaving for Sinop, though she seems to have caught up with him later.

Learning from the experience of his middle brother, Rükneddin Geyumers (or Melik Siyavuş), who had slipped off to Anatolia before him and was later to cause many disturbances, Mesud presented himself directly to Samağar Noyan, who sent him to the Ilkhan. He was welcomed by Abaqa and granted an income drawn on Amid (Diyarbakır), Harput, Malatya and Sivas, while apparently remaining in Erzincan. Following news of the Mongols’ defeat by the Mamluks at Homs (October 1281), Mesud’s nephew, Alaeddin son of Feramurz, arrived in Karamanid territory, where he was taken by the Turkomans to Larende and
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proclaimed ruler. Loyalist forces from Niğde, however, caused him to flee to Cilicia. He did not re-emerge till later (see below). 66

Sultan Gıyaseddin was meanwhile in Erzurum when news arrived of further Karamanid and Esrefoğlu (another Turkish beylik) rampages round Konya and Akshehir. He marched against the rebels and was reinforced by Mongol forces under Kongurtay. The Karamanids were defeated and pursued to the area of Ermenek and Mut, where they were attacked and besieged, until Kongurtay was recalled to Kayseri, leaving the work of subduing the Turkomans once more unfinished. 67 His brutal activities were a source of concern for the Mamluks, as raised in Sultan Qalawun’s response to the Mongol embassy of September 1282, led by Kutbuddin Şirazi (kadı of Sivas) and other Rumi officials. 68

It is likely that Kongurtay had previously left the province on the news of the death of his brother Abaqa (31 March 1282). The disputed accession of another brother, Ahmad Tegüder (1282–4), initiated a prolonged period of succession crises and rivalries at the centre of the Ilkhanid state. These were reflected in the provinces and particularly in Anatolia, which became to Tabriz what Syria was to Cairo: an excellent base from which to bid for independence.

Dissension within the Ilkhanate, 1282–94

Mesud son of İzzeddin spent some time at the ordu, until Ahmad decided on a new division of the sultanate, as in the days of Hülêgê. Rum was assigned to the incumbent sultan, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III, and the coast (vilayat-i Qamar al-Din, that is, the Karamanid region in the south) to the newcomer, Mesud. 69 The latter was welcomed in Erzinçan by Mücireddin Tahir, who not only received confirmation of his father’s former office as Mongol agent in the province, but was also appointed Mesud’s naibüs-saltana. The veteran


69 Aqsara‘i, Musamarat, pp. 137–8; Anon., Tarîkh-i Al-i Saljuq, p. 107.
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Fahreddin Ali retained the vezirate. These two worked for the sole sultanate of Mesud, who was elevated to the throne for the first time on 20 June 1283.70 In Rum as elsewhere, it was now becoming desirable to try to foster unity rather than division in the provinces, lest one party turn to a rival loyalty for Ahmad’s nephew, Arghun.

This is exactly what happened in Anatolia. It was perhaps to restore his waning influence, or because he had little choice in the matter, that Gıyaseddin became embroiled in Kongurtay’s challenge to Ahmad. Together with Arap son of Sama˘gar, Kongurtay had supported his brother’s election at Maragha and shortly afterwards, in July 1282, he was sent back to Anatolia with a large army, which carried out the brutal expedition against the Karamanids already noted. But the following summer, Kongurtay, either pursuing his own ambitions or supporting the cause of Arghun, made a bid for power in association with the Seljuk sultan. Summoned by Ahmad Tegüder, apparently in response to Mamluk complaints about his actions, he left Gıyaseddin at Erzurum on his way east. When he reached the ordu, however, Kongurtay was betrayed and killed, on the Mongol New Year’s day, 18 January 1284. A month later, Gıyaseddin also died, or was eliminated, in Erzincan.71

The upheavals in Anatolia found similar expression in other provinces of the Ilkhanate. Once Arghun had overcome his uncle (August 1284), there was a return to the policy of divide and rule, as in Kirman.72 The marriage connections of the Ilkhans with the provincial rulers were a complicating element in the formation of local interests and factions.

In Anatolia too, women played a role in political intrigue. Under Arghun, the mother of the dead Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev asserted the claim of his two young sons and another division of the kingdom was agreed: they were installed on the throne in Konya on 17 November 1284 and again, with the backing of the Karaman and Eşrefo˘glu Turkomans, on 4 May 1285.73 With this division,

the old associations were reversed: the descendants of Rūkneddin were now established in the west, while the heirs of ʿIzzeddin (represented by Mesud) were in the east.

The division lasted only a few months, however, as Mesud’s supporters, assisted in turn by his mother, were able to gain Arghun’s agreement to his restoration as sole sultan. His young rivals, who had presided over a period of extortion in Konya, were eliminated. Mesud was enthroned in Konya for a second time on 2 June 1286. He was sultan only in name: all power remained in the hands of the Mongols’ agents (shīhna).

On his accession, Arghun had sent his brother Geyhatu and uncle Hūlegū as governors in Rum, based in Erzincan, where Fahreddin Ali was responsible for their provisioning (taghar). He was held personally liable for a shortfall in the needs of the army. The Mongols’ exactions, which depleted all the wealth he had acquired over fifty years, made him weary of life. In fact, Fahreddin did not long survive; he died in Akshehir and his body was taken to Konya for burial on 22 November 1288. Mūcireddin had meanwhile gone to the ordu, where he secured the emirate (imarat) of Rum for himself and the vezirate for Fahreddin Kazvini, who had briefly been vezir in the new central government of Emir Buka. ʿAṣṣaraʾi paints a shocking picture of Kazvini’s incompetence and greed: he allegedly did not even know what the cizye (poll-tax on non-Muslims) was. Among the accusations against him is the endless refrain that he brought into the province whole trains of foreigners.

The new vezir’s credentials indicated that he held the province of Rum as qabala, that is, as a tax farm, a sure recipe for over-exploitation of the sort already initiated in Fars. With the approval of the Mongol emirs, Mūcireddin proposed an administrative division of Anatolia, so that each might be answerable for whatever prosperity or damage was caused. Mūcireddin chose the former Danişmend territory, from Sivas and Tokat to Kastamonu and the coast up to Samsun and Sinop, while Kazvini received the original share of Sultan ʿIzzeddin, now defined as running from Kayseri to the edge of the uc. Both men were accompanied by Mongol emirs, respectively Duladay Yarghuchi (interrogating

---

74 Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 111–12; Cahen, La Turquie, p. 279; Baibars al-Mansuri, Zabdat, p. 239.
76 ʿAṣṣaraʾi, Musamarat, pp. 149, 152–3. Contrast the view of Kazvini’s cousin, Mustaufi, Guzida, p. 479.
Not surprisingly, the contrast between the two administrations quickly became clear. Kazvini faced considerable difficulties in the turbulent southwestern regions, where the involvement of the Karamanids and Eşrefoğlu in the ambitions of the mother of Sultan Gıyaseddin, noted earlier, created a breakdown of control from the outset of Arghun’s reign. This was compounded by the corruption of local officials in Konya. Almost immediately, Mesud had to face a revolt of the Germiyan, until this point more or less docile. In a prolonged series of campaigns in 1286–7, the government suffered several reverses. Mongol forces were led at first by Baltu son of Nabši, and a joint Seljuk-Mongol army was later led by the elderly Fahreddin Ali, in the last year of his life. Following inconclusive reprisals against the Germiyan, Mesud and the vezir were instructed by Arghun to attack the Karamanids, while the Eşrefoğlu tried to take advantage of the momentary discomfort of the Germiyan. Eventually, in July 1288, peace was restored with all three groups.

As the Turkoman uprisings continued, it is not surprising that Kazvini’s administration, whether incompetent or otherwise, struggled to regulate a region that was barely under military control. The Karamanids eventually once more offered homage to Sultan Mesud and the vezir at Konya on 16 May 1290, while not failing to impress upon Kazvini the size of their forces. The previous year, the beylerbeyi Azizeddin defeated the Germiyan and killed their leader, Bedreddin Murad, near Denizli (Ladik).78

After the recall of his uncle Hülegü in 1286, Geyhatu had remained in Anatolia, advancing through Sivas and Kayseri to Aksaray, to the consternation of the populace. However, this time, his army of 20,000 troops was well behaved and provisioning them became a source of profit for the local economy (and tax returns). Presumably at around this date, his wife, Padşah Hatun, carried out some work at the Çifte Minare Medresesi in Erzurum, if indeed she was involved in it at all.79

Geyhatu’s presence supported the efforts of the Mongol tax officials to restore Konya’s revenues. Kazvini’s days were numbered, however, and various portents heralded his fall, not least an ominous encounter with Sultan Veled, the son of Celaleddin Rumi. Soon afterwards, Samağar, still the senior Mongol

emir in Geyhatu’s entourage, received orders to bring Kazvini to Sivas for investigation. Found guilty, he was sent to the ordu at Aladağ together with Mucireddin, who was spared on the intervention of Şeyh Kutbuddin of Konya. Fahreddin Kazvini, however, was executed on 2 September 1290, thanks not least to a certain Şemseddin of Konya rehearsing all his ‘innovations’. Among these was an attempt to manipulate the price of salt and sheep. Mucireddin’s Mongol associate, Duladay the yarghuchi, reached the ordu a month later, together with the Celayirid emir, Akbuğa, who was then sent back to Rum.

Kazvini’s demise coincided with the rise to power at court of the Jewish vezir, Sa’d al-Daula, who had replaced the Mongol Buka in June 1289. He sent Şemseddin Ahmed Lakuşi and the sons of Kilavuz to replace Kazvini and Mucireddin. Samağar seems to have been anxious to spare the populace from the even worse depredations of the sons of Kilavuz. Now with the title of yarghuchi, Samağar’s just and benevolent regime was extremely popular in Konya, at least; Arghun briefly made him and Sultan Mesud his representatives (vilayat) in Anatolia, evidence of the greatly reduced status of the sultanate. Arghun also sent the resourceful Urbai Hatun to Konya as a wife for Mesud, who was enthroned a third time on 2 October 1290. A new dispensation was announced, presumably confirming the vezirate of Lakuşi and the Kilavuz regime.

Geyhatu was rather quickly ordered to send Samağar back to the ordu and to assume control of the province himself, now with the support of the Celayirid Akbuğa and the valued services of the müstevi (mustaufi), Nasireddin Hoca, the son of Yavlak Arslan. Fahreddin Kazvini’s attempted registration of private property, gardens, water sources and trade corporations in Konya, evidently for taxation purposes, which had previously caused such consternation, was now carried through under Nasireddin Hoca’s reassuring auspices. On 29 November 1290, Geyhatu made a triumphal entry into Konya, where his regime appears to have been astonishingly benevolent, especially in contrast with his later actions. His respect for Muslim customs and concern for justice are depicted in an ideal portrait by the anonymous author, no doubt as a result of his patronage by Nasireddin Hoca. Geyhatu’s close identification with the province and his

80 Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 118–19; Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 158–62; Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tawarikh, p. 1178.
81 See esp. the bitter view of Mustaufi, Guzida, pp. 598–9.
82 Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 156–7 (Sa’d al-Daula), 159–60 (Samağar); Anon, Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 119–20; Baibars al-Mansuri, Zubdat, pp. 168–9 (Urbai Hatun’s career on reaching Rum); Cahen, La Turquie, p. 284.
preference for remaining there was a major factor in the instability of his brief reign when he succeeded to the Ilkhanate.

Arghun died on 9 March 1291 and an envoy was quickly sent to Rum to summon Geyhatu from his winter quarters there. However, several emirs, including the veteran Samağar and the rising star, Taghachar, had second thoughts and began to favour Arghun and Geyhatu’s cousin, Baidu. Forewarned, however, Geyhatu moved rapidly east. Support for the reluctant Baidu fell away and Geyhatu was elevated to the throne near Ahlat on 22 July.\textsuperscript{84}

Taghachar’s fears that Geyhatu’s election as Han would favour the Anatolians with whom he had associated during his governorship of the province were soon proved correct. Taghachar himself was disciplined and his \textit{tuman} was given to Ejei Tutaqa’ul, the former associate of Fahreddin Kazvini.\textsuperscript{85} The Celayirid family of Ilge Noyan were also favoured: Geyhatu’s chief wife was Ayše Hatun, daughter of Tuqu who was killed at the battle of Elbistan in 1277. Next was Dundi Hatun, daughter of Akbuğa, Tuqu’s younger brother. Two of Tuqu’s sons would soon receive important positions in Anatolia.

By the end of August, Geyhatu was ready to return to Rum, on reports of Turkoman uprisings and a situation that had deteriorated rapidly in his absence. He had left a certain Fahreddin Mesud in charge overall, with a different governor in each town. The sultan was in Kayseri; his brother Melik Siyavuş was persuaded by his entourage to take control of Konya. It was an ideal opportunity for the Turkomans once more to pursue their own rivalries and independence. Preoccupied elsewhere, Sultan Mesud was unable to prevent the Turkoman chief Halil Bahadır from sacking Konya.\textsuperscript{86} After a number of further engagements, forces commanded by Melik and by Fahreddin Ali’s grandson made the fatal error of pursuing the Karamanids to Larende, where they were defeated. The sultan appealed to Geyhatu, and when news of his arrival in Kayseri reached Konya, at the end of October 1291, there was rejoicing.\textsuperscript{87} However, the clemency of his earlier governorship was now transformed into the most vicious brutality.

Dividing the army into two, Geyhatu sent one half to Akşehir and himself attacked Karamanid territory, laying waste Ereğli and Larende and killing all in his path, before moving against the Eşrefoğlu. He then assaulted Denizli


\textsuperscript{85} Vassaf, \textit{Tajziyat}, p. 260.


(Ladik) and moved on the Menteşe. By the end of the year (December 1291)
strings of captives were entering Konya and a reign of terror began; the eighteen
days the Mongols were camped outside the city seemed longer than eighteen
years. Geyhatu spared Konya itself, however, perhaps as the result of seeing
Celaleddin Rumi in a dream. During this short period, two further assaults
were carried out against the Karamanids, before Geyhatu left for Kayseri. 88

Geyhatu’s absence in Rum was causing disquiet at the ordu, as the chiefs
wondered how he could exert effective control while residing at a distance
of two months’ journey away from court. Rumours of his defeat and death
at the hands of the Karamanids were circulated by Taghachar and Sadreddin
Zanjani, with a view to installing an alternative, Prince Anbarji son of Möngke
Temür, but the truth of Geyhatu’s successes and welfare was confirmed before
the prince could be implicated. In the spring of 1292, the returning Ilkhan was
met at Erzurum by his loyal officers; on 29 June 1292, a second coronation was
carried out at Aladağ, in accordance with Mongol custom, with the sanction
of the Great Han, Qubilai. Shortly afterwards, news arrived of the Mamluk
expedition against Qal’at al-Rum; the Mongol forces sent to relieve the fortress
arrived too late and it passed into Mamluk hands. Geyhatu spent the summer
in Aladağ and after recovering from a serious illness, went to Arran for the
winter. Sadreddin Zanjani was forgiven and appointed vezir, with the support
of the new senior emir, Akbuğa the Celayirid (18 November 1292). 89

Among his rivals for the post was Şemseddin Lakuşi, whose efforts in Rum
had evidently led to his dismissal, probably at the same time that Samağar was
recalled to the ordu. The main plank of his policies was the sale of divani (state)
lands to the ownership of the administrators themselves, in the belief that the
estates would be better run in private hands and generate more tax revenue
than under state mismanagement. This was merely part of a long-term process
of the transfer of land into private ownership. 90

The pointlessness of Geyhatu’s violence in Rum was quickly revealed, as
the Turkomans resumed their raiding as soon as he had left the province.
The Eşrefoğlu briefly held Kavala (Gevele, north-west of Konya), ‘the key to
Anatolia’; the Karamanids seized Alanya (‘Ala’iyya) and read the hutbe (Friday
sermon) there in the name of the Mamluk sultan, al-Ashraf Khalil. 91

88 Anon., Tarihk-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 127–8; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, pp. 491–2; Eflaki,
89 Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tawarikh, pp. 1193–5; Vassaf, Tajziyat, pp. 261–2, 264; Baibars al-
90 Mustaufi, Guzida, pp. 479–80 (Fakhr al-Din Ahmad Lakushi); Cahen, La Turquie, p. 310.
91 Anon., Tarihk-i Al-i Saljuq, pp. 128–9 (Kavala); al-Jazari, Hawadith al-zaman, tr. J. Sauvaget
The rather ambiguous activities of Sultan Mesud’s brother, variously referred to as Melik, Siyavuş and Rükneddin, eventually took the form of outright revolt, centred in Safranbolu (Burghlu). The emirs of Kastamonu took his part, and as a result Geyhatu despatched a joint force of Persian and Mongol forces to deal with the uprising. The Seljuk troops were led by Sultan Mesud and other senior government officials, who were fortunate to fight through to Osmançik, before returning in victory to the capital.92

On leaving Anatolia after his whirlwind tour of destruction, Geyhatu had appointed the restored Mücireddin Tahir as his naib, Sahib Necmeddin as vezir and Taştımur Hatayi (Taştemür Khita’i) as governor (iyalat-i vilayat). Their command was effective from Erzurum to the coast at Antalya, except that officials everywhere began to collect the taxes on their own behalf and regulate their own affairs, with numerous petitions to the ordu. Taştımur, like Fahreddin Kazvini before him, held Rum as a tax farm (qabala) and his arrival with legions of Khurasanis brought more stormy times for the long-suffering inhabitants of Konya, who endured the notorious qubchur (poll-tax) and other exactions until it became impossible to continue, and Taştımur was arrested.93 However, he was still identified as governor (hakim) of Rum at the time of Sūleimis’s revolt of 1298–9.

New appointments in 1293 do not seem to have improved the chaotic administration of the province, characteristic of Geyhatu’s government in general. Two of Akbuğa’s nephews, sons of Tuqu, received important positions in Rum: Hasan Bey was responsible for dalay (state) and Taiju for injü (crown) revenues, apparently under the continuing overall control of Mücireddin, to whom the revenues were actually paid. He became representative (naib) not only of the Seljuk sultan, Mesud, but also of the Ilkhan. This new organisation arrived in Anatolia with a full complement of hangers-on and redundant supporting functionaries.94 As at the centre, the multiplication of officials and their alleged incompetence led to the formation of factions and the pursuit of private interests, spurred on by the insecurity of office.

At court, Sadreddin Zanjani was able to do much as he pleased, and was given a free rein to intervene in the provincial governorships. Among the measures he took was the dismissal of Hasan and Taiju from their supervision of the injü estates. As in Fars, he probably merged these crown revenues with state income (dalay), removing the distinction between them. When, in

94 Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 180–2; Vassaf, Tajziyat, p. 265.
October 1293, Hasan and Taiju attacked Sadreddin’s misappropriation of state funds, Geyhatu gave his total support to the vezir.\(^95\)

The effects in Rum of this direction of affairs at the centre can only be imagined. The continuing insubordination of Sultan Mesud’s brother Siyavuş did nothing to help the establishment of a stable administration, and drew Mongol forces into the province once more in support of the sultan. On the news of the approach of Baltu son of Nabşı, Siyavuş fled to Demirli Hisar, where Baltu, however, impressed by his youthful looks, gave him his daughter in marriage. Shortly afterwards, news arrived of Geyhatu’s death at the hands of the partisans of Baidu, in March 1295. Hasan son of Tuqu went over to Baidu and as a result was later spared, but Akbuğa and Taiju were killed.\(^96\) While Anatolia’s importance remained undiminished, the affairs of the province would from now on stand in a different relationship with the central government.

**Direct rule, 1295–1335**

Baidu’s reign was too brief for him to establish an administration in Anatolia. In local sources, it is depicted merely as a period of chaos and anti-Muslim oppression, to strengthen the contrast with the reign of Ghazan Han that followed.\(^97\)

Ghazan’s victory over Baidu in 1295 is normally presented as a turning point in Ilkhanid government, ushering in a period of administrative reform, a revival of Islamic norms and the extension of central control over the empire. The events recorded in Anatolia, however, are, by and large, revolts against central authority, not just by the Turkomans, but by senior Mongol commanders, who saw the province as a place to make or restore their own fortunes. As Sümer correctly observes, Mongol dominion in Anatolia during the time of Ghazan Han was in its weakest phase.\(^98\)

Baidu sent Taghachar, who had already betrayed Geyhatu, together with the former vezir, Sadreddin Zanjani, to Rum, to get them out of the way. Pretending to head there, they had instead gone over to Ghazan. Once enthroned, Ghazan confirmed Taghachar as governor of Anatolia, also thinking it was best to have him far from court. He was despatched to his post in November 1295,

---


\(^97\) Aqsara’i, *Musamarat*, pp. 185–6.

apparently without a supporting force. The nature of these appointments itself reveals a changed view of Anatolia as a distant province and even a place of exile, rather than a prestigious posting for senior members of the Ilkhan’s family. However, as it was not securely controlled, this distance became a disadvantage, and Taghachar became the first of many Mongol commanders who sought to use Anatolia as a base for his own independence. Others, such as Ildar son of Ejei, saw it as a place of refuge. He fled to Rum with 300 men in January 1296 and finally went to ground in the Erzurum region before being caught and executed.99

Meanwhile, Taghachar was thought to have been implicated in the rebellion of Prince Süge in western Iran, and once in Rum he started to make trouble on his own account. He installed himself in Tokat, where he quickly alienated the army commander, Arap son of Samağar. Arap, who is named as governor of Sivas at around this time, retired to his own summer pastures. Taghachar went to Delice, where he was besieged by Baltu son of Nabşi and was finally captured and handed over to Ghazan’s agents.100

No sooner was Taghachar removed than Baltu himself was tempted to rebel. His long association with the province made him the most senior commander there, especially after the death of the veteran Samağar, whose son Arap was still young. Baltu’s defiance of Ghazan’s repeated summonses was apparently encouraged by Ildei son of Kongurtay, who, however, was exposed and executed in September 1296: yet another Chinggisid prince to perish at the outset of Ghazan’s reign.101

Two months later, Ghazan sent the new senior emir, Kutlüşah, with three tumans to deal with Baltu. Following a bloody encounter with the local forces of Arap son of Samağar in the plain of Malya near Kirşehir, Baltu fled and laid an ambush for his pursuers, led by Abışga (destined to remain in Rum throughout Ghazan’s reign). The next day, the main army, including forces under Arap and Sülemiş the grandson of Baiju, arrived and defeated Baltu, who fled to the uc. Many of his supporters trusted in Karamanid help to cross into Cilicia, but were massacred. Neither did Baltu obtain the help from the

---

Anatolia under the Mongols

Turkomans that he had hoped for. After various indecisive engagements with Sülemiş, he also fled to Cilicia. However, he was handed over to the Mongols and at last executed in Tabriz (14 September 1297). He never had sufficient support to make a viable bid for independence.

Once more, as in the case of Gıyaseddin and Kongurtay earlier, the Seljuk sultan became embroiled in these events. Mesud appears to have lent himself willingly to Baltu’s cause, perhaps in the hope of relaxing his subservience to the ordu. He had, in fact, been quite active since his installation by Arghun and retained at least nominal control of the Seljuk forces, though these were frequently insufficient to maintain internal security. On Baltu’s flight, Mesud surrendered to Kutluşah and was pardoned and brought to the ordu, where Ghazan ordered him to be confined in Hamadan, probably in May–June 1297.

The administration of the province was meanwhile in uproar. Aqsara’i lays at the door of the new sahib-i divan, Cemaleddin Dastgirdani, responsibility for a series of arrangements that brought further ruin to Anatolia, but as Dastgirdani held office for only a month in October 1296 and was replaced by his old adversary Sadreddin Zanjani, the latter was in fact in control of the government during and after Baltu’s revolt. A fourfold administrative division was introduced, each under the responsibility of one of the chief officers of government. There was also a further proliferation of appointments, characteristic of Mongol administration in general: four müstevis in the Divan, two to administer the dalay lands and another two for the injü. Melik Pahlavan Ghuri was appointed to ensure that the heavy impost of 60 tumanı fixed on the Mongols’ agent, Mücireddin, were collected, and then tried to mediate when Mücireddin used his influence to restore his position as naibüs-saltana. At the outset of Ghazan’s reign, a possibly similar fourfold division, together with a drive to send surplus revenue back to the central Divan, was also put in place in Diyarbakır.

Another senior figure, Kur Temür the yarghuchi, was sent to revoke the transfers of private property carried out by Lakuş, and to reclaim them for the central Divan. He had previously been sent by Ghazan, even before becoming Ilkhan, to raise money from the injü lands in Fars, but had been resisted by the
local tax-farmer. In Anatolia, too, he faced widespread unrest and petitions and soon returned to the ordu after his instructions were rescinded. Landowners were confirmed in their possessions but also in their liability for the 60 tumans, to be divided across the provinces. Part of the proceeds was paid to the treasury, but part was given to the tax-collectors of Rum, as a favour. One problem facing the administration was the loss of tax registers; some had been looted during the revolt of Taghachar, and others were later conveniently blown away and lost during a great storm near Konya, thus saving the historian, Aqsara’i, from an awkward investigation.106

After the defeat of Baltu and submission of Sultan Mesud, the sultanate was bestowed on Mesud’s nephew and long-time rival, Alaeddin b. Feramurz, who was last seen in Karamanid territory in 1281 (see above). His elevation to the sultanate was perhaps to reward the Turkomans for their lukewarm support for Baltu, though Celaleddin Rumi’s followers claimed it was due to the intervention of the atabey (tutor, regent), Meceddin (Majd al-Din). Alaeddin returned to Rum, arriving in Konya on 20 October 1297; he was formally enthroned two days later.107 Sülemiş, now commander in chief, evidently learning nothing from Baltu’s failure, but, as a grandson of Baiju, perhaps giving expression to a persistent desire for independence from the Ilkhanate, rose in revolt himself. Spreading false rumours about events at the ordu, he killed his subordinates, mustered support from the uc and the Syrian borders, and took command of the troops stationed in the plain of Kazova.

Ghazan received news of the insurrection in November 1298, while wintering in southern Iraq in preparation for an invasion of Syria. The following spring, he despatched Kutlusah and Meceddin via Diyarbakır, on the heels of an advance force under Çoban. By this time Sülemiş had attracted a substantial force, including 20,000 men from Syria and a great rabble of followers, and was besieging Sivas. The two armies met at Akşehir near Erzincan on 27 April 1299; Sülemiş was defeated and fled to Mamluk territory, where his brother, Qutqutu, remained. His accomplices, Akbal son of Uruktu Noyan the Celayirid and Taştımur Hatayi, were captured. The latter was described as governor (hakim) of Rum and a ‘clever charmer’, despite being a Mongol! Ghazan Han held a great quriltay in Ujan and Akbal was executed (31 May). Finally, Sülemiş himself returned through Cilicia with Mamluk assistance, but while causing upheavals in the uc region he was unable to muster wider

106 Vassaf, Tajziyat, p. 319 (Fars); Aqšara’i, Musamarat, pp. 216, 230–2.
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support. He fled to Ankara, where he was captured and sent to the *ordu*. Ghazan was then in Tabriz, where Sülemiş was horribly executed and burned, on 27 September 1299.\(^\text{108}\)

If these Mongol commanders, most of whom had long attachments to Anatolia, were hoping to resist the new centralising tendencies of Ilkhanid government, the effect of their defeat was the opposite. It is possible, however, that they were protesting against the shambolic financial administration that was depriving them of their incomes. Ghazan celebrated his victories with a massive issue of coinage, especially in 696 and 699 AH, after the defeat of Baltu and Sülemiş. The earlier coins are still restricted to eastern districts, but from 699 onwards, Ilkhanid coins are minted at numerous locations throughout Anatolia, particularly as assertions of central authority and as a way of making regional adherence to the Ilkhanid regime financially advantageous. But the new issues were also part of a reforming campaign to regularise and unify the administration of the empire. This clearly marks a turning point, though Seljuk models continued to be used and coins were also minted in the name of Alaeddin.\(^\text{109}\)

The retention of the sultanate nevertheless seems increasingly pointless. In May 1300, Alaeddin came to Diyar Rabi’a to present himself to Ghazan on his return from his first Syrian campaign. Impressed by this sign of loyalty, Ghazan reconfirmed his sultanate over the whole of Mongol Anatolia, from Erzurum to the Antalya coast, and from Diyarbakır to Sinop. At the same time, the sultan was married to the daughter of Prince Hülegü (son of Hülêgû Han), a union that later saved his life.\(^\text{110}\)

Proceeding back to Rum, Alaeddin, corrupted by the company in which he found himself, made a shameful progress via Diyarbakır, Harput, an unsuccessful assault on Malatya, and so to Sivas and Tokat. As the protests mounted, Alaeddin was summoned in June 1301 to the summer pastures of Abıs’ga, now


military commander of the province. Rashly choosing to abscond and attempt to establish himself at Konya – presumably still seen as a royalist stronghold – he was captured. Abıṣga sent him to the ordu, where his wife interceded for him. Escaping with a beating, he was pensioned off to Isfahan, where he was knifed after insulting a rival at a gathering.\footnote{Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 279–91 (no date); Ahmed of Niğde, f. 151r (AH 700–1).}

The restoration of Gıyaseddin Mesud in 702/1302–3 suggests that, despite everything, there was still a perceived need for some sort of local figurehead. Mesud arrived via Mosul, under the control of Abıṣga, and died in Kayseri in 1307, from a wasting illness. Coins are struck in his name till 702/1302–3, but seemingly not thereafter. He was the last of the Seljuks; however, various members of the family remained in the border regions (iuc) and around the coast, such as Gazi Çelebi in Sinop.\footnote{Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 294, 301; Ahmed of Niğde, f. 151v. Mustaufi, Guzida, p. 480; Anon., Tarihi-i Al-i Saljuq, p. 134; D. E. Pitcher, An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire, from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century (Leiden, 1972), p. 33; O. Turan, Selçuklu Zamanında Türkiye (Istanbul, 1971), pp. 644–5; al-Mufaddal b. Abi’l-Fada’i, al-Nahj al-sadid, ed. E. Blochet, in ‘Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks (part III)’, Patrologia Orientalis 20 (1929), 128, notes Mesud was sultan in 707/1310.}

This period also saw the disappearance of local dynasties in Yazd and Kirman, in southern Iran, and the first minting of coins throughout the empire in the Ilkhan’s name alone. It seems unlikely that the removal of the sultan as the titular head of local government during the reigns of Ghazan and his successor Öljettü (1304–16) had any noticeable impact on the administration of Anatolia, as all senior appointments had already long been determined at the Ilkhanid court. As elsewhere, however, the attempted centralisation of Mongol rule was far from successful in providing a stable administration in Anatolia.

After the initial defeat and flight of Sülemiş in the spring of 1299, the resilient Mücireddin Tahir remained with Sutai in Kayseri with the task of reactivating the administration and dealing with the needs of the army. He had retained the confidence of successive Ilkhanes since replacing his father Taceddin in 1280 as the principal agent of the ordu, but had been briefly displaced as naibüs-saltana by Kemaleddin Tiflisi at the beginning of Ghazan’s reign. Distancing himself from the insurrection of Baltu, Mücireddin was at the ordu going through the accounts when news arrived of Sülemiş’s uprising.\footnote{Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 209–10, 239, 247.}
The other officials in post during Baltu’s revolt had attempted to keep their positions in the face of the newcomers arriving with Sultan Alaeddin, among whom was Şemseddin Lakuşi for a second term as vezir. Conflicting jurisdictions and the free scope for financial oppression during the period of Sülemiş’s revolt led to many casualties, especially at the hands of Mehmed Bey, son of the Pervane, in Kastamonu and Konya. Lakuşi was caught up in Sülemiş’s revolt and replaced as vezir by Sahib Cemaleddin, who, however, remained in Iraq most of the year 1298–9. It was into this shambles in Anatolia that the central Divan, now headed by Sa’d al-Daula Savaji and Reşideddin (Rashid al-Din), sent Nizameddin Yahya Faryumadi, member of an influential family of Khurasani bureaucrats, in 1300, following the execution of Sülemiş, to restore the flow of tax revenue to the central government. For his expenses, he was to levy a single silver currency dinar from every unit of plough land that was tilled by oxen belonging to the peasants, and no more.114

Nizameddin brought with him a whole train of Nishapuri and Khurasani katibs (scribes, secretaries), tax-collectors from Quhistan and other officials from all over the Ilkhanate. Among his first acts of oppression on reaching Erzincan was to seize the presents that the Seljuk sultan, Alaeddin, was bringing to Ghazan in Diyarbakır. As noted above, Alaeddin and his new train of officials only compounded the disorders that quickly became the hallmark of Nizameddin’s regime, spreading from Erzincan to Sivas, Amasya, Tokat and everywhere he and his agents went. At first, the müstevi, Şerefeddin Abdurrahman, a former governor of Tabriz, appointed over the winter of 1298–9, co-operated with him. However, faced with his oppressive actions, he fled to Mücireddin, who is presented as the sole source of stability in government at this time. Mücireddin was still busy trying with some success to revive Samsun, which had been systematically plundered by Mühezzibeddin Mesud, grandson of the Pervane.115

Nizameddin Faryumadi conceived a violent hatred for the müstevi and had him attacked by an Ismaili from Quhistan; he died of his wounds on 11 June 1300. Mücireddin was at last compelled to go once more to the ordū to seek redress for Nizameddin’s extortions, but he died at Qarabagh in Arran on 8 March 1302. Nizameddin was recalled, and after a hearing in Ujan, was executed en route for Hamadan, on 4 September 1302, on the complaints of the relatives of the murdered müstevi, Şerefeddin.116

115 Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 242, 256–7, 258–9, 264–5.
116 Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 269, 276, 292–3; Rashid al-Din, Jami’ al-tawarikh, p. 1306.
The following year, the Byzantine emperor, Andronikos, sought the assistance of the Mongols in his fight against the Turkomans round Ízink (Nicaea), offering Ghazan the hand in marriage of one of his own daughters. Ghazan agreed, but died before he could send any assistance or marry the girl. In the spring of 1305, Andronikos sent another envoy, to Ghazan’s brother and successor, Öljeitü, who apparently married the princess and promised to send troops. This is perhaps the context for the despatch of a powerful force under the command of İrencin, the uncle of the Ilkhan, in June 1305, to protect the frontier. In this respect, as in many others, Öljeitü evidently inherited Ghazan’s policies and his awareness of the disruptive potential of the Turkomans, particularly the Karamanids, whom he had identified as the chief obstacle to Mongol expansion in the west.

Aqsara’i, a hostile source, gives a very negative view of İrencin’s activities, but he returned to court in July 1306, laden with gifts and swift horses, and was duly reappointed to the governorship later that year. İrencin returned with a powerful army, making his winter quarters in Niksar. It was perhaps this force that the Byzantines hoped would take action against Osman and the beyliks in the west the following year, evidently in vain.

The continuity of Mongol government in Anatolia was now restricted to the vezirate of Alaeddin Savi (appointed in 1300) and the long-standing command of Abıșga, both of whom remained in office until the death of Ghazan in 1304. Abıșga is praised for his justice and pure belief and is supposed to have become a disciple of Sultan Veled, son of Celaleddin Rumi.

In Diyarbakır, Ghazan’s death was greeted with relief, owing to the extortionate fiscal regime in place there; envoys were sent to his successor, Öljeitü, who removed the Mongol shihnas and restored the fixed contributions on the local princes, who could thus retain any surplus. It is not clear whether similar reversals of tax policy applied elsewhere in Anatolia, as they did in Fars, for example. Regardless of official policy, İrencin’s oppressive regime reduced the other government agents to impotence. First, Şerefeddin Mūsafır, nephew of the sahib-i divan, Sa’d al-Daula Savaji, took over Mūcireddin’s role in the


collection of taxes on behalf of the central Divan, but the measures he put in place were overturned by his subordinates when he left the province. The emir Ağaceri, who had replaced Abıṣga as senior commander, was ignored by İrencin and was unable to obtain redress from the ordu. He returned to find İrencin dividing the spoils of office with Lakuşi, once more vezir (having apparently replaced Alaeddin Savi), and finally left the province in despair. Ögedei son of Shiktur Noyan, who was sent to administer the injû lands in Aksaray, had a similar experience and was driven out. Ali Padişah, brother-in-law of the Ilkhan, was sent to replace him. Despite becoming a disciple of Sultan Veled, İrencin was very much a Mongol of the old school.\[121\]

İrencin’s misgovernment provided an opportunity for the Turkomans once more to advance their interests. Messengers arrived at the ordu with news of uprisings in the uc regions of Syria and Rum and most alarmingly of the capture of Konya by the Karamanids (described by Kashani as Seljuki Turkomans). Öljeytü responded to the deteriorating situation by despatching the senior emir, Çoban Suldus, in the summer of 1314; shortly afterwards, İrencin returned to court. Çoban installed himself in winter quarters at Karanbük (between Erzerum and Sivas), where most of the Turkoman leaders hurried to pay their respects. Among those enumerated are Hamidoğlu Feleküddin Dündar of Uluborlu; an Eşrefoğlu from Gorgorum (Ararım); the descendants of Sahib Fahreddin from Karahisar; Geremyan emirs and Alışiroğulları from Kütahya and neighbouring castles; Süleyman Paşa from Kastamonu; and the Armenian ruler of Cilicia. They were treated generously by Çoban and returned to their districts, but the Karamanids were conspicuous by their failure to present themselves. In the spring of 1315, Çoban moved on Konya. After some preliminary negotiations outside the city, the Karamanids requested a delay, then absconded in the night to Larende. Çoban, however, set off in pursuit and Karaman yielded on the promise of a safe conduct. Whereupon Çoban restored central control in Konya with the appointment of ‘a malik, a shihna, tax-collectors and clerks’.\[122\]

While Çoban was in Anatolia, Mamluk forces sacked the town of Malatya (April 1315), but he was unable to respond until the Syrian troops had withdrawn. He returned to the ordu, in Arran, in October, but evidently went quickly back to Anatolia: he was still there when news arrived of Öljeytü’s

---


death the following year (16 December 1316).\textsuperscript{123} He immediately headed east again, leaving his son Demirtaş in charge in Kayseri.

While these actions indicate the continuing precariousness of the Mongols’ grip on the western part of their province, there was at least a modest revival of architectural patronage in Erzurum under Öljaitü, even if not due to the ruler himself. Mongol actions against the Karamanids in Konya evidently had the support of the Mevlevi dervishes and probably other urban religious groups, who were inclined to back the established regime against the disruptive forces of the Turkomans.\textsuperscript{124}

Details of Mongol rule in Anatolia during the reign of Öljaitü’s son and successor, Abu Sa’id (1317–35), are scarce, and largely concern the ceaseless rotation of personnel. The vezir, Ahmed Lakuşi, was distrusted by Çoban, who assigned a certain Sinaneddin Ariz to be Demirtaş’s chief adviser. Nevertheless, Demirtaş protected Lakuşi from an investigation of his malpractices when Celaleddin Hoca, son of the vezir Rashid al-Din, arrived in Anatolia to supervise the collection of the provincial revenues. He too found a faithful patron in Demirtaş, when disputes at court led to the downfall and execution of Rashid al-Din in July 1318. However, in the end, Ahmad Lakuşi was not so fortunate, and Demirtaş was unable to save him from the ilchis sent from court in response to complaints from the agents of the Mongol emirs.\textsuperscript{125}

The Karamanids had not been entirely cowed by Çoban, and Demirtaş was en route for Niğde to protect Maden against their encroachments, when news arrived of İrencin’s uprising against Çoban in 1319. Rivalry between the two doubtless began in Anatolia and was compounded by İrencin’s removal first from this governorship, and then from Diyarbakır. Although the action against Çoban was instigated by Abu Sa’id himself, the Ilkhan was obliged to support his senior emir, and in the course of the reprisals that followed the defeat of İrencin, many Mongol emirs with long connections with Anatolia were implicated and eliminated. Among them were Ecil and Arap, sons of Samağar, Sultanşah and Melikşah, sons of Balıru, and Abişga. Demirtaş himself, warned by his vezir, Celaleddin, fled to Danişmend territory before news arrived of Çoban’s victory. He thereupon sent


\textsuperscript{125} Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 312–17.
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congratulations to Abu Sa’id and was confirmed in his governorship by his all-powerful father.126

Demirtaş pursued an aggressive military policy in Anatolia, first attacking Ayas in Cilicia; the Mamluks reaped the benefits, annexing the town the following year.127 This expedition necessarily involved passing through Karamanid territory and, at least to start with, Demirtaş seems to have cultivated peaceful relations with them. However, in 1323 he recaptured Konya and seized Musa Bey of Karaman and Hamidoğlu Dündar Bey. By now, if not already the previous year, he began to assert his independent power as ‘Sahib-i zaman’ and ‘Şah-i Islam’ in Anatolia. He struck coins in his own name, with the title ‘Mahdi’ – an attribute deserved, according to Aqsara’i, by his prohibition of alcoholic drinks throughout his territory, although the orders for such measures had probably issued from the ordu in 1320.128

Demirtaş’s insubordination, in terms that were evidently designed to win the support of the religious classes (if not of the Turkomans or dervishes, who were more successfully cultivated by the Safavid şeyhs Haidar, Junaid and Isma’il at the end of the fifteenth century), threatened the authority of his father Çoban at court. During the winter of 1323–4, Çoban went in person to seize his son and bring him before Abu Sa’id, who had little option but to pardon him.

On his reinstatement, Demirtaş continued his campaigns against the Turkoman emirates. He extended his authority over the region of Agrilu with its important silver mines at Gümüş, and incorporated Tugancuk, west of Trebizond (Trabzon), and Kırsəhir. He took the Esrefoğlu capital at Beysəhir on 9 October 1326, captured and killed the doomed Prince Süleymanşah,129 and pushed on towards the Mediterranean coast. In August 1327 he left his main baggage at Eğridir and despatched his lieutenant, Eretna, against Karahisar while he himself besieged the Hamidoğlu capital, Uluborlu. At this point, news arrived of the fall of his brother, Dimışk Hoca (24 August). Demirtaş returned to Eğridir in October and then moved to Kayseri to await further

---

126 Melville, ‘Revolt of the Amirs’, pp. 111–12; Aqsara’i, Musamarat, pp. 317–23; Anon., Tarikh-i Al-i Saljıq, p. 133 (execution of twelve emirs of hazaras (Mongol military divisions of 1,000)).

127 Turan, Tarihi Takvimler, pp. 70–1; cf. Abu’l-Fida, Memoirs, p. 82.


news. On hearing of the fall of his father, Çoban, he contemplated reconciliation with Abu Sa’id, but also sounded out the Mamluk sultan, al-Nasir Muhammad, who was encouraging. Demirtaş finally left Kayseri on 22 December for Larende and so on to Egypt, where he was eventually executed at the request of Abu Sa’id and partly as a result of his arrogant and overbearing behaviour.\(^{130}\)

Demirtaş’s relations with the Mamluks are not dissimilar from those fostered by Muineddin the Pervane in the 1270s, and subsequently by other Anatolian commanders such as Süleminiş, with the difference that by this period, the overt hostility between the Ilkhans and the Mamluks had been put aside in a treaty of 1323. Demirtaş had already sent envoys to Cairo in 1321, but his aggression against the nascent emirates, some of which had strong links with Egypt, caused various chiefs (such as the ruler of Antalya) to seek refuge there. Furthermore, his severe treatment of merchants in his realms prompted the Mamluk sultan al-Nasir Muhammad to write to his father, Çoban, in 1325, that Demirtaş was jeopardising the peace treaty.\(^ {131}\)

After the fall of the Çobanids, various governors were appointed in turn: Mehmed Bey, brother of Ali Padişah, Mahmud, son of Esen Kutluğ, and finally the Celayirid emir, Şeyh Hasan, known as ‘Büyük’, grandson of Akbuğa. During the last years of Abu Sa’id’s reign, in 1334, Eretna, one of Demirtaş’s chief officers, was involved in a conspiracy at court, pardoned, and sent back to Anatolia into the safe-keeping of Şeyh Hasan. Here, he seems already to have gained a considerable degree of authority, if Ibn Battuta’s evidence from 1331 is not anachronistic.\(^ {132}\)

Al-‘Umari (c.1340) cites a chronologically and geographically rather confused Genoese report that Ilkhanid territory was in a stable state, administered by Mongol governors and some remaining Seljuks, until Demirtaş’s expansion had given the Mongols control of an area as great as they (or the Seljuks) had
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ever enjoyed. Nevertheless, Ibn Battuta’s valuable description of the Turkoman emirates suggests that the Mongol presence in Asia Minor was limited to the region east of an arc between Aksaray and Niğde in the south and Amasya in the north. The largest city they controlled was Sivas and their main garrison was around Kayseri. Similarly, Hamd-Allah Mustaufi defined Iranian territory as stretching from Konya in the west to Balkh and the Oxus, but located the western frontiers in the province of Niksar and Sis (Cilicia) and over against Syria. His description of the high road from Sultaniyye to Konya misses out the last section of the route, from Sivas, perhaps a sign that control over this route was already rather vague by the time Öljeytü set up the milestones and certainly so by the time Mustaufi was writing (also c.1340). Kashani had already (c.1317) described Sivas as the border (sarhadd) of Rum.\(^{133}\)

This is consistent with the information that after the death of Demirtaş in Egypt, Hamidoğlu İshak Bey returned and regained his lands in September 1328, Paşa Musa Bey seized the stronghold of Gevele in February 1329, and the Karamanids captured Beyşehir the same year.\(^{134}\) Most of Demirtaş’s gains were thus as impermanent as those of previous Mongol assaults on the Turkomans. Mongol control was essentially confined to the eastern portions of the central plateau, where they retained many of their winter and summer quarters. It is in this area that the principality formed by Eretna, as a successor state to the Mongols, took shape.

The last phase: post-Ilkhanid dissolution, 1335–52

After the death of Abu Sa’id in November 1335, the Ilkhanid state fell apart. Anatolia could hardly fail to become embroiled in the struggle to fill the vacuum at the centre. The two main contenders for power in the Mongol heartlands of north-west Iran, the Celayirids and the Çobanids, both launched their attempts from eastern Anatolia, but having done so, they were unable to incorporate the region into their own realms, so that it became, at last, truly independent. In the process, earlier links with the Mamluk sultanate also came to some sort of fruition, as the sovereignty of the Mamluk sultan was recognised, however nominally, rather than the rule of the remaining

---


Charles Melville

The internal affairs of the region are very poorly documented; Mongol forces seem to have remained in the province, operating as elsewhere in the former Ilkhanate largely under the control of individual warlords, independently of any higher authority.

The Celayirid Şeyh Hasan was governor in Anatolia on the death of Abu Saʿid, and senior emir throughout the brief reign of his successor, Arpa Keʿün (November 1335–May 1336). When the Oirat leader, Ali Padişah, mounted a challenge for the throne, Şeyh Hasan was persuaded to go and oppose him. He left Eretna behind as his deputy. Success against Ali Padişah was followed by a victory against Taghai-Temür, a Chinggisid prince put forward by the Mongols in Khurasan, following which Şeyh Hasan appointed Eretna as governor in Anatolia.\(^{135}\)

Şeyh Hasan’s triumph brought another contender into the arena, his Çobanid namesake Şeyh Hasan, known as Küçük, son of Demirtaş. Demirtaş’s family had stayed behind when he fled to Egypt; now, pretending that his father had not in fact been killed, Şeyh Hasan ignored Eretna’s request to present himself and rose in revolt at Karahisar in the name of a ‘false’ Demirtaş. He defeated his Celayirid rival at Aladağ in July 1338 and eliminated his puppet Ilkhan, Muhammad. An uneasy stand-off ensued, during which time Küçük Hasan caused much destruction in the region round Erzincan, but failed to capture the city.\(^{136}\)

In Anatolia, Eretna could only benefit from the upheavals to the east, and he played a delicate game of alternating loyalties to the various rivals. He struck coins throughout his territories in the name of Taghai-Temür in 739/1338–9, possibly reflecting Şeyh Hasan Celayir’s temporary support for the Khurasanian candidate, possibly as a means of asserting his own independence from both the Çobanids and Celayirids.\(^{137}\) The latter is more likely, as already the previous year Şeyh Hasan Celayir was reported to be advancing on Anatolia to bring Eretna to obedience. Eretna soon sought a more powerful protector in the shape of the Mamluk sultan, al-Nasir Muhammad. His embassy returned

---

\(^{135}\) Ahri, Tarikh-i Shaikh Uvais, p. 164, tr. 64; Melville, The Fall of Amir Chupan, pp. 43–52; Cl. Cahen, ‘Eretna’, EI2, ii, p. 706.
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from Cairo with confirmation of Eretna as Mamluk governor of Anatolia.\textsuperscript{138} This represented the satisfaction of the Mamluks’ long-term aspirations in the region and the culmination of a diplomatic association that went back to the parallel rise of the rival Mamluk and Mongol states in the Near East a century earlier.

Of course, Eretna did nothing to implement Mamluk rule—quite the reverse: he minted coins in late 739/1339 for the new Çobanid puppet, Suleyman Han.\textsuperscript{139} His relations with the Mamluks were complicated by the support that they were giving to the rising power of the Dulgadır Turkomans, expanding northwards at Eretna’s expense in the border regions of northern Syria. In 1337–8 they gained Elbistan and the following year seized the castle of Darende, where Eretna had stored much wealth. These developments led Eretna to complain to the Mamluk sultan, who countered with the accusation that Eretna himself was not upholding Mamluk sovereignty in the area; he again minted for the Mamluks in 740/1339–40. Despite these setbacks, however, Eretna was able to consolidate his territory by capturing, or recapturing, Sivas and at an unknown date also seizing Konya from the Karamanoğulları, with whom he tried at first to maintain good relations.\textsuperscript{140}

Eretna’s flirtation with the Çobanids, who also disputed easternmost Anatolia with the governors of Diyarbakır, was equally short lived. During the course of 1340, Şeyh Hasan occupied Erzurum and laid siege to the town of Avnik.\textsuperscript{141} By 1341, Eretna felt able to issue independent coinage, though he continued to maintain the fiction of his subservience to Suleyman Han until his most renowned exploit, the defeat of Suleyman in October 1343 at Karanbük near Sivas.\textsuperscript{142} Eretna sent some of the spoils to the governor of Aleppo, and


\textsuperscript{139} Album, ‘Studies (I)’, p. 78; Remler, ‘Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage’, p. 172.

\textsuperscript{140} Al-Shuja’i, Ta’rikh, pp. 22, 40, 68; cf. al-Maqrizi, Suluk, II, pp. 446, 459, 490, 494–5 and 665, 676 (Darende again); Album, ‘Studies (I)’, p. 96 n. 137 (coins); Turan, Tarihi Tekvimler, pp. 70–1 (Sivas); Eflaki, Manaqib al-‘arifin, II, p. 978–9 (Konya); Sümür, ‘Anadolu’da’, pp. 103, 112–13. A confusing account of these events, and of Eretna’s relations with Karaman, in Şikari, History of the Kârâmanids, ed. M. M. Koman as Şikari’nin Kârâman Oğulları Tarihi (Konya, 1946), e.g. pp. 40, 42.

\textsuperscript{141} Mustaufi, Nuzhat, p. 96, tr. p. 99; Mustaufi, Zail, p. 462; see S. Album, ‘Studies in Mongol History and Numismatics II: a Late Ilkhanid Hoard (741/1340) as Evidence for the History of Diyar Bâk’, Studia Iranica 14, 1 (1985), 49.

\textsuperscript{142} Remler, ‘Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage’, pp. 172–3; Pamuk and Aykut, Ak Akçe, p. 219 (Süleyman coins); Mustaufi, Zail, p. 465; Ahri, Tarihi-i Shaikh Uvais, p. 169, tr. p. 70; al-Shuja’i, Ta’rikh, pp. 261–2; see also Şikari, History, pp. 57–8; Sümür, ‘Anadolu’da’, p. 105. Sanjian, Colophons, p. 84, cites an Armenian note that Eretna was defeated by Suleyman.
persisted in acknowledging the sovereignty of the Mamluks, when it suited him.\textsuperscript{143}

Eretna died in August 1352,\textsuperscript{144} by which time he was the master of an extensive territory, issuing coins in his name over an area from Ankara to Erzincan and from Samsun to Niğde. The sources are fairly consistent in praising Eretna’s character and justice, despite an accusation of hostile origin that he allowed his kingdom to fall into decay.\textsuperscript{145} He is credited with striving to strengthen and promote the Shari’a, and to honour and esteem the ulema, seyyids and şeyhs, so that he gained the nickname ‘beardless prophet’ (Köse peygamber).\textsuperscript{146}

Following Eretna’s death, his heirs, Mehmed I (1352–66) and Ali (1366–80), presided over the gradual reduction of their territory, in the face of the rivalry of the Karamanoğulları and Dulgadroğulları in the south, and the İsfendiyaroğulları in the north, and aided by their own internecine struggles. Mehmed maintained diplomatic links with the Mamluks, and early in his reign had the satisfaction of handing over the refugee Dulgadroğulları chief, Karaca, to the Mamluk sultan. Mehmed was obliged to call upon Mamluk assistance after a series of defeats by Mongol forces under a commander called Babuq, who captured and sacked Kayseri. Although Eretnid was temporarily restored with the help of the governor of Aleppo, no sooner had the Mamluks returned home than the Mongols retook the city. The following year, in October 1365, Mehmed was murdered by a group of emirs.\textsuperscript{147}

His young son Alaeddin Ali quickly lost Konya, Niğde and Aksaray to the Karamanoğulları.\textsuperscript{148} However, in 1368, Babuq, who was besieging Sivas, was abandoned by his Mongol troops, who went over to the sultan.\textsuperscript{149} In 1375–6, Alaeddin briefly lost Kayseri to Mongol and Karamanoğulları forces, and Hızır Bey, a descendant of Samağar, later also made an unsuccessful bid for the city.\textsuperscript{150} Soon afterwards (May 1378), Burhaneddin, chief kadi since 1365, became vezir. The fortunes of the principality came to depend increasingly on his energy and abilities, in the face of the continuing aggression of the Mongol forces and Karaman, and the total incompetence of the ruler.\textsuperscript{151} When Alaeddin
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Anatolia under the Mongols

Ali died of the plague in August 1380, it was Kadi Burhaneddin who took power, albeit initially in the name of Ali’s young son, Mehmed II; however, he soon proclaimed himself sultan. Burhaneddin vigorously defended his territories before being killed at Sivas by the Akkoyunlu chief, Kara Osman, in 1398. Two years later, Sivas was sacked by Timur. It was the Akkoyunlu who were able to fill the vacuum left by Timur’s withdrawal from his Anatolian campaign of 1402, in which the Ottomans, who had steadily eroded the western lands of Eretna’s principality almost up to Amasya, were thrown back.152

Eretna’s principality cannot properly be regarded as just one more of the Turkoman beyliks to emerge on the collapse of the Ilkhanate. Coinciding territorially with the heartlands of Mongol presence in Anatolia, the Mongol legacy remained strong, both in the continuing and disruptive presence of Mongol troops (such as the descendants of Baltu and of Samağar Noyan),153 in Eretna’s inherited rivalry with Karaman and the emerging Dulgadır Turkomans, and in the ambiguous relations with the Mamluk sultanate that had also been enjoyed by his former master, Demirtaş. Eretnid coinage shows more concrete continuities with the Ilkhanid models, while his sympathetic attitude to Islamic culture suggests that the urban character of late Seljuk rule was maintained in the chief cities of Sivas and Kayseri. There is evidence of rather refined cultural patronage continuing in the 1360s and 1370s, particularly associated with the Mevlevi order, at least in the field of manuscript production.154 Burhaneddin’s efforts to preserve this legacy ensured that east-central Anatolia remained distinct for some time to come and was more associated with events further east than with the rise of the new Ottoman power in the west.

The period in retrospect

Many scholars have tended to view the Akkoyunlu either as an obstacle to Ottoman eastward expansion or as a prelude to the establishment of an Iranian ‘national state’ by the Safavids.155 The same might be said, at a much earlier stage of the same process, about Ilkhanid Anatolia, often dismissed as a hiatus.

in the development of a Turkish national state from its origins in the Seljuk sultanate of Rum. While echoing Cahen’s view that ‘it is ridiculous to consider the Seljuk period as a preface to the Ottoman period’, we must leave it to the Ottomanists to assess the impact of intervening Mongol models and practices on Ottoman government and society in Anatolia. The replacement of Islamic caliphal sanction for rule by Chinggisid forms of imperial legitimation, the development of secular state law alongside the Muslim Shari’a, and altered concepts of landownership are among the legacies of the Mongol order based on the traditions of the steppes. More immediately, it is useful to try to assess to what extent the Ilkhans simply followed the pattern of Seljuk rule in central and eastern Anatolia (as elsewhere in the Ilkhanate), and what distinctive and characteristically Mongol elements they introduced.

The impact of the Mongols’ financial and economic regime was certainly severe, even if Mustaufi’s celebrated statement of the decline in revenues to the Divan from 15 million dinars ‘under the Seljuks’ to 3.3 million dinars ‘at the present day’ (that is, after the collapse of the Ilkhanate) can only be interpreted in a most impressionistic manner. Such a fall might indicate a drop in agricultural or other productivity, due to political insecurity or a change from cultivation to a more pastoral economy in some areas. More probably, a greater proportion of revenue remained in the province than formerly; and the collection of revenue by the central Divan was inefficient, both in terms of incompetence and its cost.

It is clear that the Mongols were ready to extract as much ‘tribute’ from Rum as they were able, and they despatched a succession of agents to the province for this purpose, starting with Taceddin Mutez and his son, Mücireddin. Their efforts do not seem to have proceeded particularly smoothly. These and other senior officials, whether of local origin or sent from the ordu, were often more concerned with furthering their own local wealth and interests than with serving the needs of the central government, while the brief interventions of a stream of high-powered vezirs, such as Fahreddin Kazvini, Ahmed Lakuşi Tabrizi and Nizameddin Faryumadi, were oppressive and left the situation worse than they found it. Partly, this perception of Mongol financial administration derives from the negative views of Aqsara’i, himself a bureaucrat and constantly bemoaning the importation of foreigners, the multiplication and duplication of posts, and the incompetence and venality of the officials. The same complaints arise in other parts of the Ilkhanate, however, albeit also
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from the same milieu of the indigenous bureaucratic classes, and there is no doubt that a divisive and unwieldy dual system was characteristic of Mongol government. Detailed studies of the administrative history (and particularly the financial administration) of Mongol Anatolia are needed before any firm conclusions can be reached about its impact on the province, how closely it evolved in parallel with developments elsewhere (such as Fars), and to what extent it replaced the existing Seljuk systems, or was merely superimposed upon them.\textsuperscript{158}

The fragmentation and overlap of authority also occurred in the conflicting roles of the civilian officials and the military commanders, as in the case of İrencin under Sultan Öljeytü. Mongol noyans such as Samağar and Abisga often appear in the sources in a much better light than their civilian counterparts and were at odds with them. Here, again as elsewhere in the Ilkhanate, there was a tension between the Mongols’ own attitudes to government and those of the administrative classes, which persisted after the Mongols had formally proclaimed their conversion to Islam. But there was not a straightforward dichotomy between these groupings; rather, we see the civilians collaborating with the noyans and entering into their factional alliances, and often more oppressive towards the tax-paying subjects than their masters were. In short, Mongol rule weakened concepts of the responsible exercise of power and fostered a corruption of government morality.\textsuperscript{159}

Fragmentation of the organs of Mongol rule spilled over into the territories they administered. This is most clearly visible in the frequent division of the puppet Seljuk sultanate itself, until the office became so devalued as to serve no useful purpose. The shared sultanates of İzzeddin Keykavus II and Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV and their descendants entailed the loss of territorial integrity of Rum and allowed the political history of the two portions to diverge and finally separate. There was no clearly defined locus of Mongol power: rather, a number of capitals, especially Erzurum in the east, Kayseri in the centre and


\textsuperscript{159} Aubin, \textit{Émir mongols}, for the clearest analysis of this.
Konya, stronghold of the Seljuk sultanate but increasingly under the threat of the Karamanoğulları, in the west. But, after the crisis of the late 1270s, it was the Mongol chiefs who wielded effective authority from their seasonal camping grounds, maintaining their traditional indifference to towns and leaving the ahi organisations to dominate and control urban life.  

Such centrifugal forces had been equally present under the Seljuks, whose tendency to sub-divide the sultanate, influenced by Turkish steppe traditions, was if anything even more marked. They provided great scope for the Turkoman groups occupying the peripheries of the Anatolian plateau to assert their independence. In the struggle with the Turkomans, the Mongols inherited a situation already confronted by the Seljuks, although the problem did not start to become evident until the eve of the battle of Kösedağ, in the revolt of Baba Resul. Fresh waves of Central Asian nomads reaching Anatolia both ahead and on the heels of the Mongol invasions, less Islamised than the first Oğuz who accompanied the Seljuk invasions of the eleventh century, were an even greater challenge to the establishment of an urban-based, centralising regime, which did not anyway become the Ilkhans’ priority until it was almost too late. The vicious punitive raids of Kongurtay, Geyhatu and even Demirtaş, especially against Karaman, incomplete as they were, do not seem to have been accompanied by any means of incorporating their territories more closely into the Ilkhanid administrative regime, although the great explosion of mint towns in the early years of Ghazan’s reign, partly maintained by his successors, might signal such a development.

Finally, we should note the transformation of the religious landscape of central and eastern Anatolia during the course of this century. In the early Mongol period, Rum became a refuge for scholars and mystics from further east, finding sanctuary at the Seljuk court under the patronage of the sultans and Muineddin the Pervane. But urban society and the orthodox religious life, whether in the mould of the Sunni establishment or the great Sufi masters, was as alien to the Mongols and their predominantly Turkish followers as were Islamic political ethics. Rather, by undermining the authority of Sunni orthodoxy and their own religious openness, the Mongols gave a great impetus to the spread of dervish movements, which found fertile soil among the semi-nomadic Turkoman tribes and the rural hinterlands they inhabited, a trend already discernible in the late Seljuk period. The development of these popular

---


Thus, although not accompanied by the physical destruction that they brought to parts of north-eastern Iran and Transoxania, the Mongol invasions of Anatolia introduced a period of considerable change, even if not necessarily of economic decline. New norms of government, an exploitative attitude to tax-collection that survived rather inconsistent efforts at reform, and the rise of independent principalities, partly as a Turkoman political reaction to imperial rule and partly a result of the deliberate transfer of land from state to individual ownership, all proved to be enduring legacies of Mongol rule. The Ilkhanid period also bound eastern Anatolia more closely to the political fortunes of north-west Iran, an orientation already created by the previous Seljuk Empire. This strengthened the dominance of Persian high culture but at the same time assisted the propagation of Turkish at the expense of Arabic, particularly in the border regions with Mamluk Syria, on the one hand, and northern Iraq, now part of the Mongol and post-Ilkhanid dispensation, on the other. A prolonged upsurge in popular religious movements accompanied this process. By breaking down existing patterns of political and religious life, the Mongols created fertile conditions for the forging of new amalgams with enormous dynamic energy. The effect of this was to be seen in the formation of the new Turkoman principalities that came to dominate the history of the next 150 years.
This chapter narrates and discusses some major lines of development in Anatolia between the turn of the fourteenth century and the second accession to power of Mehmed II. The emphasis lies on the early Ottoman enterprise, thanks to the fact that it had become the major power in the peninsula by the end of the 150 years under discussion. The end point of our coverage is entirely reasonable, as there is general agreement that Mehmed the Conqueror’s reign was a turning point in the creation of one imperial polity and the wreck of another, Byzantium.

It is far from clear, around the year 1300, that anyone should have expected such an outcome, for in 1300 the Mongols seemed to be suzerains of the area we term the Ottomans’ homeland. In fact, the number of those in 1299 and 1300 who recognised the period as a caesura in Anatolia’s history was small, perhaps a hundred people, almost all of them men. We do not yet know any of their names, but we do know that they were the moneyers active in the Muslim domains of the peninsula. From the 1280s until 1299, there were about ten mints striking silver dirhems for the Seljuks and Ilkhanids. For the years immediately after 1300, the number (now almost entirely for the Ilkhanids) is also around ten. But in 699/1299–1300, the number of mints striking silver dirhems shoots up to forty-six. Such a phenomenon has not occurred before or since in the recorded history of Anatolia. It was at this time that the Mongol governor Sülemiş revolted against the Ilkhan Ghazan Mahmud, and the spectacular spike in the number of mints may well reflect a convulsive moment of transition.

In the decade immediately following the revolt, the Mongols not only attempted to re-establish some control over Asia Minor, the gradient of
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1 See Rudi Paul Lindner, ‘How Mongol were the Early Ottomans?’, in *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy*, ed. R. Amitai-Preiss and D. O. Morgan (Leiden, 1999), pp. 282–9.
2 Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Ann Arbor, 2007), pp. 91–2, figs. 1–3.
effective power running from a high in the east to a low west of the plateau, but there also occurred the collapse of Byzantine power in the west, the survival of the Byzantine remnant at Trebizond, and the growth of a number of Turkish emirates in the areas between Mongol and Byzantine Anatolia; we term these the beyliks, to emphasise their creation by Turkish chiefs, many of whom had not held high office for the Seljuks or Mongols. It is customary, however, given the ultimate predominance of the Ottomans and the nature of the surviving sources, to focus on the Ottoman experience.

Before turning to the sources, the history of scholarship on this era of Anatolian history, and in particular on early Ottoman history, makes a scenic detour advisable. There are a number of ways of assessing the previous few generations of work, but for the reader it may be convenient to distinguish between two points of view, one that might be termed deductive, the other inductive. These two perspectives are not set off in sharp relief one from the other. A deductive approach arises from meditation on, and perhaps the seizure of, a particular piece or constellation of evidence, from which a more general outlook seems to follow. The inductive approach is not based upon a random walk through the evidence, nor is the choice of questions to frame made within the confines of an uncluttered, not to say empty, mind. For many years, however, many treatments of this era rested upon a particular framework that remained untested, and the work grew out of a basic understanding built upon that framework. It is only in the past few years that scholars have, not without considerable reluctance, turned in search of other models or even set forth with paradigm lost.

The framework we have lost is that of Professor Paul Wittek, followed by many and in recent years adjusted slightly in the hope of responding to a larger base of evidence and avoiding certain claims that now appear dated.
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3 On the beyliks as a whole, excluding the Ottomans, the standard reference is İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, Anadolu Beylikleri, revised edition (Ankara, 1969; repr. 1988). There has been a great deal of work on individual beyliks since, much of it dedicated to the architectural history of a particular beylik or a comparison of types and architectural features across the beyliks.

Wittek developed his ideas over a period of years extending from his service in the First World War through his years in Turkey during the heady era of the Atatürk dictatorship. On the basis of two early literary texts and an inscription dated to 1337, Wittek argued that the fundamental, driving factor in early Ottoman success was dedication to the gaza or holy war, that this religious zeal was central to Ottoman success, and that Ottoman failure followed from their abandonment of this fundamental tenet of their enterprise.\(^5\) Scholars following in Wittek’s footsteps have moved away from his strong formulation, but have begun from his perspective and retain it in large part.\(^6\) It is probably safe to suggest that at the moment there is no agreed point of reference about which most scholars gather, and that a more eclectic approach, resting more on the sources than on scholarly tradition, holds the field.

Sources

The sources for the history of this era offer something for everyone. For the scholar used to the Byzantine sources or the Persian chronicles of the Rum Seljuks, a broad vista with many pleasing prospects opens up.\(^7\) The Byzantine chronicles continue to offer much help, especially with respect to chronology: here the so-called Short Chronicles have occasionally been crucial. There are also a number of ‘official’ documents that survive, especially from monastic houses, and new editions of these are largely complete. Texts of a religious nature (hagiographical, doctrinal, apologetic) provide assistance. There are, in addition, a number of texts that remain unpublished and that may be expected to throw additional light on particular topics (for example, imperial panegyric). Further, materials (many of them Italian in origin) that help to outline the economic history of the Palaeologan era also bear on Anatolia, occasionally in

\(^5\) In addition to the works previously cited, a central discussion of the inscription is in Colin Heywood, ‘The 1337 Bursa Inscription and its Interpreters’, *Turcica* 36 (2004), 215–32.

\(^6\) Among these have been Halil İnalcık, Stanford Shaw, Elizabeth Zachariadou and Cemal Kafadar.

\(^7\) A good list of the sources and editions is in Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300–1481* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 257–64.
Such sources have helped develop the economic history of the beyliks, for which there are few surviving chronicles. Not much in the way of public and private documents survives from most of the Anatolian beyliks, and few of them found chroniclers whose work is extant. For the beyliks in central and western Anatolia, there are fundamentally two literary chronicles of note: the Düsturname of Enveri, which celebrates Umur Bey of Aydın, and a chronicle of the Karamanoğulları, written by a certain Şikari, which must be used with great care. However, the Ottoman archives possess a goodly number of documents, record books and the like, most of which are unpublished, much of which remains unstudied, some of which is still uncatalogued. And there are a small number of Ottoman chronicles produced in the course of the fifteenth century. Unfortunately, the chronicles can be highly tendentious, there are interesting gaps in coverage and there are occasional emendations; it is fortunate that not all of the alterations were skillfully done. The early Ottoman chronicles have turned out to be less circumstantial and more elliptical than their Byzantine counterparts, but they are valuable monuments to the intellectual movements of the fifteenth century. Unfortunately, there is not a single extensive account for which a satisfactory edition, based upon all the manuscripts, exists. For example, the existing edition of the Anonymous Chronicles rests upon a late recension, and the widely used chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade is available in an old edition whose basis has not been investigated, a ‘standard’ edition that attempts in vain to locate an Urtext, and two recent texts, one of which pieces together the longest version possible, while the other limits itself to two manuscripts. There is much room for further textual studies among the early Ottoman chronicles.
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9 See Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydın (1300–1415) (Venice, 1983); and Kate Fleet, European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey (Cambridge, 1999).
Our knowledge of the post-Seljuk beyliks is very much restricted, thanks to the Ottoman conquest. We know much more of their architectural remains than we do of the processes causing the ebb and flow of their histories in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Yet it is true that they formed an integral part of ‘an entirely new Turkey that some of them were starting to fashion, a country on the move’. Although there are synthetic accounts of their place in the history of Anatolian Islamic art and architecture, there is no general account that compares and contrasts their political histories. There are, however, two accounts from the 1330s, one from the traveller Ibn Battuta, and the other, culled from the accounts of contemporaries, found in the geographical treatise of al-‘Umari. Ibn Battuta visited most of the beyliks on his travels through Asia Minor, while al-‘Umari contains two sets of accounts of both the large and small beyliks. Ibn Battuta’s account contains information about the spread of the fütüvet (futuwwa) movement in the towns, groups of artisans dedicated to shared religious experience and to a certain ethical norm: the adherents of these groups were known as ahi, and the title ahi occurs from time to time in the later chronicles as evidence of the memory of these groups, which provided links between communities at a time when disunity prevailed on other levels.
The beyliks

Why did the beyliks not last? After all, politically some of them, on the west coast of the peninsula, seem to replicate the geographical and economic advantages of many of the city-states of Greek antiquity. It would be foolhardy to attempt a definitive answer to this question at the present time, especially as it is really a restatement of another question to which a definitive answer still eludes us, namely, why did the Ottomans, of all the beyliks, achieve ultimate success? But framed in terms of the beyliks, among the ideas that come to mind, one may deserve further study. Perhaps the majority of the beyliks did not have the resources to project their power or the need to obviate the perceived threat of a neighbour. In some cases, the nature of the military technology on which their forces were based was insufficient to allow them more than occasional raids: here one has in mind the plateau and southern coastal beylik of Karaman, whose forces had been nomadic, but without enough nomads. Along these lines, the Ottomans would have had certain advantages: a nearby and weak enemy in Byzantium, an early turn from nomadic towards sedentary warfare (after 1329) and the ability to develop resources in Europe in the 1370s. But these are early days in the development of a thoughtful historiography of these little jewels of statelets.

The point here is related to the history of the polities in Inner Asia after the Timurid era. In order to break out, as had the Mongols in the thirteenth century and the forces of Timur in the fourteenth, it was necessary to have the appropriate military and economic resources: and for a military arm largely dependent upon nomads, this condition translated into a sufficient number of nomads with a sufficient number of remounts. The post-Timurid attempts at building a greater enterprise were strong enough to create local clienteles in town, steppe and agricultural environments, but did not manage to gather enough force to overcome the opposition of similarly situated and endowed opponents. Ultimately, these polities fell prey to the expansion of states based upon sedentary resource bases.

The beyliks of Anatolia were smaller, had fewer resources and did not have large hinterlands of steppe or oasis. Among the fascinating, and not yet fully tested, materials presented by al-‘Umari’s informants are figures for the military of each beylik. It is not clear just what these figures represent, and they do not appear all to have been gathered on the same basis. For example, the Eşrefoğulları are said to have had more than 60,000 mounted soldiers, that is to say the equivalent of six tumans, which appears impossible, given the constraints of geography. However, it does look as if these figures, over all,
represent the limits of power of the beyliks, and on that assumption it does begin to look as if none of them, without easy pickings on the frontiers, could assert itself over the others. Perhaps one of the beyliks on the Aegean coast might have been able to gather the requisite resources through the projection of sea power, but none of them was, in the end, able to do this, perhaps because the resources of the hinterland limited the construction of proper fleets, perhaps because none of them lasted long enough to develop a strong and independent seafaring tradition, as had Venice and Genoa. In any event, the map of the beyliks appears for the most part to involve tradeoffs without opportunities for easy growth. The one exception to this is the Ottomans, who were closest to a weakening enemy and had the least difficulties in taking advantage of opportunities in the Balkans.

It is traditional in the writing of histories in this area to focus on the rise of the Ottomans rather than to provide a series of histories of the beyliks, and this chapter will not stray far from that tradition. However, it is useful to say a few words in passing about the larger of the beyliks and to offer some comparative comments that might help in the organisation of their histories as a whole. Here again we are at the mercy of our sources, not all of which have been fully analysed.

In fact, one of the source problems may provide a hint as to processes that prevented the expansion and growth of certain of the fourteenth-century beyliks. The Ottoman chronicles tend to hide difficulties between brothers and generations of the ruling house, but it does appear that some sons of the ruling leader in the early period played a role in governing districts and, later on, provinces. However, we do not see examples of rule over the entire enterprise divided between brothers. Whether this became a custom early on is unclear, and it may have been the result of accident becoming transformed, by chance repetition, into habit. We are not talking here about succession to rule but about the potential division of the polity among members of the same generation. Again, it is not clear whether this result is the outcome of design or of contingent events.

At the same time, those who have laboured to establish accurate chronologies for some of the beyliks are faced with the decision of identifying as one and the same person distinct rulers whose names do not match. Is this the result of memory lapse on the part of our medieval authors? Is this the outcome of those authors’ reliance on partial names or even nicknames? Often, however, there is evidence that members of the same generation ruled different, distinct parts of the same beylik.
For example, control of the beylik of Hamid, in Pisidia and Pamphylia, was divided between two branches, one at Eğridir and the other at Antalya. In the 1330s two brothers divided the beylik of Karası between Balıkesir (Balıkesri) and Bergama, and a similar division continued into the next generation. In the third quarter of the fourteenth century, three brothers ruled different districts of the beylik of Menteşe. In the early fourteenth century, there seems to have been a division of the Teke beylik as well. On occasion, there was the rule of a sole sovereign during one generation, followed by a division of the polity during the next. At times it seems as if one is looking at the dynastic history of Merovingian Gaul in parvo.

One possible corroboration of this line of argument is the policy followed by Timur after his defeat of Bayezid I in 1402. Bayezid had seized control of most of the beyliks during the 1390s, but Timur restored them to their original dynasts: however, some of these were again ruled jointly, which ultimately made for divisions and eased the Ottoman reconquest one or two decades later. The chief who had united the steppe and sown land of the Ulus Chaghatay appears to have wanted no strong rulers in Anatolia. It is significant that after Timur reconstituted some of the beyliks, they proved incapable of establishing an institutional structure sufficient to ward off the Ottomans within a generation of 1402. They seem to have continued on the basis of their earlier practices, which proved just as insufficient as they did in the 1390s.

What this suggests is that the nature of divided rule played a role in preventing the consolidation of resources, of power and of the ability to conquer. It was possible to quarrel within, but not to expand. Did this have an impact on trade within the peninsula? The fact that there is little evidence of the continued construction of caravansarys on the Seljuk model does not necessarily count for very much. New caravansarys would have been needed to accommodate an increase in the number of traders, caravans and a growing volume of goods, or new construction might have been needed to counter an increase in banditry; but there is little record of either. The existing network appears to have been sufficient unto the day. We also have the slim evidence of Ibn Battuta, who appears to have travelled without much let or hindrance in the early 1330s.

If we search for another measure, across the beyliks, of their success, there is a certain amount of good fortune in the remarkable growth of the discipline of art history in modern Turkey, which has bequeathed a large number of local studies, some antiquarian, some of remarkable sophistication, all useful
in ferreting out the remaining medieval monuments. The remaining architectural works differ from one another in the eyes of connoisseurs, but they are for the most part not very large or ornate. Smaller work in tapestry, wood and ceramic is not rare, but it does not reveal the availability of a large surplus of wealth. The coinages of the beyliks do not compare, in volume, weight standards or design, to the issues from the Seljuk mints; but perhaps a large volume of new coinage was not needed.

There are many difficulties associated with the chronology, lists of rulers and internal histories of the beyliks, and it seems best for the moment to discuss them in rather different terms. The beylik immediately to the south-west of the Ottomans was Karası, in Mysia, whose history begins in earnest after the Catalan expedition of the early fourteenth century. Bordering on the Marmara, the Dardanelles and the Aegean, this beylik had some naval pretensions and may have benefited from the immigration of Turks from the Dobrudja. The power, however, of the beylik was insufficient to wrest Mytilene (Lesbos) from Christian hands. Soldiers from this beylik played a role, along with Ottoman volunteers, in the Thracian adventures before the definitive Turkish installation across the Dardanelles. There is very sparse coinage remaining from Karası, and it appears reasonable to suggest that the beylik, which fell definitively to the Ottomans after various earlier partitions at the end of Orhan’s reign, was hampered by its inability to control the sea routes and by its more powerful neighbour to the east, Germiyan.

The beylik of Saruhan was centred on Lydia and lasted from the early fourteenth century to 1410, when it finally fell to the Ottomans. The capital of the enterprise was at Manisa, but members of the family of the Saruhanoğulları had subsidiary and perhaps partly autonomous residences elsewhere. From an early date the rulers of Saruhan involved themselves in campaigns at sea, where they were associated with the forces of Aydın. They were also enmeshed in politics and warfare involving the Genoese at Chios and Phocaea. On the one hand, Manisa prospered: there was a slave market and some significant building in the 1360s and 1370s. On the other, the forces of the emirate seem to have been unable to establish complete independence from the currents of war and diplomacy fostered by the

For an overview see Gönül Öney, Beylikler Devri Sanatı XIV.–XV. Yüzyıl (1300–1453) (Ankara, 1989). To the works mentioned within should be added the large number of local histories, such as the works of İ. H. Konyalı on central and south coastal Anatolia.

Ottomans after 1360, Byzantium after the 1340s and the more powerful rulers of Aydın.

Aydı'n appears to have been the most influential of the coastal beyliks, and it is, with the exception of the Ottomans, the sole western beylik from which we have a narrative source of some scope, the Destan of Umur Paşa. The dynasty, formerly allied with the bey of the Phrygian emirate of Germiyan, established itself around 1308 and shortly thereafter ruled from Birgi, although much of the Smyrna (İzmir) district, and the city itself, became part of the principality. Once again, although the head of the family claimed supreme authority, other members had their own separate residences with more or less autonomous power.

Smyrna/İzmir was then, as now, an economic centre of the Aegean basin, and the dynasty became involved in warfare with the Genoese, trade arrangements and diplomacy with the Byzantines: it even issued imitations of Italian coins. Umur Bey (1334–48), hero of the Destan, allied himself with the Byzantine claimant John Kantakouzenos, and forces from Aydın became involved in the Byzantine civil wars of the early 1340s. It proved impossible, however, to deal both with possibilities in the Balkans and with threats from the sea caused by crusaders called forth by the pope and including a number of European naval powers. Ultimately, Umur Bey died in battle at İzmir. After his death, his successors reached an agreement with the European powers in 1348, one that crippled the naval power of the beylik and threatened to lower its trade revenues substantially. The beylik continued to be influential but without offering the same naval threats as before: it is probable that its wealth for the next few generations depended more on trade and internal growth than on the opportunistic raids of Umur Bey’s career.

There are significant architectural monuments of the era: mosques, medreses and tombs. Perhaps the most significant of the monuments is the İsa Bey mosque in Ephesus (1374). There are also important works translated from Persian into Turkish from the Aydınoğulları period, an indication of the development of Turkish as a written language of high culture.

South and south-east of Aydın was the beylik of Menteşe, based in Caria. The founders of this beylik had at one time been tributary, at least in principle, to the Seljuks, since there are extant coins struck at Milas in 1291 in the name of the Sultan Mesud II. Both Ilkhanid and Byzantine campaigns entered the region in the last decades of the thirteenth century, but there was no long-term opposition to the infiltration of nomads from the hinterland and Turks from the sea (from Antalya). After 1308, the major naval opponent of the beylik was Rhodes, which remained stubbornly independent throughout the fourteenth
century. Once again, family rule prevailed in the beylik, and once again, much of the wealth came through trade, some of which involved products exported from the interior of the peninsula to the Aegean through the beylik’s ports. The dynasty fostered the translation of works from Persian into Turkish, and there are important Menteşeoğulları buildings at the centres of family rule, in particular the Hacı İlyas mosque at Milas (1330). This was yet another of the beyliks that fell to Bayezid I, was reconstituted by Timur, but failed to withstand the Ottomans after their resurgence.

The beylik of Teke was centred on the southern port of Antalya, and included parts of Lycia and Pamphylia. Antalya had been in Seljuk hands since 1207, and the hinterland was connected with the important port through a network of caravansaries by the middle of the thirteenth century. After Seljuk rule in the south-west part of the peninsula faded away around 1307, a part of the family of Hamid, in Pisidia, established itself as the beylik of Teke; again, members of the family ruled in different towns. Antalya had been a prosperous trade centre, facing Cyprus, and there was, in the middle years of the fourteenth century, both warfare and trade between the two. Whereas there is a fair amount of Seljuk material remaining in the area, from the Tekeoğlu family little survives (there is a türbe dated 1377 in Antalya, reminiscent of Seljuk architecture).

Reviewing the status of the coastal beyliks curving west of the Ottomans around the Marmara basin and the Aegean, as far as the lands opposite Cyprus, there are a few interesting points that rise above the minutiae of their separate and in many ways still confusing year-to-year history. First, their attentions seem fixed more on the sea than on the hinterland. Second, as sea powers their emphasis was on trading and raiding rather than conquest; or, at least, their power was insufficient to wrest control of significant islands from the more distant European naval powers. Third, a few of them were able to provide troops for service in the Balkans, but they were unable to establish and retain a constant presence for their enterprises across the sea. They could assist in Balkan actions, but they were unable to direct them or to set up a permanent base. In the end, during the reign of Murad I, the Ottomans encapsulated the Balkan adventurers from the coastal beyliks. Fourth, they appear to have benefited substantially from a transit trade linking merchants from the interior with European middlemen. This trade appears to have consisted of both primary goods, including slaves, and partially finished goods. Finally, although most of them issued coins, the output appears to have been far less, and of far

lower quality, than that of the Seljuks or Ilkhanids, and on the basis of scanty evidence it seems that the output of copper was greater than the output of silver, which might, if true, imply that the beylik coinage was destined for small transactions, while the extant currencies from the hinterland (and, presumably, from Venice and Genoa) served the long-distance trade. Much more will be secure once scholars have fully evaluated al-’Umari’s materials on price levels and measures, which must be considered in terms of the Mamluk models he had in mind.

Next we may turn to the larger beyliks in the hinterland: Germiyan, Hamid and Karaman. The name of the first of these is the first to appear in the sources. By our period, Germiyan was centred on Phrygia, although the ruling family had been associated with the Seljuks initially in south-east Anatolia and then later in the west. In the last quarter of the thirteenth century they were sometimes nominally loyal to the Seljuks and sometimes acted independently; at one time they were subservient to the Ilkhanids, although just what that meant in practice is unclear. At the end of the thirteenth century, from their centre at Kütahya, their influence appears to have reached as far as Ankara, at least briefly. Yakub b. Alişir, about whom al-’Umari wrote, was an impressive ruler, some of whose lieutenants founded beyliks along the coast. The Ottoman chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade claims that the forces of Germiyan threatened the Ottomans’ southern flanks during the first few decades of the fourteenth century. The economic resources of the beylik appear to have been well developed: sources discuss the manufacture and marketing of high-quality weaving, a trade in horses (the beylik contained both land suitable for intensive agriculture and areas ideal for steppe animal husbandry) and trade in such raw materials as alum. In the second half of the fourteenth century the beylik no longer had free access to seaports, and became dependent upon the Ottomans for support against the beylik of Karaman. Bayezid I annexed the beylik in 1390, and although Timur re-established the family, and in the early fifteenth century the Ottomans made no attempt to extinguish it by force, it became part of the neighbouring enterprise in 1429. The Germiyanoğullan erected a number of mosques and imarets, and established a number of vakıfs, and they were also patrons of literature and of translations of works from Persian into Turkish. In the fifteenth century, at the end of the dynasty, a number of poets writing in Turkish worked at the court. The quality of fourteenth-century Germiyanid coinage is notably superior to that of many of the other beyliks.

19 See Mustafa Çetin Varlık, Germiyan-Oğulları Tarihi (1300–1429) (Ankara, 1974).
The base of the beylik of Hamid was Pisidia, and from the highlands and lakes the power of this dynasty spread south to the area discussed under Teke. Rule was divided between two branches of the family, but the area included a major trade route from the Mediterranean up country to the pastures and lakes. There is little information about this beylik, although it is clear that at a time when the other beyliks were flourishing, that is, when the central Mongol power in Iran was waning and before the spread of Ottoman claims, the Mongol governor Timurtas ravaged the territories and crippled the government of Hamid, as well as bringing to an end the lesser beylik of the Esrefoğulları (whose temporary wealth and influence appears reflected in the building programme at Beyşehir at the turn of the fourteenth century). Hamid is an example of a beylik attempting to balance itself between the Mongols on the one hand and the expansion of trade from the Antalya coast on the other.

The beylik of Karaman is the great exception, or perhaps better, it is the beylik which in some ways seemed best able to pick up the pieces after the Mongols disestablished the Seljuks. Already in 1277, when the family first took aim at rule in Konya, their declared policy was to replace Persian with Turkish as the court language. However, in many ways the dynasty looked to the past and relied on technologies that did not succeed in the long run, foremost of which was reliance upon a nomad military arm.

The Karamanids first came to notice in the area around Ermenek, which harbours routes to the south-east and Cilicia as well as over the Taurus and the great central plains east and north of Konya. Many of the family’s supporters were pastoralists, although they do not seem to have been the military equal of Mongol mounted archers in contests from 1277 on: the Karamanids were able to raid and occupy towns but not to defeat the Mongols. It was not until the departure of Timurtas in 1327 that the Karamanids were able to effect a decisive occupation of Konya, and even then, for the next generation they had to counter the threats of the Eretnids, who had originally acted as lieutenants of the Mongols. By the end of the third quarter of the fourteenth century, the dynasty controlled most of the Lycaonian plain as well as the lands running south beyond Ermenek to the coast.

The early contacts between the rulers of Karaman and the Ottomans were diplomatic, ending in a marriage alliance, which did not prevent warfare from breaking out over the legacy of the beylik of Hamid. Bayezid I annexed the beylik, and the Ottomans found themselves facing future confrontations with the Karamanids’ sometime allies, the Mamluks. The final conquest of the beylik of Karaman after its reconstitution by Timur goes beyond the bounds of this chapter, but it is useful to note that supporters of members of the
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dynasty were always able to seek refuge in the rough hill country from which the pastoralists had first set forth in the thirteenth century. The last eruption from Karaman enthusiasts occurred in 1500–1.

To some extent, the beys of Karaman, once they ruled in confidence from Konya, inherited some of the advantages that the Seljuks had enjoyed in the 1220s and 1230s. They did not control the north coast of the peninsula, but they did have access to the Mediterranean, and a network of trade routes converged on and diverged from Konya. They shared control over the Taurus passes with Armenian lords, and they were able to extract duty from Italian merchants at a number of south coast ports. The Lycaonian plain was rich in horses and sheep, which allowed the export of animals, raised by tribes known as horse drovers (At Çeken), and quality woven goods (textiles from Aksaray). The wealth so obtained went in part to continue the traditions of Seljuk art and architecture.20

The sizeable interior beyliks differed from their coastal neighbours in a number of ways. Each had much less of a Byzantine legacy and rather more of a Seljuk and Mongol imprint. Although Karaman had a long coastline, it did not build a fleet of raiding vessels as did the beyliks facing the Aegean. They had a larger pastoral element to their economies and populations. One institution that they all shared, however, was urban adherents to the ahi brotherhoods, and if we understand Ibn Battuta correctly, it was these brotherhoods that provided certain social and also economic links that crossed the frontiers between the beyliks. Further, the opportunities for a sudden enhancement of their position, such as a successful raid or alliance with a European power might bring, really did not exist: aside from attacking a neighbour, the opportunity to increase one’s power grew only as the post-Mongol enterprise of the Eretnids lessened in importance. Karaman was the big winner here. However, none of the interior beyliks had the power to withstand the growth of the Ottomans, and it is worthwhile considering why this was the case. It may rest in part on the conservative nature of the military forces of the beyliks, or on the lack of a pragmatic administrative structure (it is typical in the scholarly literature to see the beyliks as carrying on the Seljuk traditions), or perhaps on contingent events about which we are presently ignorant.

The Candaroğulları or İşfendiyaroğulları, east and north of the Ottomans, form one of two interesting beyliks on the north coast of the peninsula. The dynasty established itself in the last decade of the thirteenth century under

20 The classic survey, representing two traditional approaches, is Ernst Diez, Oktay Aslanapa and Mahmud Mesut Koman, Karaman Devri Sanatı (İstanbul, 1950); there are numerous later publications of particular monuments and genre examples.
murky circumstances involving the Seljuks and Ilkhanids. The dynasty minted coins under Ilkhanid suzerainty in the early fourteenth century, and its two centres were Kastamonu and the port of Sinop. There are reports of a large nomad population in the area at the end of the thirteenth century, and some evidence that certain of the groups responsible for revolts against the Seljuks in 1238 had relocated there, but the sources tell us relatively little about nomadic activity. Rule was usually divided between the members of the family ruling in Kastamonu and Sinop, and the bases of power were probably different in kind, since Sinop was a great entrepôt. Once again, Bayezid I subdued the beylik and Timur saw to its reconstitution; the beylik lasted until 1461. Trade, exports of raw materials (copper, iron) from the Pontic mountains and a competent navy preserved the beylik for some time. In some ways this beylik is similar to its neighbour to the east, the Byzantine ‘beylik’ of Trebizond (Trabzon), which enjoyed prosperous agriculture in the valleys of the Pontic alps, had control of the coastal end of a major route to Iran and also held out until the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror. These two northern polities were influenced by the Mongols on the one hand and by the European trading cities on the other; the coinage of Kastamonu betrays Mongol influence, while the Trebizondine issues bear a relation to the Venetian issues.21

How different were the beyliks from the Seljuk sultanate of Rum? Most obviously, they were smaller and more compact. They had fewer resources but at the same time fewer obligations. A number of the beyliks existed on land which had not known Muslim rule before, and these faced both a Byzantine past and a maritime legacy. While some were founded by former officials familiar with the scribal traditions of the Seljuks, others grew from Turkish nomad tribes. All of them reflected greater or lesser Mongol influence, sometimes only in linguistic usage, occasionally in institutional practice, often in military orientation, and certainly to some extent in the source of their population, for of the Mongol tumans that entered Anatolia in the 1250s, not all returned to the east. When the new immigrants settled the coastal cities in the fourteenth century, they built up new areas: the new mosques are often outside the older Byzantine settlement. In the cities and the courts, Turkish became more and more the language of choice, and there was a considerable amount of translation, along with new literary production in poetry and prose. Some of the beyliks were modest centres of patronage for this literature, and most experimented with the construction of a Friday mosque, occasionally departing

21 For the coinage see Celil Ender, Üstün Erek and Gültekin Teoman, Candaroğulları Beyliği (İsfendiyaroğulları Beyliği) Paraları Kataloğu (İstanbul, 2003), pp. 33–52.
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from Seljuk models. There was probably less trans-peninsular trade, but there was more trade from the plateau to the Aegean coast, as well as the development of pastoral production (animals, textiles) in the lowlands newly settled by Turks.

The Ottomans

Of the beyliks, it was the Ottomans who succeeded, unifying Anatolia over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and advancing to the Danube. Unfortunately, their origins are obscured by the present state of the evidence and the relative care taken by their early chroniclers to homogenise the story of their rise to power. As scholars have examined the sources in greater depth and sought out neglected or new sources, it seems that in some ways they are less sure today than was the case a generation ago. What follows is surely partly true but not very likely the whole truth.

One of the problems facing historians of the earliest Ottoman years is the reconciliation of the Byzantine sources and the Ottoman chronicles. Although some of the material in the chronicles may go back earlier than 1422, it is very hard to test accounts of events dating back to the early fourteenth century. Aşıkpaşaazade claims to rely in part on a source whose author lived in Orhan’s time, but no other exemplar of this source has surfaced, and the material it retails looks to contain a certain amount of romance. The Byzantine sources are more contemporary, and it is convenient to attempt a reconciliation on the grounds that what seemed significant to one author would have found agreement from another. But this need not be true, and some of the attempts at fitting Byzantine and Ottoman accounts together have failed under closer scrutiny. So we face the interesting challenge of balancing two accounts that are occasionally rather distant from each other.

A second problem arises from the nature of the early Ottoman chronicles, which, it is now clear, contain a fair amount of folk tradition. If this is so, then at what point may we begin to take these chronicles seriously? A conservative view would place this time in the middle of Orhan’s reign. In the reconstruction

23 I am deeply indebted, in what follows, to the excellent chronological account of Imber, Ottoman Empire.
below, however, a more liberal attitude will reign, tempered by a certain humility.

How should this history be organised? This chapter will follow a tradition honoured by time and discuss the events and processes reign by reign. We have no means at present of retrieving the personalities of the early Ottoman rulers, but at the same time it does not appear that the events were more in the hands of administrators or persons whose judgement ran independently of the wish of the chief (and, later, sultan). There is some evidence that there are some changes in policy due to the character of a new sultan, but it would be imprudent to make a wholesale claim in this regard. For the moment, until one sees the development of a solid institutional base or countervailing forces away from the centre of the enterprise, it seems safe to organise the history by the reigns of the heads of the enterprise.

The forefathers of the Ottomans appear to have entered Anatolia either just before, with or immediately after the Mongol incursions of the 1240s and 1250s. Ottoman tradition had Osman’s father, Ertuğrul, like so many founders of later beyliks, arrive in the frontier zone between the weakened Seljuk polity and the weakening Byzantine Empire. In particular, the nomads and other followers in what may well have been a tribally organised group enjoyed pastures and cultivable lands between Eskishehir (Dorylaion) and what is now Bilecik, at a place now called Söğüt (probably an ancient settlement, given that spolia have been found in the area, but its ancient name is not confirmed). We know nothing about the life of Ertuğrul, and his existence is independently attested only by a coin of his son Osman.

Ottoman history begins with this Osman, about whom the chronicles weave a tantalising web of tales. It should be noted right at the start that because the contemporary Byzantine chronicler Pachymeres refers to him as Atman, Colin Heywood has reasonably suggested that he had some relation to the Mongols north and north-west of the Byzantines, and that Pachymeres had ‘hetman’ in mind. Osman’s career is one of conquest, moving to secure his rear against the beys of Germiyan, defending himself against Mongols to the south-east, and advancing slowly to the west and north-west down the Sakarya (Sangarios) river, towards the ‘Bithynian Riviera’.

The early Ottoman chronicles indicate that Osman began to act independently of the Seljuks around 1299. It is far from clear that Seljuk authority ran north-west as far as the frontier of Phrygia and Bithynia, but it does seem clear that the Ilkhanid authority came pretty close, at least sporadically. There is a silver dirhem at Tübingen minted in the name of the Ilkhan Ghazan, dated 699, with the mint Söğüt (modern Söğüt). During that year some forty-six
mints struck silver dirhems in Anatolia, a record, as mentioned previously. It is possible that there is a relationship between this annus mirabilis and the revolt of the Ilkhanid governor Sülemeş, but in any case the implication is that in 699 whoever held authority at Söğüt was beholden to the Ilkhan. And there is later evidence from an accounting treatise that in Orhan’s time the Mongols expected his tribute. So it would not be outlandish to expect to find Osman within the Ilkhanid orbit at the beginning of his public career.

Our first indisputable evidence comes from the Byzantine chronicler Pachymeres, who tells the story of a battle at Bapheus, quite near Nicomedia (İzmit), in July 1302, in which Osman and a force of nomad archers defeated a Byzantine force accompanied by Alan auxiliaries. It is possible that bad weather upstream and a rare flood of the Sakarya (Sangarios) downstream made it attractive to Osman and other Turkish beys to seek to recoup damage to their herds in the lowlands. At this time Osman was no more powerful than a number of other minor beys south and east of the Sakarya basin.

However, over the course of the succeeding decade Osman took control of lands west of the Sakarya and well into the Bursa plain. He was unable to seize any of the cities, but he extended his influence over the small communities without much opposition from Constantinople. At the time of his death, probably in 1324, he had yet to obtain control of a city, although he was master of much of the lowland areas outside of İznik (Nicaea) and Bursa (Prusa). It should be noted that in the 1290s there was little reason for the Byzantines to take much notice of him, and membership in the bands of the nomad chiefs was still fluid, depending on their successes. A good deal of Osman’s success in the Bithynian lowlands derives from the fact that the Byzantines had relaxed their defences and had a very small army available for service in Anatolia. As for Osman’s own success, there is some evidence from vakıf documents and registers. These make it clear that many of his foundations were located in the southern, less economically productive area of his domains: in fact, the resources available to him, if the foundations are any measure, were limited and by no means the equal of his neighbouring beys.25

What was the economic adaptation of the Ottomans in Osman’s time? It looks as if the military force available to Osman was nomadic, that is, it was a body of mounted archers. There is no evidence of the availability of siege engines for İznik or Bursa. Nor is there much evidence of the need for an independent coinage, although the same could be said of the beyliks to the

25 See the very suggestive study by Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, ‘La conquête de la Bithynie maritime, étape décisive dans la fondation de l’état ottoman,’ in Byzanz als Raum, ed. Klaus Belke, Fridrich Bild, Johannes Koder and Peter Soustal (Vienna, 2000), pp. 21–35.
south and north-east. Aşıkpaşazade writes of Osman’s having fostered the
growth of a town, Yenişehir, in the plain not far from Bursa, but this site is
also an ancient foundation, and it is not clear that the occupation means the
wholesale adoption of sedentary ways. It looks as though Osman was a nomad
chief making his fortune, after the early 1300s, in an area of agrarian wealth.
The early Ottoman advance, and this was true for many years, seems to have
been based upon the discovery that the rewards of expansion substantially
exceeded the costs incurred. Osman was master of the countryside but had
yet to adopt urban ways.

What was the religious orientation of the earliest Ottoman beylik? Although
the early Ottoman chronicles occasionally retail stories that have the bouquet
of heterodoxy about them, the purpose of these folktales is at least in part
to connect the Ottomans with a particular location rather than to suggest a
dubious orthodoxy. Many of the settled subjects of Osman were Christians;
many of his nomads were Muslims whose self-definition in religious terms
probably varied from those definitions of urban Muslims in the hinterland;
and as for the ruling family itself, the creation of vakıfs close to Söğüt implies
that orthodox Sunni scholars were available, as well as Sufis and, perhaps,
wandering specialists in comparative religion.  

There is nothing to be identified with certainty as Ottoman art at this early
stage. Architectural remains in many of the other beyliks survive from at least a
generation before the first Ottoman building that we may still study, a mosque
in İz尼克 founded in 1333.

In terms of administration, there is also little to be said. A surviving vakıf
document, drawn up for Orhan in 1324 and concerning the foundation of
a hospice for dervishes in Mekece, in the lower Sakarya basin, indicates that
there were scholars available and able to compose documents in Persian. The
earliest inscriptions indicate the presence of scholars competent in Arabic, and
when Ibn Battuta passed through the area in 1331 he refered to a few scholars
who had come to the area from the south and east. There is little more to help
us out before the time of Orhan.

The sources for the career of Osman’s son Orhan (r. c.1324–62) are somewhat
better. As noted before, there are gaps in the chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade, but
the Byzantine sources provide fuller information about this more threatening
neighbour, and European sources begin to notice the Ottoman beylik. It is also
possible to discern a number of processes that begin during Orhan’s lengthy

---

26 I owe this expression to Professor Jacob Lassner.
27 A good statement of the significance of such foundations appears in Caroline Finkel,
reign. First, an administration takes root, for which we have the physical evidence of an independent coinage, with a sophisticated design. Second, the military arm of the beylik turns to sedentary modes of warfare, with an infantry wing. Third, there is a military advance into the Balkans. Fourth, religious institutions and a corresponding architectural tradition take firm root. Fifth, there is evidence of a symbiosis between Christian and Muslim. Finally, there is an economic expansion corresponding to the military advance, and this follows upon the conquest of the major Bithynian cities during the first dozen years or so of Orhan’s rule. Not all, or even most, of these processes were planned in advance, but they reflect a shrewd opportunistic character shared by many persons of influence.

When Orhan came to power Bursa had already been paying tribute to the Ottomans for at least fifteen years, and the city languished under blockade. In April 1326 Bursa surrendered; within a year Orhan had established a mint and struck dirhems there. A year later, an earthquake made possible the seizure of Ulubad. By 1329, pastoralists were grazing their flocks on the hills above the coastal communities on the northern coast of the Gulf of İzmit.

The Byzantine emperor, Andronikos III, decided to do what he could to prevent the encirclement of İzmit. In June 1329, he led an army along the coast road in the hope of beating the Ottomans to the high ground. When the soldiers arrived at Pelekanon, south-west of Gebze, they found the Ottoman cavalry awaiting them on the high ground. For much of the day the Ottomans attempted, in the fashion of steppe warfare, to ride down and wear out the Byzantines with their storms of arrows, but this failed. It was only after the chance wounding of the emperor, which led to a frenzied retreat of the soldiers to the coastal keeps, that the Ottomans were able to win the day. The story of this battle, which appears in extenso in the chronicle of Kantakouzenos, is more of a Byzantine defeat than of an Ottoman victory. It tells us that, even commanding the high ground, the Ottomans were unable to dislodge the Byzantine line of defence: which means that the Ottomans did not have enough nomads. Given that the Bithynian lowlands were used for cultivation rather than pasture, and that the pastures east of and above the Sakarya basin were not yet in Ottoman hands, the lack of sufficient nomadic strength is understandable. And so is the consequent Ottoman development of an infantry wing: the new circumstances of city and country life, begun by Osman and continued by Orhan, led in due course to a sedentarisation of Ottoman military thought and practice.

On the Byzantine side, the 1329 campaign of Andronikos was his last attempt to dislodge the Ottomans from Bithynia. In due course the remaining cities
capitulated. In 1331 İznik became an Ottoman possession. When Ibn Battuta arrived a few months later, he noted the dilapidated condition of the city, which must have proved an instructive contrast to Bursa, which he found prosperous and attractive. By 1337, despite Byzantine tribute paid to protect it, İzmit was in Ottoman hands.

Some time after this, the Ottomans annexed the beylik of Karası, but the story is obscure. It is possible that family disputes hastened the fall of the independent polity, which may be dated as late as 1346. There are also indications that some of the leading figures in the beylik were in favour of adopting an Ottoman overlord, perhaps in order to increase their opportunities in Thrace. Beyond this, at some point Orhan turned his attention to the east, for in the 1330s Ibn Battuta found Göynük and neighbouring towns under Ottoman control, with Ankara added perhaps twenty years later. This expansion, the details of which are presently denied us, reflects the collapse of Mongol authority in Galatia in the last years of the Ilkhanid Abu Sa’id as well as the inability of the Germiyanids, who had once threatened Eskişehir, to control the lands east of Phrygia.

The Ottoman entry into Balkan history began during Orhan’s reign. In a history of Turkey it is unclear just how much emphasis should be placed on the internal history of the Balkans, but the topic cannot be ignored, since so much that transpired in Anatolia had close connections with developments across the straits. So perhaps it is best to rest upon the convention of the older diplomatic histories and recount part of the story of ‘Turkey in Europe’.

In retrospect, it is difficult to understand why a Byzantine leader would call upon a Turkish leader for troops to assist in Balkan campaigns. Although the Byzantines had paid tribute to Orhan in the 1330s in order to protect the northern coast of the Gulf of İzmit and the city of İzmit itself, the Ottomans seized the city in 1337. It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that the internecine quarrels over the Byzantine throne seemed more important than the preservation of Byzantine control in the countryside, and that the dynastic contenders were short sighted. Perhaps, instead, the willingness to enlist Turkish auxiliaries represents only a continuation of a practice that went back centuries in Byzantine annals, and that those who brought them in felt that their utility more than made up for the possibility that they would remain, unite and appropriate the land. It may be offered that some of the Turkish formations were tribal and fluid, willing to change allegiance when a chief faltered, and

28 Cf. Zachariadou, ‘Karasi’, a valiant attempt to solve the thorny problems arising from the sources that mention this beylik.
that possibility may have assumed primacy of place in the rulers' strategic planning.

In 1329, at Pelekanon, John Kantakouzenos fought against Orhan and his army. In 1346 the two became allies and in-laws. For the previous five years Kantakouzenos had been disputing, from Thrace, the party of the young John V Palaeologos in Constantinople. Both sides sought troops from Orhan, and Kantakouzenos won; in 1346 Orhan married a daughter of Kantakouzenos, who was able to enter the capital a year later. On three further occasions Kantakouzenos called for Ottoman assistance, and Orhan responded. During these campaigns, in which a certain amount of freebooting accompanied the planned evolutions, Orhan's forces learned about the landscape, the resources and the capacities of the opposing forces. We should bear in mind that there had already been forces from the other beyliks campaigning in the Balkans, especially from Umur Bey of Aydın. Some of these forces later came under Ottoman control, and their earlier independence is not clear from the Ottoman chronicles alone.

At this point nature intervened. In March 1354, an earthquake levelled some of the walls of Gallipoli (Gelibolu) and other neighbouring communities. Orhan’s son Süleyman Paşa, who had earlier occupied for a time a fortification in Thrace, returned from Anatolia, occupied Gallipoli and fortified it as well as other positions. Süleyman Paşa died in 1357, but not before entering Ottoman annals as a figure of heroic proportions.

The record of the Ottoman advance in Thrace is obscure, and it appears to have had a caesura for a few years after 1357 when one of Orhan’s sons, Halil, was captured and imprisoned in Phocaea (Foça). The Byzantines ultimately ransomed him and, after arranging another marriage alliance, this time between Halil and the emperor’s daughter, returned him in the hope of buying peace. This did not last, although there seems little evidence of Orhan’s intervention in Europe during Halil’s captivity. By Orhan’s death in 1362, however, the city of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka) in Thrace had recently fallen to Turkish forces.

During the latter part of Orhan’s reign, he became at least a temporary ally of Genoa against Venice (1352). This event suggests that, along with Aydın


30 Although he is famous for his remembered exploits in Thrace, he also soldiered in Paphlagonia and Galatia, where he occupied Gerede and Ankara. One should also note the large number of buildings associated with him in Ekrem Hakik Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mi’marisinin İlk Devri 630–805 (1230–1402) (Istanbul, 1966).
and Menteşe, the Ottoman beylik had assumed a larger role and was not only a menace to Constantinople but also a Mediterranean presence, despite its lack of a fearsome navy (although by this time the Ottomans had inherited the navy of Karası). And if we look at the architecture of Orhan’s era and the records of pious foundations, we see a development in the direction of greater sophistication and greater resources (away from the plateau and more firmly planted in the rich Bithynian lowlands). If Orhan had begun his independent career as a nomad chief, he ended it as a sedentary statesman, on an equal footing with the Byzantine leaders and a potential ally with whom to reckon carefully.

The year 1354 is not only the date of a definitive Ottoman advance into Thrace but also the year in which the theologian Gregory Palamas found himself in Ottoman captivity for some weeks. Palamas’s account is a precious record of a cosmopolitan moment in at least one part of Asia Minor. We learn of serious interfaith discussions (in which Palamas was a master, as his teachings on Byzantine theology demonstrate), of Graecophone employees enjoying Orhan’s confidence, and perhaps of the process of symbiosis en route to full conversion.31

The economic basis of Orhan’s beylik was broader and probably wealthier than had been the case in Osman’s time. The coinage that we can attribute to Osman seems occasional and is certainly rare. Orhan’s coinage has at least three types, one of which seems to hark back to a well-attested and frequently found Rum Seljuk issue; and while infrequent, his issues may be found in most major collections.

There is also a fair amount of construction in Orhan’s time, including not only mosques but also medreses: that is, Orhan’s religious advisers were establishing means of replicating themselves without the need of importing talent. When İznik fell to the Ottomans, mosques and medreses (the Hacı Özbek mosque and the first Ottoman medrese of 1331, the same year in which Ibn Battuta compared the newly conquered city unfavourably with Bursa) soon joined the older Byzantine structures. In Bursa, the Orhan Bey mosque (1339) shows features of Byzantine construction, so that the edifice has a style that may be termed, in the usage of Clive Foss, ‘Byzlamic’.

At this point it is useful to address an issue that has troubled specialists for quite some time, the origins of the janissary corps and the introduction of the devşirme, the enslavement of Christian children, who were trained for careers

31 Anna Philippides-Braat, ‘La captivité de Palamas chez les Turcs, dossier et commentaire,’ *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979), 109–221.
in either the military or government. The origins of these institutions are also enmeshed in the question of the origins and development of an Ottoman infantry corps. Did these originate during the reign of Orhan or Murad I? Recent research indicates that existing chronicle accounts of the origins of the infantry corps are based upon questionable grounds, which makes it more difficult to place the janissaries and devsirme before the reign of Murad. If, as now seems likely, we place these latter in Murad’s reign, it is still difficult to establish a precise date for the introduction of either. They were certainly in existence by the heyday of Bayezid I, but further research in the archives will be needed to narrow the list of possibilities to particular years in the 1370s and 1380s, as well as resolving the order of their creation.\footnote{See the remarkable short study by Colin Imber, ‘The Origin of the Janissaries’, \textit{Journal of Turkish Studies} 26 (2002), 15–19. See also the very suggestive study by Vassilis Demetriades, ‘Some Thoughts on the Origins of the Devşirme’, in Zachariadou, \textit{The Ottoman Emirate}, pp. 23–31.}

In general, our sources for the reign of Murad I (1362–89) improve as the Ottomans attracted more attention from their neighbours in the Balkans, but from the perspective of the Ottoman materials, the chronicles continue to obfuscate when it suits their patrons and victorious perspective. And of course, the European materials are centred on the Balkans, so our knowledge of Anatolian affairs suffers (and thus our treatment of them is shorter). Again, we are at the beginning of our appreciation of the materials available in Turkish archives bearing on this period. For example, we will have cause later to discuss the thorny matter of succession to rule, a topic of concern to all historians of Muslim communities, especially when laying out the bare bones of the aftermath of the battle of Ankara in 1402. However, there is evidence that even earlier the passage from ruler to ruler in the Ottoman domains was not as comfortable as the chronicles suggest, and this is also true of the passage to Murad I, although we have no precise information on the relationships of the offspring of Orhan.\footnote{See in general Joseph Fletcher, ‘Turco-Mongolian Monarchic Tradition in the Ottoman Empire’, \textit{Harvard Ukrainian Studies} 3–4 (1979–80), 236–51.}

By the time Murad cemented his hold on Ottoman rule, the Mongol imperium in central and eastern Anatolia was on the wane. Ankara may have become Eretnid at some point after 1354, but the city was in Ottoman hands by the time Murad died. None of the beyliks, save perhaps Karaman, had the military resources to withstand Ottoman pressure, and the expansion of the Ottomans to the south-east reflects this balance of power. The more populous, more agriculturally diverse and trading beyliks of the south-west coast
remained independent for another generation. However, an upland arrowhead of territory, pointed towards Ankara and with sides extending on the west as far as Simav and in the south as far as the coastline between Antalya and Manavgat, became Ottoman during this period. It contained a number of small towns, pasture areas (in the neighbourhood of Sivrihisar), the plateau lakes between Akşehir and Beyşehir, and the old caravan route south from the plateau to the coast.

The beyliks in contention were Germiyan, Hamid, a small part of Karaman and Teke. The northern section of Germiyan, including its capital Kütahya, are said to have come via a marriage alliance, and Hamid by purchase, accounts which the reader may accept with a healthy dose of scepticism. These events may have taken place in the second half of the 1370s; by the mid-1380s, the bey of Karaman raided recently acquired Ottoman lands, which brought Murad back from the Balkans and ended with the acquisition of Beyşehir; and Teke, including Antalya, he annexed immediately afterwards.

There is one aspect of these last Anatolian campaigns that reveals a change in the balance of power. In the first half of the fourteenth century, Byzantines and Balkan lords made use of mercenaries from the Anatolian beyliks. By the end of the 1380s, it was the Ottomans who could call upon their Balkan, Christian dependants to provide them with manpower for their expeditions in Asia Minor. This reservoir of soldiery was further proof that no Anatolian power could withstand the full force of Ottoman power. It also revealed that the Ottomans, on the other hand, might not be able to handle, at the same time, warfare on both the eastern and western land frontiers of their expanding enterprise.

In the Balkans, by the end of his life Murad ruled over an area probably no less in extent and economic capacity than the area he controlled in Anatolia. It is important to realise that not all of these conquests in Europe were closely directed by the sultan (and the coinage of Murad begins to refer to the ruler as sultan). A number of marcher lords, some of whom may have begun their careers as independent freebooters, spread Turkish power and enjoyed a certain independence when, for a few years after 1366, the Byzantines briefly enjoyed control of Gelibolu. They were most likely responsible for the seizure of Edirne (Adrianople) in 1369, and it may be one of them to whom we owe the introduction of what we know as the *devşirme*. They played a major role in organising raids and establishing vantage points for further advance.

---

Some of them also are responsible for a number of building programmes as well. Ultimately, a lord appearing to possess designs of independence was executed (Hacı İlbeği); others became Ottoman servants and were able to create substantial estates as they moved along with the conquest (Evrenos went from Edirne to Komotini to Serres and finally to Yenice on the Vardar).

During the early years of Murad’s reign, including the period when the crusade of Amadeo of Savoy had placed Gelibolu back in Byzantine hands, Turkish forces moved west and north, reaching as far as Filibe (Philippopolis, modern Plovdiv) along the Maritsa (Meric). After the battle of the Maritsa near Çirmen (1371) the Turks were able to consolidate their power radiating west and north of Edirne. During the early 1370s, Murad was able to cross the Rhodope mountains and advance to the Struma. Finally, by the end of the 1380s, one prong of Ottoman power had reached Monastir and Ohrid to the west, while another had reached Niš (Niš), and the campaign of 1389, advancing in between these two, had reached Kosovo. These conquests were far more rapid than the Ottoman advance to the south and east in Anatolia, and the speed of the advance may explain the survival of many Balkan institutions. It is useful to speculate that these Ottoman advances may have been due in part to the willingness of one or another participant in Balkan rivalries to support the Turks.

There remains some confusion over the chronology and order of the Ottoman advance into the Balkans during Murad’s career. After the fall of Edirne, an alliance of Serb rulers led to battle near the Maritsa in 1371. The Turks were victorious, and Edirne became a base for advances to the north and west. No later than 1376 Murad, thanks to successful interference in Byzantine affairs, was back in full control of Gelibolu. By 1380, he controlled the area of Bulgaria south of the Balkan mountains directly; the area to the north, as far as the Danube, may have owed the Ottomans service thanks to a marriage alliance. A campaign in 1388 established a clear subservience of the Bulgarian polity.

---

36 For a broader perspective linking the importance of trade routes in both peninsulas, see E. A. Zachariadou, ‘From Avlona to Antalya: Reviewing the Ottoman Military Operations of the 1380s’, in The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380–1699), ed. E. A. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1996), pp. 227–32.
37 I owe this thought to the article ‘Murad I’ in El2, vii, pp. 392–4, by J. H. Kramers.
38 Here I follow, with gratitude, Imber’s Ottoman Empire, pp. 28–36. Further details on the later chronology are in Stephen W. Reinert, ‘From Niš to Kosovo Polje, Reflections on Murad I’s Final Years’, in Zachariadou, The Ottoman Emirate, pp. 169–211.
The reader will note that there is some lack of clarity concerning the precise time when the Ottomans were again able to cross to Europe via Gelibolu. Thus, it is difficult to argue that an early advance was ‘Ottoman’ as opposed to ‘Turkish’ or due to the initiative of a marcher lord on a loose tether. We understand that at this time Murad had a governor appointed over his European domains, Lala Şahin, who also appears in the chronicle record, as well as a vezir, Çandarlı Halil. However, the lord Evrenos moved across Thrace in the late 1360s. Turkish threats against Thessalonike (Selanik), beginning already in 1372, led to renewed European diplomacy; the advance also may have fuelled rivalries at the Byzantine court, where a civil war broke out, lasting for most of the decade. At its conclusion, the Byzantines found themselves forced to provide service to the Ottomans. Byzantium was now another beylik.

To the west and south, raids continued into the 1380s, taking advantage of discord within the Byzantine ruling family and the rivalries of Balkan princes. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a series of raids and a campaign of conquest, and it is also difficult to distinguish between military exploits planned and directed from the sultan’s court at Edirne and the opportunistic adventures of the men in the field. By 1386, Albania had become a target of opportunity, parts of Macedonia had come under Ottoman suzerainty and, closer to home, Sofia had become Ottoman. In 1387 Thessalonike fell to an Ottoman siege, despite a years’-long defence. By 1388 the commercial entrepôts of Genoa and Venice had established rights in the growing Ottoman territories. The marcher lord Evrenos had, after raiding to the west, turned south on behalf of a Byzantine lord and brought his troops against Latin possessions.

By this time, Turkish raids and Ottoman occupation of cities stretching west and north-west had come close to flanking the lands of the Serbian rulers on their east and south. In 1387 the forces of Prince Lazar defeated an Ottoman army. Just how and why this occurred is not clear; a year after a campaign in Anatolia against Karaman, it is possible that the Ottoman forces were not at their best. But the same happened in 1388, when Turkish forces fought against the Bosnian king.

All this was prelude to the 1389 campaign in which Murad’s and Lazar’s forces met at Kosovo, with both rulers losing their lives after a prolonged and bloody battle, of which the memory, real and imagined, has resonated down through the centuries in Balkan emotions. The key point to bear in mind here is that, whereas the sacrifices of the Serb and Albanian forces may have stemmed the Turkish tide momentarily, the resources of the Ottomans, their organisation, their ability to project ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ forces in more than one theatre at a time, all kept the balance of power firmly in Ottoman hands.
In this overview of Murad’s generation, the military account has, as usual, taken pride of place, in large part because the literary sources emphasise such deeds. And there were important military developments, of course: the janissary corps, the adoption and spread of techniques of siege warfare, used time and again on Balkan campaigns, and the establishment of a system of revenue allotments, timars, to fund an army of mounted warriors more reliable than nomads (and the existence of these revenue allotments implies the establishment of registers of revenue sources). There is, thus, little doubt that during his reign an Ottoman administrative style began to develop, with less reliance upon Seljuk tradition, Mongol practice, Byzantine influence or nomadic custom. In terms of artistic patronage, Anatolia is still the centre, at least in terms of surviving, larger structures, such as the mosques Murad established in Bursa (e.g. Hüdavendigar Camii, 1385). In religious developments, by the end of Murad’s reign the medreses that first appear in Orhan’s years have provided nearly two generations’ worth of graduates, and the number of religious scholars who appear to have been émigrés seems smaller. The Ottomans, in 1389, were a power on two continents, against whom no immediate neighbour could stand with equal forces or resources. Murad assumed the leadership of a beylik; he left behind an imperial enterprise.

Murad’s successor, Bayezid I (1389–1402), became sultan on the battlefield of Kosovo. He is known as Yıldırım, ‘the thunderbolt’, thanks to a reputation for quick resolve. He removed himself and his forces from the field immediately in order to respond to attempts at greater independence from the beys of Germiyan, Karaman and the post-Mongol ruler of eastern Anatolia, Kadi Burhaneddin of Sivas. He took along with him Serb and Byzantine auxiliaries, while some of his forces remained behind and seized Skoplje (Üsküp) in 1391. It would be interesting to know how the leaders of the Anatolian beyliks kept in touch with Ottoman progress in the Balkans and how their strategies reflected such knowledge.

We do not know the strategic thought behind Bayezid’s campaign in western Anatolia, but it is possible to see it in part as an attempt to gain full control of outlets to the Aegean (and a larger navy) as well as a project to protect his right flank. His forces seized the last Byzantine outpost in the peninsula, Philadelphia (Alaşehir), and then the coastal principalities, and brought Germiyan completely to heel. Fighting against the Karamanids on the plateau

while repelling raids from Kadi Burhaneddin and his allies in the north proved difficult. Bayezid was unable to bring his siege of Konya to a successful conclusion, and in the north he was unable to move beyond Amasya.

Bayezid had little to fear from Byzantium as a military force, but diplomatic overtures to European powers, and especially Venice, led him to begin, in 1394, the first blockade of Constantinople; ultimately, after 1396, the Muslims resident in the city had their own judge, thanks to his pressure. The efforts of his marcher lords in the Balkans brought some success, and in early 1394 Bayezid gathered his subordinate Balkan Christian lords together at Serres, where he sought to bring them under closer Ottoman domination. Some of them turned to Venice, and this led Ottoman forces south, into Greece as far as the Morea. In 1395 Bayezid campaigned in Hungary and parts of Romania, returning via Bulgaria.

In 1396 a force of European and east European knights set forth on crusade against Bayezid. They met his army at Nikopolis and were crushed.\(^40\) This was a battle between two different conceptions of warfare: a European tradition featuring the mounted charger, and an infantry army closely dug in and difficult to dislodge by techniques of the feudal era. The ransom of captives brought the kingdom of France and the Ottomans into diplomatic contact for the first time.\(^41\)

The failure of European assistance in 1396 strengthened Bayezid’s hand vis-à-vis his enemies, who could not count on diversions from the west in their aid. In the following year Bayezid was finally able to seize Konya and the Karamanid domains, and in 1398 the lands of Kadi Burhaneddin. This in turn brought a riposte from Timur, who claimed to speak on behalf of the leaders of the former beyliks; Bayezid, on his part, opposed the Inner Asian leader’s claims to leadership. Timur had at his disposal not only the older argument for Mongol world domination; he could also claim to protect the Muslim beyliks against Bayezid’s aggressive demands. The battle between their armies at Ankara in 1402 was very different from that at Nikopolis, and in a sense it harked back to the old argument over Mongol numbers versus Mamluk training. Bayezid had at his disposal a core army of janissaries, but they were unequal in numbers to the task. The result, however, was momentarily devastating to the Ottoman cause, as Bayezid’s forces could not surmount Timur’s army, and the sultan


was taken captive. The Ottoman enterprise in Anatolia, as established (but not firmly) over the previous decade by Bayezid, foundered.\footnote{42 See the reprint, with additions, of Marie-Mathilde Alexandru-Dersca, \textit{La campagne de Timur en Anatolie} (London, 1982).}

This is not to say that the story of Bayezid is the story of hubris finding its true reward, of a Turkish Croesus discovering that if he crossed the line, the great empire that fell would be his. Perhaps too much attention is paid to the military aspect of his reign. The largest architectural monument of his reign is the complex now called Anadolu Hisari, built where the Bosphorus narrows and designed to assist in the siege of Constantinople; however, his builders also constructed a complex in Bursa, and most of the construction attributed to his reign is in Anatolia, with a number of buildings in the Balkans associated with the marcher lords. We also learn that Bayezid, perhaps as part of his rivalry with Timur, sought the title ‘Sultan of Rum’. There is also a slight hint that in the aftermath of Nikopolis at least one text recounting the deeds of the Ottoman dynasty was in the process of composition, a witness to the beginning of a historical self-consciousness that came to fruition a generation later. Bayezid reigned for too short a time, and too short a time in one place, for us to gather a clear idea of the artistic patronage he displayed.

The following twenty years are amongst the most confused in the history of the establishment of Ottoman power. There are not only the usual questions concerning evaluation of sources and the concordance of discordant traditions. There is also the problem of understanding the motivations behind the actions of the major political players. It seems fair at this remove to offer the judgement that the actions of Bayezid’s sons rested upon rapid calculations, short-sighted motives and a lack of evidence sufficient to justify rational choices (it is of course not at all clear that a ‘rational choice’ model comes anywhere near close to representing the course of events). The historian is left with the consuming desire to bring order out of chaos, and the preceding pages have reflected a decision to outline rather than to provide full detail, but in the treatment of this era it may be fairer to provide the reader with a sense of the significance of the contingent in the reconstruction of the polity Bayezid had expanded so rapidly. One key to forcing an understanding, however blunt, of the situation is to note that once a leader had won a temporarily superior position, he did not rest; rather than recoup their strengths and let the gelatin of their good fortune harden, they often pressed on, to their ultimate disadvantage.

It is also important to bear in mind that, during this period, the institutional structure of the enterprises continued, if suffering from fits and starts. In
Anatolia, of course, the campaign of Timur and his raiding after the battle of Ankara – on top of which we must place his dismemberment of the acquisitions of Bayezid and the reconstitution of the beyliks – brought the establishment of a unified administrative practice to a two-decades-long halt.\(^{43}\) However, the Ottoman practices remained in recollection, and the later Ottoman rule did not have to be installed *de novo*.

Bayezid left behind four sons: Süleyman, Mehmed, ˙Isa and Musa. Süleyman managed to outrun the Timurid troops and cross, with Genoese assistance, to the Balkans. Before departing the peninsula, Timur confirmed Süleyman as ruler of the Balkan Ottoman territories, ˙Isa at Bursa and Mehmed in the east, master of Amasya and Tokat. Musa he kept with him for a time. He also confirmed those fugitive beys who had submitted to him in their former beyliks, with Karaman the biggest winner in terms of recovered territory.

In order to preserve his position in the Balkans, Süleyman treated with his Christian neighbours and an accord resulted in 1403 at Gelibolu. The naval powers received exemptions from various exactions, the Genoese received concessions, and the Byzantines recovered Thessalonike and considerable freedom of action, and were able to expel the Turkish fifth column from Constantinople. For the moment, it appeared that Süleyman was the leading heir of Bayezid’s legacy, and in fact the earliest version of a text containing an Ottoman chronicle, the *İskendername* of Ahmedi, is dedicated to him.

˙Isa had been established at Bursa, although without many resources: Süleyman had taken the remains of the treasury with him en route to Europe. Defeated by his brother Mehmed, ˙Isa took refuge at Constantinople and ultimately joined an alliance of beys against Mehmed. Mehmed, however, managed to defeat this new group of enemies, most of whom were from the coastal beyliks, and ˙Isa fell from view in the aftermath. He had found himself unable to gather support around him and had to go along with the coalition of the moment.

It appeared now that Mehmed had succeeded in re-establishing Ottoman power in north-east and western Anatolia. However, now that ˙Isa was no longer in the picture, Süleyman decided to test his strength in Anatolia. He crossed the straits and appeared to gain strength, especially with those who feared the growth of Mehmed’s power and preferred a ruler whose interests lay in another continent. Mehmed retreated east, but he had a card still to play.

We last saw Musa as Timur’s prisoner. After Bayezid died in 1402, Musa was permitted to return to Bursa, which placed him within Mehmed’s orbit. In

\(^{43}\) Among Timur’s feats of horror was to drive the Hospitallers of Rhodes from İzmir.
1409, Mehmed sent him to Wallachia, where he gathered an army of Christian opponents to Süleyman and took to the field. Süleyman, desperate to protect his home base, returned to Europe and allied himself with the Byzantine emperor, Manuel II, a sign of the Ottoman’s weakness. In 1411 Musa managed to surprise Süleyman and have him killed. Now Musa, formerly at the will of the wind, found himself the inheritor of a potentially superior position.

At this point, Musa’s former allies of convenience found good reason to reassess their sworn loyalties. He besieged Thessalonike and the suburbs of Constantinople. Unsuccessful, he found some of his own followers seeking a more promising arrangement with his brother. Mehmed crossed the straits twice, and in 1413 his army, reinforced with local allies, defeated Musa. Mehmed was now sole ruler (1413–21). It is said that Musa had angered some of his own supporters by his need for funds. If this is so, then we can see how poorly constructed was the bond between potential ruler and local lord during this period of kaleidoscopic change.

Timur had long since died, planning a campaign against China, and the Ottoman sultan was now very much the power with which to reckon. No single Balkan power was able to withstand the Ottoman ruler. Mehmed’s base had been in Anatolia, and he sought to guarantee its security first and foremost. A year after defeating Musa he campaigned in Anatolia, securing the loyalty of the western beyliks and bringing to an end a beylik established in Ephesus by a certain Cüneyd. This left Karaman, whose bey had besieged Bursa and razed much of it. By the end of 1415 Karaman had largely submitted, and Bayezid’s legacy was reconstituted.

It was at this time that there appeared a man claiming to be Mehmed’s older brother, Mustafa, who had been taken off to Samarkand by Timur. Mustafa joined Cüneyd, who, in return for his surrender at İzmir, had been granted the governorship of Nikopolis. The two were finally penned up in Thessalonike in 1416, and Manuel II committed to keeping them under arrest. After this, the Ottomans were able to turn against Karaman in 1417 and bring its bey to heel. Shortly thereafter Ottoman forces raided the lands of the Wallachian and Hungarian rulers, obtaining tribute from the former. The last few years of Mehmed’s reign seem to have been consumed by illness and his diplomacy to prevent Mustafa from contesting the succession with Mehmed’s chosen successor, his son Murad.

Before turning to the long reign of Murad II, we need to go back and consider events of a different sort, perhaps representing a response to the destruction, warfare, uncertainty and insecurity of the decade after the battle of Ankara in 1402. These events are concerned with the career of a certain Şeyh...
Bedreddin. Bedreddin’s father was kadi of a town near Edirne, his mother a convert from a family of Byzantine officials. It is possible that on his father’s side he was descended from a vezir of the Seljuks of Rum. Bedreddin had become a student of theology and, after becoming proficient in law and theology, went to Cairo, where he became an adept of Sufi thought. He seems to have attracted attention from both the great and the humble. Although a number of his theological works are within the confines of the acceptable, he seems also to have been influenced by the more syncretistic and ecstatic dervishes whom he met. It is also said that he was influenced by Christian priests and monks whom he attracted to Islam. At any event, in 1411, Musa made him chief judge of his domains; when Mehmed replaced Musa in 1413, Bedreddin was sent to İznik, the early centre of Ottoman theological thought.

In 1416 Bedreddin left İznik for Wallachia, and in south-west Anatolia, a dervish known as Böklüce Mustafa, who may have been in contact with Bedreddin, raised the flag of revolt. We know the doctrines, which may not be identical, of these two from their enemies, and so some of what is reported may be slander. However, both leaders found themselves in areas that had been ravaged by war and were damaged by expectations denied, on the one hand in the wake of Timur’s invasion, and on the other by the decade of war followed by Mehmed’s justice against the followers of Musa. Their doctrines included more than a hint of utopian millenarianism, and both preached to the dispossessed and those who had few expectations of advancement under the new regime. It would be difficult to demonstrate that these movements were based on the sort of social discontent and economic deprivation that we associate with later movements, nor can we speak, given the state of the evidence, of the precise nature of their preachings. It does seem that there was a syncretist appeal as well as the suggestion that the rule of Mehmed was neither just nor appropriate in God’s eyes. There can be little doubt that at Mehmed’s court, they were seen as dangers that, if united, could ignite something rather larger. Both men were hunted down, arrested and killed. Centuries later, nationalist and Marxist scholars have made much of these men and their supporters.

With Murad II (1421–51) the vistas broaden out: much more survives in the way of archival documentation, including a famous tax register of Albania, and we can see a historical self-consciousness arise. On the one hand, during the early years of Murad II’s reign, a Seljuk chronicle was translated into Ottoman

Turkish by Yazıcıoğlu Ali, who introduced elements favourable to the Ottoman dynasty into the text and placed the Ottomans in the line of succession to the great Turkic leaders of the past. Beyond this work of editorship, in 1421 there appeared a text that served as the base for later recensions of the *Anonymous Chronicles*. This text served as the groundwork for several later works. It consists of a number of layers, one of which includes a great deal of folklore, another of which reflects the views of the more humble Ottoman partisans, but all of which deal with the deeds of the Ottomans as a well-earned gift from God. Further, at this time the Ottoman court had begun to play with various versions of the family genealogy, with the intent of showing the Ottomans as the heirs of one or another great tradition, in particular that of the Oğuz tribe. We have not yet the great imperial chronicles we find holding the field in the sixteenth century, but we see a number of essays towards the explication and justification of greatness.

Mehmed had arranged for his son Murad to succeed him, but Murad was untried and there were still residues of the discontent that surfaced during Şeyh Bedreddin’s revolt. Further, not all the marcher lords were happy with a centralising government that might place restraints on their wish for the greater independence their families had enjoyed in the past. Evrenos himself, patriarch of the marcher lords, is said to have died only in 1417, and his memories of a freebooting past might well have inspired many. In the event, the Byzantine emperor, Manuel II, encouraged two dangerous characters: a man who claimed to be Bayezid’s son Mustafa, and Cüneyd, whom we have seen before as ruler of a west Anatolian beylik centred on Aydın. Mustafa was initially quite successful in the Balkans, gaining some marcher lord support. When Mustafa crossed into Anatolia, however, Murad’s forces outwitted him, the marcher lords recalled their former loyalty, and the pretender fled. It is said that he was caught and killed in 1422. Cüneyd proved less of a danger, and by the middle of the decade Murad’s only Anatolian threat remained the beylik of Karaman, which could be well defended but possessed the means only to raid rather than to conquer. The bey of Karaman took advantage of the Ottomans when they were occupied in the Balkans, but in the end the beylik could not expand permanently, nor, for another forty years, could the Ottomans manage to occupy and hold the town of the plateau enterprise. It was not until 1501 that Ottoman forces were able to bring an end to nomad incursions from the Taurus in the south and to the dreams of their beys. Finally, another Mustafa, this one a younger brother of Murad, attempted to displace Murad in Anatolia, and it is not clear just whence his support stemmed. It proved evanescent, however, and he was captured and killed.
There was little that the Byzantine leadership could now do to deter the Ottomans, and in fact the city of Constantinople remained in Byzantine hands largely on Ottoman sufferance. Diplomacy and, to a lesser extent, tribute were the remaining weapons in the empire’s arsenal. In the short run, Murad contented himself with Thessalonike, which finally fell to Ottoman siege in 1430; it had been in Venetian hands for the preceding years. In some sense the beginning of the transformation of Thessalonike provided a foretaste of the reconstruction of Constantinople ordained by Mehmed II a generation later. It was measured, with considerable attention given to the preservation of the existing mercantile arrangements.

On the sea, Venice proved to be every bit as obstinate, making itself far more of a threat than its manpower reserves might indicate. The story of Venetian–Ottoman relations is a remarkable vista of the differences between a land-based and a sea-borne empire. The Venetians needed strategically and economically promising ports, as well as the opportunity to ship and sell wares at a profit. The Ottomans, on the other hand, could benefit from the presence of such a power, as they did from the Genoese, but they were never quite able to make the appropriate mutually agreeable arrangements with the Adriatic power.

In the Balkans, the Ottomans faced a number of land powers, of which the strongest was the kingdom of Hungary. For some years before Murad came to power, the Serbian lord had been a relatively trustworthy ally, but after his death the whole north-west frontier came into question again. The mountainous lands of Albania also proved hard to control, although the existence of an Albanian cadastre demonstrates that the Ottomans were beginning to have firm possession of the lands, and knowledge of their resources.

In 1439 the Council of Ferrara-Florence ended with the union of the Greek and Latin churches – or at least it seemed to, for the majority of Greek Orthodox Christians repudiated the arrangement their emperor had negotiated. For Ottoman history the most important result of the council was a renewed interest in Europe for a crusade against the Turks. What whetted European appetites was a curious and unexpected event: the decision of Murad II to abdicate in favour of his son Mehmed II. Now there had been a fair continuity of policy in the history of the Ottoman dynasty, and perhaps the changes we see between Murad II and Mehmed II reflect a natural difference in generations rather than a sea-change.

Nevertheless, we should bear some things in mind. Many of the senior servants of the enterprise over the generations since Orhan had seen their families grow in influence and power. Murad II’s vezir came from the family of
Murad I’s vezir. The marcher lords had been important supports for Ottoman expansion since the late 1350s. There was a tradition of expectations and of standard practice. On the other hand, the devşirme had been in operation for perhaps two generations by now, and the utility of the janissary corps was well established. A number of devşirme graduates were pressing up to the higher levels of power, and Mehmed II represented their future.

Unfortunately, they all overplayed their hand at the start. As the crusading army, composed in the main of forces from Hungary and Transylvania, advanced, Murad was recalled. The battle was joined (prematurely, as not all the crusader forces were present) near Varna in late 1444 and the Ottomans emerged victorious. And so they did again, when a lesser army, of similar composition, was defeated at Kosovo in 1448.

Murad retired once more, but only briefly, as Mehmed’s approach alienated janissaries concerned about possible losses as a result of a planned debasement of the silver akçe. This was also a harbinger of policies under consideration during Mehmed’s reign.

With the death of Murad II in 1451, what we might call the ‘old’ Ottoman enterprise came to an end, and what we know as the Ottoman Empire was poised to come into being. The battle at Varna in 1444 in many ways was a medieval battle, turned in the fog of war and the struggle of axes. The Ottoman field battle had yet to enter the gunpowder era; by the time of Çaldırán in 1514 gunpowder weapons had proved decisive. Murad was certainly the most powerful leader in south-east Europe and Anatolia, but in some ways he was constrained by custom, diplomacy and the advice of men to some of whom the sultan was still primus inter pares. The Ottoman administration had matured, but manipulation of practices, a full centralisation of law and the development of an active monetary policy stood in the wings still. Ottoman historiography was well in the making, but it had yet to achieve its full teleological flowering. All this was about to come to pass.
The incorporation of the Balkans into the Ottoman Empire, 1353–1453

MACHIEL KIEL

In the existing historiography of the Balkans the Turks are usually represented as those who came last and consequently, when the national states were set up, had to go first. It is therefore important to realise that the contacts between the various Turkic peoples and the Balkans are at least as old as the settlement of the Slavs (sixth–seventh century) or even older. On the following pages the pieces of scattered information at our disposal concerning these groups will be pieced together.

The Szekler, a group of more than half a million people living in the eastern part of Transylvania, trace their origin straight to Attila and his Huns. Kutrigurs and Onogurs (the latter giving their name to the country of Hungary/Ungarn) are evidently of Turkish, or, better, Turkic origin. It was in the sixth century, under the leadership of the Turco-Mongolian Avars, that the Slavs invaded and settled the central and southern Balkans, and pushed on as far as the southern tip of the Peloponnese. The Avars were finally subdued by Charlemagne and those who were left were assimilated. The Slavs remained. A rather similar fate was met by the Bulgars, a nomadic Turkic people moving in from the Eurasian steppes and, under their hans, setting up a powerful pagan empire (681). The ruins of the han’s palace, the pagan temple, the stone walls of the ‘Forbidden City’, but first and foremost the almost 20 kilometre-long earthen rampart and moat at Pliska in the north-eastern Bulgarian plains, made to protect the entire ulus (people, nation) in times of danger, still testify to the size and strength of this early Turkic settlement in the Balkans. In 865, under their han/tsar, Boris-Michael, they converted to

1 For a survey of the background of the Szekler and the earliest certain data about them see Hansgerd Göckenjan, *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 114–39, which includes a rich bibliography.

Orthodox Christianity, and slowly fused with the Slav agriculturists, the new nation identifying itself by the name of the *Herrenvolk*: Bulgarians, and the country Bulgaria. From the tenth to the thirteenth century other large Turkic groups – the Uz, the Pechenegs and the Kopçak or Cumans – arrived from Eurasia and settled on both sides of the lower Danube, leaving behind them many inscriptions and graffiti written in the runes of the Orkhon-Jenissej type. After 960 Byzantium was again in control of most of Bulgaria. Large groups of Pechenegs, after having been defeated militarily, were settled in the mountain canton of Moglena (on the border of Greece and the former Yugoslav Macedonia) and in the mountainous south-western corner of Bulgaria. There they still survive as a distinct ethnic group, the Şop. They converted to Christianity, and slowly adopted the Slav-Bulgarian language. In the twelfth century, Anna Komnene mentions other Pecheneg groups, who were settled in the south-eastern Rhodopes, in what later was to become the Ottoman kaza of Ortaköy (since 1934, Ivajlovgrad). The oldest preserved Ottoman census and taxation register from 1452/5 mentions in this area a remarkably large number of Turkish toponyms evidently dating back to pre-Ottoman times, descriptive toponyms with a Christian connotation such as Baş Kilise and Kara Kilise.

Ansbert, the historian of the third crusade, mentions that in 1190 the important

---


town of Béroè (now Stara Zagora) was defended by ‘idolaters and Turks in the service of the Emperor of Constantinople’. In the same year the ‘Historia Peregrinorum’ mentions Turks as defenders of the strong Thracian town of Didymoteichon, alongside Greeks, Alans and Cumans.\(^5\) What is more important is that the Ortaköy/Ivajlovgrad villages (‘next door’ to Didymoteichon) were inhabited by Christians, the greater part being most probably the descendants of the Pecheneg deportees, as was already suggested by Jireček more than a century ago.\(^5\) Perhaps the most important wave of Turkic people in the Balkans was that of the Kipčak or Cumans, who must have settled in the eastern Balkans in large numbers. They soon converted to Christianity, and even formed some political units, principalities along the Danube. The north Bulgarian principality of Vidin was ruled by the house of Sratsimir, which was of Cuman origin. In the last quarter of the thirteenth century the principality of Braničevo, now in Serbia, was ruled by the Cuman noblemen Kudelin and Derman. The dynasty of the Terterids ruled Bulgaria (with intervals) from 1279 to 1323, and also the last dynasty of medieval Bulgaria, the house of Šišman, was ruled by a dynasty of Cuman origin. In the last decades of the thirteenth and first decades of the fourteenth century, a semi-independent principality existed south of the Balkan mountains (including the territories of the modern cities of Sliven, Kazanlák and Karlovo) under the Cuman prince Eltemir, brother of Tsar Georgi Terter. The Cumans were ultimately assimilated into the Slav majority. Place names like the town of Kumanovo in Macedonia and villages such as Kumanite and Kumanov Brod still remind us of this now-vanished Turkic people, as does the personal name Kumanov. Eltemir is still the name of a large village in Danubian Bulgaria. The Ottoman *avariz defters* (registers of levies) of north-eastern Bulgaria (the Varna, Provadija, Balčik and Silistra districts) from the seventeenth and mid-eighteenth century, kept village by village, still contain the names of numerous Christians with evidently Turkic personal names, an indication of how slow the process of assimilation has been.\(^7\)

---

5 See Vásáry, Cumans and Tatars.
Contacts between the Balkans and Turks coming from Asia Minor date from the mid-thirteenth century. In 1261, the Seljuk sultan ˙Izzeddin Keykavus II lost his throne and fled with a large following to the Byzantine emperor, who in 1262–3 settled them in the Black Sea area from Varna to the estuary of the Danube, the dry steppe country later known as the Dobrudja. The full story is related by Yazıcıoğlu Ali in 1424, in his adaptation of Ibn Bibi’s thirteenth-century Selçukname. Sultan ˙Izzeddin soon fled to Crimea, where he died much later. His followers remained behind under the leadership of the charismatic dervish San Saltık Dede, whose deeds were recalled by the Arab traveller Ibn Battuta, who in 1331 visited the town of Babadag in northern Dobrudja, where the saint was buried. After the death of their great leader (in 1297–8, according to the contemporary Saradj) some of the Turks returned to Anatolia and settled in what then had just become the emirate of Karası, while others remained, and entered converted to Orthodox Christianity Byzantine service. Under their leaders, the Despot Balık, Culpan, Balık’s son Dobrotić and grandson Ivanko, they maintained their political independence from Bulgaria as the principality of Dobrudja, which existed from the 1330s till the final annexation by the Ottomans under Mehmed I in 1417. As a people they became known as Gagauz, a corruption of Kaykavus. The name of the province, Dobrudja, derives from Dobrotić. Already in the 1260s the Byzantines started to fear the power of these Turks, who, according to Yazıcıoğlu Ali, numbered ‘ten to twenty thousand persons’.8 When ˙Izzeddin fled to Crimea, the emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologos, captured his younger sons. One son converted to Christianity, together with his followers, and they were settled by the emperor in the Macedonian town of Verria (later Kafaferya, Verroia). When Verria became Ottoman (1387), these Seljuks became vassals and served in the Ottoman army. Yıldırım Bayezid resettled them around Zichné in Macedonia, where they remained as a sizeable Turkish-speaking Christian group until well into the twentieth century.

Yazıcıoğlu Ali met their leaders around 1422 when they had come to renew their documents on the occasion of the ascension to the throne of Murad II, and related their story. Some decades ago Elizabeth Zachariadou published five

---

documents from the archives of the Athonite monastery of Vatopedi which dealt with the Seljuk princes at Verria, who had become large landowners and protectors of the Holy Mountain. In fact, they had converted to Christianity long before Yazıcıoğlu Ali suggests. The converted Seljuk Turks from Macedonia have kept their identity as a group till today and live as Christians largely around the town of Nea Zihni, still using their old Turkish language. The Anatolian Seljuk-Turkish origin of the Gagauz – today a group of several hundred thousand people, largely living in the Republic of Moldova – is still vehemently contested in Bulgarian historiography. They are presented as Bulgarians who have kept their Christian faith but lost their Bulgarian language. Yet the evidence of the sources is overwhelming and the problem of their origin was, in fact, already solved more than half a century ago. Linguistic research in the area by Tadeusz Kowalski in the 1930s pointed to at least three layers of spoken Turkish in north-eastern Bulgaria. The oldest one was North Turkish, deriving from settlers who had come via the Russian steppes; the second was related to Anatolian Turkish but was pre-Ottoman. The youngest layer was Ottoman and also came from the south. Finally, the Byzantines, after regaining a base at the Morea (1261), used Turkish mercenaries on a vast scale, groups of whom remained behind on the peninsula and became assimilated slowly into the native population. All three groups of pre-Ottoman Turks, in varying degrees, contributed to the incorporation of the Balkans and the spread of Islam. This is clearest of all in north-eastern Bulgaria and eastern Romania, in the wide expanses of the Deli Orman and the Dobrudja, where, according to the Ottoman tahrir defters of the early sixteenth century, the majority of the population was Muslim, and, judging by the toponyms and personal names, Turkish speaking. The late nineteenth-century Ottoman census as contained in the salname of the Tuna vilayet of 1290/1873 shows a population which was two-thirds Muslim Turkish. In the Rhodope mountains and the north Aegean plains at their feet, the percentage of Muslims was even higher. The salname of the Edirne vilayet of 1310/1892–3 mentions that in the large sancak


Ottoman expansion into the Balkans

of Gümülcine (today Komotini in Greek Thrace), with 273 settlements, 84 per cent of the population was Muslim. In the smaller administrative units, such as the kaza of Sultanyeri (around Koşukavak; since 1933, Krumovgrad) with 100 settlements, the percentage of Muslims reached 97 per cent.13 Without the presence of a pre-Ottoman Turkish or Turkic population such numbers are not understandable. They formed the basis of the transformation of the Balkans after the Ottoman take-over, although in the available Balkan historiography this point is (with some exceptions) largely left in the dark for obvious reasons.

Early Ottoman conquest and settlement

The first half of the fourteenth century was filled with military contacts between various Turkish groups from western Asia Minor and the eastern Balkans, which prepared the way for the final take-over after 1354. The soil of Byzantine Thrace was, over half a century, carefully prepared for the Ottoman conquest and subsequent resettling. In 1303–4 the Byzantines had invited a large army (7,500 men) of jobless Catalan mercenaries to fight for them in western Anatolia in order to stop the advancing Turkomans. From their base at Gallipoli (Gelibolu) on the Dardanelles they did this rather successfully till 1305 when they broke with the emperor, who had murdered their leader. In the same year, according to Nikephoros Gregoras, the Catalans invited Turks from Anatolia to join them, 800 horse and 2,000 on foot. According to the other contemporary Byzantine historian, George Pachymeres, they came from Aydın, and among them were many Anatolian Greeks.14 In 1307 they were reinforced by a group of Tourkopouloi, baptised Turks, very probably some of the former followers of İzzeddin Kaykaus from the Dobrudja who had entered Byzantine service. The group joining the multi-national army at Gallipoli is said to have numbered 1,000 horsemen and 500 on foot. The chronicler of the Catalans, one of their chiefs and witness of the events, Ramon Muntaner, gives us a vivid impression of what effect this army, large for the time and place, had on the fertile and open land of Thrace:

13 Edirne Vilayet Salnamesi, 1310 (1892/3) (Edirne 1310), p. 440. The total population of the sancaık of Gümülcine was 245,072 ‘men and women, local and foreign population’, 206,914 Muslims, 20,671 Bulgarians, 15,241 Greek Orthodox, 912 Gypsies, 739 Jews, 360 Armenians and 235 foreigners. For Sultanyeri (pp. 455–7), for both men and women, the total was 48,816, 1,490 Bulgarians, 3 Greeks, 811 Gypsies (half Muslim) and 47,953 Muslims, judging by the village names all Turkish speaking.
Now it is the truth that we had been in the peninsula of Gallipoli and in
the district seven years since the death of the Ceasar, and we had lived there
five years on the land and there was nothing left. And so, likewise, we had
depopulated all that district for ten days’ journey in every direction: we had
destroyed all the people, so that nothing could be gathered there. Therefore
we were obliged to abandon that country. And this was the decision of En
Rocafort and those who were with him . . .

More destruction was wrought by the Byzantine civil war between
Andronikos II and Andronikos III (1321–8), partly fought by Turkish mercenar-
ies in Byzantine service. In 1329, 1331, 1332 and 1334 Turkish forces, presumably
Ottomans, raided Thrace and Macedonia but, in spite of this, the Byzantines
continued to make use of their services. In 1337, Aydınoğlu Umur Bey pro-
vided the emperor with 2,000 soldiers for his campaign against the rebellious
Albanians, and, in 1341, the emperor allowed the fleet of Umur Bey to pass
through the Bosphorus to attack Bulgaria via the Danube. Andronikos III died
in June 1341 and this was the signal for the Serbs, Albanians and Turkish pirates
to plunder Macedonia. Andronikos’s death led to another Byzantine civil war
between John V Palaeologos and John VI Kantakouzenos, which, with inter-
ruptions, lasted from 1341 to 1347 and wrought havoc on sorely tried Thrace
and Macedonia. Both sides used Turkish mercenaries, first from Aydın, and,
after Umur Bey’s death (1348), from among the Ottomans. Meanwhile the Ser-
bians conquered the whole of Byzantine Macedonia, Epirus and Thessaly and
pushed as far as the Gulf of Corinth. In 1346, in Skopje (Üsküp), Tsar Dušan had
himself crowned ‘Emperor of the Greeks and the Serbs’ with great ceremony.
Although Byzantium continued to survive as a sort of city-state until 1453, it
had committed suicide as a power of any kind during the long civil war.

Even if Kantakouzenos had not opened up the Balkans for the Ottomans
they would have come on their own account. After Tsar Dušan died (1355),
his short-lived empire broke into more than half a dozen mutually warring
principalities. Bulgaria, broken into three pieces, had already ceased to be
a power of any significance after 1330. Greece was a mosaic of warring mini-
states. There was no power left in the Balkans to stop the Ottomans: they filled
up a political vacuum. Soon they were also to fill the huge population gap in

15 R. Muntaner, _The Chronicle of Muntaner_, tr. from the Catalan by Lady Goodenough
16 For this crucial time see especially Donald M. Nicol, _The Reluctant Emperor: a Biography
of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk, c.1295–1383_ (Cambridge, 1996); also
Nicol, _The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453_, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1993). See also
the penetrating overview of Ernst Werner, ‘Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa und
the lowlands of Thrace and the plains and the rolling lands of Macedonia, where there was ample room to settle. Indeed, the long Byzantine civil wars, combined with the disastrous effects from 1348 onward of the Black Death (to which the settled population was more vulnerable than the mobile Turks), had well prepared the soil for Ottoman take-over.

From their base at Tzympe on the Gallipoli peninsula, which they took in 1352 when serving the emperor’s son Matthew, Ottoman forces under Prince Süleyman occupied and resettled the important harbour and fortress town of Gallipoli (Gelibolu), whose walls had collapsed in March 1353 as a result of a violent earthquake and whose inhabitants had fled. The date is handed down in a Byzantine Short Chronicle and confirmed by the Florentine annalist Matteo Villani, who wrote between 1346 and 1362. An early Ottoman account, incorporated in Aşıkpaşazade’s chronicle, stresses the point that the local population of Tzympe and its district supported the Ottoman forces in their actions, and were left in peace. It is notable that the Ottoman taxation and population registers from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries show numerous Greek Christian villages on the Gallipoli peninsula. When plotted on a map they give an impression of the destruction of Thrace before 1353 and show us where the native population survived. An impression of the deserted situation of Thrace at the time of the Turkish conquest is also found in the same early account as preserved by Aşıkpaşazade, where Süleyman Paşa is reported to have sent a message to his father, Orhan, stating that ‘if the castles and territories now conquered are to be put in good order many of the people of Islam are required’, and a few lines later adding: ‘Incessantly, day by day, people from Karası [the land opposite the straits] moved in. Where they arrived they took their homes and devoted themselves to the fight for the faith. In this manner the forces of Islam got a solid base and wherever they went and moved forward the unbelievers could no longer stop them.’

In 1366, in one of his speeches, Demetrios Kydones remarks bitterly that the Turks now lived in Thrace in greater security than the Byzantines and that the province had now been transformed into a Turkish land. The oldest preserved Ottoman tahrir defters allow us to give sound numbers for certain fixed areas. The register 0.89 in the Muallim Cevdet collection, a large fragment

17 For the conquest of Gallipoli and the sources see Colin Imber, The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1481 (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 24–5.
dated 1452–5, contains a complete description of the nahiye of Gümülcine (Komotini) which included three old fortified Byzantine towns – Gümülcine, Makri and Maroneia – and forty-nine villages. Seven of these villages which had non-Turkish names, four Greek and three Bulgarian (Ostrovic, Veternik and Stoyan), were exclusively Christian. The four others were mixed Muslim and Christian, Gümülcine and Makri were also mixed, and Maroneia was, with 162 households, the largest, and exclusively Christian, settlement. The forty-two villages with Turkish names had all, except Saslu (with twenty-five Christian households), Muslim inhabitants, 927 in all. This shows that the Christian settlements were more than double the size of the Muslim villages, the latter evidently being the newer ones. The large size of the Christian settlements reflects the concentrations of population in the troubled time before and after the conquest. Of the rural Muslim population (not counting the towns) the 1452–5 register shows that 30 per cent were yürük (nomads). The majority of the Turkish colonists must thus have settled down and turned to agriculture in the seventy-eight years between the conquest and the 1452–5 register. With 511 households, of which 422 were Muslims, the town of Gümülcine was by far the largest settlement of the district. It is also of interest to see that among the Muslims of the nahiye of Gümülcine the urban element dominated over the unsettled yürük population. The proportions were 34 per cent urban, 46 per cent rural-settled and 20 per cent yürük. As a whole, the Muslim population constituted 72 per cent of the total (1,396 Muslim households and 531 of Christians).\footnote{20 Atatürk Kitaplığı (Istanbul), Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları o.89, pp. 35–66.}

The conquest of the town of Gümülcine is traditionally placed in 1361, and was the work of Gazi Evrenos, who set up his residence there. The facts that large parts of the Byzantine town walls enclosing a rectangle of 115 by 125 metres still stand and that a sizeable Christian population continued to live in it and keep its bishop’s church, combined with the fact that Gazi Evrenos constructed a number of important buildings (a domed mosque, a monumental zaviye and a hamam) outside the walls as the nucleus of the new Muslim settlement, strongly suggest that the town was taken by treaty, not by force. The written sources, however, are silent on this point.

The fate of other old Byzantine settlements, about which a little information is contained in the 1452–5 tahrij, was different. Ottoman Ferecik, now Pherrai on the Greek side of the Maritsa (Meric¸) in Thrace, was throughout the Ottoman period the administrative centre of a kaza, comprising fifty-six villages.\footnote{21 BOA, TT 370 (1528–30), p. 50.}
The town originated from a large Byzantine monastery, fortified in 1152 by Isakios Komnenos, brother of the emperor John II Komnenos. The charter of the monastery describes the land where it came into being as ‘empty of men and habitations’. Villehardouin, chronicler of the fourth crusade, calls it ‘Abbeie de Vera’. The toponym is Slavic and means ‘swamp’, ‘swampy land’. In 1323, when the Bulgarian Tsar Michael Šišman invaded Thrace, he could not take much booty because the villagers had fled inside the spacious and strong wall of the monastery, together with their cattle. John Kantakouzenos, who as a regent visited the place in 1342, 1347 and 1352, explicitly mentions that, alongside the monks, peasants lived in the monastery, which he called a ‘fortress’ or a ‘very strong fortress’. In 1342–3 Aydınoğlu Umur Bey tried in vain to take the castle. In 1355, when the garrison surrendered to Kantakouzenos’s enemy and successor, the place was inhabited only by ‘a few savage villagers’. The Ottomans took it in 1357, shortly before Süleyman Paşa died. Local memory, preserved among the Ferecik Muslims, presents Süleyman Paşa as the conqueror of the town and the one who converted the great church of the Kosmosoteira into a mosque, which later was to bear his name. This story is recorded in the Tevarih-i Al-i Osman of the poet-historian Hadidi, a native of Ferecik, who, in 906/1500–1, wrote the inscription of the new minaret of the church/mosque and, in 1516, is known to have been the inspector of the vakıf of Süleyman Paşa in Ferecik. The Ottoman chroniclers give a confused picture of Ferecik’s conquest. Only Hadidi gives the correct date (759/1357) while the chroniclers Nişancı Mehmed Paşa and Gelibolu Ali, with 759/1358, come very close. Immediately after the conquest, a sizeable group of Muslims must have been settled in the little town, alongside the surviving Christians. In 1433, the Burgundian knight Bertrandon de la Broquières passed through the town, which he describes as follows:

And from there I came to a town which is called Vira. In this town there was a beautiful castle, which is now torn down in some places. A young Greek told me that once there were 300 monks in it, and there still is the choir of the church, out of which the Turks have made their mosque. Around this castle they have built a big city which is inhabited by Greeks and Turks. And this town is on a hill near the Maritsa.
The 1452–5 tahrir is the first to give sound numbers, noting 215 Muslim and 58 Christian households, altogether perhaps 1,200 inhabitants. Yet for time and place this was a sizeable town. The walled enclosure of the old monastery measures less than a hectare. Using the usual formula for medieval towns of 150 inhabitants to a hectare and 250–300 for a heavily built-up area we may conclude that late Byzantine Vira (Vera, Ferecik) cannot have had many more Christian inhabitants than in 1453. The Ottomans must have settled mainly outside the walls. Among the public buildings they erected were the zaviye, hamam (baths) and caravansary of Hacı Turhan, and a number of shops. The ruin of the hamam, with features of the late fourteenth century, still survives (as of 2006). Ferecik remained a small town throughout its history, in 1319/1901–2 having 3,500 Muslim inhabitants as well as 300 Bulgars and 300 Greeks. There is no record of where the Turkish settlers of Ferecik came from, but, as in the case of Gümülcine, the land of Karasi, south of the Dardanelles, is the most likely place.

In some cases the preserved foundation charters of some very early vakıfs in the Balkans show us where a part of the new urban elite came from. A case in point is the two vakıfıyes of the zaviye of Bahauddin Paşa b. Hızır in the Macedonian city of Serres from 790/1388 and 792/1390, that is, five years after Serres was taken. The zaviye was built for Şeyh Hızır from Tokat, and was under the responsibility of Ali b. Ömer Karahisarı. People from Amasya, Ankara, İzni, Kayseri, Kırşehir and Niksar (all except İzni cities in central Anatolia) signed the documents.

Most of the Ottoman records are preserved in an incomplete state, as parts or fragments. They have not been published or studied in a systematic manner. It is only the series of registers compiled in 1528–30 on the basis of the first census of Süleyman the Magnificent that give us a complete picture, with all settlements and all separate groups of society being covered. Settlement patterns in normal times do not change overnight, and because after the late fourteenth century no great upheavals are known in the history of the land south of the Balkan chain, this sound documentary base can be used

---

28 For this rule of thumb see Josiah Cox Russell, Medieval Regions and their Cities (Newton Abbot, 1972), who gives a multitude of examples of surface and inhabitants.
29 Atatürk Kitaplığı (İstanbul), Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları o.89.
30 Salname-i Vilayet-i Edirne, 1319 [1901–2], section ‘Ferecik’.
retrospectively to draw some general conclusions. It shows us the profound changes in Thrace after the Ottoman take-over. According to the census and taxation register of 1528 for the kazas of Gümülcine and Yenice-i Karasu, the number of Muslim households was 6,298 and of Christian households 3,828, giving a total of 10,126. Of the population 62 per cent was Muslim; 1,231 households of Christians, or 32 per cent, lived in three towns (Xanthi, Enos and Makri), while 565 households of Muslims, or 9 per cent lived in the towns. Of the rural Muslim households, 1,773 (28 per cent of all the Muslims) were yürük. One-quarter of the total population, 2,569 households, enjoyed tax benefits against specific duties: 412 households were tuzcus, or saltworkers (three-quarters of them Christian); 141 were miners, almost all Christians; 124 were rice growers (çeltikçiler), almost all Muslims. The largest group of privileged people were the 1,773 households of yürük.

In the Byzantine as well as in the early Ottoman narrative sources some scattered information is given about the Ottoman colonisation of the Balkans, especially as regards one aspect: deportation on government order. Chalkokondyles mentions the settlement of Turks mainly in three areas: around Philippolis (Filibe, modern Plovdiv) in Thrace, around Serres in Aegean Macedonia, and around Skopje (Üsküp) in northern Macedonia. Aşıkaşıazade mentions two deportations to the plains of Filibe, one of which was of yürük of Saruhan in western Anatolia under the command of Ertuğrul, son of Bayezid I, in 798/1394–5. They were settled to the south-west of the place where later the town of Tatar Pazarcık was to be founded. Their centre was Saruhanbeyli, which survived under the name Saran Bej till 1949, when it was renamed Septemvri. In a piece of verse the annalist remarks that when a ruler orders the ‘repopulation of empty lands’, those concerned have to accept it as their fate. Neşri has the same story in a shorter version, and adds that ‘now the land of Filibe is fully theirs’.

The second remark on deportation concerns a group of Tatars led by Minnet Bey, who roamed the land around İskilip in northern Asia Minor. On his way back from Samsun, Sultan Mehmed I saw there a large number of Tatar tents which he ordered to be transferred to Rumeli because they had not joined him on his military campaigns:

33 These two districts together include five towns – Gümülcine (Komotini), Yenice-i Karasu (Genisea), İsketiye İскеççe (Xanthi), Meşri (Makri) and Enos – and 223 villages. The districts of Ferêcik (Pherrai, Ferai) and Dimetoka (Didymoteichon) are not included.
34 BOA, tt 167.
He had Minnet Bey brought before him and ordered him [Minnet Bey] to leave the land. And he transported all these people to the district of Filibe and gave them the land around the castle of Konuș as residence. Minnet’s son Mehmed Bey erected in Konuș an imaret and a caravansaray as well, and there they settled and took this [lowland] district as their residence.  

Mevlana Neşri and the Anonymous-Giese have almost exactly the same story. Konuș and its caravansary is mentioned by a long list of sixteenth-century western travellers. Minnet Bey’s son, Minnetoğlu Mehmed Bey, became the first Ottoman governor of Bosnia (1463). The Anonymous-Giese has an interesting remark on the people of Rumeli, stating that:

When Timur Han entered this country [Anatolia] he spread such terror that nobody dared to stand against him and the majority of the people of those districts he entered fled and crossed the sea and spilled out over Rumeli. Yes, many Arabs, Kurds, Turkoman and Anatolians fled and went over to Rumeli. People who lived in these times have reported: we saw in Rumeli many people who said, ‘We are Arabs, others Turkoman or Kurds or of Anatolian origin. Others said we come from Çagatay.’ They all had fled and came to Rumeli. And they are the real reason that the greater part of Rumeli became populated.

The account is impressionistic and certainly exaggerated. When, however, we accept the vague term ‘land of the Romans’ as largely being identical with Thrace in its widest sense, then the remark is pretty much correct, and is strongly supported by the situation as shown by the 1521 tahrir.

The Byzantine historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles also mentions a number of deportations from Asia Minor to the Balkans. In Thrace, he adds (apart from Filibe) Turkish settlement in the Zagora, the land around the modern cities of Stara Zagora and Nova Zagora, which is lacking in the Ottoman sources. Chalkokondyles also mentions deportations to the districts of Serres and Üsküp. Serres, the key to eastern Macedonia, was taken by the Ottomans under Çandarlı Hayreddin. After the conquest of Verria (Ottoman Karaferya) in May 1387, Gazi Evrenos Bey, until then residing in Gümülcine, received...
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Serres as his seat. Aşıkpaşazade, the Anonymous-Giese and Neşri mention that the important cities of this part of Macedonia, Kavala, Drama, Zichne and Serres, were all taken by treaty. After these events it had become useless to keep Gümülcine as an advanced base on the border (uç) because it now lay more than 200 kilometres inland. We have to understand that Gazi Evrenos organised the deportation of yürükṣ from Saruhan in western Anatolia in 1385, as mentioned by Aşıkpaşazade and Chalkokondyles, and to the Üsküp region in or shortly after 1390, when the principalities of Saruhan and Aydın were annexed by Bayezid I.40 Chalkokondyles even gives some details: After this he brought his affairs in order. First of all he [the sultan] took the Greeks into his friendship and as allies. He made peace with the princes of Macedonia and dispatched a great number of real Turks [no converts] from Asia as well as from Europe with their families to live in the city of the Scopians’.41 Üsküp and its plain is one of the focal points of the southern Balkans, where at least six important roads converge. Turks, mainly craftsmen, were settled outside the cramped Byzantino-Slavic fortified town, where an important section of the local Christian population continued to live. The oldest preserved Ottoman register containing Üsküp and its district is 1454.42 It describes 23 Muslim mahalles (quarters, districts) with 444 households and 72 male Muslim individuals (nefer), as well as 286 Christian households and another 26 households headed by widows. With 3,500–3,700 inhabitants, Üsküp had become one of the largest urban centres of the Balkan interior. The number of Muslims (two-thirds of the town’s total population) shows the magnitude of the change. It is interesting to see that among the Muslim mahalles of the town there is one called Ali Menteşelû, pointing to settlers from that south-west Anatolian district annexed by the Ottomans around 1390. The conquest of Üsküp, beginning January 1392, is mentioned as a marginal note in an old Serbian church book.43 Almost all Ottoman sources mention only that Paşa Yiğit Bey was sent against Üsküp by Bayezid I some time after his accession to the throne (June 1389). Only Kemalpaşazade describes the conquest in some detail, but the part of his chronicle mentioning it only became available recently in published form.44

787/1385–6 with these events. Only after the spring of 1387, when Thessalonike was finally taken, was the situation stable enough to start the reorganisation of the land.

42 Published in Macedonian translation by Metodija Sokoloski, Turski Dokumenti za Istori-jata na Makedonskiot Narod, 4 vols. (Skopje, 1963–72), iii, pp. 143–283.
43 Published by Ljubomir Stojanović, Stari Srpski Zapis i Nâdpsi (Belgrade, 1908).
The settlement of Turks in Üsküp was largely confined to the town itself. The 1454 register lists ten small villages with Turkish place names and 123 Muslim households in the great triangular plain of Üsküp. Of the whole of the Muslim population of the Üsküp district, four-fifths lived in the town. It was only in later times, particularly in the course of the sixteenth century, that a dozen or more Turkish villages came into being in the plain, and the population of the old villages trebled. Yet the predominance of the town as the principal Turkish centre remained.

There is another account of Turkish settlement in the Balkans recorded in the narrative sources. The lost Ottoman chronicle known as Codex Hanivaldanus, preserved in Leunclavius’s *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum*, mentions that in the mid-fifteenth century Turkish colonists moved to the land between Şumnu (Şumen) and Silistra in north-eastern Bulgaria and worked small plots of land, and, at the same time, served in the army as *akıncı* (raiders). A note from the time of Sultan Selim I preserved in the ‘proto-statistic’ of the empire from 1528–30 seems to refer to this group of settlers. It says that before 1516–17, 1,280 households, or perhaps 6,000–6,500 people, had come ‘from Anatolia to the Dobrudja in the time of the sultans of bygone ages as a result of sürgün (deportation)’, and enjoyed certain tax benefits. This wave of settlers must have arrived shortly after the crusade of Varna, 1444, when the north-east Bulgarian lowlands suffered heavy devastation at the hands of the crusaders. An indication of this is the Ottoman name of the old castle of Petrič near Varna, which, like the other castles in the area (Galata, Mağlış, Madara, Kavarna, Kalliakra), was destroyed by the crusaders and not later rebuilt. The Ottomans after 1444 resettled the entire empty plateau south of Lake Devnja with twenty villages of Turks. One of them was Ak Viran, so called after the ruins of the castle of Petrič, which was built of the soft whitish limestone characteristic of north-eastern Bulgaria. The incoming settlers gave a new name (White Ruin) to the place, but the 1516–17 register still adds ‘also known as Petrič’. Ak Viran was later corrupted to Avren and became the name of the entire plateau. In 1935 its name was changed to Momino.

A good guide for reconstructing the history of the Turkish colonisation of the eastern Balkans could have been that faithful mirror of history, the toponomy. Yet it was precisely this source of history that was ruthlessly destroyed on the orders of the nationalist Bulgarian government in 1934–5,
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and in Greece in a more piecemeal fashion.\textsuperscript{47} An indication of the importance of the Turkish toponyms in Bulgaria is given by Minčev and Koledarov. Turkish toponyms totalled 43 per cent of all place names in the country. Indicative also are the old village names in eastern Bulgaria, still to be seen on the Austrian, German and Russian 1:200,000 military maps of the Balkans, pointing to districts in Anatolia where the settlers originated, like Germiyanlı (near Aydos, Karnobat and near Yambol), Menteşeli (near Yenice Kızılağaç / Elhovo and Doyran in Macedonia) or Saruhanlı (near Silistra and Rusokastro), or even more drastic ones like Anadolu (near Rusokastro, Karnobat, Hıroso and Yambol) or Anadolu Hüseyin, east of Şumen. Others point more directly to the town of origin, like Geredelü near Kızılağaç / Elhovo, and near Aydos, Ahlatlı (near Karnobat), Kastamonlular (near Veliko Tırnovo), Karahisarlı (near Hasköy / Haskovo) or Tokatlı (near Yambol). There are also indications of the resettlement of colonists inside the Balkans (to which the note of Chalkokondyles about Üsküp also points); examples of this are the villages of Great and Small Filebelülér near Razgrad and near Varna, or Zağralı near Eski Cumâ / Târgovişte.

The Ottoman colonisation of the great eastern plain of Thessaly, with Yenişehir Larissa as its centre, was not noted by the chroniclers. Apart from some legendary stories recorded by Urquhard and Fallmerayer at the beginning of the nineteenth century, our best guide is the 1455 register, defter Maliye Müdever No. 10, the oldest preserved for that part of Greece.\textsuperscript{48} Eastern Thessaly was practically deserted when the Ottomans came (1388–9), its former capital Larissa had been a heap of ruins since the 1330s and its bishop’s church was a retreat for bandits, as Archbishop Antonius of Larissa assures us in 1360. He therefore resided in Trikkala in the western plain, which was in a good condition and relatively well settled. The Ottomans under Evrenos Bey and his son Barak Bey founded their ‘New Town’ (Yenişehir) outside the ruins of old Larissa, where a few Christians had survived. Eastern Thessaly was destroyed in the first three decades of the fourteenth century during the endless local wars, by the Catalan invasion and especially by the Albanians. According to the 1455 register the new town had 355 Muslim households and 66 of Christians. It is illustrative of the resettlement of this town that the vast majority of the

\textsuperscript{47} A complete survey of the changes of the toponyms in Bulgaria is given by Nikolaj Minčev and Peter Koledarov, Promenite na imenate i statue and selistata na Балгария, 1878–1971 (Sofia, 1972).

\textsuperscript{48} BOA, Maliyeden Müdever [henceforth \textit{mad}] 10 is now available in transcription and in the original script: Melek Delilbaş and Muzaffer Arıkan, \textit{Hicr\textasciiacute; 859 Tarih\textasciiacute;i Sür\textasciitilde;et-i Sancak-ı Tırhala\textasciiacute;}, 2 vols. (Ankara, 2001).
inhabitants were craftsmen, such as weavers, tanners, tailors and coppersmiths. The names of the villages east of the town read like a geographical textbook: Aydınlı, Germiyanlı, Menteşeli, Saruhanlı, all of the major provinces of western Anatolia are present. Further, some village names point to tribal groups from western Anatolia, such as the Cullular, known in the Aydınlı district, or the Sarucağlar from the Kocaeli district east of Bursa.49

The later numerous Turkish population of parts of the former Yugoslav Macedonia was also present at a very early date, although still in minor groups. The district was annexed without great upheaval after its Christian lords, ‘King’ Marko and Constantin Dejanović of Velbužd (Köstendil), had perished in the battle of Rovine (1395) fighting for Sultan Bayezid whose vassals they were. The oldest preserved Ottoman register is TT 237, a fragment from the short first reign of Mehmed II (1445).50 In 1445, according to this register, the kaza of Köprüülü (Veles) along the Vardar river had six settlements with a Muslim population. The town of Köprüülü itself had 190 households, of which only nine were Muslim (not counting the kadi and a garrison of twenty Muslim soldiers). Slowly, in the course of time, through more settlement and through a slow process of conversion to Islam, the number of Muslims in Köprüülü went up to one-third of the whole population (19,700 in 1900, according to Kâncov’s figures). In 1445, there were five villages with Turkish place names and Muslim inhabitants (Çeltikçiler, Hisar Beyli, Karaslar, Koçi and Suyakları), mostly yürükts, of which one group evidently came from the land of Karasi. In time these villages also grew, and more were founded in the early sixteenth century. The area to the east of the Vardar is still known locally as ‘Yurukluk’.51

Another nucleus of the Turkish settlement was in the great Pelagonian plain in west Macedonia, between Prilep and Manastır (Monastir, Bitola), and further southwards into today’s northern Greece. The register TT 4, part of a series which Ursinus has convincingly dated to 1454–5, has the villages of

50 BOA, TT 237.
51 The 1445 register has been published in Sokoloski, Turski Dokumenti, ii, pp. 23–67. Vasil Kâncov’s work Makedonija, Etnografija, Statistika (Sofia, 1900) (reprint 1973) is regarded as containing the most reliable population statistics on late Ottoman Greater Macedonia. They are better also than the numbers contained in the various Ottoman salnames, which were made for public use and often inflate the number of Muslims and slightly reduce those of the Christians. The Ottoman nüfus defterleri (population registers), however, made for government use, were largely correct, as Kâncov discovered.
Dedebah, Timur, Şeleverci and Ali Obası with the explicit remark that they were yürikş, were free of most taxes but in return had to serve in the army as eşkinci (irregular cavalrymen). In the kaza of Manastır, very near the four villages mentioned (of which three still exist), was the village of Kanatlar. However, the great mass of Turkish colonists in the southern part of the Pelagonian plain, around Kayalar and Cuma Pazari, had evidently not yet arrived. They were to come in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, when unrest and heterodoxy fomented rebellion (the Kalenderoğlu revolt) and drove many tribal groups to settle in the peaceful plains of the southern Balkans. The same is also partly true for the three dozen yürik villages east of the Vardar, in the Štip area: the Ofçebolu Yürikleri. Some of these groups had settled before the 1519 census was taken, many others came afterwards, in the 1520s and 1530s.

The sources mentioned here give a variegated picture of the Ottoman settlement and colonisation of the Balkans. It seems that, at first, there was a spontaneous push of nomad settlers from western Anatolia, where there were many Turkoman nomads, to lands largely empty of population, that is, the greater part of Thrace; then the second wave, caused by refugees fleeing Timur’s aggression; and, third, government-ordered deportations. These three categories are reflected in the sources. The fourth category, the slow and unorganised movement of peoples from Anatolia to the eastern Balkans, and, from there, deeper inland to Macedonia, stretched over the whole fifteenth, and also the first half of the sixteenth century, but remained unrecorded in the chronicles. We only find them in the Ottoman tahrir defters, which, for many districts, allow us to see the intensity of the Turkish colonisation. They also show us which areas were not affected by it, namely, where the bulk of the native Slav, Greek or Albanian population remained where it always had been.

For decades the Turkish colonisation has been forcefully denied in Bulgarian historiography. The reason behind this is political, not scientific. Moreover, Bulgarian historians and Ottomanists were unable to make use of the rich source materials preserved in the Turkish archives, having to work with a few disconnected fragments in the Sofia National Library. The emphasis was on the aspect of conversion to Islam, which is indeed clearly visible in the sources but gained momentum only in the seventeenth century. Yugoslav historiography, doubtless the brightest of the entire Balkans, relied heavily on the Ottoman

tahrirs, of which complete sets of microfilms were available from the early 1950s. This has led to the publication of long series of sources as well as studies based on them. Here both aspects are stressed, colonisation and conversion. It was only in 1994, after the great political changes in eastern Europe, that Turks and Bulgarians reached an agreement for mutual exchange of microfilms of Ottoman source material, a process which continues and will ultimately change the entire Bulgarian historiography. The first tahrir register of Albania, the oldest of the entire Balkans, from 1432, was published in 1954 by Halil İnalcık.  

The Albanians have produced excellent publications of some entire tahrirs, but in Albanian historiography Turkish colonisation was not dealt with because it never took place. Almost three-quarters of the population of Albania converted to Islam, but this process stretched over a full four centuries.

Turkish colonisation and settlement in Greece is not a popular topic. Moreover, this neglected subject suffers from the fact that, disregarding two or three rare exceptions, Greece had no scholars able to read the Ottoman administrative scripts and most historians are hardly aware of what a wealth of sources is available. In spite of this, a promising new approach to the whole Turkish period in Greece is discernible, mostly the work of young scholars trained in western universities. Finally, some good work on the topic has been done by Turkish scholars, but here the accent has been heavily on colonisation, leaving the Islamisation of the native Balkan population underexposed. To sum up, the comprehensive work on how much of the Balkans became truly Turkish will take a long time to be written; yet we can at least conclude for now that the land to the east of the line from Nikopol (Nikopolis, Niğbolu) on the Danube to Kavala on the Aegean, and most of the southern half of Macedonia was, until 1912, at least as ‘Turkish’ as most of Anatolia.

Early Ottoman architecture in the Balkans

Ottoman architecture in the Balkans largely followed the pattern of the settlement of Turks as outlined above. As the incorporation of the southern Balkans, Thrace and Macedonia took place at a time when the young state was still in its formative stage, these provinces fully participated in the formation of the new Islamic art. It is not generally known that in the southern Balkans today there are still standing at least a dozen buildings dating from the very first

decades of Ottoman rule, that is, from before the year 1400. These are not converted Byzantino-Slavic structures, but genuine Ottoman ones, including mosques, zaviyes (dervish lodges), hamams and hans (caravansaries). As they remain very little known, they will be introduced here briefly. The line of development will also be described beyond the fourteenth century, bringing the story to 1453.

Problems of conservation

The value and the beauty of the Ottoman architectural legacy in southeastern Europe has long been unappreciated in the nation-states succeeding the empire. After 1878, and especially after 1912, the Ottoman monuments became the victims of mass destruction, being memories of a past which had no place in the nationalist ideology and education of the successor states. Because of the tendency to ‘correct the mistake of history’ (the emergence and existence of the Ottoman Empire) objects directly recalling that time had to be removed. In fact, this process went on until the 1990s: the Cultural Revolution in Albania in 1967, the anti-Turkish and Islamic campaign of the Živkov regime in Bulgaria, 1984–5, the mass destruction, with the help of dynamite, of a long list of many-centuries-old Ottoman buildings in Bosnia-Hercegovina by the nationalist Serbs as well as Croats, and most recently the destruction of whole old town centres by Serbian incendiary squads during the Kosovo crisis of 1998–9 (Djakovica, Vučitrn, Peć). The events in the summer of 2001 in the Republic of Macedonia, which led to the wanton destruction of scores of historical mosques by Macedonian extremists, show how fragile the situation still is.

On the other hand, at least since the beginning of the twentieth century, the more enlightened part of Balkan society has raised its voice against these acts of destruction, and succeeded in saving individual buildings here and there.

Illustrative of this is the case of the monumental, late fifteenth-century bedestan (covered market) in the city centre of Serres in Greek Macedonia, which in the Second World War was under Bulgarian occupation. In the process of being demolished, the bedestan was saved by the direct personal intervention of the art historian Bogdan Filov, prime minister of the fascist government of Bulgaria, and later carefully restored by the Greek Service for Ancient Monuments. It now serves as the city’s Archaeological Museum.55 A different case is that of the similarly late fifteenth-century bedestan of Yambol

55 The role of Bogdan Filov in the saving of the Serres bedestan was communicated to us by a participant of the Bulgarian occupation of Macedonia in the Second World War, Nikola Mushanov.
in Bulgarian Thrace, the only Bulgarian example of its kind surviving to our time. When in the 1960s the town centre of Yambol was reconstructed, the city council wanted to demolish the, admittedly ugly, ruin of the building. Others wanted to preserve it as a relic in a steel and glass ‘aquarium’; and the gifted architect Nikola Mushanov made a model showing a total reconstruction of the building. The city council pressed for a solution. Finally the party secretary, himself a poet, chose the Mushanov plan, and made available the huge amount of money needed. As the town and the whole district of Yambol had no other historical buildings, it was later decided to restore also the ugly-looking Old Mosque nearby. Since the 1980s both buildings, but in particular the *bedestan*, have become much appreciated beauty spots locally. When much money became available for restoration after the destructive Thessalonike earthquake of 20 June 1978, some Ottoman buildings in the city were restored with great care and attention by architects and specialists of the Greek National Service for Historical Monuments. The restorations of two very large, richly decorated and monumental fifteenth-century *hamams*, the Bey Hamami and the Pazar Hamami, are among the best of their type ever undertaken.

The dichotomy in attitude towards the Ottoman legacy in the Balkans is made very clear in the case of Skopje, the capital of the former Yugoslav Macedonia. After the catastrophic earthquake of 1963 ten of the largest Ottoman buildings, almost all from the fifteenth century, were excellently restored or even reconstructed. They all stand together around the bazaar area, in what was to become an architectural preserve, a protected cityscape. However, everything else, including more than a dozen historical mosques, a number of the fifteenth-century *hamams*, *türbes* (tombs) and *tekkes* (dervish lodges), was mercilessly destroyed so that the modern socialist capital of the Macedonian Slav state could be constructed.\textsuperscript{56} Skopje as it looks today is the outcome of the long struggle between two antagonistic forces.

The aspect of the wholesale destruction of the Ottoman architectural legacy, amounting to 98 per cent of all historical public and religious buildings, should constantly be kept in mind when evaluating the place this art once occupied in the formation and flourishing of Ottoman art as a whole.

\textsuperscript{56} These actions were, according to a communication made to us by the post-communist prime minister of Macedonia, Branko Ćervenkovski, pushed forward by the influential head of the city’s Institute for Historical Monuments, the *betonkopf* communist Alexander Kanev, who more than anyone else is responsible for the disappearance of scores of Ottoman monuments in this singularly rich city.
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The fourteenth century

The needs of the early conquerors and settlers for places of prayer must at first have been satisfied by confiscating Christian churches, which at the same time became the symbols of the victory of Islam. Early examples are the Süleyman Paşa Camii in Ferecik (Ferai) and the Fatih Camii in Vize, both in Thrace and both sizeable middle-Byzantine buildings. In the capital of the Ottoman Balkans, Edirne (Adrianople), conquered around 1369, at least two churches were converted into mosques, the Kilise Cami and the Fatih Camii. They served as the chief mosques of the city until the construction of the first Great Mosque (now known as Eski Cami), begun shortly after 1403 by Emir Süleyman. The two church/mosques of Edirne disappeared long ago as a consequence of earthquake and fire. In towns taken without violence, such as Komotini, or the great city of Serres, and in newly founded towns the Ottomans had to construct their own buildings themselves.

The oldest Ottoman buildings still standing in the Balkans are very probably the Gazi Evrenos İmaretı (soup kitchen) and the nearby Eski Cami of Gümülcine (Komotini) in Greek Thrace. The hamam, which had an Arabic inscription and was blown up in the early 1960s, was part of the same foundation. From the surviving buildings, the Eski Cami is a building which has no preserved inscription but can be dated by historical evidence. Gümülcine, a very small Byzantine fortified town, was taken by Gazi Evrenos, presumably in 1361, and became the seat of his utc facing Serbian-controlled Aegean Macedonia. It is not very likely that the early Ottoman warlords started to invest in building before the battle on the Maritsa (Meric¸) in 1371 had removed the Serbian threat. In 1383, when Serres, the key of Aegean Macedonia, was conquered, Evrenos moved the seat of his utc to that important place 130 kilometres to the west, and closer to the main field of operations. In Serres he is known to have constructed another imaret/zaviye. The vakfiye (endowment deed of a vakıf) of this foundation is dated 818 (13 March 1415–end February 1416), but the building is evidently older (Evrenos Bey died at a great age in 1416). It is interesting to see that in the vakfiye the person who ran the Serres institution is explicitly called 'Ahi'. In the early 1390s Evrenos Bey moved westward again, this time to the new town of Yenice-i Vardar, 50 kilometres west of Thessalonike, after the latter had been taken by the Ottomans in 1387. Yenice-i Vardar is a creation of Gazi Evrenos. It is the town where he erected

57 For the date of the conquest of these two cities see George Ostrogorski, 'La prise de Serres par les Turcs', Byzantion 35 (1965), 302–19; G. T. Dennis, The Reign of Manuel II Paleologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387 (Rome, 1960); and Imber, Ottoman Empire, pp. 33–4.
a number of Islamic buildings and the place where he died and was buried. Some of his works in Yenice still survive today.\textsuperscript{59} The years between 1371 and 1383 are thus the most likely for the Gümülcine buildings, between 1383 and 1390 for that in Serres and the last decade of the fourteenth century for the works in Yenice-i Vardar.

The Evrenos İmareti in Gümülcine is a good representative of the zaviye-T-plan mosque which can better be called a hanekah (dervish lodge), or zaviye (dervish lodge). It does not face towards Mecca, and is composed of a sizeable rectangular hall, covered by a dome on a network of Turkish triangles and by a barrel vault over the remaining part. The hall opens up towards the east with a huge arch of soft yellow-green limestone, emphasising the entrance, the remainder of the work being made up of a cloisonné of bricks and broken stone. The central hall is flanked on both sides by transversely placed rectangular side rooms which are accessible only from the central hall by means of a door, framed by fine portals. The one on the left (south) side has a large Arabic inscription, calligraphed and cut into the arched tympanon above the actual entrance, the whole being a part of the authentic structure and not a work of the recent restoration. The inscription is evidently the ‘Bauinschrift’ of Gazi Evrenos’s time but it is illegible, having been mutilated by the Bulgarian conquerors of 1912, who identified the building as a genuine old-Bulgarian church, ‘reconverted’ it into a church and dedicated it to the Holy Tsar Boris-Michael. The letters of Gazi Evrenos’s inscription were cut away to be replaced with a Cyrillic inscription. The modern Greek restorers carefully cleaned the remains of the original inscription which remains, alas, for the greater part illegible. It is the oldest monument of Ottoman epigraphy in south-eastern Europe. Against previously held theories, the building never had a domed or arched porch. When, during the restoration, the ugly concrete machinery halls were removed (before the restoration the building had served as the town’s power station) and archaeological research was carried out, no trace of a portico of any type was found. The form the original building had, and now has again, ranks it with the early fourteenth-century, pre-Ottoman zaviyes like those in Tokat, rather than associating it with the earliest Ottoman zaviye-mosques such as Orhan Gazi’s in Bursa (1335). The Gümülcine plan is also partly related to the Nilüfer İmaretî in İznik (1388), especially the rectangular, partly domed, partly arched lateral guest rooms. Like Gümülcine, the İznik building does
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not face towards Mecca. The link between the early zaviyes in Tokat and the Gümülçine building is indirect. The direct link is missing, but must have been formed by buildings which have now disappeared.\(^{60}\) A hint of the real nature of this and other buildings (Serres) within this group is given in the survey of staff, income and expenditure of the Gümülçine building contained in the register from 858/1454–5. The most important and best paid member of the staff is called an ‘Ahi’, thus a member of the famous late Seljuk and early Ottoman brotherhood of the \textit{ahi}.\(^{61}\) The Eski Cami of Gümülçine is preserved in a much altered and enlarged form. It stands slightly east of the \textit{imaret} and consists of an original fourteenth-century domed cube with an inner space of 7.80 metres which in the nineteenth century was enlarged by a spacious addition, enveloping it on most of its three sides. The original entrance wall was then removed to join both old and new sections; a building inscription over the door was lost in the process. The building was evidently designed as a \textit{mescid} (small mosque) in the manner of many other single-domed prayer chapels, as preserved in their dozens in old towns such as Afyon or Ayasoluğ/Selçuk and elsewhere in Anatolia. Both Gümülçine buildings are closely linked by their plans with contemporaneous structures in Anatolia, from where the inspiration came. They are built, however, using the late Byzantine cloisonné technique, then in vogue in the southern Balkans as well as in north-western and Aegean Anatolia, where we can assume the participation of local masters.\(^{62}\) The oldest preserved Ottoman utilitarian building in the Balkans also goes back to Gazi Evrenos. It is the \textit{han} near the mineral springs of Ilica (Trajanopolis),


15 kilometres east of the modern Greek port of Alexandropolis, on the road to Ípsala on the Turkish side of the Maritsa (Evros) river. The han is a spacious, barrel-vaulted, rectangular hall with fireplaces along the southern wall. This hall is preceded by a closed entrance room, now largely ruined. As a type it is closely related to a whole group of hans from the Beylik period in Anatolia. The institution of han or caravansary was unknown to Byzantino-Slavic architecture. An inscription, mentioning the name of Gazi Evrenos as its founder, existed, until the collapse of the façade in 1940, above the entrance and was mentioned by the local historian A. Samothrakis. The early seventeenth-century historian of Edirne, Hibri Efendi, described it and also attributes it to Gazi Evrenos. It must have been constructed some decades after Evrenos’s buildings in Gümülcine, thus in the 1390s.

The oldest representative of commemorative architecture is apparently the türbe, mausoleum, attributed to Lala Şahin Paşa in Kazanlák. It lies on a spur of the Balkan mountains, overlooking the town of Kazanlák in Bulgarian Thrace. This town figures as Akçe Kazanlık in the early Ottoman chronicles of the conquest of the Balkans, and appears as a small, purely Turkish settlement in the oldest preserved Ottoman registers for this part of Thrace. The building is an early example of the open canopy türbe with a dome resting on four brick-built pointed arches and four square pillars, likewise of brick. Lala Şahin, the first Ottoman beylerbey of Rumeli, died shortly after 1383. His body was buried in his still-standing türbe in Kirmasti (now Mustafa Kemal Paşa) 70 kilometres west of Bursa. His bowels must have been buried in the hill above Kazanlák, most probably the place where he died. The name of the building was handed down by tradition among the Muslim inhabitants and recorded by Franz Babinger in the 1930s. An interesting early parallel to the habit of burying the intestines of an important person on the spot where he died and preparing (or mummmifying) his body for the long transport to his desired burial place is handed down in the chronicle of the so-called Serbian janissary, Konstantin of Ostrović, who had entered Ottoman service in 1455, after Mehmed II’s capture of the Serbian silver-mine town of Novobrd on the

63 A. Samothrakis, in Thrakika Chronika 18 (1943). A large fragment of this inscription was found recently and is now kept in the Archaeological Museum of Kavalla. In the text it is mentioned that Evrenos Bey was a hacı. It is known from early Ottoman chronicles that Evrenos Bey asked Bayezid I for permission to go on hac in 1396. The building was thus constructed in the last years of the fourteenth century. The important text of the inscription is to be published by Heath Lowry.
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dge of the plain of Kosovo. This source notes that, after the battle of Kosovo in 1389, ‘Sultan Bayezid, after having been victorious, remained on the plain of Kosovo and erected there, on the battlefield, over the site where his father was killed, a monument: on four columns a dome was made and was covered with lead, and this stands till the present day.’ The Serbian janissary probably passed this monument when on campaign before 1463, when he was taken prisoner by King Mattias Corvinus, before finally settling in Poland, or knew it from his youth as he was born in the close vicinity of the monument. The same story, in different wording, is found in the fifteenth-century Ottoman chronicle the Anonymous-Giese where, after the description of the battle of Kosovo, the author states: ‘Then they built on the side where he fell a türbe and made the place visible. Even now this türbe remains on this site. Then they transported his body to Kaplıca [suburb of Bursa, where Murad’s principal buildings are located] and buried it there.’ The türbe was later replaced by a more monumental structure. The one we still see today was made on the order of Sultan Mehmed Reşad, a year before the end of Ottoman rule in the Balkans (1911). When Sultan Süleyman died before Szigetvar in 1566, the same procedure was followed, the türbe later being surrounded by a garden and a zaviye added to it. Süleyman’s body was buried in Istanbul, as is known; that of Murad I in Bursa in a monumental türbe. The practice is definitely older, and must be connected to the pronounced ancestor cult of the Turkic people, in the case of Kazanlâk and Kosovo, visibly transported to the Balkans.

Among the very early dated Ottoman single-domed mosques ranks the Eski Cami in Kırkkilise in Turkish Thrace. It is a cube covered by a dome over an

67 Giese, Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken, p. 38.
inner space of 12.25 metres, the dome resting on a belt of Turkish triangles. The original inscription is lost but one recording a major repair mentions Hızır Bey, an early member of the well-known Mihaloğlu family, as founder, and 785/1383–4 as the date of construction. The early Ottomans quickly developed the small, cubic single-domed mescids they had inherited from the Seljuks into Friday mosques (the Cami mosques) of much more monumental proportions and artistic pretensions. It was this type which became very popular in the Balkans, in most places the embodiment of all that was regarded as ‘Ottoman’ and in most cases the sole representative of this style. Gazi Evrenos’s single-domed building in Gümülcine was doubtlessly conceived as a mescid. The Eski Cami of Serres, originally also a single-domed building, was definitely a mosque from the beginning, as stated in its building inscription. It was the largest mosque of the city for more than a century, until 1492, when the huge mosque of Mehmed Bey, the son of the famous Gedik Ahmed Paşa, was built.

The Eski Cami of Serres was demolished in 1938 but old photographs and the topographical plan of the city from the inter-war period, as well as a description by Evliya Çelebi, give enough data to reconstruct it. It was a foundation of the conqueror of the city, grand vezir Çandarlı Hayreddin Paşa, who erected it between 1383, the year in which the city was taken, and 1387, the year of his death, just outside the city walls of Byzantine Serres. As a building it appears to be closely related to Hayreddin’s more famous creation, the Yeşil Cami in İznik, the seat of the Çandarlı family.

Evliya Çelebi gives the date of its completion as 787/1385 and describes it as the first mosque of the city. It was a rectangular prayer hall covered by one large dome of nearly ten metres span, and, as in İznik, by three vaults resting on two pillars. It was preceded by a domed porch. This solution reminds us of the narthex and exo-narthex of the middle Byzantine churches and might indeed be a creative reinterpretation of it. In the eighteenth century the building was enlarged on both lateral sides, and a second porch was added. Soon after its initial construction the Eski Cami was to become the focal point of the city. More than a century after its construction Çandarlı İbrahim Paşa constructed the six-domed bedestan of Serres just opposite the mosque of his great ancestor, and thus became the focal point of the city’s economic life. The old Byzantine town, however, with its dozens of churches, became largely a residential area,
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where the Christians continued to live. The Serres bedestan has managed to survive until today, as has been mentioned above.\textsuperscript{70}

At first sight the important Eski Cami of the town of Yambol on the Tunca (Tundža) river in Bulgarian Thrace appears to be an early endeavour to develop the plan of an Ottoman great mosque of the kind of the Üç Şerefeli in Edirne. In fact it is the work of two different building campaigns, as became visible during its restoration when an ugly coat of nineteenth-century plaster was taken off. The building is very early. Yambol, the Byzantino-Bulgarian border town of Diampolis, was conquered by the Ottomans in the summer of 1370. It capitulated after a long siege. The small and very strongly walled town in a loop of the Tunca must have been left as it was. It was still defendable when in 1412 Musa Çelebi attacked it. After that date the town walls must have been left to decay and disappear slowly, as was the case in Serres, and in other places where they were no longer needed. The Ottomans constructed their early buildings in the open plain to the north of the old town. The most important is the Eski Cami, of which the nucleus reaches back to the 1370s or 1380s. This part of the building is a good example of a single-domed mosque with engaged pillars. These pillars, connected by heavy, pointed arches, reduce the space which needed to be covered by the dome, but at the same time create a richer and wider inner space. The direct forerunner of this type of mosque seems to be the mosque of Koca Yadıgar in the town of İnönü near Eskişehir in western Anatolia, said to date from 776/1374. An older, slightly larger and more convincing example is the mosque of Orhan Bey in Eski Bilecik, an undated building but certainly constructed before the death of this second ruler of the house of Osman (1362). Both the Bilecik and İnönü buildings have no porch. Yambol, however, has a massive and monumental porch with closed flanks and an arcade covered by crossvaults resting on three arches carried by two square pillars. It is a solution which we also encounter in some thirteenth-century Seljuk mescids in Konya. To the right of the entrance rises a curious square minaret, the only one known in the Balkans, but rather common in south-eastern Anatolia, in the art of the various Turkoman beyliks, and clearly connected with the Syrian prototype. Locally the minaret was long held to be the tower of the old Bulgarian cathedral of Yambol but archaeological research

\textsuperscript{70} A number of old photographs of the Serres Eski Cami as it was in the first decades of the twentieth century were published by G. Kaftantsis, \textit{Oι Σέρρες δόλοτα και τότα. Αφιέρωμα}, (Thessalonike, 1985). See also Th. Pennas, \textit{Ιστορία τῶν Σερρῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Τούρκων μέχρι τῆς ἀπελευθέρωσιος τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐλλήνων, 1383–1913}, 2nd edn (Athens, 1966). For the functioning of the vakıf of this mosque see the useful work of Balta, \textit{Les vakifs de Serrès}, pp. 91–5.
underneath the floor of the mosque found no trace of such an imagined building.

Many decades later, owing to the rapid expansion of the Muslim population of the town (the 1454–5 register mentions 591 adult Muslim males but only 56 adult male Christians) and perhaps inspired by the great Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne (1437–48), the Yambol mosque was enlarged on two sides by three large units on each side, covered by cradle vaults. In this manner a building was created which evidently belongs to the same group as the great Edirne mosque.

From all the works erected by Gazi Evrenos in his residence, the new town of Yenice-i Vardar, only a large single hamam remains. It shows a complicated plan with a profusion of domes on belts of elaborate Turkish triangles but does not have the later obligatory tripartite layout. Like some other early Ottoman hamams, or those from the second half of the fourteenth century in the west Anatolian princely residences of Ayasolug and Balat, it has no large disrobing room. The Yenice-i Vardar building has been a ruin for decades, but is protected by law against demolition. It is not dated but has to be placed in the 1390s. In that decade Evrenos had moved his seat again and created a new town, probably on the site of a small Byzantine castle (the name Yenice does not mean new, but newish). His foundations there consisted of a mosque, an imaret, a great medrese (school) and the preserved hamam. His buildings are described by Evliya Çelebi and are mentioned in the various tahrir defters of the sixteenth century. Gazi Evrenos’s türbe, near the hamam, survived in the form of an early twentieth-century reconstruction. The building inscription, mentioning the death of the old warlord in 1417, was found some decades ago and was published by Vasili Demetriadi.

From the same time as Gazi Evrenos’s buildings in Yenice-i Vardar, the last decade of the fourteenth century, are two buildings in the small central Bulgarian town of İhtiman. İhtiman was founded by members of the Mihaloğlu

71 Istanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi, Cevdet Yazmaları collection, no. 0.89 (AH 899/1454–5).
72 For an older description of the Yambol Eski Cami see M. Kiel, ‘Some Early Ottoman Monuments in Bulgarian Thrace, Stara Zagora, Jambol and Nova Zagora’, Belleten 38, 152 (1974), 644–9; updated in Kiel, Studies, section VII. A detailed survey of the results of the great restoration of this building and the archaeological research underneath its floor has not been published. For Orhan Bey’s mosque in Eski Bilecik and Koca Yadiğer in İnönü see Aptullah Kuran, The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture (Chicago, 1968), p. 70, with plan and photograph.
family, three kilometres south of the Byzantino-Bulgarian town of Stipion (Stiponje), as the centre for a group of Turkish villages in this small highland valley which is surrounded on all sides by heavily wooded mountains but controls the main road from Edirne to Sofia and further on to Belgrade. After the conquest, Stipion long remained the largest, and purely Christian, settlement in the region. It was taken by treaty and the name İhtiman refers to this (‘ahd ve aman’). The Mihaloğlu constructed an imaret/zaviye as focal point of the new settlement and nearby a han of the kind found in İlica (Trajanopolis) and a hamam. The tax revenues of the Turkish villages of the mountain plain, and that of Stipion, were endowed for the upkeep of the foundation. Its founder appears to be Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey, who fell in the battle of Ankara in 1402.

The imaret/zaviye, for half a century in an incredible state of ruin, consists of a central domed space flanked by lateral rooms, also covered by domes, and a barrel-vaulted section which houses the mihrab. Originally the lateral spaces were closed and only opened to the central space through doors. In the course of the sixteenth century, when the old institution once housed in the building no longer existed, the separating walls were removed and the space incorporated to the functions of the mosque. To the right of the building, but disconnected, a very high minaret was added, the features of which betray its date. It disappeared after the First World War but is known from old photographs. The han opposite the zaviye-mosque disappeared in the nineteenth century. The hamam, however, is preserved and was excellently restored in the 1980s. The remarkable disrobing room is covered by a dome on an exceedingly high tambour, a characteristic feature of the early Ottoman dome and very probably related to the stilted domes of late Byzantine architecture. The plan of both buildings was evidently imported from Anatolia but the workmanship of the walls, with rosettes in brick and other ceramo-plastic elements, is related to the local architecture.74

Related to the buildings in Gümülcine and İhtiman is the long misunderstood mosque of Yıldırım Bayezid in the westernmost suburb of Edirne. This building is, like that in Gümülcine and the older zaviyes in Tokat and elsewhere, not oriented towards Mecca. It was therefore thought to have been a Byzantine church of unknown type. It has also been interpreted as not being from Yıldırım Bayezid but from Murad I, thus decades older, on the grounds that Edirne had no sultanic mosque. That at least two large ex-churches served as mosques, as is related by Hibri and Evliya Çelebi,
was overlooked. The building is traditionally called Yıldırım Cami, or, more revealing, Eski İmaret, to distinguish it from the Orta İmaret of Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey and the great Yeni İmaret of Bayezid II, likewise on the banks of the Tunca. It is also mentioned in some fifteenth-century account books of great sultanic foundations, showing a staff including two cooks, one baker, one dishwasher, a cellar-master and a rice pounder for the food distributed in the building.\textsuperscript{75} Moreover, its original inscription from 1399–1400, preserved broken into several pieces and kept in the Edirne Archaeological Museum (Inv. No. 1537), calls the building an imaret, not a mosque.\textsuperscript{76} The plan shows a central dome on the intersection of four barrel-vaulted eyvans (recesses open on one side). Two of the remaining corners are filled with detached rooms, furnished with chimneys and opening to the main building through doors. They were evidently the guest rooms. In front of the building, on the northern side, there once ran a porch of five units of which only the columns are still standing. Outside the building are the ruins of the kitchen building, with one huge chimney still standing. Only at a much later date was this original zaviye, called imaret in the inscription, transformed into a mosque proper, with the addition of a minaret and a mihrab obliquely placed in a corner of the southern eyvan in order to show the correct orientation to Mecca.

Another building that has long puzzled art historians is the curious mosque of Çelebi Sultan Mehmed (1413–21) in the small town of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka). This town was conquered before Edirne and had long received special treatment from the Ottoman sultans. Mehmed the Conqueror and Bayezid II were born in the palace of Dimetoka and in the fifteenth century the imperial treasure was kept there. The great mosque which still overlooks the town was begun by Yıldırım Bayezid before 1402 but completed much later by his youngest son, Mehmed I. The Ottoman registers from the late fifteenth century onward call it the mosque of Sultan Yıldırım Han, as do Evliya Çelebi and the Ottoman accounts of the İmaret-i Bayezidiye in Edirne.\textsuperscript{77} The Dimetoka mosque was conceived as an enlarged version of the Şehadet Cami in the castle of Bursa, a work of Murad I, with two large domes resting on two massive piers over the central ‘nave’ and two mighty cradle vaults on each of

\textsuperscript{75} Ömer Lütfi Barkan, ‘Edirne ve Civarndaki Bazi İmaret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları’, Belgeler 1, 2 (1964), 235–377 (for the Bayezidiye İmaret, pp. 291–3).

\textsuperscript{76} For this important inscription see the scholarly edition by F. Th. Dijkema, The Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne (Leiden, 1977), pp. 13–15 and plate 1.

the remaining lateral sections. When the walls had reached their full height Bayezid was defeated by Timur at the battle of Ankara (1402), and the building remained unfinished. Almost two decades later Sultan Mehmed I finished the work in a different and much cheaper manner than originally intended. As he had already completed the huge Eski Cami of Edirne, left unfinished by his brothers Süleyman and Musa, and was still working on the very expensive Yeşil Cami in Bursa, he evidently had to economise. Instead of stone the entire vaulting was made of wood and covered by a huge, lead-covered, pyramid roof. The woodwork, already described by Evliya in 1669, is not the product of later repairs but dates from 1420–2, as was shown by dendrochronological research by Striker and Kuniholm. In the long and elaborate inscriptions over the entrances only Mehmed is mentioned as founder, as he is in the inscriptions of the Edirne Eski Cami. The provisional character of Mehmed’s work in Dimetoka can also be seen in the fact that the mosque never had a vakıf of its own. Its staff were paid from the poll-tax of the Christians of the kaza of Dimetoka. In spite of this, the Dimetoka mosque remains one of the largest architectural enterprises of the Ottomans in the Balkans outside the capitals Bursa and Edirne. It is also the first building in the Balkans with an inscription where the architect mentions himself. This is the well-known Hacı İvaz Paşa of Tokat, the architect of the famous Yeşil Cami in Bursa. It is thus an undeniable document of the way Ottoman architecture was introduced into the Balkans from Anatolia. The building now has no function but is maintained by the Greek Service for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Antiquities, Kavalla.

The little Thracian town has more early Ottoman buildings, mostly very little known but still standing. One of them is the so-called Fısıltı Hamamı, or Whispering Bath, a foundation of Uruç Paşa, one of the sons of Timurtaş, the second beylerbey of Rumeli. Hibri Efendi in the 1630s, and Katip Çelebi and Evliya Çelebi some decades later, mention this hamam. Hibri Efendi, who himself had worked at the medrese of Uruç Paşa, gives the date of construction of this early example of an Ottoman hamam in the Balkans as 801/September 1398–September 1399. Like other early Ottoman hamams it has no great domed disrobing room, and never had one, as can be seen on the finely worked

78 See Ayverdi’s reconstruction in Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri 806–855 (1403–1451), vol. II (Istanbul, 1972) pp. 136–50. The inscriptions of this building are also given here in detail.
79 See references in various Vazifehoran Defters in the BOA (i.a. MAD 5625 from 1047–1637, p. 4; also MAD 6177 from 1046).
stalactite portal. Instead of a great domed entrance hall it has a very elaborate tepidarium. At present this once important building is a miserable ruin.  

The second early Ottoman building is the türbe of Uruç Paşa, situated on a hill to the north-east of the town, the site of the former Ottoman cemetery. It is another example of an open canopy türbe, a dome with four pointed arches, resting on four masonry piers. In contrast to the Kazanlak türbe of Lala Şahin it is made entirely of carefully cut grey limestone, which abounds in the Dimetoka area. The identification of this türbe as the mausoleum of Uruç Paşa is handed down by tradition and fixed in the late Ottoman salnames of the Edirne Vilayet of 1310/1892.  

Both Hibri and Evliya mention him as the founder of an important medrese in Dimetoka, a building ranking high in the hierarchy of medreses and mentioned as such in the official list of medreses of the Balkans from 1660. Well-known Ottoman scholars like Taşköprüzade and Dülgerzade taught at this college. The türbe of Uruç Paşa is partly in ruins but is a protected monument.

One of the most important early Ottoman single-domed mosques, the focal point of the city, is the Eski Cami in the Bulgarian city of Stara Zagora (Zağra Eskihisar) in northern Thrace. The Byzantino-Bulgarian town, still lying within its far too wide ceinture of Roman walls, was captured by Lala Şahin, apparently in 1369–70. Its conquest is mentioned by most early Ottoman chroniclers but their dates are incorrect. It was taken together with Filibe (Plovdiv) and Yambol. This can hardly have been before the conquest of Edirne, which traditionally was placed in 1361, but after new research has to be placed around 1369. In 1408, during the troubled period of civil war between the sons of Bayezid I at the time of the reign of Emir Süleyman, a nobleman of the vanquished Aydınoğlu dynasty, Hamza Bey, the brother of İzmiroğlu Cüneyd, constructed this huge mosque at Zağra Eskihisar. Its prayer room is covered by one single dome on squinches, which has a diameter of more than 17 metres. This is a remarkable feat of engineering. The usual Byzantino-Bulgarian dome over thirteenth- and fourteenth-century churches hardly reached five metres. The space covered by Hamza Bey’s dome is thus more than ten times larger. The hall is preceded by a curious porch with domes and vaults on square brick piers. The whole is extremely heavy and ponderous. As to plan and concept, this mosque is clearly related to the mosque of Yıldırım Bayezid in Mudurnu,
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built in 1388, when he was residing there as a prince. An earlier example of a huge single-domed mosque is that of Ahmed Gazi, the Menteşe prince, in Eski Çine, built not in 1308, as is sometimes said, but around 1370, when he was the actual ruler of the little principality. The domes of the Mudurnu and Eski Çine mosques are even slightly bigger than that of Zağra Eskihisar but the latter is evidently a further development of the two works in western Anatolia, less heavy, more harmonious, but still a little primitive.

In a long Arabic inscription Hamza Bey proudly styled himself ‘Shadow of God on Earth’, which is a part of the title of a ruler and evidently a hint at his princely background. When Mehmed I reunited the empire, after 1413, such use of titles would no longer have been possible. In the imposing Zağra Eskihisar mosque Hamza Bey showed the same pretensions. The mosque was carefully restored in the early 1980s, but in 1985, during the anti-Islamic persecution campaign of the late Živkov regime, the minaret was blown up. Shortly afterwards the ornamental half-moon at the top of the great dome, symbol of Islam, was cut off. Since then the mosque stands, castrated. 85

At the time when Hamza Bey, Aydınoğlu prince in Ottoman service, was conceiving his mosque in Zağra Eskihisar, the ruler of Rumeli, Emir Süleyman, planned a truly sultanic great mosque in his capital, Edirne. By the beginning of 1403, Süleyman had secured his position in the Balkans with the treaty of Gallipoli, which he concluded with Byzantium, Genoa, Venice and the Knights of St John. In 1404 and 1405 he was busy fighting his brother Mehmed in Anatolia and in most of 1410 and the beginning of 1411 he was occupied with the struggle against his other brother Musa, in which he finally succumbed. Thus 1406–9 are the years in which he could actively push the construction of the great Edirne mosque. It was to be a smaller version of the Bursa Ulu Cami, with nine large domes (of more than 13 metres) on four massive square piers, instead of twenty domes on twelve piers, and practically continues the type of large multi-pillared mosques developed under the Seljuks. The Sungur Bey Mosque in Niğde (1330) constitutes the link between these and the earliest Ottoman creation of the same type, the Şehadet Mosque in Bursa, built sixty-five years after the Niğde building. In the literature, the Eski Cami of Edirne is often said to be the work of the architect Hacı Alaeddin of Konya, which would explain the link with Seljuk art. Yet his name does not figure on the two large historical inscriptions of the Edirne building. 86

85 For this building, mostly misdated in the older literature and attributed to the wrong founders, the most up-to-date source is M. Kiel, Studies, vii, pp. 635–654b.
The early Ottoman chronicles mention that Emir Süleyman was unable to finish the building and that it was continued by Musa, who in his short reign (1411–13) also failed to complete it. This was finally done under the triumphant Mehmed I in 1416, as is stated in the inscriptions. There Mehmed mentions only himself, omitting the role of his brothers, as he was also to do a few years later in Dimetoka.

Opposite the mosque Mehmed ordered the construction of a huge multi-domed covered market hall, a bedestan. It is the first of its kind known in the Balkans and together with the Great Mosque became the new city centre of Edirne, outside the walls of the old Adrianopolis. The Edirne bedestan was designed not only to become the focal point of commerce but also as a source of revenue for the vakıf of the new Ulu Cami. The accounts of this vakıf, from the late fifteenth century, as published by Barkan, show that it indeed was the foundation’s largest source of income. Both buildings are truly ‘sultanic’. They demonstrated to all that the Turks felt confident of their hold on the Balkans, that they had come to stay.

The original design of the Edirne mosque had no porch and no minarets. One free-standing high minaret was added soon after by Murad II; the second one came much later, awkwardly improvised on the northern corner of the building. That the huge five-unit porch was added later, perhaps as a change of plans under Mehmed, can still be seen clearly.

Some architectural curiosities, rather than great monuments, must be mentioned briefly here, one in Larissa (Yenis¸ehir) and one in Berat in southern Albania. After a fire in a pizzeria in the oldest part of the historic capital of Thessaly, Larissa, in central Greece, in February 1994, three well-preserved walls of a small (9 by 12 metre) single-domed mosque became visible. A reconstruction shows that the building belonged to the small group of Ottoman mosques which have an inner narthex, behind the usual open porch in front. The plan is related to the Ye¸sil Cami in Iznik and its simpler brother in Serres, and a few other examples. Apart from an ugly and featureless mosque of the nineteenth century, Larissa, which once boasted more than forty mosques, now has none. The appearance of the remains of a clearly very old mosque created a local sensation.

The eastern Thessalian plain where Yenis¸ehir was to arise was conquered by the Ottomans in 1386–7 under Gazi Evrenos, and the western plain, with Trikkala, in 1392–3 by Bayezid I. The eastern plain was largely depopulated

Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles’, Der Islam 60 (1983), 268–96. For the two inscriptions on his Edirne mosque see Dijkema, Inscriptions, pp. 17 ff.

87 Barkan, ‘Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin’, p. 299.
in the wars and depredations of the first half of the fourteenth century and Archbishop Antonios of Larissa (1333–63) was forced to reside in Trikkala, Larissa being totally ruined and his cathedral a refuge for robbers.\(^{88}\) On flat ground below the ruins of the destroyed Byzantine town situated on the only hill of the eastern plain, at the point where the river Pineios can be bridged, the Ottomans under Evrenosoğlu Barak Bey were to found their new town, Yenişehr, which was to become one of the ten largest Ottoman cities of the Balkans, and until 1882 a city with a population that was more than three-quarters Muslim-Turkish. According to the vakif section of the 1506 tahrir defter Barak Bey erected in Yenişehr a mosque and an imaret, which provided free food for travellers and the poor, as well as a hamam and rows of shops. Mosque and imaret were probably housed in one and the same building, known in the literature as a zaviye-mosque. Barak Bey is known to have been active in 1408, 1413 (in the decisive battle against Musa Çelebi) and in 1422 when he was involved in the blockading of Thessalonike.\(^{89}\)

Nothing survives from Barak Bey’s foundations in Larissa. What has survived from his time, however, are the remains of a small, very well built mosque of one of the kâdis of Yenişehr from the years around 1400. Only three walls of this mosque have come down to us, built in a very carefully executed cloisonné technique which links it to known Ottoman buildings from the last decade of the fourteenth and the first two decades of the fifteenth century. The site of the mosque was remembered locally as the place where once the Bayraklı Cami had stood, the mosque from which the sign was given that it was prayer time by flying a flag from the minaret. Until the 1994 fire the existence of the building remained wholly unknown. An Ottoman survey of the vakfıs of Thessaly from 1248/1833–4 makes clear that the Bayraklı Cami was the work of Kadi Musliheddin.\(^{90}\) The date of the building has been ‘read’ by a number of experts on Ottoman architecture as ranging between 1390 and 1420, that is, the period of Evrenosoğlu Barak Bey. The remains of the building were cleaned and conserved by the local service for historical monuments but as of 2006 no further reconstruction work had been undertaken.


\(^{89}\) For Barak Bey see Imber, Ottoman Empire, pp. 61, 62, 94, referring to Venetian and contemporary Greek sources. A vakfiye of Barak’s foundations in Larissa is apparently not preserved. For a detailed extract of it as it appears in the tahrir defter of 1506 see Kiel, ‘Das türkische Thessalien’, p. 98.

\(^{90}\) BOA, Evrak Nezareti 9442.
The historical city of Berat in southern Albania was annexed by the Ottomans (by whom it was named Arnavud Belgrad) in 1417. The Orthodox Christian walled city on the mountain top was left untouched. A new open Muslim city was to develop in the plain at the foot of the old town and no churches were confiscated. Only in the highest part of the old town, in the upper castle, was a small mosque constructed to serve the needs of the Ottoman garrison. The foundation walls from this building still stand, as does the greater part of the minaret. The latter is constructed in alternating layers of brick and stone according to the local Byzantine building traditions. The architectural concept, however, was imported from the east. The small mosque was named after Sultan Mehmed I and is the oldest in Albania.

Edirne has more remarkable buildings from the time when it was the capital of Rumeli. One of the best is the so-called Orta İmaret, or Gazi Mihal Camii, situated on the banks of the Tunca river, opposite the city, on the main road to Sofia and Belgrade. It is a good representative of the early Ottoman zaviye, designed to give accommodation and food to the traveller according to the ethics of the ahi brotherhood. It shows a more developed form than the buildings of the same category in Gümülcine, İhtiman and Yıldırım in Edirne. According to its preserved inscription it was built in 1422 by Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, one of the commanders of the Ottoman vanguard and an important figure in his time.

The building is composed of a domed central hall flanked by two closed lateral rooms equipped with chimneys and communicating with the central hall through doors. In the rear of the central hall is a barrel-vaulted space for prayer, with a mihrab in the axis of the building. In contrast to the older buildings of this kind, the Orta İmaret of Edirne is oriented towards Mecca. The building is preceded by a monumental porch of five units. Originally it had no minaret. This was awkwardly improvised much later on the left-hand corner of the building.

Old photographs, taken before the Second World War, show a separate kitchen building immediately to the left of the zaviye-mosque with its back to the river Tunca. It disappeared when the river dykes were made under the Menderes government.

The entire building, like most of those in Edirne, is made of neatly cut blocks of grey limestone. Although the building inscription gives the year 1422 as the date of construction, the building itself must be a decade older. Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey had been beylerbey of Rumeli under Musa Çelebi (1411–13) and was thus well positioned to erect a monumental and expensive building. After Mehmed I’s victory over his brother in 1413, however, Mehmed
Bey was thrown into prison in Tokat and remained there until early in 1422, when, owing to his popularity among the troops of Rumeli, Murad II needed him in his attack against the pretender known as the Düzmé (false) Mustafa. His Edirne buildings were completed in the year of his release. They were evidently begun earlier as half a year is far too short a period in which to build such a complicated structure. This would largely explain why this building has such an archaic feature as a barrel vault over the section reserved for prayer. In the inscription the building is called a ‘blessed place’ (makam’l-mubarek), not cami. On the opposite banks of the Tunca, sandwiched between the old and the new highways to Sofia and Belgrade, still stands the great double hamam of Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, in a shameful state of ruin but structurally sound. It is another example of a hamam without a great disrobing hall, following the Syrian plan, with a very elaborate tepidarium. The decoration of the vaults and domes of this hamam belongs to the richest Ottoman architecture has to offer. The great multi-arched stone bridge over the Tunca, connecting both of Mehmed Bey’s buildings, is a work of the same person.

The oldest Ottoman Ulu Cami preserved in the Balkans outside the former capital of Edirne is the so-called Hüdavendigar Murad Camii, or Cumaya Cami in Filibe (Plovdiv), the capital of Bulgarian Thrace and in early Ottoman times, until 1455–6, the seat of the beylerbey of Rumeli. This building, too, has been misdated in the existing literature, which focused on the title Hüdavendigar, supposed to have been used only for Murad I (1362–89). In fact it is used throughout the fifteenth century, and even later, to denote the sultan.

The Cumaya Cami of Plovdiv is a further development of the theme of Ulu Cami and falls between the Ulu Cami of Bergama, from Bayezid I (1395), and the Eski Cami of Edirne. It has three spacious domes over a central ‘nave’, resting on four massive square piers, and has three large cradle vaults over both lateral spaces. It was once fronted by a porch of five domed units, which disappeared during an eighteenth-century earthquake and was replaced by a wooden penthouse. Traces of the domes became visible during the reconstruction of this penthouse in the 1970s. The springs of the pointed arches of the portico are still to be seen in the walls of both short sides of the porch, which are closed. The mosque has a tall minaret, adorned with an intricate pattern of rhombic fields, which is characteristic of the early fifteenth century.

---

91 Cf. Imber, *Ottoman Empire*, pp. 70, 92–3. The chronicler Aşıkpaşazade, then a young man, accompanied Mehmed Bey from Tokat to the battlefield at Ulubad (Lopadion), as he himself relates.

The grand building has no original inscription. That which we see now refers to an eighteenth-century repair under Abdülhamid I. Ottoman Filibe was destroyed in the summer of 1410 during the struggle between Emir Süleyman and his brother Musa Çelebi. The open town at the foot of the castle hill was burnt down but the upper town, with its walls, was apparently spared, as can be inferred from the text of Konstantin of Kostenets, the Bulgarian scholar and biographer of the Serbian ruler Stephen Lazarević. During this event the surviving Greek Christian population left the town and settled in the nearby Stamimaki at the foot of the Rhodope mountains. Filibe was resettled with Muslim Turks. According to the oldest preserved Ottoman register concerning this town, Filibe then had 796 Muslim households, 78 of Christians and 33 of Gypsies. The great Plovdiv mosque constitutes the heart of the open town. After Murad II had consolidated his rule, around 1425, he must have taken care of the reconstruction of Filibe, first of all building a new large Ulu Cami. The mosque is explicitly mentioned as his foundation by the well-informed Hibri Efendi, the local historian of early seventeenth-century Edirne, but his work long remained little known and preserved in only a few manuscripts. The mosque had no vakıf of its own but was part of the large foundation for the maintenance of Murad II’s buildings in Edirne, the Üç Şerefeli Mosque and the Muradiye, as is to be seen in the vakıf accounts published by Barkan, but which was overlooked by all who wrote about this building.

Important work of military architecture was also carried out under Murad II in Thessalonike. Immediately after the conquest of the city (1430), Murad’s governor, Sungur Çavuş Bey, led the construction of the citadel of Yedi Kule, now called Heptapyrgion, which dominated the town. Names and date (1432) are written on a large inscription in Arabic over the entrance gate. It was long believed that the great hexagonal Yedi Kule citadel was a Byzantine work, to which Sungur Bey only added a new gate on which to write his name. Recent

93 See Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimârîsinde, 1, pp. 301–2 (with incomplete reading) and İbrahim Tatarlı, ‘Turski kultovi sgradi i nadpisi v Bulgarija’, Godišnik na Sofijskija Univerzitet, Fakultet po Zapadni Filologii (Sofia, 1966), pp. 567–615, with complete text.
94 See Maximilian Braun, Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarević von Konstantin dem Philosophen, ‘s-Gravenhage (Wiesbaden, 1956), pp. 49–1. Compare also the account by Colin Imber, Ottoman Empire, pp. 68–9, who used another edition of the same text of Konstantin.
95 BOA, TT 26 from 1489/90, ff. 64–82.
96 We used the manuscript of the Vienna National Library, No. 1052 (Flügel, ii, 259) where the work is called ‘Tarih-i Edirne’, f. 61v (ve Filibe’nini Câmi’i ‘Atîki ve mahrûse-i Brusa’dâ câmi’i-şerîf). See also the modern Turkish edition of Abdurrahman Hibri, Ensîsîl Mûsâmîrin–Edirne Tarihi, ed. Ratip Kazanc˘gil (Edirne, 1996), p. 67.
and extensive dendrochronological work by Striker and Kuniholm, however, has proved that almost all the work is from 1431–2.

The same Sungur Çavuş Bey is also known to have been the founder of a number of important buildings of which nothing but notes in the sources and some old photographs have come down to us. Besides a monumental single-domed mosque in Edirne and another in Vidin on the Danube, he also built in 838/1434–5 in Bitola (Manastır), the second city of Slav Macedonia, a massive and ponderous Friday mosque (cami), a zaviye, a han to accommodate merchants and travellers, and a hamam. These buildings, situated on the former tereke pazari (corn market) in the oldest part of the city, were the oldest known Ottoman monuments of this city and constituted the nucleus around which Ottoman Bitola developed. The cramped fortified Byzantino-Slavic town was situated on the hill overlooking the town in the north. This settlement was apparently destroyed during the conquest (1385) and afterwards slowly deserted in favour of the new site on the plain along the small river Dragor. During the construction of the mosque, stones from the ruins of old castles were reused, among them the famous Bitola inscription of the Bulgarian Tsar Ivan Vladislav from 1015. This surfaced again when in 1956 the mosque of Sungur Çavuş, known as Eski Cami, or Old Mosque, was demolished by order of the city council in order to 'beautify the town'. The zaviye, which also had the function of distributing food to the needy and poor, functioned until 1941.

The Eski Cami of Bitola appears in old photographs as a massive, block-like prayer hall surmounted by a dome with a circular drum, and preceded by a portico of three units resting on four heavy square pillars. Porch and prayer hall form one block which is, together with the circular drum of the dome, a very old feature in Ottoman architecture. The building is of interest because it is explicitly called a mosque in the preserved vakıfnane from 838/April 1435. The domed and lead-covered building of Sungur Çavuş Bey in Edirne, which was only slightly smaller than the one in Bitola, however, is called a mescid. With the Bitola building the unknown architect clearly attempted to make the single-domed structure the architecturally dominant and focal point of the külliye (mosque complex). That is why the forms chosen were so heavy and impressive. The existing literature expresses the opinion that the Ottomans developed the T-plan mosque or zaviye-mosque because they wished to have a more monumental building as the focal point of their building complexes, the single-domed mosque not offering enough possibilities to attain this. The Bitola mosque was an example that pointed in a different direction. The building was, moreover, a very early example of the transition of the single-domed mescids of the past into a fully fledged Friday mosque, composed of a domed
square, a domed or vaulted porch and a tall minaret: the classical Ottoman building type, the most popular form of Ottoman mosque and, in the Balkans, often the sole representative of this art.\textsuperscript{98}

In 1436–7 Sultan Murad II completed the great stone bridge over the Vardar in Üsküd (Skopje), and a large congregational mosque on the site of the ruined monastery of St George on the Serava. Neither building has survived in its original form. The bridge was reconstructed in 987/1579. The mosque, a well-built rectangle with a flat wooden roof supported by two arcades of three columns each, burnt down twice: first by accident under Süleyman the Magnificent, to be reconstructed by him in 1539–40, and later, in 1689, on purpose, set fire to by the Habsburg army under General Piccolomini, who destroyed the entire town. It was rebuilt a second time under Ahmed III in 1124/1712. The story is related on large inscriptions, published by Elezović and Ayverdi.\textsuperscript{99}

Also dating from 839/1435–6 is the once large foundation of another member of the Mihaloğlu family, Firuz Bey, in the medieval Bulgarian capital of Tirnovo. It consisted of a relatively small, but very well-constructed domed mescid, as is stated on the foundation inscription, as well as an imaret in the sense of a public soup kitchen, a single hamam, a bridge over the Yantra river, a han, a mescid in the han, and a medrese, all in Tirnovo, and a mescid in the village of Murad Bey and another mekteb in Umur Bey. The complex was maintained from the tax revenue of the nearby villages of Umur Bey, Murad Bey, Pavlikeni, Mihaliç-i Buzurg and Mihaliç-i Küçük. The imaret and han disappeared long ago, the bridge was replaced by a concrete one and the mosque was demolished to discover the ruins of the palace of the Bulgarian medieval kings underneath it, destroyed during the violent capture of 1393. Only the hamam, the oldest in Bulgaria, is still standing as a ruin. During the above-mentioned excavations a brick was found in the ruined walls of the mosque, in the clay of which an inscription had been carved, when it was still wet. The inscription states: ‘Kosta, son of Yanako, on the 27 of the month of June, these karamidi [bricks] were made and built in the masgit of Ferizbeg’. The Tirnovo brick is a good


Ottoman expansion into the Balkans

Illustration of Ottoman building practices: plan, artistic style and concept were provided by the Ottomans, the materials by a local workforce who can be presumed to have participated also in the manual labour.100

Under Murad II (1421–51) a number of important buildings were erected in Edirne, which was developed during his rule into the real capital of the empire. The most important is the huge new imperial mosque, known as Üç Şerefeli Cami, the largest Ottoman mosque hitherto built and in many ways an innovative building which was to become the starting point for the great developments in architecture in the sixteenth century. Murad himself, and his commanders, also erected a number of other important structures. Still standing are half a dozen small, but monumental and very well constructed, domed *mescid* – the Şahmelek, Kuşçu Doğan, Kirazlı, Gazi Hoca and Hızır Ağa mosques and the Saruca Paşa *mescid* – most of them with an inner space of seven or eight metres diameter, covered by a dome on a belt of Turkish triangles. Among the more important works of this time is the so-called Beylerbey Camii in the northern part of the city, above the road to Murad’s Yeni Saray (New Palace), on the banks of the Meric river. Its founder was Sinanuddin Yusuf Paşa, generally called Sinan Paşa, who was beylerbey of Rumeli under Murad, but who had before served as governor of Thessaly, where the early Ottoman chroniclers (Aşıkpaşazade, Oruç, Ruhi-i Edirnevi, Neşri) mentioned him in connection with the struggle between the princes Musa and Mehmed in 1413 and later as beylerbey of Rumeli. The building has no inscription. The date of construction is given by the early seventeenth-century historian of Edirne, Hibri Efendi, who noted: ‘Another [building] is the Beylerbey Camii, which is roofed by a dome and a half dome. But which beylerbey has made it is not known. However, its *vakfiye* is dated in the year 832 [1428–9]. His [the founder’s] name is given as Yusuf Paşa.’101

In a survey of the foundation’s income and expenditure contained in the *vakif defter* from 1568–9 the main building is explicitly called an *imaret*.102 A *medrese* with ten student cells, a *mescid*, a huge double *hamam* and the *türbe* of the founder belonged furthermore to this great foundation. The *türbe* and

---

100 For the Tirnovo brick see the periodical *Arheologija* 2 (Sofia, 1967), 27–35, and the comments of M. Kiel in *Studies*, pp. xiii–xiv. The accounts of the *vakif* of Firuz Bey and list of the staff of his foundation were published in *Turski Izvori za Bulgarskata Istorija*, vol. III (Sofia, 1972), pp. 430–7. For the inscription on the mosque of Firuz Bey see Ananiasz Zajaczkowski, ‘*Materiały do epigrafiki osmansko-tureckiej z Bulgarii*’, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 26, 2 (1963), 12–15, with a good photograph.

101 Codex Vindob. 1052, f. 23r.

the hamam still stand (as of 2006), both in an incredible state of ruin and decay. The main building, now a mosque, was wrecked by an earthquake and drastically restored and partly reconstructed in the 1970s. The main building of the group shows an interesting variant of the T-plan type. A central, domed room is flanked by two smaller domed rooms, accessible only through doors leading from the main hall. The latter has a separate section for prayer, reached by several steps and covered by a stilted dome. Its most specific feature is the mihrab wall in the form of an apse, covered by a melon-shaped half-dome. This is perhaps the first example of the application of the half-dome in Ottoman architecture, an element which was to have a great future. It was soon to be followed in the zaviye-mosque of Yahşi Bey in Tire in 1441\(^{103}\) and very probably also played a role in conceiving the plan of the great mosque of Mehmed Fatih in Istanbul (1462). The five-unit porch in front of the Edirne building is a modern reconstruction. The ruined türbe still shows some panels with a cobalt blue tile decoration, a relic of the Seljuk past and rare in the Balkans.\(^{104}\)

Less than a decade later, but also without a date secured by a Bauinschrift, is the highly monumental Muradiye Cami in the eastern outskirts of Edirne. It shows roughly the same plan as the Beylerbey Camii but is one-third bigger. A central domed section of 9.80 metres in diameter is followed by a slightly smaller prayer section, surmounted by a dome. This two-domed space is flanked by a domed room on each side. This is now connected with the main space through large arches but they have evidently been broken through later, when the space was united with the main room. The building is preceded by a monumental porch of five units. The glory of this building is the tile decoration of the walls of the prayer section and the mihrab, showing evidently Chinese-inspired flower motives in various shades of blue against a white background.

Mecdi, the sixteenth-century translator of Taşköprüzade’s famous biography of Ottoman scholars Şaqa’iq al-Nu‘maniyya, claims to have seen the vakfiye of the building dated 830/1426–7.\(^{105}\) Hibri, however, gives 839/1435–6 as the date of construction and adds a number of interesting details in his description:

Another [building] is the Muradiye Mosque, built by His Highness the Father of Munificence [Murad II], which has two domes and one minaret, the minaret being decorated with tiles. It is built on a high hill. He himself had made it Mevlevihane [a lodge for Mevlevi dervishes] and indeed, to ensure that during

\(^{103}\) Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimârisinde, ii, p. 542.
\(^{104}\) The most detailed description of the buildings of Beylerbey Yusuf Paşa, and the best plan and elevation is by Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimârisinde, ii, pp. 577–81.
the ritual dance (sema) sorbets would flow, pipes have been placed [in the walls], and some of them are still there. After some time, when it became a noble mosque, a separate Mevlevihane was built opposite it.

The meals prepared in royal imaret, being extremely tasty and abundant, are not only given to the Mevlevi dervishes and the poor students but also to the houses in the surroundings. This mosque was built in the year 839 [1435–6]. It is related that when His Highness Sultan Murad Han beheld this place, he immediately ordered the construction of this priceless Mevlevihane for His Exaltedness Mevlana [Celaleddin Rumi].

The building, one of the best representatives of the so-called Bursa plan mosque, or zaviye-mosque, was thus definitely not intended to be a mosque. It only became one much later, by removing the walls separating the main central hall from the lateral rooms, which can hardly have been anything else but guest rooms or rooms for the Mevlevi dervishes. As with the Orta Imaret of Mihalo˘glu Mehmed Bey, or the Yıldırım Camii nearby, the actual cooking must have been done in a separate building, which has not survived. It should be added that the accounts of income and expenditure from 1491, mentioned before, call the building either an imaret or Mevlevihane. The well-preserved Bauinschrift has only imaret.

In the year the Muradiye was completed, Murad II started the construction of the grandest mosque of the empire hitherto, the Yeni Cami (New Mosque) as it was called. It is known to us as the ¦Uc¸ Şerefeli Cami because of its largest minaret, which has three successive balconies, a novelty in Ottoman architecture. The date of construction is handed down by the early Ottoman chroniclers and is written on various well-preserved inscriptions. The great building (62 by 64 metres) was begun in 841/1437–8 and was completed in 851/1447. As its site, a flat terrain was chosen outside the old walled city of Edirne in the market area, a little north of the Eski Cami (Old Mosque). The plan evidently is a further development of the Ulu Cami of Manisa, as was first pointed out by Robert Anhegger and is now generally accepted. Manisa had been the capital of the beylik of Saruhan in western Anatolia, the place where Murad had resided as prince before coming to the throne, and the place where he spent a year and a half in retirement after his abdication in favour of his young son Mehmed II (1445–6). The great colonnaded courtyard, the first in Ottoman architecture, came from Manisa, as did the concept of an oblong prayer hall, covered by a huge central dome and several smaller ones over the lateral spaces. The more remote ancestor is the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, and

106 Codex Vindob. 1052, ff. 16v–17r.
the beyliks of western Anatolia had had intensive cultural contact with Syria, to prove, in a sense, their independence from the successors of the Seljuks in central Anatolia. The general form of the Edirne building, however, was wholly ‘Ottomanised’, made more homogeneous and surveyable. The main dome, spanning 26 metres, is the largest the Ottomans had constructed up to that point. It rests on a hexagonal base of arches, supported by the front and rear walls and by two massive hexagonal piers. The proportions of the buildings are still low and ponderous, the architect evidently being unsure about pushing the enormous dome to a greater height. The Üç Şerefeli Cami is a revolutionary building. Its role in the development of Ottoman architecture was once compared by Sir Nicolas Pevsner with that of the choir of the Abbey of St Denis as reconstructed under Abbot Suger for the emergence of Gothic architecture. It paved the way for the development of the vast centralised inner spaces of the sixteenth century, but it nevertheless shows an almost Romanesque bulkiness. As a building it was the greatest architectural undertaking in the Balkans since the days of Justinian.

The local historian and contemporary Ruhi-i Edirnevi is the only one of the early Ottoman chroniclers to give the name of the architect: Usta Müsliheddin. The same source tells us that Müsliheddin had also constructed the great bridge of Cisr-i Ergene (now Uzunköprü), south of Edirne, which was completed in 847/1443–4, and was also employed by Murad’s successor, Mehmed II, for his new palace on the banks of the Tunca river outside Edirne. Parallel to the construction of the Üç Şerefeli Cami, work was undertaken on buildings designed partly to promote the hygiene of the Edirne Muslims, partly to provide revenue for the upkeep of Murad’s great foundations. One is the Alaca Hamam, a large hamam with an exquisite stalactite decoration, built just north of the northern wall of Byzantine Adrianapolis, and the other, on an even more magnificent scale, on the main north–south artery of Edirne, to the east of the old castle walls: the so-called Tahtakale Hamamı in the Saracılı Caddesi. The Alaca Hamam is dated by an inscription, now housed in the Edirne Museum. The Tahtakale Hamamı is one of the largest and most important works of this kind in the entire domain of Ottoman architecture. In


contrast to the Beylerbey Hamamı and the Gazi Mihal Hamamı, mentioned above, which are only slightly older, this hamam has large, domed, disrobing rooms, and departs from the Syrian plan of the aforementioned hamams. The male disrobing room is surmounted by a huge dome of almost 16 metres in diameter, which sits on an elaborate stalactite filling in each of the four corners. Through a tepidarium of six compartments one enters the bath room proper, which shows the classical four-eyvan scheme, with four domed cells in the remaining corners. All vaulting is highly elaborate, showing a profusion of muqarnas (stalactite vaults), fillings and geometrically designed vaults. In the tepidarium we even see a melon-shaped half-dome, the same elements as applied in the Beylerbey Camii from a decade earlier.

In contrast to the male section, the section of the great Edirne hamam reserved for women is but modest. Here the dome of the disrobing room, 9.70 metres in diameter, sits on Turkish triangles. The tepidarium is very small and the bath room proper shows a reduced version of the four-eyvan scheme, with two eyvans only and with only two cells, flanking each other, without eyvan between them. The great bath, which without exaggeration might be called a ‘cathedral of hygiene’, is not dated by inscription but must be placed around 1435–40, when Murad was actively promoting Edirne into a truly Islamic capital. The hamam occupies an area of 58 by 28 metres. According to the annual accounts of 896/1491 published by Barkan it was the largest source of income for the darülhadis (religious school) of Murad II in Edirne. Another building in this series is the exquisite hamam built in the depression between the Muradiye Cami of Edirne and the famous Selimiye and popularly known as Yenici Hamamı. Compared with those mentioned above it is small. Its importance lies in the high-quality decoration of the vaults and dome, with spiral, star and half-melon domes, sitting on elaborate muqarnas work in cut plaster. This single hamam served as a source of revenue for the külliye (mosque complex) of Murad II in Cisr-i Ergene (Uzunköprü), as is mentioned in the annual accounts of 896/1491.


In the 1430s important work was also carried out under Murad II in the larger provincial centres, such as Üsküp (Skopje) and Filibe (Plovdiv). The bridge and Great Mosque of the sultan himself have already been mentioned. Üsküp was situated in a dominant location at the intersection of six important roads from all corners of the Balkans. It was therefore chosen as the base for the operation against Serbia and Albania, which had not yet been entirely subdued. Üsküp had been taken in 1392, during the aftermath of the battle of Kosovo, by the provincial commander Paşa Yiğıt. Paşa Yiğıt was in charge of the western uc throughout Yıldırım Bayezid’s reign (1389–1402) and subsequently under Emir Süleyman, Musa and Mehmed I, and is mentioned as such in the early Ottoman chronicles. He was succeeded by his son, or adopted son, İshak, who is the founder of the noble family of Ishaković, which dominated the town for almost a century, before being replaced by governors of devşirme origin.

In 842/1438–9, Ishak Bey completed an extensive külliye in Üsküp, of which the most important parts still survive today. They are situated outside the narrow boundaries of the old Byzantino-Serbian capital, half a mile to the north of it, on the road to the plain of Kosovo and further north to Bosnia. Originally the foundation of İshak Bey consisted of a zaviye-mosque, a medrese, a türbe, a kitchen building and a hamam, grouped together, and a second group consisting of a six-domed bedestan with a large han opposite. Both the latter buildings constituted the core of the Üsküp Çarşı district. Of the first mentioned group, the medrese, the kitchen building and the hamam, all three of which are mentioned in the foundation charter, have disappeared. The hamam was still standing in 1925 when Gliša Elezović published the first detailed study about the Ottoman monuments of Skopje. The main building, known as Alaca İmaret, and the türbe are still standing. The main building is dated by its original Bauinschrift to 842/1438–9 and is called a ‘noble imaret’.

In 1519 the imaret was changed considerably by removing the lateral walls which separated the central hall from the side rooms. This change can still be seen by the trained eye. The new arches, made to support the superstructure, are crooked and awkward improvisations. The transformation from imaret into mosque proper is documented by an inscription from 1519 placed above a door in the left flank, made from an old window. It states that the old building was ‘enlarged’ into a ‘great mosque’ (cami-i kebir) on order of Hasan Bey, a grandson of the founder in the month of Receb of 925/July 1519. It is one of the rare documents pinning down the date of the transformation of an original, and early, zaviye-mosque.

The han and the bedestan of İshak Bey are undated but must be from the same years as the imaret. Both are mentioned in the vakfiye, which is dated
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Zilkade 848/February 1445. The han, locally known as Suli An (Sulu Han), is the oldest of its kind in the Balkans to have come down to us largely intact. It shows the usual rectangular cloistered courtyard with two stories of barrel-vaulted cells. Those on the upper floor disappeared in earthquakes and fires and were reconstructed in their nineteenth-century form. The lower part is largely authentic. The court is flanked on its short side by a vast hall with flat crossvaults on four massive square pillars. It functioned as the stables for the animals in winter time. Along the façade on the main shopping street of the çarşı (market) was a row of twenty shops fixed to the han proper. They have now completely lost their original shape and were not reconstructed as they had been.

On the opposite side of the main shopping street stood İshak Bey’s covered market hall, the bedestan, which had, according to the vakfiye, twenty-four shops on its four sides. The main hall must have been covered by six domes on two heavy square pillars but they have been destroyed long ago. Inside the still-standing four walls, new wooden shops were built during a renovation in 1906.111

In the fateful year of 1444, when a huge crusader army was laying waste Danubian Bulgaria and advancing on Varna on the Black Sea, the beylerbey of Rumeli, Şihabuddin Paşa, also known as Kula Şahin Paşa, was completing a vast külliye in his residence, Filibe (Plovdiv). The complex was loosely spaced out over an area of more than a hectare at the southern end of the Meriç bridge of his fourteenth-century predecessor Lala Şahin Paşa, straddling the main axis of the Ottoman city. This ran from the Cumaya Cami of Murad II at the foot of the ruins of the Byzantino-Bulgarian hilltop town in the south, to the bridgehead in the north. The new compound and the mosque of Sultan Murad were the two foci around which Ottoman Filibe would develop. The complex consisted of a zaviye-mosque, a large han at the bridgehead, a large and very monumental hamam across the road, the mausoleum of the founder, a kitchen block, a mektep (school) and, between the zaviye-mosque and the river, a large, U-shaped medrese with twelve student cells. The building inscription gives 848/1444 as the year of its completion. Five of the seven buildings of this group survived into the early twentieth century. They are indicated on the detailed 1891 map of Plovdiv by J. H. Schnitter. The hamam, which was so big

111 Fundamental for this group of buildings are Gliša Elezović, ‘Turski Spomenici u Skoplju’, Glasnik Skopskog Naucnog Društva 1 (1925), 136–76 for the buildings, and Turski Spomenici, vol. I (Belgrade, 1952), for the vakfiye. See also Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimârîsinde, ii, pp. 557–63 with good plans and photographs and transcription of the inscriptions. The statement that the han no longer exists is based on insufficient observation.
that it could house the local parliament of eastern Rumeli, was demolished in 1931. The medrese is known from some good photographs preserved in the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul, which also has photographs of the hamam before, and in the course of, being demolished. Today only the zaviye-mosque and the mausoleum of the founder are preserved, both restored by the Bulgarian Institute for Monuments of Culture and in an excellent state.

The socio-economic and religious-educative compound was financed from the tax revenue of a vast property, including many houses and shops in Edirne and Malkara, five Turkish villages near Malkara and the very large and rich villages of Kuklen, Vodno, Mavrovo and Novo Selo, south of Filibe itself, as well as two big rice plantations of which the irrigation canals had been dug on the initiative of the founder. In 1528 this property near Filibe yielded on its own, according to the vakıf section of the tahrir register, a total of 179,897 akçe.112 The villages mentioned above were highly privileged. Kuklen and Vodno also contained Orthodox Christian monasteries which, especially in later centuries, developed into important centres of Bulgarian Christian culture.113 The so-called İmaret Camii of Filibe is one of the largest of its kind in the Balkans outside Edirne. It is composed of eleven domed or vaulted units. The heart of the building is a central, dome space of almost nine metres in diameter, lit by an oculus in the centre of the dome, covered by a turret. This central hall is flanked by two domed rooms of six metres in diameter each. The mihrab is placed in a domed room in the rear, which opens towards the main hall. Most of the domes rest on intricate belts of Turkish triangles and pendentive-like fillings of very rich muqarnas cut in plaster on a background of geometric brickwork. Curious, and for long not understood, are two barrel-vaulted corridors between the lateral rooms and the monumental portico, which runs in front of the building. They have, apparently, no function at

112 BOA, tt 370, f. 101.
113 For short descriptions and good photographs of these, and other monasteries in the country see Georgi Čavrakov and Konstantin Tančev, Български Манастири (Sofia, 1978), pp. 331–41. The story about the destruction of the monastery in the course of the forced mass conversion of the Christians of the Rhodope district in the 1660s given in this work is part of the nineteenth-century Bulgarian nationalist mythology. The story was widely disseminated during the communist period. The Ottoman tahrir defters from 1516, 1529, 1569, 1595 and 1712 clearly show that Islamisation did take place but was a process stretching over more than two centuries. After the fall of communism the monastery of Gorno Vodno was transformed into a luxury brothel. For details on the real story of the conversion of the Rhodopes see M. Kiel, ‘Istorijata na “nasil-stveno masovo pomjusjulmanˇcvane” na Rodopskite Hristijani i njakoi izvori, svırzani s nego. Osmanskite registri na naselieto i dan ˘aˇcnoto oblagane ot XVI–XVII v.: Krajat na Mitologijata?, in Мюсюлманската Kultura po Българските Земи, ed. Rositsa Gradeva and Svetlana Ivanova (Sofia, 1998), pp. 56–126 (with facsimiles of the most important Ottoman sources).
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all. The portico consists of five domed and vaulted units resting on six massive masonry piers. The minaret, which can be reached through the narrow lateral corridor on the right, has a shaft in the form of a twisted spiral. The entire building is made of carefully executed cloisonné. The fronton above the central unit of the portico has a ceramo-plastique decoration of geometric brickwork.

In the Bauinschrift the building is called al-‘imaret al-‘aliye. The chronicler Neşri, who also mentions the construction, likewise calls it an imaret. Locally the building is called İmaret Camii. In the 1960s and 1970s the building was carefully restored by the able architect Nikola Mushanov. When taking off the various coats of plaster on the inside of the building it was discovered that the two lateral rooms, which nowadays form the cross axis of the building, were originally closed off from the main central hall by solid walls. These had been removed at a much later stage, as the various coats of plaster indicated. It was also found that underneath the floor there was a much older, original floor, covered with marble and having a water pond in the middle. Thus the central room of the ‘mosque’ had originally been something else. The prayer section proper had been restricted solely to the second dome section, which was originally reached by five steps in the middle. Niches to put one’s shoes in before mounting to the prayer section were also found, as were chimneys in the lateral rooms. The function of the curious lateral corridors then became clear. The right one partly gave access to the minaret, and to the lateral room, which had been nothing other than a guest room of the institution. The corridor to the left had in fact been a separate, lateral entrance to the guest room, where one could enter without disturbing those assembled around the pond in the central hall. As had been the case with the Alaca İmaret of Ishak Bey in Üsküp the space for praying had been enlarged at the expense of the function of accommodating travelling dervishes and scholars and other distinguished guests. The change occurred in the third decade of the sixteenth century, when Sunni orthodoxy became dominant and early Ottoman institutions and brotherhoods like the ahi, who made offering hospitality to travellers their main task, slowly disappeared or fused with other organisations.

It would be better to cease referring to the kind of building to which the İmaret Camii of Plovdiv, as well as the Alaca İmaret in Üsküp, the Mihaloğlu

İmareti and the Muradiye in Edirne, or the Gazi Evrenos İmaret in Gümülcine, belong as zaviye-mosques. They were not a combination of various functions, not a zaviye to which a mosque had been attached in order to create a more monumental building at the centre of a külliye. The greater part of these buildings were simply zaviyes for the ahi brotherhood and were transformed into mosques at a much later stage. Not for nothing is the head of the institution called Ahi in the foundation charters and notes in the vakıf registers, such as those for Gümülcine and in 1470 for the İsa Bey İmaret in Üsküp. Only in a limited number of buildings of the same plan was this type used to accommodate the Mevlevi brotherhood, as was explicitly the case in Edirne’s Muradiye, and also in the case of the Yeşil İmaret Camii/Yahşi Bey Camii in the west Anatolian city of Tire, from 1441, where the vakfiye calls it a zaviye and the traveller Evliya Çelebi mentions that it had previously been a mevlevihane.

The important archaeological findings in the İmaret Camii in Plovdiv have been left visible during the restoration of the building which, after the collapse of communism, again serves as a house of prayer.

The türbe of the founder of this building complex, singularly important for Filibe, stands in the greatest contrast to the monumentality of the other buildings. It is but a simple, brick-built domed and lead-covered octagon of modest dimensions, situated to the right of the main building. It doubtlessly expresses the intentions of this old warlord, who played a decisive role in the fateful battle of Varna, and again during the conquest of Constantinople, to have his last resting place as simple as possible, as had also been the wish of his master of many years, Murad II. The mausoleum was also restored and is still held in veneration by the local Plovdiv Muslims.

A grand building completed in the same year as the imaret of Plovdiv is the so-called Bey Hamami on the main central square of Thessalonike (Ottoman Selanik). Murad II had taken the city in 1430 and had converted the early Christian basilica of Achairopoietos into a mosque, later known as Eski Cami. In the early 1440s he started the construction of a huge double hamam in the


116 For an early description see Gertruda Rudlov-Hille and Otto Rudlov, ‘Grad Plovdiv i negovite sgradi’, Izvestija na Bulgarskija Arheologičeski Institut 8 (1934), 379–425, which also includes the Schnitter plan of 1891. For more detail see Ayverdi, Osmanlı Mimarisinde, II, pp. 479–83. For the important inscription see in detail Tatarlı, ‘Turski kultovi sgradi i nadpisi v Bulgarija’, p. 593.
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centre of town, about the largest of all Turkish hamams in the Balkans and exquisitely decorated with a profusion of stalactites. Remarkable is the large (15 metres in diameter) octagonal, domed disrobing room of the male section. It is followed by a likewise octagonal tepidarium. The hot section proper shows the fully developed four-eyvan plan, with four separate cells (halvets), one at each corner. The first one on the left side is covered by a muqarnas-dome with a profusion of stalactites. It must have been the room reserved for the sultan himself, as is hinted at by Evliya Çelebi in 1668. The female half of the bath is more modest. It has a square disrobing room, followed by an octagonal tepidarium. The hot section, sıcaklık, is a tripartite rectangular vaulted space communicating with two halvets of the same size as in the male half of the bath.

A long inscription in Arabic, placed over the main entrance portal, mentions Sultan Murad, son of Mehmed, son of Bayezid Han and his full title as Leader of the Muslims, and ‘sultan al-guzat wa-’l-mudjahidin’ as builder, and the month of Cemaziyevvel of the year 848/September–October 1444 as the date of completion. In the 1970s the great monument was bought by the Greek Archaeological Service and has since been restored in a most exemplary manner, now serving as an exhibition room.

A little north of it stood, until the end of the 1920s, a large and monumental han that also belonged to the foundations of Sultan Murad in this city. A long Arabic inscription gave the name of the ruler. In the nineteenth century, when the story of Ottoman architecture was unknown, the building was declared to be a Byzantine work. It was a vast rectangle around a cloistered courtyard with seven arches at the long sides and five at the short sides. On the ground floor it had thirty-three vaulted cells for the accommodation of travellers and on the first floor a corresponding number. At the rear, opposite the entrance, was a vast vaulted stable with twelve massive square piers carrying the vaults of the two-bay hall. This is the same solution as at the almost contemporary Sulu Han in Üsküp, albeit much bigger. On three sides of the exterior the Bey Han had vaulted shops, nine on both short sides and eleven at the long front side. The great hamam was also called Bey Hamamı, bey being the colloquial title of the ruler in the period the buildings came into being. Both buildings served as a source of revenue for the upkeep of Murad’s church/mosque in Thessalonike. The quality and especially the grand size of both works show the scale of investment to reconstruct Selanik as an Ottoman

To the extensive foundations of Ishak Bey in Üsküp, Şihabuddin Paşa in Filibe and Sultan Murad in Edirne and Selanik, all created in the 1430s and early 1440s, should be added four mosques and mescids, three zaviyes, two caravansarys, a hamam and two bridges, all of Gazi Turhan Bey, in various places in Thessaly, but none now extant (the vakfiye of these foundations was written in 1446), as well as the monumental domed mescid of Şarabdar Hasan Bey in the castle of Vize from 1444 and the Yeşilce Cami, also known as İmaret of Mezid Bey, in Edirne, which was finished two years earlier.\footnote{119}

This whole group of buildings marks the summit of a highly creative period, in which Ottoman architecture definitively found its own code of aesthetics. The year 1444 ended with the ‘Varna crisis’ when the huge crusader army under King Wladislaw Jagiello and the redoubtable Janoš Hunyadi put the whole of Ottoman northern Bulgaria to the torch before being finally annihilated. Another crisis took place in 1448 when the second battle of Kosovo finally removed the threat of invasion from the west. These years were not very productive for architecture. Only shortly before his death (1451) did Sultan Murad again show confidence in the future by starting a new palace on the banks of the Meriç river outside Edirne. It was to be finished by his son and successor, Mehmed II, with whom a new period begins.

The Ottoman architecture of the Balkans around 1450 shows that by then the land had been wholly integrated into Ottoman culture. The plans for the buildings and their whole conception came from north-western Anatolia as an imported art, but the masonry often shows local influences.\footnote{120}

\footnote{118} For a plan and elevation of the building which has now disappeared see L. de Beylié, \textit{L’habitation byzantine} (Grenoble and Paris, 1902), p. 71. In later local literature the opinion that the great and specifically Ottoman work was of Byzantine origin was repeated until recently. See also the excellent new study by Paschalis Androudis, ‘Historical and Archaeological Evidence on the Great Karavan Saray (Büyük Kervansaray) of Thessaloniki’, \textit{Makedoniká} 35 (2005–6), 63–97. For the Bey Hamamı see M. Kiel, ‘Notes on Some Turkish monuments in Thessaloniki’, \textit{Balkan Studies} 11 (1970), pp. 123–48, reprinted and updated in Kiel, \textit{Studies}. Good photographs and plans can also be found in Anna Zombou-Asimi, ‘Bey Hamam, Thessaloniki, Greece’, in \textit{Secular Architecture in the Balkans}, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjitryphonos (Thessalonike, 1997), pp. 318–21. Anna Zombou was the leader of the restoration of the great hamam. See also Ayverdi, \textit{Osmanlı Mimârîsînde}, ii, pp. 536–7 (with the incorrect reading of the date as 840, failing to recognise the şamān (8) before the arba’în).

\footnote{119} Both the two latter buildings have long been in an incredible state of decay. The zaviye-mosque of Mezid Bey was recently drastically ‘restored’, losing most of its original features. For this building see Ayverdi, \textit{Osmanlı Mimârîsînde}, ii, pp. 397–400, and Kuran, \textit{Mosque}, pp. 126–8. For its vakfiye property see Gökbilgin, \textit{Paşa Lîvâsi}, pp. 243–4.

expanses of the Balkans were a new land for Islam, where all the institutions it needed had to be imported since they did not exist in the local architectural repertoire (mosques, medreses, hans, hamams, zaviyes, türbes and so on). It might be suggested that this factor greatly helped to push the development of Ottoman architecture forward and gave it more space for experimenting than in the more traditional Anatolia. By 1450 the south-eastern Balkans had become fully integrated in Ottoman culture, becoming a part of the Turkish world. The census and taxation registers of the early period make this clear for the ethnic and religious situation. The preserved monuments of Ottoman architecture make the intensity of this integration visible to us still today.
The formative period, c.1300–1370s

The early Ottoman military organisation was a peculiar amalgam of Turkoman nomadic, Seljuk-Illhanid and Byzantine elements, but it was the nomadic tradition which predominated among the various constituent parts in the early period of the formation of the state. As in other Eurasian nomadic societies, it may well have been very difficult to distinguish between society and military among the Turkomans living in the Bithynian marches. All followers of the Ottomans capable of fighting could and did participate in raiding or in defence if need arose. The predatory raids were called *akın* in Turkish, and those taking part in them were *akıncı* (later, as the Islamic character of the state strengthened, the term *gazi*, that is, warrior of the faith, came to be preferred). Yet, apart from the undifferentiated bands of warriors, we see from the outset a relatively small but well-organised and well-trained force which gathered around the ruler and rendered services to him in war and peace.

This type of ‘military retinue’ was not an Ottoman invention. It was a universal institution which had existed in the east and the west since time immemorial. In the empires of the Inner Asian Turks and Uighurs the retinue of the *kagan* (ruler) was called *buyruk*, while the Karahanids and the Mongols knew it under the names *koldaş* and *nökör*, respectively. The same body

---


of warriors appeared among various western and eastern European ‘barbarian’ peoples, many of whom had founded their own states by the end of the first millennium (Celtic vassus, German Trost or Gesinde, Russian družina and Scandinavian hird, for example). The military retinue was a group of armed, mainly free men (the majority of them foreigners), who served on a voluntary basis and were attached personally to the leader. They were his closest companions, friends and servants; they commanded the troops in wars, while a select group of them served as his bodyguard. Their livelihood was secured by their master, predominantly from the booty acquired during incursions and wars. The strength of these retinues ranged from a few dozen to 3,000 men. When the founders of the new states began to transform their personal might into territorial power, they relied heavily on their military retinues, delegating them to and settling them on the territories they controlled. In this Gefolgschaft-type of state, it is the military retinue to which the origins of the formal institutions of power can be traced back.

The counterpart of this institution among the Oğuz/Turkomans, the predecessors of the Ottomans, was known as yoldaş and yiğit. In addition, the chiefs and their most renowned companions willingly assumed the title alp or alp-eren (hero, brave man), an epithet of the distinguished nomadic adventurers-warriors from the time of the ancient Turks. With the ascendancy of the Chinggisid states, there was a clear tendency to replace the term yoldaş by the word nökör/nöker, its Mongolian equivalent. In view of this we can regard it as
natural that the early followers of Ertuğrul and Osman are repeatedly referred to by such terms in the earliest Ottoman chronicles.6

Osman’s entourage seems to have been heterogeneous, consisting of Turks (his closest, permanent followers and warriors from neighbouring lands who fought on a temporary basis), Byzantines, Catalans and—in small but increasing number—slaves.7 His retinue may have numbered a few hundred men at most. His allies and semi-independent companions also had their own retinues and sometimes acted on their own account. Apparently, they formed several smaller ‘marches’ within the larger Bithynian frontier.8 When they engaged in large-scale military adventures or faced enemy attacks, they joined their forces including the tribal warriors. This happened in 1301–2 at Bapheus and in 1329 at Pelekanon when possibly the entire force which could be mobilised from the Ottoman territory fought against the Byzantines.

At that time the Ottoman army consisted largely of mounted warriors with some supplementary infantry. The poet Aşık Paşa, who clearly regarded details of a warrior’s weapons as important, portrayed the alp of his time in Garibname (1330) as a soldier having a good horse, carrying a keen-edged sword (kılıç), bow (yay), arrows (ok) and lance (süngü), and bearing an impenetrable and awe-inspiring coat of mail (ton).9 As the conduct of the two battles mentioned above clearly shows, early Ottoman warfare was based largely on the ancient steppe tradition. Its principal elements included the avoidance of close combat, placing the mobile mounted troops in ambush, the feigned retreat with incessant shooting in order to disrupt the enemy’s battle array, and repeated sudden attacks until the enemy became totally confused and fled.10 The greatest challenge was the conquest of the Byzantine fortresses
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and fortified towns. In the earlier phase the Ottomans blockaded a town or fortress for years or even decades, setting up stockades and watch towers, and occupying and, when necessary, devastating the surrounding countryside.\(^1\)

It was during these prolonged blockades that villages or other sources of income began to be granted in order to provide for the subsistence of the retainers who were constantly under arms.\(^2\) These assignments, which were allocated for the ‘nourishing’ or ‘feeding’ of the warriors in the strict sense, were called timars, a Persian term meaning care, forethought or solicitude, and the holder was called a timar eri. In this period the timar was an undifferentiated, general form of remuneration given to the grantee to enable him to make a living. This early stage is reflected in the fifteenth-century written sources where the concept of timar-holding is most often designated by the term ‘to eat a timar’ (timar yemek).\(^3\) It is worth noting that the armed retinue was similarly called ‘fed’, ‘nourished men’ (threptos anthropos) among the Danubian Bulgars, and in the Kievan Rus state the princely retainers, who were nominated governors, were assigned portions of princely revenues for ‘nourishment’ (kormlenye).\(^4\) Indications of the fact that the first timar-holders were chosen from among the members of the leaders’ retinues can also be detected in the fifteenth-century timar registers. A grant was most often made on the basis of what was referred to as yoldaşlık which alluded to participation in a campaign and the display of bravery, although originally – as was seen above – it only denoted companionship and the performing of (excellent) service as a retainer of a military leader.\(^5\)

The origins of the timar system are still being disputed. Some scholars argue that it derives from the Seljuk ikta, others from the Byzantine pronoia.\(^6\)

---

\(^3\) Cf. e.g. Halil İnalcık (ed.), *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1987), passim.
\(^5\) The notion of yoldaşlık is first attested to in a document of 1391; Lowry, *The Nature*, p. 62. In the early timar registers its synonyms are erlik and şirmedlik.
Whichever might prove true, the first timars were apparently hereditary, as were the appanages and estates (mülek, vakıf) assigned to family members, allies and military commanders.\(^7\) The principle and practice of heritability were not alien either to ikta of the Mongolian period, or to pronoia of the Palaeologan era.\(^8\) The size of the timars must have varied widely for, if credence can be given to the later chroniclers, prominent leaders could obtain entire former principalities as timars.\(^9\)

The principle and practice of heritability were not alien either to ikta of the Mongolian period, or to pronoia of the Palaeologan era.\(^{18}\) The size of the timars must have varied widely for, if credence can be given to the later chroniclers, prominent leaders could obtain entire former principalities as timars.\(^{19}\)

The ruler and the major figures in the state had continuously to make up for their lost retainers who had settled on their timars. At the same time, the protracted sieges of Byzantine cities called for the creation of an efficient infantry. This dual challenge was met by Orhan, probably around 1330, when he set up an army of foot soldiers called yaya (literally ‘footman, infantry’) recruited from the people in his own territory. Owing to the lack of contemporary sources, we have to fall back on fifteenth–sixteenth-century tradition concerning these troops. The earliest material maintains that the yayas were the ruler’s own private (has) soldiers or armed escorts who replaced the yoldaşes and wore white caps (ak börk) to differentiate them from the retainers of other lords and the tribal warriors who all wore red caps.\(^{20}\) Although another, later, stratum of the tradition claims that the yayas were recruited from among the tax-paying peasants (reaya), who served on a voluntary basis in return for exemption from various taxes and were given minimal pay (one or two akçe a day) during warfare, it is almost certain that this scheme reflects the realities of the fifteenth century projected with some distortions into the past.\(^{21}\)

At any rate, the transformation must have been rapid and radical because the geographer al-‘Umari – undoubtedly exaggerating – reported in around 1331 that Orhan had 25,000 or 40,000 mounted troops and innumerable infantry.\(^{22}\)

\(^{17}\) Cf. Aşıkpaşazade, Tevârîh, p. 104.
\(^{19}\) Nesri, Kitab-ı Cihân-nûmâ, i, pp. 166–7; Feridun M. Emecen, İk Osmanlilar ve Bati Anadolu Beylilikler Dünyası (Istanbul, 2003), p. 94.
\(^{22}\) Al-‘Umari, Al-‘Umari’s Bericht über Anatolien in seinem Werke Masâlik al-âbârî fî mamâlik al-âmsâr, vol. I. Text, ed. Franz Taeschner (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 21, 41; cf. İbn Battuta, \(\text{Voyages}\)
Although there are hardly any reliable data available for the first half of the fourteenth century, a comparison between the thirteenth-century Seljuk and fifteenth-century Ottoman organisations suggests that the early Ottoman military administration and territorial division followed the Seljuk model. One of the key figures of the Seljuk military organisation during the Mongol domination was the *subaşı* (its Arabic and Persian synonyms being *zaim*, *şihna*, *ser-leşker*, *server*), who was consistently also called *bey* (*amir* in Arabic), the office he filled being called *zeamet*, *emaret*, *serveri* or *ser-leşkeri*. The *subaşı* *bey* or *zaim* governed a territorial unit called a *vilayet*, or a larger city, and was the commander (*zaimü’l-cüyüş*) of the ikta-holder cavalry (*sipahi*) and the fortress garrisons (*mustaḥfız*) under his authority. Comparing the information provided by a document of 1348 with data concerning *subaşıs* in official registers from the first half of the fifteenth century and the early chronicles, we find that the Ottoman territorial division was the immediate successor to the Seljuk system. *Subaşı* *beys* (*zaimü’l-cüyüş*) remunerated by large *timars* were appointed to lead the *vilayets* or other territorial units of similar size (*il*). It was their duty to command the *timar* *eri* cavalry (also called *sipahis* after the Persian model) in military operations, while they also played a role in civil administration. Süleyman, son of Orhan, who appeared without any title in

---


a document of 1324 as a witness, and had also gained the title of paşa in the source of 1348 cited above. All this appears to confirm that later chroniclers mirrored the reality of the age faithfully, ascribing the titles bey, subaşı and paşa repeatedly to the noted yaya commanders and marcher lords (for instance, Evrenos) of the second half of the fourteenth century.

During the second third of the century, however, a new military-administrative unit was taking shape as a new organisational level above the vilayets or subaşılıks: the sancak (district or sub-province). Originally, the word meant flag or banner, and it designated an army unit or company without territorial connotation. Some scholars argue that the prototype of the territorial sancak is to be found in Orhan’s grant of Bursa and its vicinity to his son Murad as ‘the ruler’s district’ (bey sancağı) after the capture of İznik (1331).

Two factors may have played important roles in the subsequent multiplication of sancaks. First, there was a dynastic drive to curb the subaşıs with local, familial or tribal bonds by means of new military leaders more strongly dependent on the rulers. Second, probably as a result of military considerations and for reasons of consolidation, there was a tendency to incorporate the newly conquered Turkoman principalities into the Ottoman system by keeping their original boundaries, and the larger sancak must have been better suited to this purpose.

The rise of the classical Ottoman army, 1370s–1453

In the second half of the century, especially in the 1360s–70s, the Ottoman military underwent fundamental changes. These, and the following, decades witnessed the emergence and consolidation of the troops and structures that determined Ottoman warfare until the middle or end of the sixteenth century, and in some regards even much longer. In short, this was when the classical Ottoman war organisation emerged. We will discuss each of the main components in turn.

28 Emecen, İlk Osmanlılar, pp. 95–9.
The timar-holding sipahis

By the last two decades of the fourteenth century, the timar-holding sipahi had become the backbone of the provincial army and of the whole Ottoman military organisation. The sipahi (also referred to as timar eri, timar-hor, eh-i timar, süvari) was first and foremost a mounted soldier who had to perform military service in exchange for his prebend granted by the state (the grant was valid as long as he met his obligations). The timariots constituted the largest single unit among the various central and provincial troops. This was also due to the fact that the officers of other troops, of the peasant militias, auxiliary and paramilitary troops, as well as a considerable portion of the court mercenaries and garrison troops, were also incorporated into the timar system. There were many civil office-holders, too, who received timars in lieu of salary and many of them were also obligated to go to war, in the same way as the sipahis proper.29

By the fifteenth century, therefore, the timar-holders were recruited from the most heterogeneous sources of manpower. In the first half of the century there was still a significant, but continuously decreasing number of old retainers described in the sources as ‘ancient’ (kadimi) or ‘of sipahi origin’ (sipahi asıllı) among the timar-holders.30 They inherited the service and often the estate, or a part of it, over generations; sometimes even women or underage children were entitled to the estate provided that there was a relative who took care of them and someone who carried arms for them. The Muslim sipahis of the conquered Anatolian principalities and the Christians of Byzantine-Slav origin also belonged to this category; they had entered into Ottoman service in order to keep at least parts of their privileges and old iktas, pronoias or baştınas estates. The importance of the latter is evidenced by the following figures: 18 per cent of all timars in Arvanid (Albania) in 1431–2 and 17 per cent of the timars in the district of Tirhala in Greece in 1454–5 were in the possession of Christian sipahis.31

The central power had long been determined to increase the timar-holders’ dependency and to complement or replace them with elements more closely tied to it. The first aim was ensured by the method of mass deportation:

Anatolian *timar*-holders were transferred to Rumeli and those from Rumeli sent to Anatolia in order to detach them from their native environments.\(^{32}\) Able-bodied peasants and other volunteers who had shown bravery had also had access for some time to *timar*-estates. However, the most important means for the centralisation of the *timar* system was to grant the estates of ‘ancient’ and other traditional *sipahis* to soldiers of slave origin who came from the sultan’s household and acted as local agents of the ruler. This constantly expanding group of *timar*-holders was called *gulam-i mir* (in Turkish *bey kulu*), since the rulers had most frequently been referred to by the title *mir* or *bey* until the early fifteenth century.\(^{33}\) In the frontier districts with special status (see below), the marcher lords in the main recruited new *timar*-holders from among their followers of slave origin or status (*gulam, nöker, hizmetkar*). As a result, the *sipahis*’ position as a status-group (also manifest in the treatment of the sons of *sipahis* as a separate legal category) gradually vanished, and the *timar* became more and more closely tied to service.\(^{34}\)

The main duty of a *timariot* was to go to war when summoned, taking with him the required weaponry and a certain prescribed number of armed retainers (*cebelül*). These obligations were determined in proportion to his revenue. For a considerable period there was apparently no uniform regulation valid for the whole of the empire, and thus the same amount of revenue could at times entail widely differing obligations. By the same token, it seems that no effort was made before the second half of the fifteenth century to create a more distinct separation between the ordinary prebends, which carried the obligation of going to war (*eskün timari*), and the prebends of fortress troops, granted in lieu of salary (*hisar eri/müstahfız timari*) but which in practice could also entail going to war (*esmek*). Towards the end of Murad II’s reign reforms may have been introduced in both aspects of the system since the *defter* surviving from the middle of the century stipulated the quota of *cebelül* to be mobilised and listed other obligations following the same principles as the central law code promulgated in 1501.\(^{35}\)


\(^{33}\) The terms *gulam-i mir/bey kulu* have generally and erroneously been interpreted in scholarly literature as denoting the servants, slaves (the ‘men’) of the district governors; cf. e.g. N. Beldiceanu, *Le timar*, pp. 88–9.


Table 1 The obligations of the timariots according to the categories of revenue (mid-fifteenth century)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akçe</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (cebelü)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (cebelü) + 1 gulam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 1 cebelü + 1 gulam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000, 4,500, 5,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 1 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 tentkür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,500, 6,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 2 cebelü + 1 tentkür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500, 8,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 2 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 tentkür</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 3 cebelü + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000, 10,500, 11,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 3 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 4 cebelü + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500, 14,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 4 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 5 cebelü + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,500, 17,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 5 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 6 cebelü + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,500, 20,000</td>
<td>the timar-holder (bürüme) + 6 cebelü + 1 gulam + 1 çadır</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Šabanović, Krajište; Todorov and Nedkov, Fontes Turcici, pp. 11–41, 119–231; Hadžibegić et al., Oblast Brankovića; Bojanić-Lukač, Vidin i vidinskijat sandžak, pp. 55–90, facs. 1–111; Delilbaşi and Arikans, Hicri 859 Tarihli; cf. Beldiceanu, Code, ff. 9v–10r.

The weaponry of the ordinary timariots consisted of a coat of mail (cebe) or a cevšen (coat of mail reinforced with iron or steel lamellae), mail coif and turban (miacevveze), bow (yay), arrows (ok), broad arrow-heads (bilek/bilik), javelin (gönder), shield (kalkan) and a lightly curved sabre (kılıç).36 Those whose annual revenue was 3,000 akçe or above had to wear the so-called bürüme instead of the cebe; this was a mail-and-plate armour that was fixed on a leather garment or a dress of several layers of cloth and covered a much greater part of the body than the cebe.37 As Table 1 shows, a timariot was obliged to bring a man-at-arms with him for every 3,000 akçe of income. Further, he was also expected to bring a young servant (gulam, sometimes called nöker) and various tents (tenktür, çadır) if his income exceeded a certain figure. Most of the cebelüüs were chosen from among the sons, relatives and (at least in the Balkans) Christian


subjects, and not infrequently, from among the freed slaves (azadegan) of the timariots.\textsuperscript{38}

In the first half of the fifteenth century the average income of the timars seems to have been relatively modest. In 1431–2, 70 per cent of estates in the district of Arvanid were in the income category of 500 to 3,000 akçe. Hence, a considerable number of recipients were not obliged to provide men-at-arms.\textsuperscript{39}

On the other hand, the number of timars and that of the timariots differed considerably because many of the estates (as was also the case with the Byzantine pronoiás) were held jointly by two or more timariots who usually, though not always, went to war on a rotating basis. The importance of this can be illustrated with the help of the defter of Tırhala (1454–5). Apart from those of the commanders, a total of 192 (159 ordinary and 33 garrison) timars were registered, ‘eaten’ by a total of 291 persons (including 15 under age). The 159 ordinary timars provided for 175 sipahi and 213 armed retainers, that is, a total of 388 men. Thus a timar provided an average of 2.44 people for war per annum and maintained 2.88 people (excluding women and other relatives).\textsuperscript{40} These figures indicate that, however small the average income appears to be, it was sufficient for the system to run smoothly.

Some holders of collective estates, and a few individual landowners, enjoyed the privilege of not performing active military service unless the sultan or the provincial governor led the campaign in person. In all other cases they could send a man-at-arms or a son in their place. A cebelü or eşkıncı could also replace the owner of a private estate who was under the obligation of going to war (eşkıncülü mülk).\textsuperscript{41}

From our sources it can be inferred that with the passage of time the changes among prebend-holders gradually increased. The major reasons for reassigning timars included a timariot’s failure to report for service, premature return from war, leaving the estate and resignation. Timars were very often transferred to other holders owing to losses in war, especially along the frontiers, as indicated by the entry ‘dead’ (mürde) in the defters. The change in the attitude of the central power referred to above – the mass penetration of the sultan’s gulams into the ranks of timar-holders – also contributed to the constant mobility among the sipahis.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. e.g. Delilbaş and Arıkan, Hicrī 859 Tarihli, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{39} Mutafchieva, Agrarian Relations, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{40} The calculation was made by the present author.

The timariots were expected to live in the district where their estates were situated. The cavalry of a nahiye (originally a military, later a territorial unit) was commanded by a çeribası or serasker (literally ‘commander of the army’) who was remunerated with a larger timar. From the description by Georgius de Hungaria, who wrote in the mid-fifteenth century, we know that the sipahis, placed under the çeribasısı, were divided into hundreds. Several nahiyes made up a vilayet or subaşılık headed by the subaşı. His prebend (towards the end of the period, the one-time Seljuk designations zaim and ziamet appeared again for the subaşı and his holding, respectively) was generally termed has and his yearly income could amount to more than 100,000 akçe. Around the mid-fifteenth century, subaşıs were in charge of deploying a retainer for every 4,000 akçe of their revenues, and bringing with them one set of horse armour (geçim), three tents (two çadir and one tenktür) and one young servant (gulam) for every 30,000 akçe.

From the last decades of the fourteenth century, the supreme commandership of the timariots in the district rested with the governor (sancakbeyi, or mir-i liva in Arabic) who was granted the privilege of having his own military band and standard (tabl ve alem). The existence of this office is first attested to in a diploma of 1391. By the 1430s the number of the sancaks had risen to thirteen in Rumeli and sixteen in Anatolia, and it was constantly increasing as a result of new conquests. In the few instances which are known, the annual revenue of the district governors’ has-estates always exceeded 200,000 akçe and was mostly of the order of 300,000 to 500,000 akçe. The sancakbeyi had to field one armed retainer for every 5,000 akçe of his income, as well as one set of horse armour and a specified number of tents for every 50,000 akçe, to be used, for example, for the kitchen, treasury, pantry or saddlery. The officially designated followers of the governors and subaşıs constituted a considerable part (20–30 per cent) of the district’s military strength, not to mention their innumerable non-official retainers whom they ‘fed’ at their own expense. It was a custom to leave a small percentage of the sipahis at home for the defence

44 E.g. Todorov and Nedkov, Fontes Turcici, pp. 77, 122–3, 287.
45 N. Beldiceanu, Le timar, pp. 78–81.
49 N. Beldiceanu, Le timar, pp. 76–7.
of the district. The *sancaks* along the borders of the empire were entrusted to so-called ‘marcher lords’ (*uç beyi*) who enjoyed special privileges (see below).

Sometime in the last third of the fourteenth century, the Rumelian and, slightly later around 1393, the Anatolian districts were organised into separate provinces (*beylerbeyilik* or *vilayet*). In 1413, a third province came into being in central Anatolia with Amasya as its centre, but the military role of its leader remained insignificant in comparison with that of the first two. The governor-general (*beylerbeyi*) of Rumeli had his residence at Sofia, while that of Anatolia was either at Ankara or later at Kütahya. There were perhaps two concerns underlying the central administration’s creation of these offices. First, it desired to curtail the political power of the *beys* by placing above them a supreme commander of slave origin whose loyalty was unquestionable; and second, it wished to secure the unified military command of the territorial districts and the infantry districts (*yaya sancakları*, see below) which were being established simultaneously at that time.

The governor-general, who also had the title *paşa*, commanded the entire army of his province, including infantry and auxiliary contingents. In the main it was he who granted *timars* to applicants on his own authority, issuing his own documents of assignment (called, among other terms, *biti* or *mektub*). Measured by the standards of the time, his official *has*-holding was extraordinarily large, enabling him to maintain a considerable household and ‘private army’ which in most cases numbered more than a thousand men. According to some later information, about one-third of these men received full equipment including a coat of mail or mail-and-plate armour, and many of their horses were harnessed with armour.

The total potential and the mobilisable strength of the timariot army is not known for any precise period, but taking the number of the districts into account and calculating on the basis of the few extant *defters*, it can be said that the *sancaks* of Rumeli and Anatolia may have been able to deploy 10,000 to 15,000 *sipahis* for the imperial campaigns during the 1430s and 1440s.

*The marcher districts (uç beylikleri) and the akincis*

Within the provincial organisation, the so-called marcher districts had a special position. Their leaders (*uç beyleri*) usually came from old state-founder

They possessed thousands of slaves and private troops as well as huge hereditary estates, and they allocated timar-estates within their jurisdiction, acting practically as vassals rather than subjects of the sultan. Their main duty was to watch the neighbouring countries, prepare for their conquest by annual raiding and merciless devastation, contribute to the maintenance of the war machine by acquiring booty and provide slaves by seizing captives in war and raids. In military campaigns they were assigned the tasks of scouting and constant harassment of the enemy, pillaging enemy territory, securing deployment routes and guarding the baggage train.

To carry out these tasks they had at their disposal, in addition to the timariots, enormous numbers of akıncıs (raiders) living in their districts. The raiders were descendants of nomadic tribal warriors who had withdrawn to the frontiers and who emerged as a distinct military body in the late fourteenth century. They lived by livestock rearing and bred excellent horses that were able to cover, on little fodder, three or four times the distance achieved by an ordinary horse.\footnote{Georgius de Hungaria, 'Incipit', p. 64–7; Konstantin Mihajlović, Memoirs of a Janissary, trans. Benjamin Stolz, notes Svat Soucek (Ann Arbor, 1975), p. 177.} The akıncıs made a living by selling the spoils at good prices. Captured boys who seemed fit for military service were bought or seized by the sultan’s officials. Though the majority of the raiders were professional soldiers, in the period under discussion their numbers were often augmented by volunteers, Muslims and Christians alike. According to the few and often unreliable sources we have, they numbered some 10,000 to 20,000 and were probably divided from the outset into groups of 10, 100 and 1,000. Their weaponry was adapted to their form of warfare: they usually had only a sword, lance, shield, and perhaps a mace, and wore a typical red headgear to distinguish them. A large number of the volunteers were poorly armed, carrying only a club in their hands.\footnote{Doukas, Decline and Fall, p. 134; Bertrand de la Broquière, Le Voyage d’Outremer de la Bertrand de la Broquière, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), p. 185.} Their officers were tovıcas (a word of Mongolian origin), who had the same rank as the çeribası of the timariots and like them usually received timar-estates by way of remuneration. The commander-in-chief was the marcher lord who was therefore also called akıncı beyi.
The salaried troops of the court (kapukulu ocakları)

Janissary infantry

In the second half of the fourteenth century the ruler’s entourage was transformed into a more complex household and court modelled on Islamic military slavery. As part of this process, the yayas of his retinue had been gradually relegated to the status of provincial soldiers and their place occupied by a combined force of salaried court troops.

The first in the series of the new-style household warriors were the janissaries (yeniçeri, literally ‘new army’). The supposition that their name originated from the Catalan genetari/ginetari and was transmitted through the Byzantine term ianitzaroi seems to be unfounded. This infantry corps (ocak) was most likely established in the 1370s, and initially consisted of perhaps a thousand men at most who were divided into hundreds commanded by yayabası, a clear indication of their close relation to the yayas. The first janissaries were enlisted from among the prisoners of war who entered the corps immediately and – as later janissary tradition maintains – received a two-akçe salary a day. According to the same tradition, this practice changed soon afterwards: novices were enrolled after serving five years on ships sailing up and down between the two shores of the Straits. The next step was to introduce two new methods in order to place recruitment on a more solid basis. The first of these was to take one-fifth of the captives acquired in enemy territories during military operations. This institution, which was based on Islamic precepts concerning the division of spoils, was called pencik, from Persian penc u yek, ‘one-fifth’. Recruits coming from this source were called pencik oğlanı by the Ottomans. The second was to collect the children of the Christian subjects of the empire at different intervals (once in five to twelve years, alternating the provinces) and at varying rates: one boy per forty households may have been most typical. This system and the recruits supplied by it was known as devsirme (literally ‘collection’), but Konstantin Mihajlović, himself a janissary between 1456 and 1463, calls the boys collected within the
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Ottoman realm çilik; a distorted Persian word meaning ‘one in forty’, thus confirming the supposition that this rate may have been in force at that time.\(^{59}\) The same author also maintains that the janissaries of pencik and devs¸irme (çilik) origin had different legal status.\(^{60}\) Recent studies tend to accept that these two forms of manpower supply were probably first applied by the marcher lords and later borrowed from them by the sultans. There is sufficient evidence to claim that the devs¸irme, in a sense the extension of the one-fifth levy to the sultan’s own domain, was already in existence in the 1380s.\(^{61}\)

Once selected, the janissary novices received education and military training. The first reliable information on how this happened is provided by Georgius de Hungaria, who lived in the empire between 1438 and 1458. He relates that the ruler distributed the novices among the households of the magnates in his dominion where they were taught morals and the handling of weapons. At the age of twenty they returned to the court and became the sultan’s salaried infantrymen.\(^{62}\) Though Georgius does not mention it, we may suppose that many of the apprentices were brought up in the ruler’s court. During the early years of Mehmed II’s reign a new and totally different method of training was introduced.\(^{63}\)

At the beginning, all the janissaries served as the ruler’s bodyguard; they were his ‘companions’ or ‘retainers’ (yoldaş). As time went by, their number and tasks gradually, and constantly, increased. As a result, a special unit consisting of fifty to sixty men was selected from among them and given the name solak. Led by the solakbaşı and with bows in their hands they marched before the ruler. In the first half of the fifteenth century, large numbers of janissaries were sent to the provincial fortresses to man the garrisons and act as the ruler’s local representatives.

The head of the janissary corps was given the title ağa. The first holder of this office, a certain Mehmed, appears in a document of 1389, where he is said to have led 2,000 infantry (piyade) archers at the battle of Kosovo.\(^{64}\)

---

62 Georgius de Hungaria, *’Incipit’*, p. 74.
63 Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyyê, pp. 135, 271. From this time on they were sold to Turkish farmers where they remained about seven or eight years, learnt Turkish and became accustomed to hard work.
After the ağa in the hierarchy came his deputy, followed by the yayabasıs who commanded the main units (orta) of a hundred men each, with the lowest ranking officer being the corporal. In 1451 the keepers of the sultan’s hounds (sekban) were attached to the corps. Before this date, the total strength of the corps did not exceed 3,000 men, but soon afterwards it rose to about 5,000. Each of the ordinary janissaries received three to five akçe pay a day and a yearly allowance of garments as well as a certain amount of cash for buying a bow. The distinctive feature of their uniform was their white headgear (zerkülah) with a flap turned backward. Their basic armament included a bow, sabre, shield and light coat of mail. Some units also used crossbows (zenberek), others – mainly during the 1440s – were increasingly equipped with hand guns, and there were contingents which employed pole-arms – lances, halberds, war-axes (balta, naçak) – instead of or in addition to some of the weapons mentioned above. From the turn of the fourteenth century, the janissaries played a crucial role both in the guarding of the ruler’s person during pitched battles and in the assaults on enemy fortresses.

The salaried horsemen

The second main component of the central standing army was the six cavalry regiments, referred to as altı bölük halkı in later sources. The most prestigious among them were the sipahi öğrencileri (cavalry youths) and the silahtar (armbearers), followed by the ulufeci (salaried men) of the right and the left wings, and the garib yiğitleri (foreigners) of the right and the left wings. They were mostly paid in cash and the amount of their salary reflected their prestige within the court hierarchy. Owing to the lack of reliable evidence, it is impossible to establish the date and the sequence of their foundation. If we consider, however, a short, and often misunderstood, notice in the Ottoman

---
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chronicles and the fact that the hierarchy of ranks within the Ottoman military was often determined according to the time of establishment, we may suppose that the sipahi oğlanları and the silahtar were first organised, most probably, in the second half of the 1370s. Some indirect evidence in the 1431–2 timar register and narrative sources suggests that the garib yiğitleri were actually recruited from uprooted or foreign elements arriving either from outside the realm or from diverse ethnic, mainly Tatar, groups. The bulk of the other divisions was enlisted from the graduates of the palace and, in the case of the silahtar and the sipahi oğlanları, from the janissaries who were promoted in this manner. Each of the regiments was commanded by an ağa.

The strength of the court horsemen before 1453 cannot be accurately established. Yet, from Konstantin Mihajlović’s description an estimate of their number as being between 1,000 and 2,000 seems realistic. They were armed with bow, sword, lance and shield. Their weapons and armour were provided by the ruler; some of them (about one-third) received cuirasses, others were given coats of mail, helmets and – in smaller numbers – horse armour. Together with the janissaries, the cavalrymen accompanied the ruler on campaign, carried his arms, led his horses, and stood round him to left and right during field battles.

The artillery corps (topçı) and the armourers (cebeci)

Though we have no evidence at our disposal, it is assumed that during Murad II’s reign a separate salaried corps of court artillery was set up. This assumption is based on those findings which show the existence of professional cannoneers remunerated with timars during the reign of Bayezid I and Mehmed I. At any rate, a contemporary Ottoman source mentions a topçibaşı (chief gunner) in 1444 which implies that a separate unit may have existed under his command. The advanced state of Mehmed II’s early artillery also supports this hypothesis, for his cannoneers could not have operated so effectively without skilled forerunners.

69 Saadeddin, Tacii’t-tevârîh, 1, p. 94. 70 Uzunçarşılı, Kapukulu Öcakları, II, p. 147.
71 See Konstantin Mihajlović, Memoirs, pp. 159, 161; Laonikos Chalkokondyles, Historiarum Demonstrations, ed. Eugenius Darkó, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1922–7), II, p. 9 (he states that garibs came from as far as Egypt and Libya).
72 Chalkokondyles, Historiarum Demonstrations, II, p. 9.
73 Konstantin Mihajlović, Memoirs, pp. 159, 161.
74 Iacopo de Promontorio, Die Aufzeichungen, pp. 31–2.
75 Agoston, Guns for the Sultan, pp. 20, 28.
While the sources are silent on the topçis, a small unit of cebeci (armourers) appears already to have existed at the court in the period under discussion. They may have numbered fifty to sixty men at most. They cleaned, repaired and in part manufactured the arms of the court salaried troops, first and foremost those of the janissaries. According to Konstantin Mihajlović they too were mounted soldiers and were under the command of an officer called cebecibaşı.\(^{77}\)

**Fortress garrisons**

Occupied fortresses and fortified cities were brought entirely under central control because the government regarded them as the means and symbol of the territorial integrity of the empire and of the strength of the sultan’s power. The court used an increasing number of the janissaries and other salaried court troops (gulam-i mir) for this purpose. These troops were probably already entering service in the provincial fortresses on a rotating basis at this time. Further, more and more gulams were appointed to the post of fortress captain. The other, larger, part of the garrisons was recruited from provincial troops including a large number of Christians and renegades, especially in the Balkans.\(^{78}\)

The fortress guard was called hisar eri, müstahfiz or merd-i kale, the fortress captain dizdar and his deputy kethüda, all, apart from hisar eri, terms of Persian origin. The soldiers were divided into units of ten men each commanded by a decurion (bölükbaşı). The majority were simple infantrymen complemented by several special units such as arbalettes, guards, store men, musicians, craftsmen and armourers. In the first half of the fifteenth century new units were also drafted and integrated into the garrisons, particularly in fortresses along the frontiers: the artillerists, the voynuks and the martaloses (see below). In major riverside fortresses waterborne units were in service, headed by the kapudan (captain).

The remuneration and service of the fortress troops were wide ranging. Some received timars, others salaries, and the combination of the two could also occur. Collective timars were frequent, and, as with the sipahis, many fortress soldiers served on a rotating basis. A considerable part of the garrisons consisted of local elements of semi-military and peasant origin who rendered service in return for exemption from certain taxes, most frequently from

---

\(^{77}\) Konstantin Mihajlović, *Memoirs*, p. 163.

poll-tax and extraordinary war taxes. They manufactured arms or ammunition, shields, arrows and ropes, for example, built and repaired the fortress walls, bridges, moats and ships, undertook regular patrols, and (sometimes also on a rotating basis) served as artillerymen and arbailesters. There were large stockpiles of arms and food in the fortresses but the latter were only drawn upon during sieges. At other times, each soldier was responsible for his daily subsistence at his own expense.

**Peasant soldiers, peasant and town militias**

From the latter half of the fourteenth century, the Ottoman standing army was supplemented by a whole range of paramilitary units and peasant militias. Some were ‘invented’ by the Ottomans, others were found in the conquered countries and integrated into their own system with minor alterations.\(^7^9\)

**Azabs**

Hardly any factual information survives about the *azabs* prior to the second half of the fifteenth century, although apparently they constituted one of the pillars of the Ottoman war machine. The word *azab*, meaning unmarried, occurs in the fourteenth-century Levant and west Anatolia denoting seamen or pirates, whereas in the Ottoman army they seem to have been land foot soldiers who were enlisted from the peasants for the duration of a campaign.\(^8^0\) Tradition puts the emergence of the *azab* army before that of the janissaries, but the chronicles mentioned them with increasing frequency in connection with the wars at the end of the century and the domestic strife of the early fifteenth century.\(^8^1\)

By the 1420s the method of their recruitment may already have been the following: a fixed number (ten to twenty) of peasant and craftsman households had to supply a suitable young man and provide his campaigning costs.\(^8^2\) The archer *azabs*, who sometimes also carried lances, were usually deployed in front of the battle array of the court troops and thus – especially with the

---

81 Neşri, Kitab-ı Cihân-nûmâ, 1, pp. 248–9, 290–1; Azamat, Anonim Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osman, pp. 61–2.
spread of firearms and artillery – would suffer considerable losses. Narrative sources put their number in important battles at tens of thousands, and list their commander (azab ağası) among the most prestigious statesmen. Later infantry azabs also appear among the regular soldiers of castle garrisons, and river and naval fleets, but it is not yet clarified how the three troops were connected apart from having the same name.

Yayas and müsellems

As mentioned above, by the end of the fourteenth century, the yaya (or piyade in Persian) footmen had been transformed into provincial soldiers and their number constantly increased. This was achieved partly by recruiting and settling tribal nomad warriors and partly by conscripting peasants into the yaya corps. During the last decades of the century they were provided with farms with special legal status (yayalık yer) to meet the expenses of their campaigning. In fact, they may have been free peasant soldiers who enjoyed their lands in return for military service. They can be found everywhere in the areas occupied in the fourteenth century: in eastern Thrace and the Maritsa valley, as well as the western and west-central parts of Asia Minor. There is enough evidence to suppose that the widely scattered yayas were organised into non-territorial districts independently of the timariot cavalry (atlı sancaks) and placed under the command of the yayabaşı, who usually also had the rank of subaşı. The later chronicles mention several of them by name as participants of the wars in the 1380s–90s, while Ulu bey subaşı, also called Sarımüddin Saruca Paşa, is indicated as the chief commander of the Rumelian footmen (Rum ilinın yayabaşısı). This person, who is presumed to have belonged to the marcher lords, played a crucial role in settling the yayas, providing them with land and establishing their organisation.

83 For their importance, see İnalcık and Oğuz, Gazavat-ı Sultân Murâd, pp. 21, 23, 56–7, 59, 63–5; Konstantin Mihajlović, Memoirs, pp. 165, 167.
85 Aşıkpaşazade, Tevârîh, p. 185; Azamat, Anonim Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osman, pp. 54, 76; Nesri, Kitâb-i Cihân-nûmâ, i, pp. 652–5.
From the end of the fourteenth century, the central administration began to impose taxes on their hitherto free land grants, which made it more and more difficult for the yayas to fulfil their military duties. Upon the advice of a chief councillor, the pretender Mustafa completely reshuffled them in 1421, and the legitimate rulers subsequently adopted the system he had introduced. He created units of three to five men (tocak) from the yayas on a parcel of land. These men alternated annually in rendering military service, known as eskünci. The remaining yayas on the land (yamak, ‘assistant’) paid 50 akçe per person to cover the expenses of those serving. In exchange, these yayas were exempted from extraordinary taxes, and their tithes and other levies were used to provide for the organisation and the officers. In 1421 the Rumelian yayas were converted into mounted soldiers, with the exception of those in Gelibolu (Gallipoli), and called müsellem. Either at the same time or shortly afterwards, müsellem units were also set up in Anatolia and served in the same way as the yayas. Presumably around this time separate yaya and müsellem sancaks were created with a subaşı holding the rank of sancakbeyi heading each district. The sancaks were divided into nahiyes under the yayabaşı for the footmen and the çeribasısı for the mounted units. These commanders, like the beys, received timar-holdings as remuneration. With the passage of time, an upper stratum evolved, especially in Rumeli, from the esküncis and their replacement (the çatals or mıstereksls) within the yaya and müsellem ocaks until they eventually monopolised military service.

Until the late 1440s the archer yaya infantry was one of the centrally important military units of the Ottoman army, heading the defensive system around the sultan together with the azabs. Towards the middle of the century, however, both they and the müsellemes were gradually degraded to auxiliary ranks. The new duties of the latter included the clearing of the roads, while the yayas were put in charge of transporting guns and ammunition.

Yürük and Tatars

In order to consolidate its conquests, the Ottoman state settled nomadic Turks (yürük) in the Balkans in large numbers. In addition to this, there was also voluntary mass migration from western Anatolia into these territories. As a result, heavy yürük concentrations developed in Macedonia, Thessaly, Thrace...
This large manpower resource was used by the government partly as reserve, partly as the pool from which to recruit a special military unit. Although no contemporaneous data are extant it seems obvious that the yürüks, just like the yayás, were organised in ocaks and performed service in return for tax exemption. However, their units were probably more heavily manned and stratified, since the person whose turn it was to go to war and his three replacements (çatal) were supported by twenty yamaks in the second half of the fifteenth century. Their commanders were timar-holding subaşís with the rank of sancakbeyi, below whom were the çeribaşís, as was the case for the müsellems. In the Balkans, the yürüks took over the role of the yayás turned müsellems and fought armed with a coat of mail, lance, shield, sword and bow.

In the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries, a few Tatar groups also settled in the Balkan peninsula, first mainly around Edirne. Later, they are found concentrated in four districts, mainly along the military routes where they lived mixed with the yürüks, and rendered service within the latter’s military structure.

_Cerehors_

In the Anatolian Seljuk armies of the thirteenth century there was a unit called jira-khvar. This was a general term designating hired soldiers of various ethnic origins who were mainly recruited in times of emergency. After the Ottomans had conquered the old Seljuk territories in central Anatolia, they adopted the method of mobilising volunteers in return for wages. These irregularly enlisted warriors, who included both Muslims and Christians, were called cerehor in Ottoman-Turkish, or sometimes serehor/sarahor. They were armed with a sword, shield and lance, and some also had armour. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, the cerehor service gradually lost its voluntary character. The government transformed it into an irregular levy imposed on the tax-paying population and integrated it into the system of extraordinary war taxes. Under this system, each four or five households had to supply a man (cerehor) fit for

war and had to provide for all his expenses and supplies. The mobilisation of the *cerehors* was often associated with the proclamation of a general call to arms (*nefir-i am*) resorted to in critical situations. The *cerehors*, whose number occasionally amounted to about 10,000, generally fought on the left wing of the army, and the majority of them went to war on horseback. By the second half of the fifteenth century, the *cerehors* had lost their combatant role, and had been relegated to act as sappers.97

Voynuks, Vlachs and *martoloses*

The *vojnici* or *vojini* belonged to the lesser nobility of the Balkan Slav states and possessed hereditary estates (*baština*). Tradition maintains that the Ottomans incorporated them into their own military under the name *voynuk* in the 1370s.98 It is not known how this took place, but in the early 1430s the *voynuk* army demonstrably mirrored the *yaya* troops with the difference that the basic unit consisting of a mounted or foot *voynuk* and two to three assistants (*yamak*) was here called *gönder*. The *voynuk* and his assistants had *baštinas* exempted from taxes. The replacement was ensured by the family and the relatives who were registered as official reserves (*zevaid*) and rewarded with considerable tax allowances. Most of the Bulgarian *voynuks* were ordered to serve the sultan’s stable.99 The *voynuk* organisation was also extended to (or, what is equally feasible, borrowed from) the Vlachs (*Eflak*), a populous group of shepherds and peasants with special legal status (*ius walachicum*) living in large numbers in the Balkans.100 They rendered *voynuk* service and tended to their lands in return for extremely favourable lump sum taxes (*adet-i eflakiye*). Their commanders – the *lagator*, the most junior, followed by the *primikür*, the *ceribaşı* and, at the top of the hierarchy, the *voynuk* district governor who co-ordinated the geographically widely scattered *voynuks* – either had free *baštinas* or belonged to the sipahi class as *timar*-holders. Although they were found everywhere, they lived in large numbers along the strategic routes and in the border zones, playing a key role in warding off enemy raids and guarding the castles and towns.101

98 Saadeddin, *Tâcî’t-tevârîh*, i, p. 94.
The organisation of the martoloses (from the Greek armatolos, ‘armed men’) also derives from pre-Ottoman times, and they are thought to have been incorporated into the Ottoman military around 1421. Initially, they served mainly along the European borders of the empire, partly on foot and partly on horseback. The Ottomans used them to man fortresses and river fleets, to guard riversides, carry out raids, reconnoitre and take prisoners as well as for various policing activities. At first, they and their families were exempted from paying several taxes and many of them also received regular pay and a share of the booty.102

The majority of the listed contingents had some basic features in common. Their members fought in return for tax exemption (mostly from extraordinary war taxes) or tax allowances, or, in other words, they fulfilled their obligation to pay war tax by doing military service and/or raising the costs of the conscripts. Collective military service may have been the outcome of autochthonous development as in the Frankish empire where in the 800s the impoverished freemen did not go to war individually but two to five men jointly equipped and supplied a warrior (see also the German agrarii milites in the 900s).103 Since, however, the earliest element of the system (voynuk) and several terms (such as lagator, primikür and gönder) are of pre-Ottoman origin, it cannot be precluded that we are faced with the Ottomanised form of the late Byzantine smallholding system.104 Among those who served under the ocak system, service was usually passed down from father to son, and the state itself was intent on making them into an increasingly closed group. To this end, they were gradually elevated to the military (askeri) class, even though most of them still lived a peasant way of life. Consequently, the majority of the Ottoman peasant soldiers could be subsumed under the regular standing army. Through these agencies, broad masses of not only the conquerors but also the subjugated were involved in


104 For this, see Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, pp. 157–90.
and benefited from the wars of conquest. This ‘socialisation’ of the war was one of the main guarantees of the dynamism and efficiency of the Ottoman military organisation in that period.

Vassals

From the second half of the fourteenth century the vassal states were expected regularly to send contingents of varying size to fight on the side of the Ottomans. Between 1379 and 1400 Manuel II (Byzantine co-emperor from 1373 and emperor from 1391) and his army had to accompany Murad I and Bayezid I on their campaigns almost every year. The same fate befell the Serbian princes after the battle of Kosovo (1389). During the 1430s the Serbian despot of Smederevo had to send a force of 800 to 3,000 men commanded by one of his sons to assist the Ottoman army. The vassal troops often provided invaluable help to the Ottomans as exemplified by the battles at Nikopolis and Ankara. In the first case, it was the charge of the Serbian cavalry of Stefan Lazarević that decided the outcome of the battle; and in the second, it was his 5,000 cavalry lancers covered in ‘black armour’ who stood fast by the sultan and were the last to flee from the battlefield.

Armament: the diffusion and use of firearms

Mention having been made of the arms and equipment of the Ottomans in the discussion of individual army units, only a few general characteristics will be emphasised here. Contemporary foreign observers usually stressed two aspects. First, that the armament of a considerable segment of the army appeared very simple, and was often regarded as poor. Bertrandon de la Broquière, for example, had a low opinion of the quality of the weapons in 1433. Second, the arms of even the best-equipped mounted troops (especially their armour) were much lighter than the enemy’s, and the resulting agility and manoeuvring ability ensured them enormous advantages in field battles. The armament was lighter because the smaller Turkish horses could carry less weight. It was, nevertheless, the excellent horses that were one of the main assets of the Ottoman cavalry, as they were less demanding, more enduring.

106 Ostrogorsky, History, p. 547; Bertrandon de la Broquière, Voyage, pp. 185, 209.
107 Imber, The Ottoman Empire, p. 46; Doukas, Decline and Fall, p. 93; Jorga, Geschichte, 1, pp. 321, 331.
109 Konstantin Mihajlović, Memoirs, p. 171.
and faster than the European mounts.\textsuperscript{110} Since the Christian cuirasses withstood the sword, the weaponry of the Ottoman infantry also contained various thrusting and cutting tools such as the war-axe, the halberd and especially the pick-axe (\textit{külülink}) that were capable of breaking through the heavy armour.\textsuperscript{111} While lighter weaponry was advantageous in field battles, its disadvantages became apparent in sieges, as the soldiers were far more vulnerable while climbing the fortress walls, more exposed to the arrows and bullets showering on them than were the plate-armoured defenders of a fortress.

It was during their conquest in the Balkans (in the 1380s) that the Ottomans became acquainted with gunpowder technology and guns and began to adopt and integrate them into their own warfare. In this process, a major role was played by the Balkan vassal subjects as well as the western experts who, entering Ottoman service, initially transmitted and later further developed the then up-to-date knowledge. As a result, within the next half a century the Ottomans became a real ‘gunpowder empire’ ahead of their rivals in many regards.\textsuperscript{112}

There is evidence at our disposal showing that the Ottomans first used firearms during the repeated sieges of Constantinople (1394–1402, 1422).\textsuperscript{113} While these cannons (actually large bombards) proved rather ineffective, those used at the siege of Thessalonike (1430) were far more successful. Cannons had become the fundamental and indispensable weapons of the Ottoman army by the 1440s. Based on experiences gained in the series of battles with the Hungarians, the Ottomans created their field artillery and used it with success as early as the battle of Kosovo in 1448.\textsuperscript{114} It was apparently also from the Hungarians that they learnt the Wagenburg-tactic (\textit{tabur cengi}) of Hussite origin, though they rarely resorted to it prior to 1453. This was a sort of fortification created from hundreds of carts chained together by their wheels and packed with crossbowmen, hand-gunters and light artillery.\textsuperscript{115} In 1444 the Ottoman

\textsuperscript{110} Bertrandon de la Broqui`ere, \textit{Voyage}, pp. 218, 221, 229; on the Turkoman horse, see Mehmet Altay K¨oymen, ‘Alp Arslan Zamanı Selçuklu Askeri Teşkilatı’, \textit{Tarih Ara\u015f\i rmalan Dergisi} 5 (1967), 53–72.
\textsuperscript{111} İnalçık and O˘guz, \textit{Gazavat-ı Sultån Muråd}, pp. 21, 53, 55, 62.
\textsuperscript{114} Ágoston, \textit{Guns for the Sultan}, pp. 17–18.
Ottoman warfare, 1300–1453

artillery was already capable of firing at enemy ships, that is, moving targets, to
cover the troops crossing at the Bosphorus. During Murad II’s reign shipboard
artillery also appeared.\footnote{Inalcık and Öğuz, Gazavât-ı Sultan Murâd, pp. 47–8; Ágoston, Guns for the Sultan, p. 18.}

The largest part of Ottoman artillery in this period comprised wrought-
iron monster guns. They were huge hard-to-transport bombards that could
shoot stone balls of several hundred kilograms each. By the mid-fifteenth
century the Ottomans had learnt to cast bronze guns that included smaller
calibre pieces too. For lack of permanent foundries, they usually cast the
guns on the spot using materials brought with them. The situation gradually
changed towards the middle of the century, especially when they began to
prepare for the siege of Constantinople. For this major undertaking (1453),
they deployed one of the world’s most advanced artilleries with a variety of
guns: giant bombards including a monster gun of unprecedented size cast by
Master Orban of Hungary; mortars or heavy short-barrelled guns that threw
the stone balls or explosive shells with parabolic trajectories, used now for the
first time against the Byzantine ships; and small-calibre cannons, similar to
the most advanced French artillery,\footnote{Bert S. Hall, Weapons and Warfare in Renaissance Europe: Gunpowder, Technology, and Tactics (Baltimore and London, 1997), p. 130.} which they deployed in mixed batteries
(fourteen in number). With these mobile units, they carried out one of the
first mass bombardments in history.\footnote{John Norris, Early Gunpowder Artillery c.1300–1600 (Ramsbury, 2003), pp. 108–11; Feridun M. Emecen, İstanbul’un Fetih Olayı ve Meseleleri (Istanbul, 2003), pp. 18, 37; Ágoston, Guns for the Sultan, pp. 61–8.}

We have enough reason to suppose that parallel with, or in the wake of,
the field-pieces, hand-held firearms also appeared in the Ottoman army. As
noted above, a small number of the janissaries probably carried hand guns
\((tüfek, tüfenk)\) during the 1440s. In the middle of the century, the existence can
be attested to in some Balkan fortresses of gunner units \((tüfenkç), many of
whom were Christian subjects of the sultan. The guns may well have been
imported from abroad and in part acquired during the skirmishes. However,
these weapons, which were probably matchlock arquebuses, were not used
widely until the later part of the fifteenth century.\footnote{Ágoston, Guns for the Sultan, pp. 19, 88. The question remains whether the more
expensive Ottoman arms and armours were in the main domestic or imported products
in the period at issue. While there is ample evidence showing that Italian trading cities
exported large quantities of arms and armours into the Levant during the thirteenth and
eary fourteenth century, such evidence verifying the supposed Genoese and Venetian
arms trade into the Ottoman Empire during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century
is still lacking. Cf. Kate Fleet, European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: the Merchants of Genoa and Turkey (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 112–21. It is worth noting,
Supply and transport

Very little information survives about the provisions of the army and the transportation of ammunition. It is highly probable that, in a similar way to later practices, a well-organised camp folk accompanied the sultan’s army including a whole range of craftsmen from food merchants to blacksmiths.\textsuperscript{120}

A considerable proportion of the food, fodder and ammunition was delivered by subjects in exchange for tax exemption or as extraordinary war tax (\textit{avarız-i divani}) introduced in the latter half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{121} At the same time, producers were also expected to sell their surplus produce to the soldiers at fixed prices.\textsuperscript{122} A part of the timariot army was supplied by the equipment (kitchen, saddlery) brought along by the officers. The court troops were provided for by the central treasury.

In most of the period under discussion the Ottomans hardly, if at all, used carts for transportation. Towards the mid-fifteenth century, however, the big siege-guns would be forwarded to their destination on wagons drawn by oxen. The main transporting vehicles were the camel, the mule and the draught horse; they were provided partly by the common subjects and the dignitaries, and partly loaned by merchants. The sultan’s treasury, the military band, the food and arms of the court troops were loaded on the many hundred camels and mules of the ruler’s stable.\textsuperscript{123} The camels were used to barricade the camp or the centre and to disorganise the lines of the enemy (see below). In the latter case, they were employed with caution because the frightened animals could easily become uncontrollable.\textsuperscript{124}

The conduct of war

\textit{Field battles}

By the end of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans had developed a special Ottoman \textit{mani`ere de combattre} based on the co-operation of the light-armoured cavalry using the traditional nomadic tactic, and the infantry whose discipline

\begin{itemize}
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\end{itemize}
was unparalleled in the age.\textsuperscript{125} This battle array was aimed primarily at guaranteeing the personal safety of the sultan, hence it was basically defensive.\textsuperscript{126} The ruler was always situated in the centre, in front of the camp, flanked on the right and left by his court cavalry, clad partly in heavy armour. In front of him were the janissaries, the \textit{yayus} and the \textit{azabs} arranged in several ‘layers’ (\textit{kat}), of which there were seven at the battle of Varna for example, to make their ranks impenetrable. When field artillery appeared, the guns were placed here, before the janissaries and behind the \textit{azabs}. An entrenchment was created (first attested to as early as in 1396) around the centre crowned by a line of densely placed wooden stakes and pavises, the janissaries shooting their arrows, and later their bullets, from behind this blindage. In the second battle of Kosovo in 1448 they fortified the entrenchment with wagons (\textit{Wagenburg}). The \textit{sipahi} cavalry of the two provinces and the \textit{akıncı} troops were lined up on the right and left wings, reinforced sometimes with foot \textit{azabs} and militiamen as well as \textit{cerehors}.

The battle process was usually as follows. With feigned attacks and retreats the \textit{sipahi} cavalry disrupted the mounted troops of the enemy, also disturbed by the incessant shooting of arrows and by burning camels, and led them towards the Ottoman infantry. When the attackers reached the latter’s ranks, they parted suddenly to give way, then closed behind them. The Ottoman foot soldiers then systematically killed the enemy horses with their thrusting and cutting weapons, and annihilated the immobilised soldiers in close combat. Those who were not thus trapped were encircled and destroyed by the returning cavalry that had in the meantime restored its order. In the 1440s, the Christian soldiers surviving the massacre usually retreated into their camp, strengthened with a wagon fortress. The Ottoman infantry either made an assault on it, or, if it was equipped with superior firepower, encircled it and forced those inside to surrender by starving them out.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The Ottoman army owed its successive victories first of all to the infantry and the court troops, as well as to good co-operation between various units. Communication was ensured by the sophisticated military music and the corp of the çavuşes who rapidly forwarded the sultan’s orders to the different companies. The most prominent commanders of enemy armies and observers such as the Hungarian Michael Szilágyi and Georgius de Hungary recognised the decisive role of the infantry and the court troops. However, as long as their opponents insisted on a battle tactic based primarily on the attacks of the heavy (in the west) or the light (in the east) cavalry and were short of an efficient infantry, they usually left the battlefields defeated.

Siege warfare

In the latter half of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans made great progress not only in field battles but also in formal siege warfare, adopting all its most up-to-date elements. At the turn of the century they used various siege engines (mangonels and siege towers) and mantelets, and within a decade or two, and certainly by 1422, they had learnt the use of mining to weaken the walls and protect the besiegers. Cannons were also used for the first time around this date, growing in significance from the 1440s in the assaults on fortresses. In the siege of Constantinople in 1453 nearly all these elements were present, including multi-level siege towers, but it was the cannons and mines which proved to be the most efficient weapons.

In the first phase of a siege the besiegers encircled the fortress, dug trenches and shot holes in the walls with the siege engines and field-pieces. Having caused enough damage to the fortifications, the troops were commanded via criers to launch a general assault. On the eve of the attack – as we read in the evocative description of Konstantin Mihajlović –

---

128 The need for an effective infantry was also felt by the Ilkhanids of Persia, but they failed ‘to field a force of heavy cavalry and supporting infantry that was at least equal in size to that of the Mamluks’; A. P. Martinez, ‘Some Notes on the Íl-Xánid Army’, Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 6 (1985 [1987]), 179.
129 Imber, The Structure of Power, pp. 254–5. As Kantakouzenos mentions briefly in his chronicle (Geschichte, ii, p. 89) the forces of Orhan used siege engines at Nicomedia (İzmit) as early as in 1333.
lighted tallow candles [are] raised profusely throughout the army so that it looks as if the stars are shining . . . above the clouds . . . And at night they go toward the city from all sides silently, slowing approaching the fosse, carrying before them barricades woven of branches and also strongly-built ladders so that they can climb up and down both sides of the ladder. The Janissaries then in this fashion go to the place where the wall is breached and having approached the breached place, they wait until day begins to appear. Then first the gunners fire from all the cannon . . . [and after that] the Janissaries quickly scale the wall, for at this moment the Christians are retreating before the cannon, and when they see that the Janissaries are on the walls, having turned about suddenly, they begin to fight bravely on both sides. And here the Janissaries, urging one another, climb up. And in addition the shot from bows comes very thick, for they continually bring and replenish their shot, and besides [there is] a great tumult from drums and human outcry. Thus the battle lasts an hour or at most two.\textsuperscript{132}

This piece of information sheds light on the crucial role of the janissaries once again: while they played a basically defensive role in field battles, they also constituted the most efficient offensive formation of the Ottoman army in siege warfare. It is hardly accidental that the defences were first broken through by janissary units during the siege of Constantinople.

\textit{Naval and river fleets}

For an empire possessing large dominions in both Asia Minor and Europe it was essential to secure the continuity of communication and transfer of forces between the two continents. This could not be achieved without effective control of the Straits, a task which, in turn, could not be fulfilled without a naval fleet, especially as long as Byzantium existed in the heart of the empire.\textsuperscript{133}

However, lacking any seafaring experience, the Ottomans were forced to turn for help to various Turkish forces who practised piracy on the Aegean. A Venetian report suggests that they had a smaller fleet of their own as early as 1374.\textsuperscript{134} After the conquest of the maritime principalities of Aydın and Menteşe several skilled men and experts came into Ottoman service, giving a great impetus to the development of the navy. The Ottomans also used and

\textsuperscript{131} On this practice, see also Emecen, \textit{İstanbul’un Fethi Olayı}, p. 24, 92–3.
\textsuperscript{134} Fleet, ‘Early Turkish Naval Activities’, p. 133.
integrated Byzantino-Greek traditions and manpower, just as they were ready to learn from, and accept the help of, the Latins, especially the Genoese, in the Levant. It was the Genoese who undertook several times to ship the Ottoman troops across the sea. In shipbuilding and dockyard technology, they were most strongly influenced by the Venetians. This openness and multi-directional acculturation is reflected by the Ottoman nautical vocabulary which abounds in Greek and Latin/Italian words.

During Bayezid I’s reign, the Ottoman fleet had a mere seventeen vessels, whereas around 1402 a traveller reported forty to sixty ships. The first marine base and main crossing point of the Ottomans was Gelibolu (Gallipoli), earlier the centre of the Byzantine fleet. The Byzantine historiographer Doukas recorded that Sultan Bayezid had it considerably rebuilt and fortified with towers to make it suitable for shipbuilding and the accommodation of large galleys, and to enable its naval forces to control the commercial traffic through the Straits and to levy duties on it. The harbour consisted of an outer and an inner pool separated by a bridge fortified by a three-storey tower. The mouth of the harbour was closed by a chain in case of necessity. By 1422, further fortifications (walls and towers) had been built, necessitated by the enemy attacks of the previous years.

The Gelibolu base had irritated the Venetians from the beginning, since they were worried that the strengthening Ottoman naval forces would threaten the freedom of their trade. The first open sea battle between the two powers took place on 29 May 1416, after the Ottoman fleet, consisting of thirty vessels and led by Admiral Çağlı, had plundered the Venetian islands. The Venetians scored a crushing victory, seizing twelve, fourteen or twenty-seven ships, according to different sources. In the course of the Venetian–Ottoman war of 1423–30 the Venetians broke into the inner harbour of Gelibolu but in the end failed to keep the docks.

By the middle of the century the size of the Ottoman fleet, which consisted mainly of oared galleys with single masts and lateen sails (kadırga), had increased considerably. According to a Venetian eye-witness account, the Ottoman fleet blockading Constantinople in 1453 comprised 145 ships: 12 galleys, 70 to 80 large galiots (fusta/kalyata), 20 to 25 parandaria and other ships, including pirate vessels. In addition to the warships, the Ottomans probably from an early date used larger ships for transporting men, horses, ammunition

---

137 Fleet, ‘Early Turkish Naval Activities’, p. 134.
and, later, ordnance.\textsuperscript{138} The fleet admiral’s post was probably filled by the district governor of Gelibolu, although the first evidence to verify this assumption dates from 1453.\textsuperscript{139}

The Ottoman fleet was for a long period deployed around the Straits, its activity being restricted to covering the crossings, as well as attacking enemy ships and shores. In the late 1420s, it ventured into the Aegean and, in support of the land troops, took part in combined attacks, for example in the sieges of Thessalonike (1430) and Constantinople (1453). The role of the navy in both cases was to complete the blockade of the city on the side facing the sea and deprive the defenders of the possibility of obtaining external help. Although it was a great step forward, the Ottoman warships were still far from standing their ground in an open formal battle with the more heavily built, better-equipped western fleets. The fact, however, that apart from the Venetians and the Knights Hospitaller of Rhodes, only the Ottomans had a regular navy, considerably increased the political weight of their state.\textsuperscript{140}

When the Ottomans reached the Danube and encountered the Hungarian ships laden with artillery, they quickly recognised the importance of river fleets. Apparently, they already had river forces on the Danube and on the Morava in Serbia during Murad II’s reign. Hungarian sources inform us that when King Sigismund laid siege to the fortress of Galambóc (Golubac, Güğercinlik) on the Danube in 1428, the Ottomans tried unsuccessfully to break through the Hungarian blockade with ships sent up the Morava.\textsuperscript{141} In 1433, Bertrandon de la Broquiè re noted that the sultan kept eighty to a hundred fustas (galiots, small oared warships) at the confluence of the Serbian rivers, the western and southern Morava, for the crossing of horses and troops, and that the ships were guarded by 300 men, replaced every two months. He found another hundred fustas at Galambóc, also used to transport soldiers across to Hungary.\textsuperscript{142} It has been suggested that the Ottomans may have used some sort of ordnance aboard these ships because their Hungarian counterparts were also equipped with small cannons.\textsuperscript{143} On the basis of this information and these suggestions, it can be concluded that river flotillas must have been employed for the transport

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{138} For the Ottoman types of ships, see Bostan, Osmanlı Bahriye, pp. 83–97; Bostan, Kürekli ve Yelkenli, pp. 169–281.
\item\textsuperscript{139} Cf. Elizabeth Zachariadou, ‘Notes on the Subasıs and the Early Sanakbeys of Gelibolu’, in Zachariadou, Kapudan Pasha, pp. 61–3.
\item\textsuperscript{140} Ágoston, Guns for the Sultan, p. 49.
\item\textsuperscript{141} Pálosfalvi, Nikápolytól Mohácsig, p. 62.
\item\textsuperscript{143} Ágoston, Guns for the Sultan, p. 18.
\end{itemize}
of troops and animals as well as for the siege of riverside fortresses in a variety of ways: taking troops to the shore, blockading a fortress and shooting at the fortress wall from the cannons aboard.

Concluding remarks

During a century and a half, the Ottomans developed one of the best war machines of the age. This was due to a variety of factors. The first was their possession of a large standing army before their enemies started to create similar forces; the composition of this army was well balanced and could be mobilised and deployed with an unparalleled rapidity. Second, they had a numerical superiority and an abundance of manpower supply which enabled them to replace their losses in a short time. Third, they benefited from having plenty of raw materials and victuals which allowed them to provide the army with armament and provisions relatively easily. Fourth, they had the necessary ability and readiness to accommodate foreign technologies and experts and to take an active part in the international trade and transfer of knowledge and weapons. Based on these factors, they developed tactical elements which, being far ahead of the age, eventually ensured the Ottomans repeated victories.

144 On some of these, see Virginia Aksan, 'Ottoman War and Warfare 1453–1812', in Black, War and the World, pp. 147–75; Ágoston, 'Ottoman Warfare'; Gábor Ágoston, "'The Most Powerful Empire': Ottoman Flexibility and Military Might", in Empires and Superpowers: Their Rise and Fall, ed. George Zimm and David Hicks (Washington, DC, 2005), pp. 127–66.
It has been an often accepted axiom that Turks and economy were not good bedfellows. Presaged by the clouds of an army on the march, the arrival of the Turk was synonymous with economic disaster. For many historians of the nineteenth century, the imprint of the Turkish horse left eternal destruction and economic ruin. Even if modified and toned down in the later twentieth century, this view of the Turk as an economically destructive presence has, like the Turk’s horse, left its mark on thinking about the Ottomans and has coloured much scholarship on the empire.

While later historians regarded the Turks as lacking economic motivation or acumen, contemporary Byzantines did not. Indeed, for Doukas, a well-informed observer of the Turks who knew Turkish and who worked for the Genoese, first in New Phokaea and then in Lesbos, the Turkish ‘nation’ was ‘a lover of money’. Writing much earlier, Kinnamos, too, noted the Turks’ concern with financial matters, commenting that nothing distressed them more than economic loss. The Genoese, those quintessential merchants and entrepreneurs, likewise viewed the Ottomans not as mere military men but as economic partners. It was to money and his constant use of it that the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II owed his ascendancy in the estimation of the Genoese merchant Iacopo de Promontorio, active for many years in Ottoman territory during the reigns of both Mehmed and his father Murad II.

Putting to one side, therefore, the concept of the economically destructive Turk, one can proceed to consider the economy of the period 1071 to 1453, from the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) which removed effective Byzantine
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1 Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, tr. and ed. H. J. Magoulias (Detroit, 1975), pp. 224–5.
ability to stem the flow of the Turks into Anatolia, to the fall of the Byzantine capital to Mehmed II and the end of the Byzantine Empire, and ask what kind of economy it was and whether there was what might be termed a Turkish economic approach. Before doing so, however, one needs to acknowledge two major problems: sources and the considerable length of the period examined.

Any in-depth understanding of the early Turkish economy is severely hampered by lack of sources, and the observation of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü that ‘the political and social history of the Turks of Anatolia from the eleventh to the fifteenth century has still not been saved from the darkness which covers it’ still applies. There is an almost total absence of Turkish data before 1453. Apart from coins, monuments and inscriptions, only a few Seljuk vakıfnames (deeds of trust of pious foundations), the majority of which are Ottoman copies, and a few tahrirs (land surveys) for the fifteenth century are extant. There are Persian sources – the works of Ibn Bibi, Efegi, Aqsara’i and Mustaufi – Arabic sources – in particular al-‘Umari and Ibn Battuta for the fourteenth century – and the Greek histories of Choniates, Doukas, Pachymeres, Gregoras, Kinnamos, and Kantakuzenos. To these may be added some travel literature, such as the accounts by Marco Polo and Bertrandon de la Broquièrè. The majority of the material which has survived and which is particularly relevant for economic history, however, comes from the trading states in the west, in particular the city-states of Genoa and Venice. These data include notary deeds (particularly important for trade between merchants, commodities and locations), merchant letters, commune account books, state discussions over trade relations, and treaties, in essence trade agreements, with Turkish states. Other western material includes the merchant manual of Pegolotti, the account by the Cretan merchant Piloti and the account book of the Venetian merchant Badoer. The inevitable result of this level of Latin material is that the image of economic activity becomes dominated by Turkish–Latin commercial relations. This dominance may in fact represent the reality of the period, but it is essential to bear in mind that this may well not be the case. Trade relations with the Mamluks, with Iran and the east, and with the northern regions

4 I use Turkish economic approaches here to mean those implemented in Turkish-ruled states.
6 Philip Remler has argued, for example, on the basis of his study of the silver coinage of the beyliks of the Ottomans, Eretna and the Isfendiyarogulları in the fourteenth century that the western beyliks were dependent on the trade from the east and remained in that economic sphere; P. N. Remler, ‘Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage: a Currency Community in Fourteenth-Century Anatolia’, American Numismatic Society Museum Notes 25 (1980), 186.
across the Black Sea were clearly significant and their absence from many of the sources does not necessarily reflect their lesser importance in comparison with western trade, but could well be related to the absence of the sources themselves. This absence could be due to either the destruction of data or the absence of such data in the first place. It is certainly the case that Latin merchants employed notaries to record every transaction. This was not the case among Ottoman merchants in later centuries whose transactions were verbal not written, and it would be reasonable to presume that such a practice existed also in the earlier period. That documents such as letters or treaties between Turkish states and their neighbours in the east or south have not survived can easily be accounted for by the general political turmoil of the period in which there was a quick succession of states rising and falling in a region often ravaged by warfare.

Much of the non-Latin material we do have is often difficult to interpret. For example, the figures given by Hamd Allah Mustaufi Qazvini, writing around 1340, for the tribute received from Anatolia by the Mongols present problems and while it has been argued that it is possible to accept the overall totals (3.3 million dinars under the Mongols, as opposed to 15 million under the Seljuks), the data in general should be treated with caution. The same applies to many of the economic data from al-‘Umari which are very difficult to interpret. According to al-‘Umari all foodstuffs sold in Anatolia for moderate prices because of various factors: the low level of taxation, the abundance of free pasturage, the expansion of commerce and the proximity of the sea. Ibn Battuta, too, commented on the modest prices in Kastamonu, so low he noted that he had never in any country seen a city where prices were lower. But as Cahen notes, this, if true, does not necessarily mean prosperity and could be an indication of either wealth or poverty. Currency values are not clear, and nor are those of the weights and measures used. The exact workings of the market remain obscure.

Taking a period of nearly four centuries and attempting to consider it as one is, needless to say, a risky undertaking. Inherent in such an approach is the

10 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 171.
danger of assigning to the period overall patterns and formulae which function for one time-span. What works well for the fourteenth century may well not do so for the twelfth. There clearly were periods in which the economy was much more disrupted than in others and when there was a high level of military activity: Turkoman raiding, crusader activity, Byzantine revolting or Timur’s invasion. We should not, however, overstate the level of destruction for the region overall. Further, certain periods were more prosperous than others, that from around the mid-twelfth to the mid-thirteenth century being described by the eminent historian of the period, Claude Cahen, for example, as a period of ‘exceptional economic development’. There is one distinct advantage to viewing 1071–1453 as one continuum. It breaks down the artificial divisions of time, to which historians are so prone, and allows one to understand the fluidity and continuity of Anatolian existence through the various political shifts and changes that occurred. The transition from Orthodox Byzantium to Islamic Ottoman Empire was a very slow one, involving a fluid process of gradual transformation and adaptation. This was a period characterised more by continuity than by abrupt change and economic processes were thus not necessarily subject to rapid transformation.

The Turks who arrived in Anatolia from the late eleventh century on established an economy which developed, thrived and prospered. Far from bringing economic destruction in their wake, it has been argued that their arrival was beneficial for the economy of the region. Initially very much a nomad economy, the economy of Anatolia under the Turks developed a strong rural and urban base and an important international trade sector.

The nomad economy

Leaving their homes for the grassy meadows of Anatolia, as the twelfth-century Byzantine historian Choniates put it, the Turkoman nomads moved westward from Central Asia and Iran into the rolling upland pastures of the central Anatolian plateau. Ideal for large-scale ranching, the economic backbone of the obstreperous Byzantine magnates in the tenth century, these lands provided the nomads with both winter and summer pasture for their extensive

11 Doukas describes Timur’s progress through western Anatolia when troops moved from city to city ‘leaving each in such a state of desolation that not even the bark of a dog nor the cackle of a hen nor the cry of a child was any longer heard’; Doukas, Decline, p. 99.
12 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 168.
13 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 156, 163.
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herds and flocks. Crossing this central region, by now largely out of Byzantine control and the preserve only of the latifundia of absentee landlords, the Turkomans spread further westwards and by 1146 had apparently reached the region of the Meander river (Büyük Menderes) where the Byzantine emperor Manuel I came upon them unexpectedly when relaxing in what he thought to be safe territory. Attracted by rustling, the Byzantines were distressed to find Turkoman herds grazing near where they had stopped to rest as they returned from Anatolia to Constantinople.\(^{16}\) The Turkomans travelled in considerable numbers of families and flocks, setting up large tent encampments, such as that of 2,000 people described by Kinnamos around Dorylaion (Eskişehir) in 1175.\(^ {17} \)

The nomad economy of the Turkomans rested on their herds which provided them with their livelihood, supplying their daily needs – food, clothing and tents\(^ {18} \) – and the items with which they traded – meat, dairy products, hides and hair, as well as the raw materials with which they manufactured kilims and carpets. The Turkoman herds, as Bertrand de la Broquièrè noted, were extremely large.\(^ {19} \) Those in the beylik of Germiyan in western Anatolia were so great that, according to one contemporary, only God could calculate them.\(^ {20} \) Of these the most numerous were the sheep ‘for they truly cover the surface of the land’.\(^ {21} \) Apart from the large, fat, long-tailed sheep, the delicacy of whose fat and the exquisite flavour of whose meat excited the praise of the Egyptian al-‘Umari in the 1330s, the nomad herds included horses, camels, mules, asses – whose heads and hooves, ears and hair were like those of stags – and long, soft, curly-haired goats, the most beautiful Bertrand de la Broquièrè had ever seen, whose skin was as fine as silk.\(^ {22} \) Buffaloes were used to carry the Turkomans’ merchandise.

One of the most valuable livestock assets of the Turkomans was the horse. The central Anatolia plateau was ideally suited to horse breeding. It was here that most of the Byzantine imperial stud farms had been located and loss of this region to the Turks may have disrupted supplies of horses for the Byzantine army.\(^ {23} \) Turkoman horses were highly regarded and fetched high prices,\(^ {23} \)

18 Bertrand de la Broquièrè, Le Voyage d’Outremer de Bertrand de la Broquièrè, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892) pp. 89, 92, described the tents as the most beautiful you could see, made of white cotton cloth and blue felt. Each tent, which was round, could house fifteen or sixteen people, and contained all the people’s needs.
23 Harvey, Economic Expansion, p. 152.
Marco Polo commenting on this and on the excellence of a breed of horses he called ‘Turki’ as well as on the outstanding mules found in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{24} Horse pedigrees were kept, the people of Germiyan knowing ‘perfectly well’ who were the sires and dams of their horses.\textsuperscript{25} These horses, at least according to al-‘Umari’s Genoese informant Balaban (Domenico Doria), were the best in Anatolia, nimble and swift and impossible to outdistance.\textsuperscript{26} Horses from the Kastamonu region, too, were famous and fetched very high prices, in the early fourteenth century as much as 1,000 gold pieces, which was ‘a price thought by those who know about these things to be worth it’.\textsuperscript{27} It was apparently merely necessary to say that a horse was from Kastamonu to give it extraordinary merit in the eyes of the buyer and ensure a lucrative sale.\textsuperscript{28} Horse trading was not restricted to the mainland for in the fourteenth century both the Hospitallers, the Genoese on Cyprus and the Venetians on Crete sought to buy horses from the region.\textsuperscript{29}

Horses were not the only animals the Turkomans traded, for they provided animals to the surrounding regions, to Syria, Iraq and Iran which were apparently stocked with livestock from the Turkomans in the early 1300s.\textsuperscript{30} The nomads also traded cheese, yoghurt, meat, wool and leather with the local sedentary population. This trade with the settled, often Byzantine, population is reflected in the later accounts of the relations between Osman, the eponymous founder of the Ottoman state, and the tekfur (Byzantine ruler) of Bilecik (Bekloma) in north-west Anatolia. Osman was said to have given cheese, butter and cream to the tekfur to whom he entrusted his goods while he moved to the summer pastures.\textsuperscript{31} As with horses, the trade was not

\textsuperscript{24} Marco Polo, \textit{The Travels of Marco Polo}, tr. Aldo Ricci (London, 1931), p. 50.
\textsuperscript{25} Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 355.
\textsuperscript{26} Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 355.
\textsuperscript{27} Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 341; Ibn Battuta, \textit{Travels}, p. 462.
\textsuperscript{28} Al-‘Umari, ‘Voyages’, p. 341.
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restricted to internal commerce, for such goods as goats’ hair, and leather and hides were among the exports from Anatolia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.32

Apart from raw products, the Turkomans also wove kilims and carpets (also among the gifts from Osman to the tekfur of Bilecik).33 Turkish carpets, which were to be so famous in Europe in later centuries, were exported by the Latin merchants from ports such as Antalya in the south and Balat in western Anatolia.34 Marco Polo commented on the manufacture of beautiful carpets in the mid-twelfth century,35 and the beauty of such carpets from Aksaray was famous from early on.36

While livestock formed a key asset in the nomad economy the Turkomans also benefited from another lucrative economic activity: raiding. The initial impact of such raiding was felt in the immediate aftermath of the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) into the next century. With the greater control imposed by the Seljuks, the impact of Turkoman raiding decreased, but came to the fore once more with the decline of the Seljuks and the subsequent weakening of Mongol authority in the later thirteenth century. The situation began to improve in the fourteenth with the imposition of control by the various beyliks and with the establishment of the Ottoman state. Such raiding provided considerable hauls of booty, in particular slaves who were often taken in great numbers: 26,000 Armenians were seized in Cilicia and sold in the slave markets in 1186,37 and 20,000 captured after the fall of Tralles (Aydın) a century later in 1282.38 By the beginning of the fourteenth century such raiding had taken to the water and Turkish raiding of the Aegean islands was a source of deep concern to the Byzantines and the Latins alike. In one year alone, 1331–2, 25,000 people were snatched from the islands, according to the Venetian Marino Sanudo Torsello, who wrote the

33 Asılıpasızade, Chronik, pp. 9, 14. 34 Piloti, L’Égypte, pp. 60, 73.
35 Polo, Travels, p. 50. 36 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 161.
Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis urging a crusade against the growing Turkish menace.\footnote{Marino Sanudo, Studien über Marino Sanudo den Aelteren, Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. VII, ed. Fr. Kuntsmann (Munich, 1855), no. 5, p. 797.}

The Turkomans did not only raid on their own account but also provided raiders in various internal Byzantine feuds. It was Turkish reinforcements who contributed to the success of the false Alexios when he revolted against Emperor Alexios Angelos and attacked the towns around Ankara.\footnote{Choniates, Annals, p. 254.} Michael, a tax-collector in the province of Mylassa, was supported by Rūkneddin when he revolted against the same emperor in the summer of 1200, the Seljuk ruler providing him with troops which he used to ravage the cities along the Meander (Büyük Menderes).\footnote{Choniates, Annals, p. 290.} Sometimes rebelling Byzantines provided the Turks with more than raiding opportunities and work as mercenaries. When Mangaphas revolted against Emperor Isakios Angelos he took a large number of captives in Caria whom he handed over to the ‘local barbarians to be led away into captivity’.\footnote{Choniates, Annals, p. 220.}

The land

While Turkoman raiding was a positive factor in the Turkish advance across Anatolia, and the availability of booty attracted forces to the various Turkish leaders, it was not an asset when it came to the establishment of a state economy, and the ‘portable’ economy of the nomad was not a sound economic basis for state construction. The basis for this was land.

As it had been under the Byzantines, so too agriculture was the backbone of the Turkish economy. This backbone, however, was severely strained by the nomads. Turkoman raiding was disruptive. It ravaged agriculturally productive regions and interfered with trade. Caravans were attacked, roads cut or made unsafe and merchants preyed upon.\footnote{Ibn Bibi, Selçuknâme, tr. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (Istanbul, 2007), pp. 162–3, 211; Karim al-Din Aqṣara’i, Selçuklî Devletleri Tarihi. Aksaraylı Kerimeddin Mahmud’un Mûsameret al-ahyar Adî Farsça Tarihînîn Tercîmesî, tr. M. Nuri Gencosman (Ankara, 1943), p. 211; Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, i, pp. 321, 453; Ahmed Eflaki, Ariflerin Menkibeleri, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı (Istanbul, 2006), pp. 386, 680; Ibn Battuta, Travels, pp. 427–8, 448.} Turkoman raiding meant that in the Ottoman state in the fourteenth century people could only travel in large groups in the vilayets (provinces) of Amasya and Tokat, and even then not with impunity.\footnote{Aşıkpaşazade, Chronik, p. 99.} Fighting often involved scorched-earth tactics. In the
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summer of 1176, for example, the Turks, avoiding any major encounter other than light skirmishes, destroyed the grass in order to prevent the Byzantines finding forage for their horses, and contaminated the water, thus denying them pure drinking water. They had adopted similar tactics when faced with the approach of the forces of the first crusade and had laid waste to the area around Konya before withdrawing. The Turkoman problem was not merely a matter of raiding, however, for the land itself was also important to them. It was on the fertile plains that ‘their herds of goats and cattle grazed, romping in the verdant meadows’, and it was for this reason that Manuel’s rebuilding of Dorylaion (Eskişehir) was of such concern for it threatened to force them to abandon their pasture lands.

Turkoman attacks put a severe strain on the agricultural economy. Peasants were forced to abandon their fields and to protect their flocks and herds by keeping them within the towns. The inhabitants of Tavas in the early fourteenth century kept their livestock within the town walls at night because of the occupation of the countryside by the Turkomans, as did the inhabitants of Laodikeia (Ladik, modern Denizli) who lost countless animals, and men, to Kılıç Arslan II after his successful siege of the city. Turkish sieges meant that the fields around besieged towns remained uncultivated for the inhabitants could not come out to tend them. In consequence, the townspeople were often faced with starvation. Turkoman attacks in 1256–7, for example, devastated the countryside round Melitene (Malatya) and reduced its inhabitants to starvation. The inhabitants of Antalya, under Turkish siege in 1147, were luckier for although they were unable to cultivate their fields, they were able to import grain by sea. Devastation of the surrounding agricultural land and destruction of crops was a common occurrence, caused not merely by the Turkomans. The Mamluks, too, ravaged the crops and land around the citadel of Sis when they laid siege to it in 1320, and drove off great numbers of cattle. It was starvation that reduced many towns and delivered them into the hands of the Turks. Gangra (Çankırı) was starved into submission in 1136.

51 Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, i, pp. 426–7.
52 William of Tyre, History, ii, p. 178: ‘It possesses very rich fields, which are nevertheless, of no advantage to the townspeople, for they are surrounded by enemies on all sides who hinder their cultivation. Therefore, the fertile soil lies fallow, since there is no one to work it.’
'while the emperor’s attention was diverted with other grave issues',\textsuperscript{54} as was Trailles, which fell to Menteşe, and Nysa, Tripolis and Thyraia, reduced by Emir Sassan.\textsuperscript{55} Prusa (Bursa), put under a siege so tight that 'an infidel could not even extend a finger out of the castle',\textsuperscript{56} fell to the Ottoman ruler Orhan in 1326 as a result of starvation, as did Nicaea (Izink) in 1331, and Nicomedia (İzmit), in 1337.\textsuperscript{57} When Bayezid I put Constantinople under siege in the 1390s he did not do this, as Doukas notes, by actually waging war against the city. There were no siege engines or military engines. Instead he deployed men around the city to prevent anything entering or leaving. In consequence, there was a terrible dearth of grain, wine, oil and other provisions.\textsuperscript{58}

Failure to cultivate land as a result of Turkoman activity put a severe financial burden on the Byzantine state which sought to protect productive land where possible. In Choniates’s estimation, Manuel’s ‘best deed’ was to fortify the villages and build fortresses to protect the horse-breeding plains in the region of Pergamon (Bergama) and Atramyttion (Edremit) which were prey to Turkish raiding in the 1160s and 1170s. As a result of Manuel’s actions the region prospered, fields were cultivated and crops abounded.\textsuperscript{59}

The Turkomans were, of course, not the only ones to raid. Devastation of agricultural land was also brought about by various rebelling Byzantines who called in Turkish forces. One such, a man claiming to be Alexios, son of Emperor Manuel, earned himself the nickname ‘crop-burner’ during his revolt against Isakios Angelos, when he ravaged cities along the Meander (Büyük Menderes) with Turkish forces and laid waste the cultivated fields.\textsuperscript{60} Mangaphas, who also revolted against Isakios Angelos, recruited Turks for his attacks on Byzantine farmers, killing draught animals and burning and destroying the grain fields in the summer time.\textsuperscript{61} Byzantine forces, too, state or rebel, could devastate with or without Turkish assistance, destroying crops and seizing flocks and shepherds.\textsuperscript{62} Manuel Komnenos took large numbers of men and animals captive in his attack on the lands round Pentapolis,\textsuperscript{63} while his successor, John Komnenos, attacked Konya and despoiled the enemy’s land, taking captive both men and animals of all kind, draught animals as well as

\textsuperscript{54} Choniates, Annals, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{56} Aşıkpaşaçazade, Chronik, p. 23. According to Oruç, Oruç Beğ Tarihi, ed. Atsız (Istanbul, 1972), p. 31, no one could leave the castle.
\textsuperscript{57} Gregoras, Historia, vol. 1, viii, 15, p. 384, ix, 9, p. 433, xi, 6, p. 545.
\textsuperscript{58} Doukas, Decline, p. 83. \textsuperscript{59} Choniates, Annals, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{60} Choniates, Annals, p. 222. \textsuperscript{61} Choniates, Annals, p. 220.
\textsuperscript{62} Choniates, Annals, p. 110. \textsuperscript{63} Choniates, Annals, p. 70.
those suited to riding.\textsuperscript{64} During the civil war of 1341–7, John Kantakouzenos burned and sacked villages and towns between Selymbria and Constantinople, causing great destruction and desolation.\textsuperscript{65}

Turkoman raids, therefore, so useful in devastating the land of the enemy and for fighting, advancing and capturing territory, were not so useful when it came to state control. Once towns began to fall and Turkish states started to emerge, the level of disruption caused by Turkoman activity became as unacceptable to the Turkish rulers as it had been to the Byzantines. For all administrations, Byzantine, Mongol or Turkish, nomads were a problem and were generally disliked by the settled populations. States therefore sought to control them, to tax them, settle them or force them to move elsewhere. What was important was to control the land, protect and increase its productivity, and tax it.

Under the Turkish system of landholding all land, with few exceptions, was state land (\textit{miri}). Land could be granted as freehold (\textit{mi\text{"u}lk}), assigned as a land grant (\textit{ikta} under the Seljuks and \textit{timar} under the Ottomans who assigned such lands to maintain troops), or placed in a \textit{vakif}, a pious endowment.\textsuperscript{66} In times of difficulty rulers could resort to giving as gifts extensive lands as private property, as Rükneddin did, or of selling them, as was done by ˙Izzeddin.\textsuperscript{67} Land was also no doubt simply appropriated on occasion, as indicated by Rashid-al-Din’s drive to reclaim illegally appropriated land at the beginning of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{68} While the Ottoman landholding system owed much to that of the Seljuks, it was not simply a straight continuation, but was affected also by the impact of Mongol rule, and by Byzantine practice, in Anatolia, as well as by systems in place in the Balkan regions which the Ottomans conquered.

As land was a source of wealth for the state, it was therefore essential in order effectively to assess revenue that the state should know the productivity of the land under its control. This was achieved through a system of land surveying, which under the Ottomans resulted in detailed, and regular, inventories of villages, peasants, animals and crops, and the tax revenue produced. Immediately after the conquest of a region, a survey (\textit{tahrir}) of the land and population was conducted, listing tax returns, productivity and property.\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Choniates, \textit{Annals}, p. 18.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Doukas, \textit{Decline}, pp. 73–4.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Osman Turan, ‘Selçuk Türkiyesi’nde Faizle Para ˙Ikrazına Dair Hukuki Bir Vesika’, \textit{Belleten} 16, 62 (1952), 252–4. For the \textit{timar} system see chapter 6 in this volume.
\item \textsuperscript{67} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, p. 329.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, p. 329.
\item \textsuperscript{69} For what appears to be the earliest extant example of a \textit{tahrir}, see Halil İnalcık (ed.), \textit{Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid} (Ankara, 1987).
\end{itemize}
The results of such a survey were entered into a detailed register, a *defter-i mufassal*. Another, less-detailed summary register was also drawn up, the *defter-i icmal*, which gave only the names of the villages and the administrative divisions, and annual production figures. These registers listed the number of households (*hanе*), widows and unmarried men in a region, together with the total return from the region. Such registers give other details such as the number of orchards, olive trees, vineyards and beehives and production figures for crops such as wheat, corn and grain, fruit such as grapes, or other agricultural products such as honey. Little is known about what taxes were charged under the Seljuks but under the Ottomans agricultural taxes included the *çift resmi*, the *çift* tax charged on Muslims working on the land. The *ispence* paid by Christian peasants in the Balkans was equivalent to the *çift resmi*, and was charged at the rate of 25 *akçe*s per non-Muslim married man and 6 *akçe*s from a widow in the fifteenth century. Tithes, *rüsum* (dues from a range of things including vineyards, grain mills, beehives as well as market dues, bride tax and fines) and *avarız-i divaniye* (extraordinary levies) were also charged. Non-Muslims also paid the *cizye*, a poll-tax.

As in any system in which agricultural production was significant, it was vital to ensure that peasants remained on the land. This was a problem which faced all Turkish administrations, as it had the Byzantine, when warfare, raiding, famine and, in the case of an increasingly hard-pressed Byzantine administration, excessive taxation all drove the peasants from the land. To avoid this, Turkish rulers took various measures: transferring populations to uncultivated land, granting tax breaks to keep peasants in place and to attract others, and providing implements and seeds. A good example of the care exerted by Turkish rulers is the treatment of 5,000 Byzantines captured in 1198 by the Seljuk ruler Keyhusrev in a series of attacks in the Meander region and in Phrygia. Having had a list drawn up of the captives, giving their names and where they came from, Keyhusrev then transferred them to Philomilon (*Aksеhir*) and assigned them to land there, providing them with grain and seed. Promising that if an agreement was reached with the Byzantine emperor they would be returned home, he guaranteed that if no such agreement materialised they would remain tax free for five years, after which they would be taxed lightly, never at a rate greater than that which they had paid to the Byzantine authorities. This policy was successful for it ensured that the captured Byzantines settled and even attracted others who had not themselves been captured but had heard of this favourable treatment. In the words of Choniates the

70 İnalçık, *Defter*, pp. xxxii–xxxiii.
Byzantines thus ‘preferred to settle among the barbarians rather than in the Hellenic cities and gladly quit their homelands’.71

Under the Ottomans, abandoned land was handed for cultivation to dervishes, or to state slaves and serfs who were also provided with seeds and oxen. Mehmed II used prisoners of war and Turkomans to settle villages deserted by the Greeks after the capture of Constantinople in 1453.72

Anatolia was an agriculturally rich region. While the central plateau provided abundant pasture lands, the west, south and east produced grain, cotton, pulses and vegetables, fruit, rice, honey, as white as snow, and excellent sugar, neither too sweet nor too bitter.73 There was vine cultivation,74 and grapes were exported from the region,75 as was wine, produced in the south, in the Aegean region and in Cappadocia.76 Wine formed part of the revenue of the Seljuk sultan in the mid-twelfth century,77 and was exported from Fethiye in the south, from the Aegean coast, and from the north, from İncir Limani (Paralime, Liminia) and Giresun (Kerasunt).78 Wine was also imported into the region, a trade in which the Genoese played an important role. It was imported into Gelibolu and Menteşe, and from Naples it was traded into Theologos.79

One of Anatolia’s most important products was grain, one of the main export commodities in the trade between the Turks and the European merchants. Grain was vital for the Latin trading colonies in the eastern Mediterranean and even on occasion for the mother cities of Genoa and Venice. The importance of this commodity is highlighted by Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini who in his chronicle of the years 1212–1354 regarded it as a cause
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of the western crusade against Aydin in 1344. The beyliks of Menteşe and Aydin were active in trading grain with the European merchants, and it was sold and exported from Theologos and Phokaea to Cyprus and the west. The Ottomans traded it from the early days of their state’s existence, and the Venetians were buying grain from Orhan in 1333. The Ottomans also sold to the Genoese. Grain was exported too from the Black Sea region, from Thrace, from Tarsus and Antalya. Even the Hospitallers, whose raison d’être was the struggle against the infidel, obtained grain from the Turks and were granted a papal dispensation to do so in 1379. Grain was not the only agricultural produce which the western merchants purchased for they also looked to Anatolia for vegetables and pulses which they bought, for example, in Antalya and the markets of the Aegean coastal region. The Genoese on Chios bought biscuit from Aydin and the Hospitallers on Rhodes obtained foodstuffs from Turkish rulers.

Anatolia was also a region of mineral resources. There were silver mines, iron mines (one of which in Karaman was credited by al-’Umari with greatly contributing to the success of the beylik), salt mines and lapis lazuli quarries. High-quality copper was mined in north-east Anatolia in the region of Kastamonu, Sinop, Samsun and Osmancık. According to the Byzantine chronicler Kritoboulos, copper was the most important produce of the Sinop region, while another Byzantine contemporary, Chalkokondyles, estimated that the annual tax income from the mines of Sinop when Mehmed II
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The Turkish economy, 1071–1453

conquered the region in the middle fifteenth century was 50,000 gold pieces.\textsuperscript{95} During Mehmed II’s reign the area of Kastamonu produced ‘infinite’ amounts of copper.\textsuperscript{96} With the Ottoman takeover in the Balkans, further mines fell into Turkish hands, as they did, for example, after the battle of Kosovo in 1389.\textsuperscript{97}

As with wine, Anatolia was both an exporter and importer of metals. The metal trade is a particularly difficult one to trace, both because of the scarcity of primary data for the early period, and because of the bans imposed by western governments and the church on the trade in metals with the Muslim world. It is often argued that such bans led not to a halting of the trade, but merely to it being concealed. However, it is possible that, rather than existing secretly, there was in fact not the volume of imports implied by this argument. Anatolia was both a producing and exporting region, and so did not need to import much of its metal needs. While firearms did arrive in Turkish territory\textsuperscript{98} and guns were used, for example, at the battle of Varna in 1444,\textsuperscript{99} what perhaps was more significant than hardware and metals was the importation of expertise, such as that of the Hungarian cannon maker Orban who forged the cannon which destroyed the walls of Constantinople and delivered the city into Ottoman hands in 1453.\textsuperscript{100}

Metals were exported to the west.\textsuperscript{101} Lead was exported westwards as well as to Egypt; copper was exported in considerable quantities, the İsfendiyaroğulları ruler Süleyman trading it with the Genoese in the 1390s,\textsuperscript{102} and Turkish merchants apparently trading it on Chios.\textsuperscript{103} Silver was sold in the markets of Antalya and Theologos,\textsuperscript{104} and gold appeared in the markets of Antalya and Edirne.\textsuperscript{105} Anatolia also imported metals, such as iron which sold
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in Antalya and Bursa, and which the Genoese traded into Balat around the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{106} The Genoese imported tin into Balat and it was also sold in Antalya.\textsuperscript{107}

One of the most important mineral resources of Anatolia was alum, vital to the European cloth industry as a fixer in dyes. Until the discovery of alum mines south of Rome in the second half of the fifteenth century, Anatolia remained the main source of this mineral which was a major export item in the trade between the Turks and the European merchants. Alum from Anatolia appeared as far west as Spain and England.\textsuperscript{108} It was being produced and traded in the thirteenth century when the alum resources of the Seljuks were handled by two merchants, the Genoese Nicolao de Santo-Siro and the Venetian Benefatio de Molendino.\textsuperscript{109} The Turkish alum trade was largely dominated by the Genoese, the Zaccaria family controlling alum extraction in the early fourteenth century. The Maona of Chios controlled the alum of Phokaea from 1346, and the Gattilusio family, having established themselves on Lesbos a decade later, monopolised the alum production there and on the other islands of the northern Aegean. By the 1440s extraction and export was in the hands of a cartel when in 1449 a major partnership was established under the control of Francesco Draperio.\textsuperscript{110}

The main producing regions were Karahisar in the Black Sea region, Kütahya and Phokaea (Foça).\textsuperscript{111} Smaller quantities came from Ulubad (Ulek Abad, west of Bursa), Camalı (south of Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli)) and Kapıdağ (Cyzicus, west of Bursa). Simon de Saint-Quentin referred to a valuable alum mine near Sivas and a mine of alum and kermes near Hacsar.\textsuperscript{112} Al-‘Umari talks of an alum mine in Germiyan, sales from which brought in considerable riches.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{107} Piloti, \textit{L’Egypte}, p. 72; Pegolotti, \textit{Pratica}, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{108} For the alum trade see Fleet, \textit{Trade}, pp. 80–94.
\textsuperscript{111} R. Muntaner, \textit{L’expedició dels Catalans a Orient}, ed. Lluis Nicolau d’Olwer (Barcelona, 1926), p. 156. All ships sailing from Phokaea to the west took a cargo of alum and Phokaea supplied French, German, Italian, Spanish, Arab, Egyptian and Syrian dye makers; Doukas, \textit{Decline}, p. 148.
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The urban market

The economy which developed under the Turks was not restricted to a rural base for it also involved the development of an urban economy. One of the characteristics of the fourteenth century was the multiplication of medium-sized towns.114 As the Turks advanced across Anatolia, and under the Ottomans into the Balkans, they took many of the towns that lay in their path, mostly by starving them into submission. Simon de Saint-Quentin refers to a hundred towns in the Seljuk state in the mid-thirteenth century, listing among others Sivas, Antalya, Alanya, where he states the sultan kept his treasury, Malatya, Erzurum, Konya and Niksar.115 Such urban centres and ports were important markets for both local and international trade, and were production centres for goods such as carpets and worked cloth, and industries, such as shipbuilding, noted in Antalya by the Cretan merchant Emanuele Piloti, writing in the early fourteenth century.116 Siirt produced excellent brass utensils and ‘famous and incomparable’ goblets, according to Mustaufi.117 Good quality cloth was manufactured in Denizli and Akşehir,118 woollen goods in Sivas and Kastamonu in the mid-thirteenth century,119 kemha, velvet and scarlets in Erzincan, linen cloth in Erbil and Siirt, and silk in Bursa.120 Aksaray produced rugs of sheep’s wool which, according to Ibn Battuta, had no equal in any country and were exported to Syria, Egypt, Iraq, India and China.121 Large quantities of silk were produced in the region.122 The manufacture of rich, high-quality silks of various colours was noted by Marco Polo, who also commented on the beautiful buckram made by the Armenians of Erzincan.123 Cloth production was not just for local consumption and cloth was exported from Anatolia.124 Sheep’s wool and very high-quality goat’s wool was worked up into hats of bonnet (a kind of cloth) which were apparently sent for sale in France and England.125 Erzincan buckram sold in
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Pera and Constantinople and much further afield, in Pisa. Silk cloth, which formed part of the annual tribute paid by the Seljuks to the Mongols (together with horses, camels, rams and money) according to Simon de Saint-Quentin, was also exported, both Iranian silk which had been brought into Anatolia, and Turkish silk, seta turci. Much of the Anatolian silk was exported to Byzantium and the west. This was ideal for the manufacture of Greek taffeta, most of which was made from this source. Silk traded out of Antalya and Alanya went not just to Constantinople but also to Alexandria. Turkish silk appeared, too, in markets much further west, such as Pisa.

A thriving economy required thriving towns, and so Turkish rulers set out to ensure that the urban centres they captured flourished. As with land, it was imperative to ensure that the population remained in place, or was reinforced or replaced by people brought, either forcibly or through various inducements, from elsewhere. Osman was said to have repopulated the empty town of Karaca Hisar after its capture with people from Germiyan. Murad II brought people in from the surrounding area and settled them in Thessalonike after its conquest by Ottoman forces in 1430, giving houses as freehold to those who stayed willingly and encouraging those who had fled the city to return to their homes, promising them amnesty. Captives were ransomed and had their homes returned to them. Mehmed II, too, hastened to encourage the repopulation of Constantinople, bringing in people from all regions of the empire as part of his drive to recreate a thriving commercial capital and erecting bedestans (buildings in a bazaar used for valuable goods), caravansaries and markets. In Pera he ordered a survey of the inhabitants. Finding many houses bolted as the Latins had fled, he ordered them opened and an inventory taken of their belongings. He stipulated that should the owners return within three months, they would be allowed to reclaim their possessions. If not, then all would be confiscated by the ruler.
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Not a great deal is known about the urban landscape under the early Turkish rulers. One of the most tantalising details concerns the ahīs. The ahīs were apparently an important element of the urban fabric from the early days of the Turkish conquest. From Ibn Battuta’s account of his travels in Anatolia in the 1330s they appear to have formed some kind of trade-related organisation, and were certainly widespread. But quite what their role was or how their organisation functioned is far from clear.\footnote{For ahīs see Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 193–200, and chapter 8 in this volume.}

Even if certain aspects of urban development are obscure, however, it is clear that the urban economy was important for Turkish rulers who encouraged urban development and promoted the urban market. Urban economic prosperity guaranteed the state important revenues and was thus something to be nurtured. Immediately after conquering a town, one of the actions of the new Turkish ruler was to establish a market, along with a mosque and a hamam (bathhouse). The eponymous Ottoman ruler Osman, thus, is credited with having established markets in Eskişehir and Karaca Hisar.\footnote{Asıkpaşazade, Chronik, pp. 14, 20.} It was not sufficient, however, merely to establish a market, for its security also had to be guaranteed in order to attract traders. The importance of an effectively regulated market is illustrated by Asıkpaşazade’s account of Osman’s behaviour in protecting the rights of the infidels who traded in the market he established at Eskişehir. According to the story, Byzantines from Bilecik made good jugs which they sold in the market. When a man from Germiyan bought a jug but failed to pay for it, the men from Bilecik complained to Osman. The man was punished and Osman forbade the damaging of Byzantine interests. ‘Because commerce was thus conducted justly and the situation progressed well, even the women of the infidels of Bilecik came to the market at Eskişehir, and did their shopping and came and went and carried out their business in safety.’ Although Asıkpaşazade’s chronicle was written much later, in the late fifteenth century, and it is not unlikely that the story is more legend than fact, yet it still indicates something of Ottoman policy in the period and gives an idea of the pragmatic approach to the workings of the market.\footnote{Asıkpaşazade, Chronik, pp. 14–15.}

The official in charge of the market was the muhtesib. Subordinate to the kadı he was responsible for law and order, for controlling trade, and for checking prices and the quality of goods on the market. It was his job to prevent fraud and ensure that the correct prices were charged and true weights and measures used. The issue of weights and measures was an important one. In the beyliks
of Menteşe and Aydın in the fourteenth century three copies of weights and measures were made, one copy each being kept by two officials of the emir and the Venetian consul.140 As other western merchants, in particular the Genoese, were also trading there and in Anatolia in general, it seems likely that a similar system was applied also for them and presumably in places other than these two beyliks, although we lack any evidence of this.

While it is clear that standardisation of some sort applied to weights and measures in the marketplace, it is not at all clear now what such weights and measures represented. The Venetian merchant Zibaldone da Canal complained vociferously about the constant fluctuation of the *modius* in Ayas. No one, he wrote, could say exactly what the measure was because the Armenians increased it and decreased it as they wished.141 That fluctuations occurred is also indicated by the clauses in the Venetian treaties with Menteşe and Aydın which stipulated that another measure, the *shinik*, should be restored to its previous weight.142 The variation of weight according to locality is also reflected in the sale of copper in 1390 to the partnership of Constantino de Groto and Raffaele Capello who bought 16,000 pounds of copper from Süleyman Paşa, the İsfendiyaıı ruler, at the weight of ‘Solimambasa Turchus’.143 A variety of weights and measures were in use in Turkish territories, both local and foreign, such as the *mann*, the *modius* (or *modio* or *moggio*), the *batman* (or *battimano* or *patumani*), the *shinik*, the *botte*, the *braccia*, the *canna*, the caps or *casa* (a container for soap), the *chanela*, the *fardello*, the *kantar*, the *mazo*, the *migliaro*, the *mine*, the *rotol*, the *seruch* and the cloth measure the *staperronos*. Another weight of which the value was far from fixed was the Ottoman *yük*, described by Halil İnalcık as ‘one of the most varied and imprecise measures in the Ottoman empire’.144 According to al-‘Umari there were two chief measures in operation in Anatolia in the earlier fourteenth century, the *mudd* (a unit of capacity) and the *ratl* (a unit of weight).

This problem of fixing value applies equally to the coinage used by the Turks in the period before the conquest of Constantinople, and the coinage, too, presents a confusing picture. The first minting appears to date to the period
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of the Danişmendid Gümüştekin and the Seljuk ruler Mesud. At this point the 
coinage was only copper, and thus for local trade, silver coins not appearing 
until the reign of Kılıç Arslan II,\textsuperscript{145} and gold not until the thirteenth century. The 
predominant coin in the eastern Mediterranean until the fourteenth century 
was the Byzantine gold coin, the \textit{hyperpyron}, which, by the middle of that 
century, had become a money of account. The \textit{hyperpyron} was superseded by 
the new ‘dollar’ currency, the florin, in turn ousted by the Venetian ducat 
which became the dominant currency of the fifteenth century. The common 
coin in use in Turkish territory in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was 
the silver \textit{akçe} (Greek \textit{aspron}, Latin \textit{asper}), the weight of which varied according 
to where it was minted. The copper bought by the Genoese merchants in 1390 
from the İsfendiyar ruler Süleyman Paşa, for example, was sold for 471,000 
\textit{akçes} of Kastamonu.\textsuperscript{146} The Turks also struck copper coins, the \textit{mangır}. The 
lack of uniformity in the monetary system is indicated by al-‘Umari’s account 
according to which each beylik struck its own coinage which did not circulate 
in any other state. According to al-‘Umari the \textit{dirhem} (here meaning the \textit{akçe}) 
was in general worth three-quarters of an Egyptian \textit{dirhem}.\textsuperscript{147} Exchange rates 
apparently fluctuated constantly, at least in the fifteenth century. The Turkish 
\textit{akçe}/\textit{hyperpyron} exchange rate fluctuated daily on the Constantinople money 
market, although remaining in the range of approximately 10.5 to 11 \textit{akçes} per 
\textit{hyperpyron}. In this period the exchange rate between the \textit{akçe} of Samsun and 
the \textit{hyperpyron} was around 19:1, thus making the exchange rate between an 
Ottoman \textit{akçe} and the \textit{akçe} of Samsun around 1:1.73. The \textit{akçe}/ducat rate in 
the same period was around 33:1.\textsuperscript{148} 

Apart from the Turkish coins, there were also counterfeit Venetian ducats 
in circulation, struck in certain of the beyliks. This practice resulted in clashes 
between Venice and the beyliks for the Venetians regarded it as damaging to 
their interests. In 1368 the Venetian senate despatched an ambassador to Aydın 
and in consequence the emir agreed to desist from striking imitation ducats 
and to destroy the mould for minting.\textsuperscript{149} Menteşe was less co-operative for, 
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gigliato, a Latin coin originating in Naples, and there were false akçe, too, in circulation.

While barter remained a method of trade throughout the period, cash payment grew in importance and certainly the Ottomans appear to have been keen to receive payment in this way. In 1441 the Ragusan government was concerned over the need to acquire silver because the Turks required payment for everything in money. Apart from barter and cash, another method of payment seems to have been in use in Turkish territories by the first half of the fifteenth century. This was the bill of exchange. Such bills, which originated in Genoa at the end of the twelfth century, allowed a merchant to buy goods using a bill of exchange, drawn up in one place but settled in another. A merchant could thus buy a bill of exchange in one city by paying a drawer or taker who drew up the bill. The bill of exchange was then sent to another merchant in another town who presented it there to the payer, who acted as the agent for the drawer, and settled the amount. It seems that western merchants started to use them in Ottoman territory, at least in dealings with their own agents there, by the fifteenth century and various examples of letters of credit used by western merchants in Gelibolu and Edirne are listed in the accounts of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer dating from the 1430s.

The markets in which the merchants, both local and foreign, used their coins, bartered or produced their letters of credit were hubs of commercial activity. Markets such as those of Bursa, Konya and Sivas were thriving centres of international trade. Sivas, where east–west and south–north routes converged, was a meeting place of merchants from Iran, Egypt and Syria as well as for Russian and Kitchak traders from the north. Iranian merchants also frequented the markets of Konya, a large and thriving trading town, and of
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those of the 'great and important city' of Bursa where they sold raw silks of Astarabad and Gilan, musk and rhubarb from China and Central Asia, and Chinese porcelain. Here they purchased the imported velvets, brocades and woollens brought by the western merchants who in turn bought spices, cotton, silks and slaves. Ports in the south, such as Alanya and Antalya, a bustling city frequented by a constant flow of travellers, and 'one of the finest . . . and most handsome cities to be seen anywhere as well as most populous and best organized', were linked by sea with Egypt and the west. They were markets for imported European cloth such as scarlattini, camlets, buckram and panni gentili. Well aware of Turkish preferences, the western merchants were careful to bring in cloth in the cuts and colours which the Turks liked, bright scarlets, pistache green and yellows selling well on the Antalya market. The market there also sold spun gold and silver, spices and cotton, bought by European merchants, and timber and wool, exported to Egypt.

Cloth, which sold in the markets throughout Turkish-controlled territory, was one of the main import items brought in both from the west and from Iran and further east as well as from the Mamluk sultanate. Silk fabrics came into Anatolia from Syria, worked silk, fine cloth and linen from Egypt, and raw silk from Iran. Silk arrived from Baghdad, Tabriz, Nishapur and China. A major aspect of the Anatolian cloth market was the imported western cloths, fine woollen fabrics, camlets, taffeta, Florentine cloth, cloths of Chalons, Champagne, Lombardy, Narbonne, Perpignan, scarlet cloth of Mantua, white damascene, silk brocade, Irish saye, wide English cloth, and cloth of Genoa. Western cloth was much prized and was used as gifts for
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visiting Ottoman dignitaries by the Genoese of Pera, the Genoese settlement in Constantinople, in the 1390s.171

With the Turkish conquest of the Aegean coastline and the establishment of beyliks such as Menteşe and Aydın, the ports in these regions, too, became important Turkish markets. Balat, the main port for Menteşe, and Theologos (modern Selçuk), the port of Aydın, served as major import-export ports for the Turkish–European trade, exporting grain and slaves and importing soap, wine and western cloth such as woollens from Florence, cloth of Chalons, Narbonne, Toulouse, Perpignan, and cloths of emerald green, pistache green, azure, turquoise and scarlet.172 Like Antalya, Theologos also had its own requirements for lengths in which cloth was sold;173 and it, too, was a silver market.174 Other beyliks without a coastal outlet profited from the Mediterranean trade and merchant ships sailed up and down the Büyük Menderes (Meander) from Germiyan to the sea.175

Ottoman advance into Europe further extended the Turkish market with the conquest of important towns such as Plovdiv (Filibe) and Edirne, the second capital of the empire and a well-populated and important market frequented by many foreign merchants in the 1430s.176 Goods sold and exported from this region included wool, which was exported from Tekirdağ (Rodosto), Edirne and Gelibolu,177 and slaves. Gelibolu, taken in 1354, became a major Ottoman slave market, exporting slaves to the Mamluk sultanate and westward across the Mediterranean. Slaves were also sold in other Turkish markets in Rumeli (the European section of the Ottoman Empire) such as Üsküp. It was not just in Rumeli that this was a lively trade. Beyliks along the Aegean coast, Karası, Saruhan, Menteşe and Aydın, had major slave markets. Slaves sold in great numbers on the markets of Saruhan and Karası.178 It was in the market of Theologos that Ibn Battuta bought a young Christian girl for 40 dinars in the early 1330s.179 Other major slave markets were found in Bursa and in the ports of the south, in Antalya and Alanya from where they were exported across the Mediterranean.

171 1390.iii.31: ASG, San Giorgio 34 n. 590/1304, f. 25v; 1391.xii.19: ASG, Antico Commune
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Together with grain, alum and worked cloth, slaves, either from the region or traded through it, were the major export items from Turkish territories, supplying the Mamluk sultanate in Egypt and providing labour for the Aegean islands, including Cyprus, Crete and Hospitaller-controlled Rhodes. They were sold on the markets in Constantinople, on the Aegean islands, and in the west, in Genoa and Venice. This was a trade in which the Turks took part not merely as traders, both buying and selling, but also as a commodity, for Turkish slaves, too, were sold in the markets of the eastern Mediterranean, in Constantinople, Crete and Chios, and further west in Venice and Genoa. Turks ‘and similar sea monsters’ appeared in Pisa, and were shipped across the Mediterranean to Spain.

The Turkish market was assured a constant supply of slaves in consequence of the captives taken both in raiding and in larger-scale battles. Umur of Aydın was particularly renowned for his activities at sea, swooping down on the Latin settlements and sailing off with numerous captives. The islands were vulnerable to Turkish attack and Crete lost population to raids from Menteşe. The islands of Andros, Paros and Melos were hit by Ottoman forces under Çali Bey in the early fourteenth century and many of the inhabitants were seized. Constant fighting kept the markets of Karasi supplied and specialist slave merchants frequented these markets, living on this type of trade. Warfare and large-scale battles resulted in a glut on the slave market and a consequent fall in prices. As a result of warfare between the Seljuks and Leon of Lesser Armenia, and the Seljuk capture of the castle of Hancın, prices fell on the market at Kayseri, resulting in an extremely beautiful Armenian slave and her female child selling for 50 dirhems, a bull and cow for two, and five sheep for only one dirhem. The military successes of the Byzantine general Philanthropenos at the end of the thirteenth century resulted in the price of a Turkish slave falling to less than that of a sheep. The battle of Nikopolis in 1396, when the crusader forces were crushed by the Ottoman ruler Bayezid, produced such a

glut that no one in Anatolia or Rumeli was left without a slave. The Mamluk sultan Barquq also did well out of this battle for a Turk sent him a present of 200 Christian captives from the battle. Ottoman advance into the Balkans in the 1430s caused prices to fall to such an extent that beautiful young females sold in lots of three for only 100 akçes and a four-year-old boy for 20 akçes in Üsküp. Aşıkpaşazade himself sold five slaves, whom he had captured, on the market at Üsküp for 900 akçe and other captives in Edirne for 100 akçes for two, and 100 akçes for three slaves.

Apart from the Mediterranean ports, the Black Sea ports, too, were important markets, both in the coastal trade between the Byzantine cities of Trebizond (Trabzon) and Constantinople, and in the trade across the Black Sea from Crimea and Russia. Samsun and Sinop were markets for fur, cloth and copper. Giresun for alum and merchants travelling to and from the lands of the north frequented Kastamonu and ports such as Sinop. These ports were also frequented by western merchants, particularly the Genoese and Venetians who had trading settlements in Crimea, Caffa in the case of the Genoese and Tana for the Venetians. The importance of the Black Sea region for the European merchants is indicated by the presence of Genoese consuls in Sinop and Amasra in the early fifteenth century.

All these markets were an important source of revenue for the Turkish rulers in the form of market taxes and import and export dues. According to Simon de Saint-Quentin, Sivas, for example, brought in a lucrative income for the Seljuk sultan. The Seljuks certainly took a healthy interest in taxation from early on. William of Tyre described how Kılıç Arslan I claimed all the region from Tarsus to the Hellespont. Thus ‘in the sight of Constantinople itself he had his own procurators who exacted duties from those passing by and collected for the use of their master tributes and taxes from all the surrounding country’. In the fifteenth-century chronicle of Aşıkpaşazade Osman is credited with having established a market tax in Karaca Hisar of two akçe for every yük brought and sold in the market. Nothing was paid for goods left unsold. Certain commodities attracted specific charges, such as that levied on wheat in Antalya in the fourteenth century of three aspers per
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moğgio,\(^{197}\) two *aspers* per *modio* on grain exported from Menteşe, one *asper* per *modio* on barley and dried vegetables, three *aspers* per head for horses, oxen and donkeys at two and slaves at ten, and wine which attracted a special levy of 50 *aspers* per *vegetam de Napoli*.\(^{198}\) Levies were charged in Aydın in the first half of the fourteenth century on imported wine per *butam di Napoli* and on imported soap at one florin per *casa*.\(^{199}\) Other taxes included brokerage and weighing charges such as that levied in Antalya at the rate of one *asper* per *moğgio* for wheat.\(^{200}\) Goods were charged for warehousing. That for wheat in Theologos was fixed at 1/5th of a gold florin per month per 100 *moğgio*.\(^{201}\) Warehouse charges could also include transportation from land out to the ship, as was the case in Antalya where the rate of one *asper* per *moğgio* of wheat included transportation.\(^{202}\) In Theologos the rate for hiring animals to transport wheat from the city to the sea, a distance of nine *miglia* by land, was 2.5 gold florins per 100 *moğgio*.\(^{203}\)

A major source of revenue in port cities was customs charges on imports and exports. In Antalya, the Cypriots were charged a rate of 2 per cent.\(^{204}\) In the beylik of Menteşe the Venetians paid an import tax of 2 per cent, and 2 per cent also on exports.\(^{205}\) In Aydın in the early years of the fourteenth century there was no import tax but a levy on exports of 4 per cent, except on wax which paid at a rate of 2 per cent.\(^{206}\) By 1337, Venetians in Aydın were being charged an export tax of 6 per cent on all goods which were measured by the *shinik* (presumably meaning grain and pulses) and 4 per cent on all other commodities, such as alum, slaves, horses and wax, though there was still no import tax.\(^{207}\) By the middle of the century Aydın was imposing an import tax of 2 per cent on the Venetians, and exports were charged at 2 per cent (including alum and wax), or 4 per cent in the case of grain, pulses, slaves and animals.\(^{208}\) These were presumably preferential rates. The Genoese, too, along with the Venetians, Arabs and Greeks, paid preferential customs rates on pulses, barley, millet and other grains under the terms of the 1387 treaty

\(^{197}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.  
\(^{199}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{200}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 58.  
\(^{201}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{202}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{203}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{204}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{206}\) Pegolotti, *Pratica*, p. 56.  
\(^{207}\) Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, 1337A, p. 191; for a discussion of the meaning of the term *seruch* see p. 149.  
concluded with Murad I, though the treaty does not specify what the rates were. In the treaty concluded in 1403 between Süleyman and the Genoese, the Venetians, the Byzantines and the Hospitallers, the rates to be charged are not given, the clause specifying only that they were to be paid according to custom. The rate charged in the 1430s in Gelibolu, Edirne and Samsun was 2 per cent.

A Turkish economic approach

The economy which emerged under the Turks in the four centuries after the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) was one grounded on the land with significant urban economic activity and a highly active international commercial sphere. Beyond describing the various aspects of the economy which developed, it is interesting to consider whether it is possible to discern any common patterns in the way the various Turkish leaders handled their economy that would constitute what might be termed a Turkish economic approach.

It is obvious that economic motivation drove conquest. Apart from the basic desire for booty, Turkish rulers were interested in taking control of economic assets such as mines, port cities, major markets and trade routes. Commercial considerations were behind the Seljuk expedition to Sudak in Crimea and the conquest of Antalya, a major Mediterranean port, by the Seljuk ruler Keyhusrev in 1207. In Ibn Bibi’s account the conquest was the result of merchant complaints. Merchants had protested to the sultan that returning from Egypt they had gone to Antalya where they had been maltreated by the Franks and their goods seized. Economic motivation played a part in the conquest of Constantinople, a city which, although a mere shadow of its former self, was soon to become once more an international centre of enormous commercial wealth, and was behind Mehmed II’s building of Rumeli Hisari, the castle on the European coast of the Straits opposite Anadolu Hisari. The location of Rumeli Hisari allowed Mehmed to control shipping through the Straits and thus to extract customs dues. Any ship attempting not to pay taxes was to be sunk by the efficient and awe-inspiring cannons of Firuz Ağa, the castle’s commander. Ottoman–İsfendiyaroğulları rivalry rested at least in part on
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the rich copper mines of the Black Sea region, round Sinop and Kastamonu, which the Ottomans wished to take over.\(^{216}\) It was also rivalry over metal resources, this time silver and gold mines, which played a part in the struggle between Murad I and Serbia and Bosnia.\(^{217}\) While it is clear that economic motivations drove Turkish conquest, this does not on its own contribute much to a search for a Turkish economic approach, for it is a factor common in essence to all patterns of conquest.

A factor of much greater significance in economic approach, and one which undoubtedly in part accounted for the success of the Turkish conquests, was the Turks’ avoidance of economic disruption. Rather than overturning the economy of the regions which they conquered, the Turks tended to leave much of the economic system untouched, thereby guaranteeing minimum opposition from the conquered population and securing continued revenue for the new rulers. The Ottomans, for example, were keen to keep pre-Ottoman taxes in place, converting many from labour services into cash payments and referring to them as customary dues (rüsum-i urfiyye or tekalif-i urfiyye).\(^{218}\) They made no major changes to the system in operation in the mines in the Balkans when they took over the region.\(^{219}\) Balkan taxes were adopted by the Ottomans and became the ispence, the tax of 25 akçe levied on the Christian population in the Balkans, the word originating perhaps in the Slavic župan, županica or župnica, a poll-tax.\(^{220}\) The timar system whereby land was granted in return for military service was possibly related to the Byzantine landholding unit, the pronoia,\(^{221}\) though it may also have been derived from the Seljuk ikta.\(^{222}\) The division of land, the çift, conforming to the Byzantine zeugarion/jugum, both representing the amount of land which could be ploughed by a pair of oxen.\(^{223}\) Vocabulary, too, came from the Byzantines, such as the word for customs itself, gümrük, from the Greek word komerkion (Latin

\(^{216}\) Neşri, Kitab-ı Cihân-nûmâ, i, pp. 320, 322, ii, pp. 540–2, 574–6; Aşıkpaşazade, Chronik, pp. 65, 79–80, 92–3; Chalkokondyles, Historiarum Libri Decem, p. 185.
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The Ottomans also took much from the Ilkhans, whose coins the early Ottomans imitated and many of whose financial accounting methods they adopted. In the same way as a fluid religious approach and an avoidance of strict orthodoxy smoothed the path of Ottoman conquest and eased the acceptance of new rulers among the Byzantine Orthodox peasantry, so too did the adoption, rather than destruction, of economic systems such as taxation or systems of landholding. The more minimal the element of abrupt change, the less the potential for revolt became. Revenues were not disrupted and the state avoided any need to construct, impose and run new methods of income collection.

As nature abhors a vacuum, so the Turkish economic system in this early period showed an abhorrence of complex structures. This was a further factor in ensuring the success of the new Turkish states and served them well in avoiding instability. A prime example of this is tax farming. Under this system a state auctioned off the collection of a source of revenue, such as customs dues, to an individual or individuals for a lump sum. This ensured the state a fixed income without the need to maintain any form of collection system or to run any risk involved owing to such factors as market fluctuations or, in the case of crops, harvest failure. All such risk in this system fell on the tax farmer who, however, benefited from any successful speculation and reaped the profits from a rising market or boom harvest. This system is often regarded as a backward one for it delivered considerable power into the hands of the tax farmers and abnegated the state’s responsibility in an important sector of its economy. It certainly had considerable drawbacks in the later period when tax farmers became in essence uncontrollable semi-independent magnates whose activities in the eighteenth century were severely damaging to the local populations and the state alike. The negative impact of tax farming in the later period does not mean automatically, however, that its use in the early Turkish states of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was a bad thing. In fact, so long as the state was strong and able to control its tax farmers, preventing abusive over-taxation, the economic security it brought to these young states was considerable, ensuring a secure income without the necessity of complex structures for revenue collection, and even, it could be argued, providing a stimulus to commercial activity, for under this system the tax farmers had every incentive to increase production and, in the case of import and export dues, to encourage trade.

---

Tax farming seems to have been in use among Turkish rulers from early on. In the middle of the thirteenth century control of all alum resources was granted by the Seljuk sultan to two merchants. This resulted, according to William of Rubruck who travelled through Anatolia in this period, in a price 22 per cent higher than it should have been. Whether this was a monopoly or tax farming is unclear from the evidence available, but it seems plausible at least to suggest that tax farming was involved, particularly in view of the high price level. In the following century tax farming was apparently in use in the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın and was applied to such goods as alum, wax and hides, textiles, soap and wine, which were placed ‘in appalto’ or ‘in gabella’, terms which seem to mean a tax farm. Tax farming no doubt existed, too, in the early days of the Ottoman state for there is no reason to presume that Ottoman practice in this respect differed from that in the other beyliks of the period. In any case, it certainly seems to have been in operation in the reign of Murad I when Kara Rüstem Paşa was collecting the 25-akççe slave tax in Gelibolu, and under Murad II when a tax farmer (amaldar) was operating in the same location around 1421.

One interesting aspect of tax farming under the early Turkish rulers was the use they made of Latins. Of the two merchants in control of alum in the mid-thirteenth century, one, Nicolao de Santo-Siro, was Genoese, the other, Benefatio de Molendino, Venetian. It seems that foreigners were used by the Ottomans to collect customs revenue and that during the reigns of Murad I and Bayezid I Latin, probably, Genoese, tax farmers were operating in Ottoman ports in this capacity, as indicated by a Venetian document from 1390. The tax farm of alum was held under Mehmed I by the Genoese Giovanni Adorno, who held the same concession for some time under Mehmed’s successor, Murad II. Another Genoese, Francesco Draperio, a merchant of considerable consequence close to the Ottoman ruler, tax farmed the alum mines under both Murad II and Mehmed II. The Turkish use of Genoese and
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Venetian tax farmers is a further example of the fluidity and pragmatism of early Turkish economic policy. Keen to benefit from a highly lucrative market, Latin merchants were willing to invest money, and expertise, in the Turkish economy and the Turks were willing to benefit from it in what proved to be, particularly in the case of the Ottomans and the Genoese, a symbiotic relationship of mutual benefit.

The Turkish rulers, while adopting much that they found and benefiting from the Latins operating in their territories, were also both active promoters of economic activity and traders in their own right. They did much to promote economic prosperity, essential to the survival and success of their states. They took measures to ensure that land was not left uncultivated, making certain that peasants stayed on the land, either through persuasion or population transfers, an approach they also adopted towards the towns. They secured a vibrant economically active population for their cities. The Seljuk ruler settled rich merchants in the recently conquered ports of Antalya and Sinop to ensure the development of trade.\textsuperscript{233} Kılıç Arslan II, when establishing the town of Aksaray, settled merchants there to maintain its prosperity.\textsuperscript{234} Mehmed II enforced the movement of artisans into the newly conquered city of Constantinople.

Keen to facilitate trade in their territories the Seljuks in particular built caravansaries to provide shelter and security for merchants and their goods. Such caravansaries were set up on the major east–west and north–south international trade routes, bringing goods from Egypt and Syria to Antalya and Alanya and crossing through Konya, Sivas and Erzurum and on to Iran, or to Sinop and Samsun and from there across the Black Sea to Crimea, or running across Anatolia through Konya and Akşehir westwards to Constantinople and Anatolia.\textsuperscript{235} The first caravansary was built in the reign of Kılıç Arslan II near Aksaray.\textsuperscript{236} Others were built in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{237} Such caravansaries were important for the security of both merchants and merchandise, and for providing everything a traveller might need: a place to sleep, food, depots for goods, stables, fodder for their animals, hamams, mescids, hospitals, even blacksmiths and cobblers. They were staffed by officials who dealt with the

\textsuperscript{233} Osman Turan, ‘Selçuk Kervansarayları’, \textit{Belleten} 10, 39 (1946), 473.
\textsuperscript{234} Turan, ‘Selçuk Kervansarayları’, 476.
\textsuperscript{236} Turan, ‘Selçuk Kervansarayları’, p. 476. \textsuperscript{237} See chapter 8 in this volume.
administration and with the income and expenditure. Apart from ensuring the economic activity of major routes and towns, caravansaries also made the region round them a centre of trade. Zaviyes and hanekahs (dervish lodges), which were so abundant when Ibn Battuta travelled through Anatolia, served in many ways as caravansarys did for travellers, though on a smaller scale. In the towns the Turkish rulers built bedestans and hans (caravansaries), commercial buildings in which merchants lived, traded and stored their goods, such as the Bey Han of Orhan, or Geyve Han and İpek Han built by Mehmed I, and the bedestan with shops round it built by Mehmed I in Edirne.

The Turks were themselves active merchants, trading not just within their own territories but also within the Byzantine Empire, in Constantinople, in Syria and in the Black Sea and Crimea, as they did under the Seljuks and on the islands in the Aegean. At the end of the twelfth century merchants from Konya were trading in Constantinople. In 1414 a Turk, Sipahi Bayezid, was trading grain with Domenico Balbi on Chios, a trade in which Cüneyd Bey, the then ruler of Aydın, was also involved as he too sold grain to Chios. Turks were also apparently trading copper there in this period. Bayezid I’s demand for the right to sell slaves in Rhodes without any restrictions indicates that Turks were trading slaves there in the late fourteenth century. It was Bayezid who insisted on the establishment of a kadı in Constantinople to protect the interests of Turkish merchants trading there. That Turkish merchants were active in Pera in this period is supported by the statement issued by the Genoese authorities in 1402 urging any Turks with complaints against former Genoese

---
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officials to come forward as part of the investigation into the conduct of Ettore di Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano who were being tried for corruption.\footnote{250} There were very close relations between the Turks and the Genoese of Pera, according to Bertrand de la Broqui`ere, who remarked that the Turks were quite at home there.\footnote{251} Turks were also trading in Syria in the same period, for Bertrand de la Broqui`ere travelled with four Turkish merchants from Hama to Aleppo, and in Constantinople,\footnote{252} and there were Turks in Constantinople at the time when Mehmed II was building Rumeli Hisar.\footnote{253}

As Bayezid’s actions over a \textit{kadi} in Constantinople show, Turkish rulers took care to protect their merchants. When merchants complained to Alaeddin Keykubad about losses they had sustained because of attacks in the Caspian Sea, in Lesser Armenia and at sea when attacked by the Franks (an incident in which the merchant concerned was enslaved), the sultan was upset and ordered them compensated for their losses, announcing that it was necessary to send troops against those who harmed the merchants of the land.\footnote{254} Keyhusrev took the same approach. In response to Alexios Angelos’s imprisonment of Turkish merchants from Konya and the seizure of their goods, which were then redistributed to others, he launched a surprise attack on the towns of Karia and Tantalos, along the Meander river (B"uy"uk Menderes), enslaving all those ‘who were in the prime of life’, and plundering many other cities before moving on into Phrygia.\footnote{255} It was again the behaviour of the Byzantine emperor Alexios Angelos which prompted the Seljuk sultan R"ukneddin into action in order to protect Turkish merchants from Byzantine aggression. Constantine Frangopoulos, under instructions from the emperor, spent several months attacking merchantmen in the Black Sea with his fleet of six triremes. Seizing merchants’ goods and money, he killed some and stripped others, leaving them ‘as naked as a pestle’.\footnote{256} Making their way to Constantinople, the surviving merchants appealed to an uninterested emperor. The merchants of Konya then turned to R"ukneddin who responded by sending envoys to the emperor and demanding the return of the merchants’ monies. An agreement was reached
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and Rükneddin received 50 minae of silver as compensation for the losses in addition to the annual tribute. Turkish rulers were also concerned to protect their agents. Murad I’s desire to protect his own interests and those of his commercial agent, Giovanni Demerode, acting for him in Constantinople, who had been over-taxed by Byzantine officials, is evident in the clauses of the treaty between him and the Genoese enacted in June 1387.

As has been noted earlier, there was a particularly close relationship between the Ottomans and the Genoese, the Ottoman rulers Orhan and Murad I employing Genoese agents, for example, Orhan using Filippo Demerode and Bonifacio da Sori, and Murad Filippo’s brother Giovanni. This attitude, evident also in the level of diplomatic to-ing and fro-ing between the Genoese in Pera and the Ottoman court in the 1390s, did not just apply to the Ottomans and the Genoese for all Turkish rulers were keen to attract foreign merchants, European, Iranian or Mamluk, into their domains. It was economic interests which largely drove their diplomatic relations, and treaties between the Turks and various western states were in essence commercial agreements. The Seljuk treaties with Venice and those concluded by the beyliks of Menteşe and Aydın with Venice between 1331 and 1414 consisted largely of clauses concerning rates and trading practices, as did that between Aydın and the Santa Unio in 1348. The treaty drawn up between the Ottomans and the Genoese in 1387 was again very much a commercial agreement. Other Ottoman–Genoese treaties, that enacted between Orhan and the doge in the winter of 1351–2 and that negotiated with Bayezid I in 1389, are apparently no longer extant, but can be presumed also to have been commercial in nature. The beylik of Saruhan concluded a treaty with the Genoese Giovanni Giustiniano and Francesco Giustiniano, partners in the Maona of Chios, probably in the

257 Choniates, Annals, p. 290.
261 References to such contacts appear in the account books of the Genoese comune of Pera; ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1304; ASG, Antico Commune 22.
262 1387.vi.8: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2729. doc. 26; Fleet, ‘Treaty’.
263 1358.xi.20: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, f. 304v; Belgrano, ‘Documenti’, no. 21, p. 129; Kantakouzenos, Ioannes Kantakouzenos, Historiarum libri IV, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1828–32), iii, p. 288; Gregoras, Historia, iii, p. 84.
late 1340s, and Aydın with Genoa in 1351. The Ottomans also concluded treaties with the Venetians, the Venetian ambassador Daniel Corner arriving to negotiate a treaty with Murad I in 1387 and Francesco Querini with Bayezid I in 1390.

Such treaties offered various commercial concessions and inducements to the western traders who represented considerable profits for the state from extensive import and export trade, customs revenues and other related taxes. Reduced customs rates were charged for favoured ‘nations’, the Seljuks granting the Venetians a reduced customs tax of 2 per cent and the Ottomans giving a concessionary rate to the Genoese, Venetians and Arab merchants in 1387. Apart from tax reductions, other concessions were also granted such as exemption from customs charges on grain, precious stones, gold and silver conceded to the Venetians under the Seljuk–Venetian treaty of 1220. In the early fourteenth century merchants paid no import duties in Altoluogo (except on soap and wine). The right of foreign merchants to trade safely in Turkish territory was safeguarded. On occasion the foreign trading community was given land, or a church, the church of S. Nicola being given to the Venetians by the emir of Menteşe in 1337, for example. The Venetian and Genoese trading communities were granted extra-territorial legal privileges in Turkish territory for their affairs were handled by their own consuls. The Venetians had consuls in Aydın from 1337 and in Menteşe from possibly as early as 1318. Such consuls had considerable powers both in cases involving only their own nationals, in which they had the right to impose punishment up to and including the death penalty, and in cases involving a Turkish plaintiff or a Turkish defendant.

Commercial concessions were by no means restricted to the Turkish side in an unequal partnership, for just as the presence of merchants was important to Turkish rulers, so the Turkish territories were important to the

---

foreign traders for whom they represented a hugely important commercial prospect. The European states were equally anxious to negotiate treaties. The Genoese certainly were. Simon Bocanegra, the doge of Genoa, regarded the treaty with Orhan concluded in the winter of 1351–2, for example, as most advantageous to Genoese interests, and it is clear that the Genoese government was keen to maintain good relations with Aydın in the same period.

Just as the Turkish rulers were ready to offer concessions to attract merchants into their territories, so, too, were the western states willing to make concessions in order to gain access to the lucrative Turkish market. They were prepared to pay tribute, as the Genoese of New Phokaea (Foça) did to Saruhan in return for freedom to trade. They were also ready to grant tax concessions in their own territories. When Orhan wrote in March 1356 to the Genoese requesting tax concessions for his agents, Filippo Demerode and Bonifacio da Sori, the Genoese government agreed despite the damage this represented to Genoese interests. In his letter to the Genoese authorities in Pera instructing them to grant these concessions, the locumtenente noted drily, 'he who does not suffer in giving, does not receive that which he wishes'. In this case the suffering was worth the anticipated return. The 1387 Ottoman–Genoese treaty gave Turkish merchants in Pera exemption from payment of commercium.

Aware of their economic strength, the Turks controlled and manipulated the market, fixed prices, banned exports and imposed monopolies. In 1384 the Venetians were forced to negotiate the price of alum, which they wished to bring down. Wine was made a monopoly item by the rulers of Aydın and Menteşe. The Ottomans banned the export of key commodities, such as grain, the export of which was forbidden by Bayezid I in 1390. In the

276 1356.iii.21: ASG, San Giorgio Manoscritti Membranacei IV, f. 304r.
277 1351.v.26: ASG, Archivio Segreto 2727, doc. 43, f. 1v. The document refers to the ruler of Aydın’s known goodwill towards the Genoese, to whom he had offered all possible help in his letters.
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aftermath of King Peter of Cyprus's attack on Alexandria in 1365, the export of horses to the Hospitallers was banned.\textsuperscript{284} Aydın imposed a ban on the export of timber, cereals and horses, forcing the Venetians to send an ambassador in 1400 to investigate the possibilities of this prohibition being removed.\textsuperscript{285} Professor İnalcık has argued that the Ottoman policy of prohibiting the export of grain and other raw materials, such as cotton, raw wool and hides, ‘was pursued with the purpose of preventing shortages in necessities for the masses’.\textsuperscript{286} This does not, however, seem to be the case here, at least with Bayezid’s ban in 1390 or that on grain export in 1400, but is more related to the considerable power of the Ottomans at this point when they were doing particularly well and Bayezid’s siege of Constantinople had forced up the price of grain.\textsuperscript{287} Nor does it appear to be related to any great dearth in the region, for it seems that at least in 1392 there was no problem with the harvests.\textsuperscript{288} It certainly does not seem to be the case for the export of horses, and in the example of the Hospitallers is politically motivated. There was also some form of control over the export of alum for in 1384 Venice instructed its ambassador to Murad I to try and ensure that Venetian merchants could load and export the commodity from Ottoman territory.\textsuperscript{289}

In conclusion, therefore, it can be argued that there was a Turkish economic approach which was essentially pragmatic and laissez-faire, motivated by a desire to avoid economic disruption, a willingness to adopt rather than change economic systems which were already in place, and an avoidance of complex structures, as well as a proactive engagement involving active promotion of economic development, both rural and urban, protection of merchants, both local and foreign, cultivation of commercial relations, in particular with the west, and manipulation of the market.

By the early fourteenth century, the land of Anatolia into which the Turks had first moved towards the end of the eleventh century was described by Ibn Battuta in glowing terms: ‘This country called Bilad al-Rum [i.e. Anatolia] is
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one of the finest regions in the world, in it God has brought together the good things dispersed through other lands. Its inhabitants are the comeliest of men in form, the cleanest in dress, the most delicious in food, and the kindliest of God’s creatures’. By 1453 the Ottoman Empire had emerged as one of the great commercial empires of the period, a Mediterranean power with an economy of enormous power and wealth.

290 Ibn Battuta, Travels, p. 415.
The century and a half between the disappearance of the Seljuk dynasty in Anatolia at the beginning of the fourteenth century and the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453 is a period in which Turkish art and architecture underwent a significant transformation. It is a time when, on the one hand, forms, functions, vocabularies and techniques which defined Rum Seljuk art and architecture continued to flourish in the towns of the central and eastern Anatolia, while on the other, striking departures from that tradition, drawing on diverse sources, including late Byzantine, Timurid and Mamluk art, manifest themselves, in particular in the Turkish border lands of western Asia Minor. In part, no doubt, the artistic ferment and change of the period are related to the decentralisation of political authority that characterises Anatolia throughout the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Because of this political division, the centralised patronage of the Rum Seljuks, which had produced a more or less homogeneous period style in the thirteenth century, was replaced by a patronage dispersed throughout a constellation of small principalities, the rulers of which often sought to enhance their prestige and legitimacy through ambitious building programmes. The result, not surprisingly, was the proliferation of regional centres of architectural activity, and with this the emergence of a number of more or less distinctive regional styles.

The Turkish conquest of the uc, the southern and western borderlands of Anatolia in which, through careful cultivation of resources, the Laskarids had been able to revive Byzantine administration and culture during the time of the Nicaean Empire, gave rise to sometimes striking syncretisms of Seljuk and Byzantine traditions. With regard to the visual arts, these manifested themselves not only in terms of technique, but on occasion, in terms of formal and ornamental vocabularies as well. At the same time, Mamluk influence can be felt in southern Anatolia in decorative vocabularies and techniques as well as occasionally in planning, while in the early years of the fifteenth century, the cultural splendours of Timurid Samarkand and Herat were reflected in the
architecture and decorative arts of Bursa and Edirne, where Iranian craftsmen laboured in the service of the Ottoman sultans. In time this interchange gave birth to a new imperial Turkish art and architecture, one consciously formulated and promoted by Sultan Mehmed II and made manifest in the Ottoman monuments and decorative arts of the decades following the conquest of Constantinople in 1453.

Among the decorative arts it is ceramics, carpets and woodworking that are best represented. A scattering of textiles and objects in metal plus a handful of illuminated and illustrated manuscripts are known as well, but serve only to hint at the existence of œuvres that are today largely lost. Architecture, on the other hand, is documented by an extensive corpus of monuments which survive not only in the old Seljuk heartland of central Anatolia, but in even greater numbers in what were the Turkoman principalities of the west Anatolian marches and in the south-eastern Balkans. While aspects of this material have been dealt with in a fairly extensive body of literature, it has yet to form in and of itself the subject of a systematic independent study.

Centres of architectural activity and town planning

The gradual decay of the Seljuk sultanate of Konya following the Mongol victory at Kösedağ in 1243, the imposition of the Mongol protectorate over central and eastern Anatolia and the breakdown of central authority over the Turkoman beys of the march lands of southern and western Anatolia gave rise, beginning in the latter years of the thirteenth century, to a series of more or less ephemeral principalities (beyliks) in the western Taurus, the Aegean hinterland and the Black Sea littoral. Already in the 1250s the Karamanids make their appearance in Issuria and a decade or two later the Eşrefoğlu are mentioned in the region of Beyşehir. In western Anatolia, Germiyan centred on Kütahya began severing its links with the Seljuks after the execution of Sultan Mesud III in 1283, while along the coasts there gradually came into existence a series of Turkoman principalities – Hamid, Teke, Menteşe, Aydin, Karasi, Osman, Candar – some of them on territories which had slipped from Seljuk control, others in areas newly carved out of the Byzantine sphere. In central and eastern Anatolia, the enfeeblement and eventual extinction of the Seljuk sultanate was paralleled by the emergence of an increasingly direct Ilkhanid administration and, after the death of Abu Sa‘īd Khudabanda in 1335, by the creation on the part of the last Mongol governor, Eretna, of an independent state based on Kayseri, Sivas and Tokat. Here Seljuk-Mongol traditions enjoyed a considerable continuity down to the end of the fourteenth
century. The far eastern region of Anatolia, on the other hand, was a zone of powerfully conflicting ambitions and fluid frontiers, the major players in which were rival Turkoman confederations – the Dulgadıro˘glu, Karakoyunlu and Akkoyunlu – and behind them competing outside powers such as the Jalayrdis, the Mamluks and later the Ottomans.

It should come as no surprise that in this fragmented political environment, with its complex and shifting mosaic of competing principalities, architectural styles, planning and patronage should, from region to region, have manifested quite varied tendencies. It is further apparent that patronage and building activities were intimately linked to the shifting economic and political fortunes of the principalities and regions with which they were associated. Epigraphy suggests that by the last two decades of the thirteenth century architectural activity had come virtually to a halt in the towns of the old Seljuk heartland such as Konya, Kayseri and Sivas and that this hiatus continued into the early decades of the fourteenth century, when the region was under direct Ilkhanid rule.¹ The fortress town of Ni˘gde at the northern end of the Taurus passes, on the other hand, was enriched by a pair of quite outstanding monuments in the early fourteenth century, a mosque built by the Mongol emir Sungur Bey and the tomb of Hüdavend Hatun, a daughter of the Seljuk sultan Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan IV, who was in all likelihood married to a local Mongol emir. Likewise Tokat and Amasya seem to have enjoyed moments of prosperity under Ilkhanid rule, for epigraphy commemorates the foundation of a mosque, a tekke (dervish lodge) and a pair of tombs in the former and the construction of a monumental hospital as well as a pair of mosques in the latter, while to the east, in Erzurum, the first two decades of the fourteenth century witnessed the construction of several noteworthy monuments, most outstandingly Yakutiye Medrese of 710/1310.² One is left, then, with the impression of impoverishment and exhaustion in the towns of the old Seljuk heartland, contrasting with a perhaps modest prosperity in the towns along the trade route to Tabriz.

¹ For construction and restoration texts and epitaphs which can be used to date tombs in Konya, see Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe (Cairo, 1931) [henceforth RCEA], nos. 4826, 4861, 4862, 4905, 4906; for Kayseri, RCEA, 4840; for Sivas, RCEA, 5152, 5489.
² See for Ni˘gde, RCEA, 5308 (which mentions the name of Abu Sa’id) and 5693; for Tokat, RCEA, 4789, 4903, 4999, 4960, 5114, 5178, 5326, 5390. For the construction text of the Bimarhane of Amasya (giving the names of the Ilkhan Öljeytu and his spouse Yıldız Hatun), see RCEA, 5238; for other Amasya inscriptions, RCEA, 5461, 5611. For the construction text and vakfiye of the Yakutiye Medrese of Erzurum, which again mention Öljeytu and state that it was founded during his reign using the surplus revenues of Sultan Ghazan and Bulghan Hatun, see RCEA, 5276, 5277; for lesser monuments in Erzurum, see RCEA, 5239, 5350.
While architectural activity was at a low ebb in the zone of direct Mongol control, new centres of patronage began to appear in the Turkoman principalities of the western Taurus and the Aegean hinterland. Already at the end of the thirteenth century the Karamanoğlu and Eşrefoğlu were engaged in ambitious building programmes in the main towns of their newly independent states. At Beyshehir in 687/1288 the Eşrefoğlu emir Seyfeddin Süleyman renovated the town walls, no doubt in part to assert his independence, although the inscription on his citadel gate still recognises the suzerainty of the Seljuk sultan Gıyaseddin Mesud II, and this was followed a decade later by the construction of a royal mosque and tomb complex. Meanwhile, in the Taurus uplands, a dynastic mausoleum was built in the village of Balkasun by Karamanoğlu Mahmud Bey for his father, Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, and a few years later Mahmud Bey founded a large if unpretentious dynastic mosque in his capital at Ermenak. Within a generation, the centre of Karamanid architectural activity had shifted to the north, to what had become their new capital, Larende (Karaman), where throughout the remainder of the fourteenth and much of the fifteenth century a succession of important monuments were erected, including the Emir Musa Paşa Medresesi (c.1350), the Mader-i Mevlana Zaviyesi (772/1370), the Hatuniye Medresesi (783/1381–2), the tomb of Karamanoğlu Alaeddin Bey (c.1388), the Halil Efendi Sultan complex (812/1409–10) and the İbrahim Bey İmaret (836/1432). Secondary centres of Karamanid architectural activity developed in the other important towns of the principality, including Konya, Niğde, Akşehir, Mut and Ereğli.3

In south-western Anatolia and along the Black Sea shore, as Germiyan and Hamid broke their links to the Seljuks in the last decades of the thirteenth century, and, as a series of new principalities – Menteşe, Aydın, Saruhan, Karası, İsfendiyar – came into existence in what had been Byzantine territory, fresh architectural activity manifested itself in the key towns of these states. Thus, in Pisidia and Pamphylia, in the beylik of Hamid, Eğirdir, Korkudeli and Antalya became noteworthy centres of building activity, while in the principality of

3 For the Beyshehir inscriptions, see RCEA, 4907, 5037, 5082, 5083, 5140; for the inscription of the Balkasun tomb, which contains the graves of Mahmud Bey and Mehmed Bey in addition to that of Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, see RCEA, 4489 (in which the Seljuk sultan Mesud II ibn Keykavus is mentioned as sovereign, indicating at least nominal Karamanid vassalage) and RCEA, 5154. For the Larende (Karaman) monuments, see RCEA, 4817, 5347, 772–010, 772–011, 783–014, and İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, Âbudileri ve Kitâbeleri ile Karaman Tarihi (Istanbul, 1969); for Karamanid Konya, RCEA, 5618 and Mehmet Onder, Mevleva Şehri Konya (Ankara, 1971), pp. 209, 211, 212, 215, 218–9, 222, 311; for Niğde, see Albert Gabriel, Monuments turcs d’Anatolie, 2 vols. (Paris, 1932–4) [henceforth MTA], 1: Kayseri – Niğde, pp. 133, 141, 148, 149; for Akşehir, RCEA, 5713, 5729; for Mut, see Mehlika Arel, ‘Mut’taki Karamanoğulları Devri Eserleri’, Vakiflar Dergisi 5 (1962), 241–50.
Geremiyan, the prosperity of Kütahya is attested by the construction of the Vacidiye Medrese in the early years of the fourteenth century and later by the founding of a series of mosques – the Kurşunlu Camii, the Balıklı Cami, the Kale-i Bala Camii, the Çatal Mescid – in the reign of Süleyman Şah. In Caria, on the south-west coast of Anatolia, the Turkoman of Menteşe, already present in that country as early as the 1260s, embellished their capitals, Milas and the nearby Peçin, with a series of fine buildings. Ibn Battuta describes them as among the finest and most extensive cities of Rum and singles out Menteşeoglu Orhan Bey’s new palace in Peçin, its congregational mosque and other buildings for special mention.

Further north in the emirate of Aydın, the towns of Birgi, Tire and Ayaсолuk (Ephesus) became centres of architectural activity in the fourteenth century. Birgi, which was occupied by Gazi Mehmed Bey in 707/1307–8, was embellished with his state mosque – the Ulu Cami (712/1312–13) – his medrese (school) and a series of dynastic tombs including those of Mehmed Bey himself (734/1334), of his sons Gazi Umur Paşa and İsa Bey, and of his sister Sultan Şah Hatun (710/1310). In Tire, which is described by Ibn Battuta as being a fine town of streams and gardens, notable monuments included the now ruined mosque of İsa Bey’s daughter Hafsa Hatun (mid-fourteenth century), the Aydınoğlu Mehmed Bey Camii (c.727/1326–7) and the tomb of Süleyman Şah ibn Gazi Mehmed Bey (750/1349–50), who was appointed governor of Tire by his father. Ayasoluk, which suffered considerable decline in the last period of Byzantine rule, underwent a striking revival under the beys of Aydın. Ibn Battuta states that it had fifteen gates and that a large church (presumably the Church of St John) had been converted into the town’s congregational mosque. The importance of the town is reflected in an even more substantial way by the congregational mosque (776/1375) built by İsa b. Mehmed Bey, one of the most impressive monuments of the period of the emirates to survive in western Anatolia.


6 A full list of the monuments of the principality as attested by inscriptions and by archival documents is given in Himmet Akın, Aydınoğulları Tarihi Hakkinda bir Araştırmalı (Ankara, 1968), pp. 216–20; see also N. Emire, ‘Aydınoğulları ve Eserleri’, Arkitekt 10–12 (1973), 307–20. Of the monuments of Birgi, the tombs of Gazi Umur Paşa and İsa Bey are no longer
The beys of the principality of Saruhan in the rich Gediz plain embellished their capital, Manisa, in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, to which its İlyas Bey Mescidi (764/1363), the far more impressive Ulu Cami complex (778/1376) including a mosque, a medrese and the tomb of Saruhanoğlu İshak Bey, and a no longer extant zaviye, the Mevlevihane (770/1368–9) on the slopes of Mount Sipylus, all date. That the town continued to retain its importance into Ottoman times is clear from the fact that it was the residence of several Ottoman princes during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.\(^7\)

The emirs of the short-lived principality of Karası made Balıkesir and Bergama their capitals, but little remains in either from the period of their independence. Indeed, Ibn Battuta describes Bergama as a city in ruin, and notes that although Balıkesir was a populous city with pleasant bazaars, there was no congregational mosque for Friday prayers, one having been begun, but left unfinished at the time of his visit.\(^8\) Along the Black Sea coast, however, the principality of İsfendiyar, centred on the towns of Kastamonu and Sinop, was a region of rather more notable building activity. A number of important fourteenth-century foundations survive in Kastamonu and in nearby villages, including the İbni Neccar Camii (754/1353), the Halil Bey Camii (765/1363–4) of Kemah Köyü and the Mahmud Bey Camii (768/1366–7) of Kasaba Köyü. Although construction seems to have petered out in the last decades of the fourteenth century, there appears to have been a revival of activity after Timur’s restoration of the principality in the early fifteenth century. The most impressive monuments of this late period are the İsmail Bey complex, consisting of a mosque, tomb (858/1454), medrese, imaret (soup kitchen), han (caravansary) and hamam, and the İsmail Bey Camii (855/1451) in the nearby Kurei Hadit Köyü. Sinop, further to the east along the Black Sea coast, served throughout the period as an important commercial and naval base. Annexed by İsfendiyar in 1322, its importance is attested by the construction of a series of mosques – the Fatih Baba Mescidi (740/1339–40), Aslan Camii (752/1351–2), Kadi Camii


Howard Crane

In central Anatolia, it was the emir Eretna and his descendants who were the successors of the Ilkhanids after the death of Abu Sa’id Khudabanda. Curiously, despite the size of their principality and their well-known support of learning and of literature, the building activities of the beys of Eretna including Kadi Burhaneddin appear to have been only moderately ambitious. In part this appearance may be due to the loss of inscriptions and vakfiyes (endowment deeds of a vakıf, a pious foundation), although it may also reflect the modest prosperity of the central Anatolian region in the fourteenth century as compared with conditions a century earlier. Nonetheless, a number of important and unusual monuments are found in the main cities of the principality, Kayseri and Sivas, as well as in some of its secondary towns such as Kirşehir and Ürgüp. Among the most notable are the tomb of Eretna Bey’s eldest son, Şeyh Hasan, known as the Güdürk Minare (748/1347) in Sivas, the so-called Köşkü Medresesi (740/1339) in Kayseri and the mosque complex of Taşkin Paşa in Damsa Köyü near Ürgüp. Of the towns themselves, little remains in the way of contemporary accounts, although Mustaufi describes Kayseri as a great city defended by a citadel of squared masonry and Ibn Battuta states that it was one of the chief cities of this land and the residence of one of the hatuns of Emir Alaeddin Eretna. As to Sivas, it is described by Ibn Battuta as the largest of the cities possessed by the Ilkhan in Rum and the residence of his emirs and functionaries. He states that it had wide streets and fine buildings, the most outstanding being a hospice for descendants of the Prophet (dar al-siyâda) founded by Ghazan Han. Although Erzincan enjoyed considerable prosperity and importance during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, virtually nothing remains of the monuments of that period.

 Nonetheless, Mustaufı noted its walls were built of squared masonry, and Clavijo, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, states that while it was not particularly large, it was very populous and possessed many fine streets and beautiful mosques. Located on a plain near the Euphrates, he found it to be surrounded by many towns and fruit gardens and enclosed by walls and towers of stone.  

Erzurum seems to have suffered an extended period of instability following the collapse of the Ilkhanid state. Occupied successively by the Mongol emir Çobanoğlu Şeyh Hasan (1340), Mehmed Bey, the son of Eretna (1360), the Karakoyunlu Turkomans (1385) and the Akkoyunlu (1465), its existence was apparently too troubled for there to develop any strong tradition of local architectural patronage. Already in the 1330s, Ibn Battuta notes that although of vast extent, the city was largely in ruins in consequence of factional feuds between the Turkomans. However, seventy years later, Calvijo states that while it was formerly the largest and richest city in this country, in his time it was no longer very populous. Indeed, no significant architectural monuments survive in Erzurum from the period following the collapse of the Ilkhans. And east Anatolia as a whole seems to have sunk into considerable disorder, as rival Mongol emirs, Turkoman tribal confederations and outside powers struggled for pre-eminence. The Karakoyunlu Turkomans, who sprang from the region between lakes Van and Urmia, but in time, came to establish their capital at Tabriz, left a scattering of monuments in towns such as Ahlat and Erciṣ, but their most ambitious building activities were reserved for regions outside east Anatolia. Their rivals, the Akkoyunlu, whose origins lay east of Erzincan in the region of Bayburt, Palu and Ergani, were in time able to establish themselves in Diyarbakur and Mardin as well as in western Iran. Their most important building activities, however, date to the second half of the fifteenth century. As to the Dulgadroğlu, who ruled the region from Maraş to Malatya in the eastern Taurus, although Elbistan became their capital in 1339, the town was destroyed by Timur in 1400 and again by the

---

10 For construction and funerary texts of Kayseri in the period of the principality of Eretna, see RCEA, 5812, 6017, 6078, 6128, 6163; for Sivas, RCEA, 6057; also Kemal Göde, Eratnahiler (1327–1381) (Ankara, 1994), pp. 157–62. For the monuments of Kayseri, see Albert Gabriel, MTA, i, pp. 3–100. Ibn Battuta’s description is found in Travels, ii, pp. 433–4; for Mustaufı, see Mustaufı, Geographical, p. 98. Concerning Sivas, see Ibn Battuta, Travels, ii, pp. 434–5; Mustaufı, Geographical, p. 95. As regards Erzincan, see Mustaufı, Geographical, p. 95; Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, AD 1403–6, tr. Clements R. Markham (London, 1859), pp. 72–3; repeated devastation caused by earthquakes has destroyed most of the early monuments of Erzincan and its environs.
Safavid Shah Isma’il in 1507, so that little remains from the period of their ascendancy.\footnote{For south-east Anatolia, see Albert Gabriel, \textit{Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale} (Paris, 1940); also for Mardin, Ara Altun, \textit{Mardin’de Türk Devri Mimarisı} (İstanbul, 1971); for Diyarbakır, Metin Sözen, \textit{Diyarbakır’da Türk Mimarisı} (İstanbul, 1971); also Sözen, \textit{Anadolu’da Akkoyunlu Mimarisı} (İstanbul, 1981).}

For the later development of Turkish art and architecture it was to be the Ottoman principality in north-west Anatolia that was to be of particular significance. In the earliest period its key centres were Bursa, conquered by Orhan Gazi in 1326, and İznik, occupied a few years later. By the early fifteenth century, however, other Anatolian towns such as Amasya and Kütahya were also becoming notable foci of Ottoman building activity, while in the Balkans, the conquest of Gelibolu (1354), Dimetoka (1359), Edirne (1361) and Filibe (1363–4) was followed by significant building programmes in those towns as well.

In contrast to most Turkish towns in Anatolia, whose physical appearances and patterns of growth in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries can only vaguely be discerned from scattered buildings and fragmentary travellers’ descriptions, the form and evolution of early Ottoman Bursa, and to a lesser extent Edirne, can be reconstructed with some assurance, using epigraphy, standing architectural monuments, documentary sources such as vakfiye and early Ottoman historical accounts including Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri. From sources such as these, it is clear that while some urban spaces, notably the religious and social complexes (külliye), which were such an outstanding feature of Anatolian Turkish architecture, were the subject of careful planning, as a whole Ottoman towns were the products of a rather haphazard evolution. Thus, for example, while in Bursa or Edirne külliye such as the Yıldırım complex, the Yeşil complex and the two Muradiye complexes were consciously built to function as the social and religious foci of new urban districts, the evolution of the surrounding neighbourhoods was far more organic.

Among Ottoman towns it is the evolution of Bursa that is best documented. From available sources it appears that at the time of Orhan Gazi’s conquest of the town, it was a centre of only secondary importance with its Greek population restricted to the old Byzantine citadel or Hisar (Fig. 8.1). Shortly thereafter, the Greek residents were forced to move beyond the walls and new Turkish inhabitants were settled within the citadel. Almost immediately, efforts were made to provide the new inhabitants with a Muslim architectural and institutional infrastructure. Indeed, of the twelve mosques built in Bursa during Orhan’s reign concerning which we have data, fully seven were located inside the Hisar, the earliest being the no longer extant İl Eri Oğlu Ahmed
Figure 8.1 Plan of Bursa showing expansion of city in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (based on Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, p. 9)
Bey Mescidi adjoining the Bey Sarayı, built according to Neşri immediately following the conquest. The Alaeddin Bey Camii can be dated by its vakfiye to 733/1332–3 and the Orhan Gazi Camii can be dated by its inscription, which is all that survives from it, to 738/1337–8. Documentation exists as well for the construction of a pair of medreses in the Hisar, plus several bathhouses (hamams). Finally, a tomb was built in the north of the Hisar for Orhan’s father, Osman Gazi, who had originally been buried in Söğüt, and the adjoining residence of the Greek tekfur or governor was rebuilt as the Bey Sarayı.

Simultaneous with this transformation of the Hisar, an energetic effort was made to develop a commercial district in the eastern suburbs of Bursa. It was here, for example, that Orhan Gazi built a social-religious complex (740/1339–40), including a mosque, medrese, mekteb (school) and imaret-zaviye. In addition, several commercial buildings were erected, most notably Orhan Gazi’s Emir Hanı (or Eski Bezzazistan) and the Bezir Hanı of Lala Şahin Paşa.

This process of expansion beyond the walls of the Hisar continued in the reign of Murad I, with the construction of the sultan’s Kapan Hanı in the eastern commercial district and of the Koca Naib Camii just outside the Kaplıca Kapısı to the west of the Hisar. However, Murad’s most significant foundations were located in the Hisar itself, where he built the congregational Şehadet Camii, and in the rather remote suburb of Çekirge, two kilometres west of the citadel, where, beginning in 767/1366, he built a major complex including a mosque, medrese, imaret, hamam and tomb (türbe). Yıldırım Bayezid’s efforts were concentrated to the east of the Hisar. He founded the Ulu Cami in the commercial quarter and the great Yıldırım complex beyond the Gök Dere, some two kilometres east of the Hisar in an area which in the late fourteenth century must still have been well beyond the city’s limits. Development seems to have occurred in this period as well in the area to the north-east of the commercial quarter known as At Pazarı, in Pınar Başı, the district to the south-east of the Hisar, and in Çınar Önü to the west of the citadel.

Although Bursa was sacked and burned by a contingent of Timur’s army following the defeat of Bayezid I at Ankara in 1402, the city recovered during the reign of Çelebi Mehmed, when, with the construction of the Yeşil complex, it was extended in a definitive way to the east of the Gök Dere. Bursa’s most striking growth in this period occurred during the prosperous reign of Murad II, when new districts were endowed and named after Sultan Murad, Fazlullah Paşa, Hacı İvaz Paşa, Hasan Paşa, Umur Bey, Cebec-Ali Bey, Şihabeddin Paşa and Reyhan. Although the most densely settled districts continued to be located round the Hisar and the market quarter to its east, the area beyond the Gök Dere, centred on the Yeşil complex and Emir Sultan, now began to be built up as
well. The construction of two new bridges across the Gök Dere at this time (the Boyacı Kulu and İrgandi bridges) can be explained by the development of these eastern districts. Expansion occurred to the west as well, where in 1426 Murad completed his mosque, medrese, imaret complex, the Muradiye, on the road to Çekirge. Thus, by 1432, when the Burgundian merchant and spy Bertrand de la Broquièire passed through Bursa, he encountered a town which was ‘a very fine commercial centre, the best city belonging to the Grand Turk’, a town, moreover, which appeared even larger than it was, for it was made up of a series of distinct quarters (Bertrand calls them villages) separated by a river (the Gök Dere) flowing north from Ulu Dağ (the Bithynian Olympus). It was in Bursa, he noted, that the Ottoman sultans were buried and in the town ‘there are many nice buildings, like hospitals, in three or four of which bread, meat and wine (sic) are distributed to those [in need]’. In addition, there were two bazaars, in one of which, among other things, silks, precious stones, pearls and cotton cloth were sold, while in the other cottons and white soap were important items of trade. ‘On a low mountain at the western end of the city there is a fine, large castle. There are about a thousand houses inside. This is [the site of] the lord’s very beautiful residence . . . [within which] there is a garden and a very nice pool where the lord takes his ease.’

Architecture of the beylik and early Ottoman periods

The architecture of the beylik and early Ottoman periods has been the subject of attention by architectural historians since the end of the nineteenth century. Pioneering efforts by European scholars such as Friedrich Sarre, Rudolf Riefstahl and Albert Gabriel, whose surveys were organised regionally rather than chronologically, did much to introduce to the learned public what had hitherto been a largely unknown field. During the 1930s and 1940s, further efforts were made to publish the monuments of key early Ottoman centres, including Bursa, Edirne and İzmir, to examine the architecture of particular Turkoman principalities and to survey systematically specific architectural types dating to the period of the beyliks. Since the late 1950s, what had earlier

been a rather modest flow of publication has turned into a veritable torrent, the most important work being undertaken by Turkish architects and art historians such as Oktay Aslanapa, Aptullah Kuran, Oluş Arık, Metin Sözen and Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal. Aslanapa, for one, has carried out important excavations of beylik and early Ottoman monuments with the aim of clarifying specific questions of plan and date. Finally, Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi published a monumental, multi-volume documentation of Ottoman architecture through the period of Mehmed II. Notwithstanding the sheer volume of this literature, the fact remains that there has appeared no study of the Turkish monuments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries that seeks to integrate in a comparative manner Ottoman materials with those of the other principalities. Nonetheless, the typologies and developmental outlines of this architecture are well known.\footnote{Regional surveys include Friedrich Sarre, \textit{Konya, Seldschukische Baudenkm"aler} (Berlin, 1921); Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem, \textit{Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum arabicarum, Troisième partie, Asie Mineure, tome premier – Siwas, Diirrigi} (Cairo, 1917); Riefstahl, \textit{Turkish Architecture}; Gabriel, \textit{MTA}; Gabriel, \textit{Voyage archéologique}; Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, \textit{Les monuments islamiques de la ville d’Erzurum et de sa region} (Paris, 1968). The early Ottoman monuments of key towns of the principality are dealt with in: Katharina Otto-Dorn, \textit{Das Islamische Iznik, mit einem quellenkundlichen Beitrag von Robert Anhegger}, Istanbuler Forschungen, vol. XIII (Berlin, 1941); Sedat Çetintas, T"urk 

As noted above, the proliferation of independent Turkoman principalities at the beginning of the fourteenth century gave rise to a number of regional centres of architectural activity and produced an environment in which the broad stylistic unity that had characterised Seljuk architecture in the thirteenth century was supplanted by one of pronounced local distinctions. Central and east Anatolia, with old and relatively deeply rooted Islamic traditions, continued to build in styles clearly descended from the Seljuks. The west Anatolian principalities, on the other hand, were more experimental and eclectic in their architecture, not only drawing on ideas and vocabularies, techniques and
formulae derived from the Seljuks, but borrowing as well from the Antique and Byzantine building traditions encountered in these newly acquired frontier lands and from the Mamluks’ architecture. It should not be concluded, however, that the old Seljuk heartland and the lands of the western frontier constituted two distinctly separate architectural provinces existing in isolation from one another. In fact there was a good deal of overlap, especially in the fourteenth century, buildings of a strongly Seljuk character at times appearing in the lands of the western \( wc \), and structures of a more innovative sort usually associated with the western border lands being erected in the Anatolian interior.

**Mosques**

Beylik and early Ottoman mosque architecture is characterised by a striking diversity of form and planning that often defies arrangement in neat and simple typologies. Among the most common types, three groups stand out: the single-dome mosque; the hypostyle congregational mosque; and so-called zaviye-mosque. Of these, by far the most common is the simple single-dome mosque, consisting of a square prayer hall covered by a single dome on squinches, Turkish triangles or pendentives. Where present, minarets are usually attached to the right or left of the entry façade, although in some instances, such as the Kazirzade Mosque (late fourteenth century) in Tire and the original Orhan Gazi Camii (early fourteenth century) in Bilecik, the minaret is a detached, free-standing structure. Of generally small dimension, this type of mosque was built throughout Anatolia and the Ottoman Balkans in both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Its antecedents are to be found in the Seljuk architecture of the thirteenth century, in mosques such as those of Ferruh Şah (621/1224) in Aksèhir and the Hacı Ferruh (612/1215–16) in Konya. In its simplest form this single-dome mosque type is exemplified by buildings such as the Saray Mescidi (776/1375) in Sinop, the Pekmez Pazarı Mescidi (783/1381–2) of Kütahya and the Kubbeli Mescid (731/1331) of Afyon.

Not all single-domed mosques are so modest, however. In scale, materials and workmanship perhaps the most striking single-dome mosque of the period is the İlyas Bey Camii at Balat (Miletus) (Fig. 8.2), built in 806/1404 by the emir of Menteşe, following the restoration of his principality’s independence by Timur. Part of a larger complex consisting, in addition to the mosque, of a medrese and the tomb of the founder, all arranged around an irregular courtyard, the İlyas Bey Camii is square in plan, measuring 18 metres on the exterior façades. Built of rubble and roughly drafted stone, it is revetted on both interior and exterior with a veneer of reused marble taken from the
Figure 8.2 (a, b) İlyas Bey Camii, Balat (Miletus), plan and view of north façade (Photo Walter B. Denny)
Antique monuments of Miletus. In old photographs a brick minaret can be seen adjoining its north-west corner. The square prayer hall is covered by a 14-metre dome on squinches filled with Turkish triangles and scalloped fluting. Illumination is provided by two rows of windows, the lower ones covered by iron grates while the upper windows are screened with marble grilles of geometric openwork. On their exteriors these windows are framed by varied torus and *muqarnas* mouldings and are spanned by relief-carved lintels enriched with geometric, epigraphic and vegetal compositions, some inlaid in blue and red marble intarsia work. The *eyvan*-like porch on the north façade, virtually unique in Anatolia, encloses three hipped arches of bichrome (*ablak*) voussoirs in the Mamluk style, carried on reused Antique columns with *muqarnas* capitals. Geometric openwork screens close off the openings to the right and left of the central gateway bay. The interior of the mosque is dominated by a magnificent marble *mihrab* framed by borders of *muqarnas* and geometric strapwork with vegetal compositions in the spandrels and six rows of *muqarnas* in its half dome. The stone carving of the İlyas Bey Camii, extraordinary for its meticulous and elegant workmanship, makes the Balat mosque one of the outstanding monuments of the period of the emirates. Typologically, however, the mosque belongs to the simple, single-dome group, although its dome is one of the largest of the period.

A common variant on the single-dome mosque has a portico (*son cemaat yeri*) of two, three or five domed or vaulted bays across the entry façade. This arrangement is encountered in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century mosques throughout Anatolia and the Balkans, including the mosques of Hacı Özbek (734/1333–4) in İznik, İbn Neccar (754/1353) in Kastamonu, the Kürşûnlû Camii (779/1377–8) in Kütahya, the Ak Mescid (800/1397–8) in Afyon, the Kara–hasan Camii (early fifteenth century) in Tire and the Eski Cami (811/1408–9) at Zağra in Bulgaria. A further variant is characterised by an extension in one or more directions of the mosque’s interior space beyond the limits of the square, dome-covered bay. Such is the case, for example, with the Orhan Gazi Camii at Bilecik (early fourteenth century), covered by a dome measuring c.9.50 metres supported on four enormous corner piers linked by pointed arches so as to form an interior with a cruciform plan. A more common variant, found in Murad II’s Darülhadis Camii (838/1434–5) in Edirne, has a vestibule between the portico on the mosque’s entry façade and the domed prayer hall. The most outstanding example of this arrangement is the Yeşıl Cami in İznik (Fig. 8.3), constructed by the architect (*bami*) Hacı bin Musa between 780/1378 and 794/1392 for Çandarlı Halil Hayreddin Paşa (d. 1387). The mosque’s portico of three bays is covered by a flat-topped cross-vault, with a tall octagonal drum.
Figure 8.3 (a, b) Yeşil Cami, İznik, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and view from north-west (Photo Katharine Branning)
Art and architecture, 1300–1453

topped by a fluted dome rising from the centre vault. The square prayer hall, a typical single-domed square mosque, has a belt of Turkish triangles in the zone of transition. Between the prayer hall and the portico stands a vestibule screened from the rest of the mosque’s interior by a pair of massive columns linked by pointed arches. Consisting of three bays, the vestibule, in its vaulting, mirrors the portico, with the centre vault supporting a tall fluted dome with a blind lantern. The exterior of the mosque, like that of İlyas Bey at Balat, is revetted with a veneer of marble, which is applied to the lower part of the interior walls as well. As with the Balat mosque, a brick minaret adjoins the mosque on the right and is decorated in the Seljuk manner with glazed tiles, from the colours of which the mosque, not surprisingly, derives its name.14

Many, although by no means all, single-domed mosques functioned as mahalle or small neighbourhood mosques. Congregational mosques (cami) were generally larger than most single-dome mosques and were characterised by a wide variety of plans, including both hypostyle and basilical arrangements. The most conservative of these congregational mosques are to be found in central Anatolia, in the principality of Karaman, and are distinguished by one or more arcades or colonnades running parallel to the kible wall, as in the Ulu Cami (1302–3) of Ermenak (Fig. 8.4). A plainly constructed building of roughly drafted stone, it has a rectangular prayer hall divided into three aisles by squat, heavy masonry arcades. A small entry vestibule stands to the west of the prayer hall and the entire structure was covered by a flat timber and earthen roof. Recalling in its plan such Seljuk period mosques as the east wing of the Alaeddin Camii (probably before 1155) of Konya, the Ulu Cami of Ermenak finds Karamanid parallels in the Hacıbeyler (759/1357–8), Arapzade (1374–1420) and Dikbasan mosques (840/1436) of Karaman.

While the Ulu Cami of Ermenak was no doubt the reflection of an indigenous, Anatolian vernacular tradition, other related mosques with arcades parallel to the kible wall, but with large, domed bays or transepts on the axis of the mihrab, have Syrian connections. The earliest examples of this type are to be found in the Artukid lands of south-east Anatolia. Examples include the Ulu Cami of Diyarbakur (seventh century but rebuilt in 1091–2 and restored later), the Ulu Cami of Mayyafarikin (Silvan, finished in 1157) and the Ulu Cami of Dunaysir (601/1204). That mosques of this sort continued to be built in south-east Anatolia into the fourteenth century is attested by the Latifiye Camii
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of Mardin (772/1371), built by a certain ʿAbd al-Latif b. Ṭāhilāḥ, an official in the service of the Artukid rulers Melik Mahmud el-Salih and Melik Davud II el-Muzaffar. It was in the principality of Aydıñ in western Anatolia, however, that the most interesting and historically significant example of this sort of mosque was built in the fourteenth century. The Isa Bey Camii (776/1375) (Fig. 8.5) in Ayasoluk, built by the emir of Aydıñ ʿIsa b. Muhammad, is a large rectangular
Figure 8.5 (a, b) İsa Bey Camii, Ayasoluk, plan (after Kuran, Mosque, p. 62, courtesy University of Chicago Press) and view from south (Photo Walter B. Denny)
howard crane

structure measuring some 52 by 56 metres, enclosed by high walls of limestone and marble, much of it spoils from the nearby ruins of Ephesus. While the north, east and south walls are of roughly drafted masonry, that on the west is fashioned of carefully cut stone, emphasising its importance as the mosque’s main façade. Within, the Isa Bey Camii is divided into a long, narrow prayer hall on the south preceded on the north by a rectangular courtyard, formerly enclosed by colonnaded porches on three sides. Three gateways give access to the courtyard, one on the north, and another pair functioning as well as the plinths of a pair of minarets, at the point where, on east and west, the porches join the prayer hall. In its interior the prayer hall is divided by a colonnade into a pair of aisles paralleling the kıble, which in turn are cut by a transept of two domed bays on triangular pendentives on the axis of the mihrab. The antecedent for this plan is immediately apparent as being found in the Umayyad caliph al-Walid’s early eighth-century Great Mosque of Damascus, a connection which is explained by the name of the architect, ‘Ali b. al-Dimashqi, given in the construction text over the west portal. This Syrian link is further emphasised by the portal’s tall, narrow dimensions, by the angular knotting in bichrome marble reminiscent of Ayyubid Aleppo in its spandrels and by the bichrome (ablak) joggled joints of the relieving arches over the lower windows of the west façade.¹⁵

A second type of beylik-period congregational mosque has columns or piers arranged in rows perpendicular to the kıble wall to form a central nave and side aisles. Like the Ulu Cami of Ermenak, the origins of this ‘basilical’ type are to be sought in Seljuk mosque architecture of the thirteenth century, in buildings such as the Ulu Cami (626/1229) of Divriği, the Alaeddin Camii (620/1223) of Niğde, and the Esrefoğlu Camii (699/1299–1300) of Beyşehir. A particularly fine fourteenth-century example is Sungur Bey Camii (736/1335–6) of Niğde (Fig. 8.6) with its unusual north and east portals (the latter flanked by a pair of minarets) and its manifestly Gothic features, including bipartite and rose windows and a ribbed pointed groin vault in the east porch, inspired perhaps by Cilician Armenian architects. Although much modified following a fire in the eighteenth century, there can be no question but that the interior was originally divided by arcades into a central nave and side aisles covered by groin and star vaults (although Gabriel speculates that the bays of the nave were covered with domes). In the principalities of western Anatolia,

¹⁵ For the Ulu Cami of Ermenak, see Diez et al., Karaman Devri Sanati, pp. 5–7; Kızıltan, Anadolu Beyliklerinde Cami, p. 20; the mosques of Karaman are discussed in ibid., pp. 26–9; also Diez et al., Karaman Devri Sanati, pp. 35–43. For the Isa Bey Mosque in Ayasoluk, see Otto-Dorn, ‘Die Isa Bey Moschee in Ephesus’.
Figure 8.6 (a, b) Sungur Bey Camii, Niğde, plan (after Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d’Anatolie*, i, p. 125) and view of north portal (Photo Walter B. Denny)
'basilical' plans are found in the Ulu Cami of Birgi (712/1312–13), the Ulu Cami of Tire (early fifteenth century) and the Mahmud Bey Camii (768/1366–7) of Kasaba Köyü near Kastamonu. Examples from the Ottoman lands include the Yıldırım Camii of Bergama (801/1398–9), the Hüdavendigar Camii of Plovdiv (c.1389) and, following İ. H. Ayverdi and Robert Anhegger’s reconstructions, the Şehadet Camii in the Hisar of Bursa (767/1365–6).16

Still another type of congregational mosque, one associated most closely with the Ottomans, is characterised by a hypostyle arrangement of piers or columns which divide the interior into a multiplicity of equal bays, each covered with a separate dome. An early example is the Hamidid Yivli Minare Camii (774/1373) of Antalya, divided by twelve reused columns into six equal bays covered by domes on Turkish triangles. Built on the foundations of an earlier Byzantine church, the symmetry of the mosque is disrupted by the awkward trapezoidal extension of the prayer hall on the west. Other examples of this domed hypostyle type are to be found in what was the Ottoman principalcity, the two most outstanding being the Ulu Cami of Bursa (c.802/1399–1400) built by Bayezid I to commemorate his victory in the battle of Niğbolu (Nikopolis), and the Eski Camii of Edirne (805–16/1403–14), begun by Süleyman Çelebi and completed by his brother Musa. The former (Fig. 8.7), a large, rectangular building measuring 68 by 56 metres, is built of finely drafted limestone with exterior façades enlivened and unified by blind arcades that mirror each row of domes and frame two storeys of windows. The main entrance in the north façade is a projecting portal in the Seljuk manner, although its carving is less exuberant than that of most of its thirteenth-century antecedents. In the interior the mosque is divided into twenty equal bays by twelve enormous piers, with each bay in turn being covered by a hemispheric dome on pendentives. The dome at the intersection of the mosque’s longitudinal and transverse axes as established by its north portal and mihrab niche, and its two side portals, has an open oculus beneath which there is a sixteen-sided pool with a fountain. Although on the interior the domes appear equal in height, it is apparent on the exterior that as one moves from the sides towards the centre the elevation of each row of domes is increased. The mosque, though devoid of a portico, has two minarets, placed at the corners of the north façade, that on the north-west

Figure 8.7 (a, b) Ulu Cami, Bursa, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and interior of prayer hall (Photo Walter B. Denny)
Howard Crane

dating to Bayezid’s original foundation, while the one on the north-east was probably added by Mehmed I between 815/1413 and 821/1421.

While the domes of the Ulu Cami of Bursa are all of equal dimension, the mihrab axis is nonetheless highlighted by the raised elevation of the domes placed along it. This tendency to emphasise the mihrab and its axis is characteristic of beylik and early Ottoman-period congregational mosques, and accounts for the placement of the transept on the mihrab axis of the İsa Bey Camii of Ayasoluk, for the increased breadth and height of the central nave of ‘basilical’ mosques like the Sungur Bey Camii of Niğde and the Ulu Cami of Birgi, and for the large dome constructed over the mihrab bay of Latifiye Camii in Mardin. Of course, none of these devices are the innovations of the fourteenth- or early fifteenth-century builders. All have antecedents reaching back to the earliest centuries of Islamic architecture and are encountered in buildings such as the Great Mosque of Qairawan in Tunisia and the Azhar and Hakim mosques in Cairo, not to mention the Seljuk-period mosques of thirteenth-century Anatolia. Rather more original was a tendency in some beylik and early Ottoman congregational mosques of the hypostyle type to merge several bays before the mihrab under a single larger dome, a tendency not only giving expression to the importance of the mihrab, but reflective as well of an ongoing interest on the part of Anatolian Turkish architects in experimenting with domical vaulting and pushing its limits as covering for ever larger interior spaces (as in the closed court medreses of Celaleddin Karatay and Fahreddin Ali in Konya). In western Anatolia towards the end of the fourteenth century, this tendency to experiment with the construction of large domes, now over the mihrab bays of multi-bay hypostyle congregational mosques, is encountered in the Ulu Cami (778/1376) of Manisa (Fig. 8.8).

Built by İshak Bey, the ruler of the principality of Saruhan, it has been described as having the most important and most interesting plan of any of the fourteenth-century mosques in Anatolia. It was built as part of a complex including, in addition to the mosque, a medrese and the tomb of the founder, both contiguous to it on the west. In plan, the mosque is formed of two approximately equal spaces, a prayer hall on the south and a portico-enclosed fountain court on the north, both measuring approximately 16 by 30 metres. Not only are the dimensions similar; the plans of the two units mirror one another as well. Thus, the prayer hall, nine bays wide and four bays deep, is covered by a series of small domical vaults, except for the space, equivalent to nine bays, before the mihrab niche. This latter is surmounted by a single large dome of 10.8 metres on pendentives, carried by an octagon of arches supported by six great piers and the kible wall. Although the placement of
Figure 8.8 (a, b) Ilyas Bey Camii, Manisa, plan (after Riefstahl, *Southwestern Anatolia*, fig. 3) and view of prayer hall interior (Photo Walter B. Denny)
a large dome on an octagon before the mihrab niche to create a prayer hall with unified interior space has, possibly, some tenuous connection with similar arrangements in south-east Anatolian mosque architecture of the twelfth and early thirteenth century, the use of this formula in the Ulu Cami of Manisa represents a new development for western Anatolia, one which was to be of considerable significance for the later evolution of Ottoman architecture. Important as well in the context of Ottoman architectural development is the courtyard of İshak Bey’s mosque. Like the prayer hall, it measures seven bays in width and four in depth, but with the area on the south, again equivalent to nine bays, left open and forming a fountain court immediately before the prayer hall façade. This open, arcaded fountain court is a feature almost entirely absent from Anatolian Seljuk mosque architecture, and along with the large dome of the prayer hall, is a feature which anticipates developments more fully expressed in the Ottoman architecture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

It is in mosques such as the Güzelce Hasan Bey Camii (809/1406–7) of Hayrabolu near Tekirdağ and, more significantly, in the Üç Şerefeli Cami of Edirne (841–51/1437–47) that these tendencies first manifested in the Manisa mosque are taken up by the Ottomans. The Üç Şerefeli Mosque, in particular (Fig. 8.9), represents a bold leap in both planning and structure. Built by Murad II in the years immediately before the conquest of Constantinople, the mosque is almost square in layout, measuring 66.5 by 64.5 metres, with an oblong prayer hall approximately two-thirds as deep as the fountain court that precedes it. The courtyard, which can be entered through the main portal on the north and a lateral gateway on the west, is surrounded by a portico covered by twenty-two round and elliptical domes of various sizes, with five bays along the south side of the courtyard and seven along its north. It is the oblong prayer hall, however, which is the most distinguishing feature of Murad’s mosque. Like the Ulu Cami of Manisa, it can be seen as a multi-domed congregational mosque of eight units, the four central units of which have been merged and covered by a large central dome of 24 metres. The effect produced by its lower flanking domes and high central dome is one that foreshadows the pyramidal massing of volumes characteristic of the great imperial mosques of Istanbul of the sixteenth century. In contrast to the Ulu Cami of Manisa, the central dome of the Edirne mosque is carried on a hexagon, supported on north and south by the walls of the prayer hall and on east and west by a pair of enormous hexagonal piers. On the exterior, the dodecagonal drum of the central dome is reinforced by eight flying buttresses, apparently the first use of this device in Ottoman architecture. As seen from the interior, the central dome completely dominates the senses, although the perception of
Figure 8.9 (a, b) Üç Şerefeli Cami, Edirne, plan (after Kuran, *Mosque*, p. 177, courtesy University of Chicago Press) and view of covering showing arrangement of prayer hall domes (Photo Walter B. Denny)
spatial unity that it is intended to produce is decreased by the low hang of the hexagon’s arches. Four minarets of unequal height and disparate design are set at the corners of the courtyard, that at the south-west, soaring to a height of 67.65 metres, being, after the minarets of the nearby Selimiye Camii, the highest in Ottoman architecture. Its three balconies (şerefe) give Murad’s mosque its name.

The Üç Şerefeli Cami is, thus, a kind of climax to Turkish architectural developments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, deriving as it does, on the one hand, from the Anatolian hypostyle congregational mosque of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and, on the other, from the continuing experimentation by Turkish builders with the construction of ever more expansive domical vaults. In both plan and structure, the mosque must be seen as the point of departure for the development of the great mosques dominated by vast, centralising domes that characterise Ottoman architecture of the classical period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.17

Finally, in addition to simple single-domed mosques and a variety of congregational mosques, art historical literature frequently distinguishes a third Turkish mosque type of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century, the so-called Bursa or reverse-T mosque. Recent research suggests that this latter type was, in fact, a multi-purpose building serving a variety of functions, educational, social and religious, and with this in mind the term zaviye-mosque has been proposed to describe it. Arguments in favour of the multi-functional explanation have been most systematically put forth by Semavi Eyice, who notes that these buildings are typically characterised by a T-plan with a dome-covered mihrab hall on the kible side of the building, a dome-covered fountain court behind it, symmetrically arranged chambers flanking the fountain court on right and left, and a portico along the north façade. Minarets, where they exist, can generally be shown to be later additions.

More than sixty structures of this sort dating to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are still extant, almost all of them on territories which had been brought within the frontiers of the Ottoman principality. Early examples include the Nilüfer Hatun İmaretı (790/1388) and Yakub Çelebi Zaviyesi (late fourteenth century) in İznik, and the Firuz Bey Camii (797/1394–5) in Milas. It is in Bursa and Edirne, however, that the finest buildings of this sort are to be found, among them the Hüdavendigar İmaretı (767–87/1366–85) of Murad

---

17 For the Ulu Cami of Bursa, Ayverdi, OMİD, pp. 401–18; Gabriel, Une capitale turque, i, pp. 31–9; Kuran, Mosque, pp. 151–3. For the Ulu Cami of Manisa, see Riefstahl, Southwest Anatolia, pp. 7–15; for the Üç Şerefeli of Edirne, Kuran, Mosque, pp. 177–81; Aslanapa, Turkish Art and Architecture, pp. 203–5; Ayverdi, ÇSMDC, pp. 422–62.
I in Çekirge, Yıldırım Bayezid’s Bayezid İmareti (begun c.793/1390) in Bursa’s eastern suburbs, and Murad II’s Muradiye Camii (830/1426) to the west of the Hisar and Muradiye Zaviyesi (839/1436) on the northern outskirts of Edirne, each the core of a larger complex including tombs, medreses, hamams and imarets.

Unquestionably the most spectacular of the zaviye-mosques of Bursa is the Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20) (Fig. 8.10), built by Çelebi Mehmed, with work on its decoration continuing until 1424. Part of a külliye including a medrese, imaret and tomb, its architect was Hacı İvaz b. Ahı Bayezid, who also built the Çelebi Sultan Mehmed Camii (824/1421) at Dimetoka in eastern Thrace. The mosque was originally preceded by a five-bay portico that collapsed in the earthquake of 1855. In its present form, therefore, the façade is divided into two storeys, reflecting the two-storey elevation of the entry block behind it. While the windows on the first storey are enclosed in muqarnas frames and richly carved blind arches, those of the second storey are designed as balconies and contain low, openwork stone balustrades. The tall portal, extending to the roofline, is recessed into the façade. Carved with low-relief vegetal interlace decoration, it represents a clear break with the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century design and is the first in an imperial Ottoman style which will be continued with little change until the nineteenth century.

In the interior the mosque has four eyvans – three large and one small – opening on the domed central fountain court. That on the south contains a mihrab and functioned as a prayer hall. The two side eyvans, slightly smaller in size, are each flanked by a pair of rooms, while the smaller north eyvan was the entrance passage. The lavishly decorated entrance block includes a second-storey balcony overlooking the fountain court which must have functioned as an imperial tribune (hünkâr mahfili). While the entrance eyvan is covered by a barrel vault, the side eyvans, kible eyvan and central courtyard are all covered by domes on belts of Turkish triangles and squinches. An octagonal pool stands at the centre of the fountain court under the dome’s nineteenth-century lantern that replaced the open oculus of the fifteenth century. Also of nineteenth-century date are the two minarets that stand at the corners of the entry façade.

While there is little in the overall design of the Yeşil Cami to distinguish it from other contemporary zaviye-mosques in Bursa and Edirne, its decoration imparts to it a quality of richness and exuberance that supports its claim to be the most beautiful of early Ottoman architectural monuments. Indeed, it seems no effort or expense was spared in its construction and embellishment. Built of carefully drafted stone, its façade, portal and window frames are all of
Figure 8.10 (a, b) Yeşil complex, Bursa, site plan and view of south-west exterior of mosque (Photo Walter B. Denny)
marble. But the most sumptuous part of the mosque is its interior, originally enriched with painted (kalem işi) foliate arabesques, some traces of which still survive to the present day, and by extravagant revetments of cuerda seca tiles recalling in both technique and aspiration the expansive tile façades of Timurid Samarkand and Herat. ¹⁸

While popular opinion and some architectural historians continue to hold that these T-plan buildings were mosques, as the current name of Çelebi Mehmed's foundation, Yeşil Cami, would seem to affirm, scholars have long puzzled over the function of the side rooms which flank the central court, describing them as, among other things, halls of state and medreses. It was the Turkish architect Sedat Çetintas who first advanced the notion that they functioned as zaviyes, that is, as hospices for itinerant dervishes and travellers, an idea which was further supported by the research of Semavi Eyice, who saw their most immediate precursors in such buildings as the thirteenth-century hanekah of the Sahib Ata Fahreddin Ali (678/1279–80) adjoining his Larende Camii in Konya. That the side rooms do seem to have functioned as hospice rooms (tabhane) is suggested by the presence in them of built-in cupboards and fireplaces, which could be used for storage and for the comfort of guests. Even more telling is the fact that in their foundation inscriptions, their vakfiyes and other contemporary documents, many of these buildings are referred to not as mosques but as imarets or zaviyes. Thus, despite their present designations, these buildings seem to have been multi-purpose structures, serving the needs not only of worship but also of charity and learning. Their foundation appears to have been associated in at least some cases with ahi fraternities, those semi-religious orders of late Seljuk and early Ottoman times recruited mainly from among the ranks of craftsmen devoted to the ideals of fütüvva. While intended to provide shelter for travellers (Ibn Battuta's account of his travels in early fourteenth-century Anatolia includes descriptions not only of hospices of this sort but of the ahis who maintained them), they at the same time provided moral and material support for the process of Turkicisation and Islamicisation in newly settled areas during the period of Ottoman expansion. Subsequently, as the ahi orders lost their original character in the sixteenth century, these zaviye-mosques lost some of these functions and were transformed into the simple mosques that they are today. ¹⁹

¹⁸ See the section on ceramics, pp. 336–46, below.
¹⁹ For an important general discussion of the so-called ‘Bursa’ type mosques and their function, see Eyice, ‘İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dinî-İctimal bir Müessesesi’, pp. 3–80. For the Yeşil Cami, see Ayverdi, ÇSMD, pp. 46–94; Gabriel, Une capitale turque, pp. 79–94.
Medreses

Medreses of the beylik and early Ottoman periods continue the two types of Seljuk medreses of the thirteenth century. The more common of these, the open court type, is found not only in Anatolia but in the Ottoman Balkans as well. A fine example is the Hatuniye Medrese (783/1381–2) (Fig. 8.11) in Karaman founded by Nefise Sultan, the wife of the Karamanid ruler Alaeddin Bey and daughter of the Ottoman sultan Murad I. Symmetrical in plan, the building has a heavily decorated and rather archaic gateway copied from that of the thirteenth-century Gök Medresesi in Sivas, which projects strongly from the north façade. Beyond the gateway, a small entry eyvan flanked by a pair of small domed rooms gives access to the medrese’s central courtyard. The sides of the courtyard were bordered by arcaded porticos of reused columns, behind which were domed student rooms. At the back of the courtyard a raised eyvan presumably served as the summer classroom (dershane). In the traditional Seljuk manner, it is flanked on either side by a pair of square, domed rooms entered through doors enclosed by frames richly carved with palmette and lotus motifs. Although her cenotaph (sanduka) is no longer extant, the room to the left of the eyvan originally contained the tomb of the founder, while that to the right was perhaps a winter classroom. Meinecke has established that both the eyvan and the tomb chamber had dados of dark turquoise-green glazed hexagonal tiles and it may well be that the cenotaph was revetted with faience as well. An inscription on the gateway identifies the architect (mimar) as Hoca Ahmad b. Nu’man. Although the medrese is today heavily restored, it is clear that it was originally the most richly decorated building of Karaman.

Similarly planned beylik open court medreses include the Karamanid Tol Medrese (740/1339–40) in Ermenak and the Hatuniye Medrese (835/1431–2) in Kayseri, the Hamidid Dyndar Bey Medresesi (701/1301–2) of Eğridir and the Ilkhanid Bimarhane (708/1308) of Amasya. The finely wrought Ak Medrese (812/1409–10) of Niğde is remarkable for its two-storey construction and for its balcony of Gothic-appearing bipartite arcades, rather like that of the Hûdavendigar İmareti at Bursa, across the second storey of the main façade. The large and traditional Zincirli Medrese (mid-fifteenth century) of Aksaray is notable for its four-eyvan plan.

Closed court medreses, although rather rare in the beylik period, derive like their open court counterparts from Seljuk models. The earliest beylik examples, the Ilkhanid Yakutiye (710/1310–11) and Ahmediye (714/1314–15) medreses, were built in Erzurum. Both have rectangular central courts covered with groin and barrel vaults recalling the hospital of Turan Melik (626/1228–9) in Divriği.
Figure 8.11 (a, b, c) Hatuniye Medrese, Karaman, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive), view of portal (Photo Bernard O’Kane) and view of courtyard (Photo Katharine Branning)
The Yakutiye in particular, with its fine, relief-carved portal, its façade originally flanked by a pair of brick minarets, and domed mausoleum at the back is reflective of the nearby Çifte Minareli Medrese dating to the mid-thirteenth century. Beylik period closed court medreses in central Anatolia are rather closer to the Konya tradition, with hemispherically domed courtyards recalling the Karatay (649/1251–2) and İnce Minareli (c.1265) medreses. Two such buildings were formerly found in Karaman. The first, the no longer extant Emir Musa Medresesi, was founded by Karamanoğlu Musa Paşa and dated to the middle years of the fourteenth century, while the second, identified by its foundation inscription as an imaret, though in form belonging to the closed court medrese type, was built by Karamanoğlu İbrahim Bey in 836/1432. A third closed court medrese of the Konya type dating to the early beylik period is the Vacidiye Medresesi in Kütahya (Fig. 8.12), in the principality of Germiyan. Local tradition holds the Vacidiye Medresesi to have been an observatory and connects it with a certain 'Abd al-Wajid ibn Muhammad (d. 1434), a Khurasani authority on the religious and secular sciences, who is said to have settled in Kütahya during the reign of the Germiyanid ruler Süleyman Şah (1363–87). The foundation inscription on its portal, however, states that it was founded as a medrese in 714/1314 by one of the Germiyanoğlu emirs, Yakub Bey I, Mubarizeddin Umur Savci, whose daughter was the mother of Yakub Bey II, using the cizye (poll-tax on non-Muslims) of Alashehir. Constructed of drafted sandstone, the medrese has in recent years been extensively restored. It is, nonetheless, clear that its plan was originally strictly symmetrical. The main façade has a three-tier arrangement with a rather simple but strongly projecting portal on the medrese’s longitudinal axis. An entrance hall, covered by a dome on squinches and flanked by a pair of small, barrel-vaulted rooms, gives access to the central courtyard covered by a 9.5 metre dome on Turkish triangles with a large oculus. A square pool occupies the centre of the courtyard, which is flanked on either side by three barrel-vaulted student rooms. At the back of the medrese, following an oft-repeated formula, a raised eyvan covered by a pointed barrel vault is flanked symmetrically by a further pair of domed rooms. Although the eyvan must originally have functioned as a classroom, it today contains a cenotaph (sanduka) said to be that of Molla Vacid (d. 1434), who served as müderris (teacher) of the medrese. Whether either of the rooms flanking the eyvan originally functioned as the mausoleum of the founder, Mubarizeddin Umur, is uncertain; no trace of a cenotaph can be seen in either. Overall, the medrese presents a rather plain and unadorned appearance, with relief-carved

20 RCEA, 5346.
Figure 8.12 (a, b) Vacidiye Medresesi, Kütahya, plan (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and view of courtyard and eyvan (Photo Katharine Branning)
decoration restricted to the portal and to a narrow frame around the eyvan. Formally, however, it adheres closely to the closed court medrese tradition of Konya and Çay of the second half of the previous century.21

Closed court medreses are virtually unknown in the Turkoman principalities of western Anatolia. A single Ottoman exception would seem to be that of Hacı Halil Paşa (the Haliliye Medresesi) (Fig. 8.13) in the town of Gümüş some 25 kilometres from Merzifon. Built by Halil Paşa, the emir of Gümüş Madeni who was later made beylerbeyi in 1413 by Çelebi Mehmed, it is constructed of rubble stone and brick and has a square plan with classrooms projecting from three of the four sides. Although the central courtyard is today enclosed by an arced portico carried on wooden columns, squinches filled with Turkish triangles found beneath the portico make clear the fact that originally the courtyard was covered by a dome measuring c.12.6 metres. Built, according to its inscriptions, between 816/1413 and 818/1415, the medrese is unique in Ottoman architecture, which favoured the open court medrese in the thirteenth-century tradition, albeit with minor variations.

Although a number of medreses are recorded as having been built in Bursa, İznik and Yenişehir in the reigns of Orhan Gazi and Murad I, only a handful survive, most notably the Lala Şahin Paşa Medresesi in Bursa, the Süleyman Paşa Medresesi in İznik, and the medrese in the second storey of Murad Hüdavendigar’s imaret at Çekirge. In all cases these are asymmetrical or anomalous buildings, and it is not until the reign of Yıldırım Bayezid that open court medreses of the type that was to become typical of Ottoman architecture are attested. Frequently these are built as part of larger religious and social complexes (külliye), as is the case with Yıldırım Bayezid’s medrese in his complex in the eastern suburbs of Bursa completed in c.802/1399–1400. A long, narrow rectangular structure, it was entered through an eyvan in the main façade covered by a dome atop a high, octagonal drum. The courtyard is enclosed on three sides by porticos behind which were ranged student cells. A square classroom, its floor two steps above the pavement of the courtyard, stood

opposite the entrance and was again covered with a large dome atop a high octagonal drum, mirroring the vaulting of the entry eyvan. Signs of a new Ottoman architectural style include the abandonment of the exaggerated decoration of the Seljuk gateways, the transformation of the classroom eyvan into a square room open to the courtyard and covered by a domical vault, and, from the exterior, the transformation of the block-like mass of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century medreses into a more articulated composition characterised in its covering by a rhythmic sequence of domes and chimneys.

Of all surviving early Ottoman medreses, it is that of Bursa’s Muradiye complex (Fig. 8.14) that is the most attractive both in its proportions and in its sober and harmonious decoration. Situated immediately to the west of Murad II’s
mosque, the *medrese* is an Ottoman reworking of the traditional Anatolia open court *medrese* plan. A classroom at the back projects on the exterior beyond the south wall and opens on the north on to the rectangular central courtyard, the other three sides of which are enclosed by domed and groin-vaulted porticos. On the north a domed porch precedes the portal. Student cells distributed symmetrically along the east and west of the courtyard each contain a fireplace and niches set into the walls for personal possessions. These, as well as the service rooms ranged along the north side of the courtyard, are all vaulted. The classroom, the floor of which is raised eight steps above the level of the courtyard, is covered with a hemispheric dome on an octagonal drum carried on *muqarnas*-filled pendentives. Although harmoniously proportioned,
the most striking and attractive aspect of the *medrese* is the ornamental treatment of its masonry. Exterior and interior façades are for the most part constructed of alternating courses of brick and stone with more elaborate patterns worked out above the courtyard porticos and on the façades of the gateway and classroom. The nuanced and sober effect obtained through the utilisation of simple brick and stone contrasts pleasingly with the colours of the octagonal, turquoise-blue tiles used for the dado around the interior of the classroom.\(^{22}\)

*Tombs*

After mosques, it is commemorative architecture which is the single most common building type in thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Anatolia. These monuments were founded for essentially two categories of individuals: members of the ruling elite, that is, rulers, members of princely families, emirs and high state officials; and revered religious figures, including popular saints and, occasionally, honoured members of the *ulema*. Of the two groups, the former is by far the better represented in terms of the number of standing monuments, and is generally associated with the more outstanding examples of tomb architecture as well. This should come as no surprise, given the fact that it was the ruling elite who commanded the resources needed for ambitious architectural projects. It should be noted, however, that scale and elaboration of surface treatment aside, in formal and planning terms, the mausolea built by and for these two groups are essentially indistinguishable.

As in the Seljuk period, the tomb (*türbe*, *künbed*) architecture of the Turkoman principalities, with a few notable exceptions which obstinately refuse to fit any category, can be divided between the two basic types encountered in Iranian commemorative architecture: the tower tomb and the domed square or canopy tomb. Of the two, the tower tomb in its many variations is by far the more common in beylik Anatolia and is even more varied than in the Seljuk period. Nonetheless, the Anatolian Seljuk tradition is apparent in the proportions of these buildings in that they tend to be far less lofty than is the case with the tower tombs of the eastern Islamic world.

In both the beylik and early Ottoman periods, tomb architecture generally retains its centralising and vertical character. As in thirteenth-century Anatolia, mausolea consist of a cylindrical or polygonal shaft enclosing an uncompartmentalised room with one or more windows, entered through a single door.

\(^{22}\) For the Gümüş Medrese, see Ayverdi, ÇSMD, pp. 171–7, with photographs of the squinches. For the medrese of Yıldırım Bayezid, see Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 73–4; Ayverdi, OMİD, pp. 447–54. For the Muradiye Medrese, see Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, pp. 112–14; Ayverdi, ÇSMD, pp. 316–20.
Although these rooms often contain symbolic sarcophagi or cenotaphs (sanduka) and a mihrab, this is not unfailingly the case, suggesting that the main function of this space is not in fact to house any particular object, but rather to serve simply as an architectural interior. Generally, in beylik tombs the shaft is covered by a conical or polyhedral cap, while in those of the early Ottoman period, domical caps are more usual. Frequently, the shaft stands atop a square, rectangular or polygonal crypt (mumyalık) covered with a barrel vault, groin vault or dome, although such semi-subterranean chambers are not always present. In many cases, their presence cannot be definitively ascertained short of excavation, since frequently they do not have entrances. Where in fact a mausoleum marks an actual burial site and is not simply a commemorative cenotaph, the deceased is always interred in the ground, whether or not a crypt is present, and never in the sanduka found on the raised floor of the room within the tomb’s shaft.

Typologically, it is the form of the shaft that more than any other feature serves to distinguish groups of mausolea from one another. The largest number of beylik tombs is polygonal in shape, most commonly octagonal, with pyramidal roofs. Unelaborated examples include the tombs of Zincirkıran Mehmed Paşa (779/1377) in Antalya, of Kalender Baba (c.1428) in Konya and the Hocendi or Büyük Türbe (c.1326) in Mut. In some instances monumental portals or porches are added to the entry façade, as in the Ali Cafer Türbesi (c.1350) in Kayseri, where this feature took the form of a small, enclosed vestibule, and the Eminüddin Türbesi (c.1452) in Karaman, which had a domed porch supported by columns. Perhaps the most spectacular of these octagonal tombs, one of the most outstanding among Anatolian mausolea, is the türbe of Hûdavend Hatun in Niğde (Fig. 8.15), the exterior surfaces of which are richly worked in geometric, vegetal and zoomorphic relief. Situated atop a low, octagonal base that may house a crypt, the tomb is covered by a pyramidal roof on the exterior and a hemispheric dome in the interior. The tomb chamber is reached by a double flight of three steps, and entered through an elaborately framed gateway that is mirrored in the decoration of the mihrab within. The three windows have pointed relieving arches above their lintels, the lunettes of which are filled with openwork screens of vegetal arabesque flanked in the spandrels by high-relief harpies, sphinxes and eagles. A dedicatory inscription identifies the person for whom the tomb was built as one of the daughters of the late Seljuk ruler Rûnbeddin Kılıç Arslan IV, Hûdavend Hatun, who is thought to have been the wife of a Mongol prince. Although the inscription states that the tomb was erected in 712/1312–13, the inscription on her cenotaph informs us that she did not die until 732/1331–2.
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While the largest number of polygonal funerary monuments of the beylik period is octagonal in plan, there exist a small number of pentagonal, hexagonal and dodecagonal tombs as well. These latter forms first make their appearance in Anatolia in the period of the emirates. The Yürük Dede Türbesi (late fourteenth century) in Ankara is a unique example of a pentagonal tomb, while the hexagonal type is represented by the türbe of Hızır Bey (mid-fourteenth century) belonging to the Taşkın Paşa complex in Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp. The dodecagonal plan is particularly associated with the Karakoyunlu in the region around Lake Van. Examples include the tombs of Halime Hatun (760/1358–9) in Gevaş and of Erzen Hatun (799/1396–7) in Ahlat. The mausoleum of Alaeddin Bey in Karaman (c.1388) is the only example of this type in central Anatolia. Funerary monuments with cylindrical shafts and conical caps are rather rare as well. Their origins are to be found in the regions of Erzurum and Ahlat and for the most part they date to the latter part of the thirteenth century.
Beylik-period examples include the Sırcılı Kümbet in Kayseri, an Eretnid tomb of the mid-fourteenth century, and the unique Akkoyunlu tomb of Zeynel Mirza (second half of the fifteenth century) at Hısn-i Keyf (Hasankeyf) on the Tigris in south-east Anatolia. This latter, a Timurid-appearing structure, built according to its inscription for Zeynel Bey, the son of Sultan Hasan Bahadur Han (presumably Akkoyunlu Uzun Hasan), is constructed of brick with square kufic renderings of the names of the Prophet and Rightly Guided Caliphs in blue-green glazed brick on its shaft, and is covered by a bulbous, Timurid-style dome.

Square tombs constitute a more complex and diversified group. The most common type has a square base supporting an octagonal drum with prismatic elements in the zone of transition resembling exposed squinches. Examples include the Ilkhanid Nureddin ibn Sentimur Türbesi (713/1314) in Tokat and the Karamanid tombs of Fakih Dede (860/1455–6) in Konya and of İbrahim Bey (868/1463–4) adjoining his imaret complex in Karaman. Far grander in scale but similar in plan are the tomb of Şeyh Hasan Bey, the emir of Eretna, in Sivas, known as the Gündük Minare (748/1347), with a system of exposed Turkish triangles around the zone of transition and a cylindrical shaft and conical roof, and those of Seyyid Mahmud Hayrani in Aksaray and Celaleddin Rumi in Konya. Both of the latter, though originally built in the Seljuk period, were rebuilt in their present form by the Karamanid emirs in the early fifteenth century and have great, fluted, cylindrical drums above square bases. Other examples of this square type of tower tomb, such as the Gündoğdu Türbesi (745/1344) in Niğde, have square bases with bevelled upper corners forming an octagon atop which is placed an octagonal drum. The most extraordinary variant on the square type, however, is the tomb of the fourteenth-century Turkish poet and mystic, Aşık Paşa (d. 733/1333) in Kırşehir (Fig. 8.16). Rectangular in plan, it consists of a vaulted entry hall along one of the sides of the tomb and a square tomb chamber covered by a hexagonal drum and dome on pendentives. Entrance into the tomb chamber is through a door in one of the long sides of the entry hall, requiring that the visitor turn through 90 degrees to pass from the entry hall into the tomb interior. It is the main façade of the building that, even more than the plan, is the tomb’s most remarkable aspect, however. Veneered in marble, it is dominated in the Seljuk manner by a monumental portal projecting from the mausoleum’s north-west corner. Curiously, although harking back to thirteenth-century antecedents in its composition, the portal is profoundly un-Seljuk in terms of the specific forms: a frame relief carved knotting in place of geometric interlacing and central niche headed by a fluted shell form in place of a muqarnas-filled semi-dome.
The result is a tomb absolutely unique in the context of Anatolian Turkish architecture.

In early Ottoman tomb architecture, in contrast to that of the other Turkoman principalities, it is variations on the domed square rather than the tower tomb that are most commonly encountered in the period before the middle of the fifteenth century. Although a tomb said to be that of Ertuğrul Gazi is located in Söğüt, and those of Osman Gazi and Orhan Gazi are located in the Hisar in Bursa, all are late reconstructions of earlier buildings ordered by sultans Abdülaziz and Abdülhamid II in the second half of the nineteenth century. The earliest surviving Ottoman tombs do, nonetheless, date to the reign of Orhan Gazi, and include those of Osman's son Çoban Bey, in Bursa, of Lala Şahin Paşa (c. 749/1348) in Mustafakemalpaşa (Kirmastı) and, in all likelihood, the tomb known as the Kırgızlar Türbesi (mid-fourteenth century) in İznik. These last two are particularly interesting because of their unique plans: a domed square tomb chamber preceded by a deep eyvan, an arrangement met nowhere else in Turkish Anatolian architecture.

More typically, early Ottoman tombs are characterised by square tomb chambers, frequently preceded by an open porch or small vestibule. Such, for example, was the case with the tombs of Yıldırım Bayezid and Gülçiçek Hatun, the wife of Murad I and mother of Bayezid I. Bayezid’s tomb, one of
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the dependencies of his social and religious complex in the eastern suburbs of Bursa, was initially built four years after his death by his son Emir Süleyman. It was subsequently sacked by the Karamanids in 1414, restored by Mehmed I before 1421 and renovated a second time following the great Bursa earthquake of 1855. Although the plan of the tomb as it stands today is surely original, there is some question as to whether the restored elevation is entirely true to the fifteenth-century original. There seems little question in this connection as regards the tomb of Sultan Murad II. Built as a dependency of the Muradiye complex in Bursa, it is dated by inscription to 855/1451 and adjoined on the east by the domed square tomb of three of Murad’s sons, Alaeddin, Ahmed and Orhan. A large structure measuring 13.45 metres square, Murad’s tomb is entered through a simple portal on the north under the projecting eaves of a painted and carved wooden porch of later date. In the interior, a barrel-vaulted ambulatory encloses a central bay containing the sultan’s cenotaph and covered by a dome carried on a colonnade of alternating columns and piers. Interestingly, the dome has an oculus directly above Murad’s cenotaph, a feature that, according to tradition, responds to the sultan’s expressed desire that his mortal remains be watered by the rains. Overall, the tomb is striking for its sobriety and the absence of decoration, said to be a reflection of the sultan’s pious nature.

In this respect, the tomb of Murad II stands in striking contrast to that of his immediate predecessor, Çelebi Mehmed, whose Yeşil Türbe or Green Tomb is surely one of the outstanding monuments of Ottoman Bursa. Forming part of Mehmed’s social-religious complex, the tomb is distinct from Murad’s not only in its lavish decoration, but in its form as well. An octagon in plan, it is much nearer the Seljuk and beylik norm than those of the other early Ottoman sultans. Built atop a stone crypt, the tomb is constructed of brick and stone with engaged piers of cut marble at the angles carrying pointed arches to form a blind arcade running around its eight sides. The shaft of the tomb is topped by an octagonal drum and is covered in turn by a hemispheric dome on a belt of Turkish triangles. Two rows of windows admit light into the interior and a simple cut-marble entrance enclosing a scalloped semi-dome rather similar in form to that of the Aşık Paşa Türbesi of the previous century in Kırsähir projects from the north façade. The exterior of the tomb is revetted in turquoise faience, with inscriptions in the tympana over the lower windows and floral patterns in the hood of the portal niche. This faience decoration is carried on into the interior of the tomb as well, where a turquoise dado enriched with floral medallions, a splendid mihrab and Mehmed’s ceramic cenotaph are to
be found. The entire aesthetic, like that of Mehmed’s nearby Yeşil Cami, is one closely related to Timurid Iran.23

Civil and commercial architecture

Little of the diverse secular architecture of the Turkoman principalities has survived in its original form. Nonetheless, a scattering of fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century civil and commercial buildings do exist in various parts of Anatolia which serve to suggest something of the character of this architecture. Contemporary travellers mention a number of palaces belonging to Turkoman beys of central and western Anatolia. Ibn Battuta, for example, briefly describes the residences of the rulers of Menteşe and Aydın at Peçin and Birgi, and Bertrand de la Broquièrè visited the palace of the ruler of Karaman at Konya and reports details of the Bey Sarayı in Bursa. Archaeological remains of fourteenth-century Turkoman palaces and pavilions (köşk) have been identified at Oba near Alanya, Aksaray, Niğde and at Peçin in the principality of Menteşe. Without question, the most imposing such structure, however, is the palace of Taşkin Paşa at Damsa Koyu near Ürgüp in central Anatolia (Fig. 8.17). Larger and more spacious than surviving Seljuk palaces, its plan bears more than a passing resemblance to that of a contemporary open court medrese, for which it was long mistaken. The palace is laid out symmetrically around a rectangular central courtyard with an eyvan opening off its south end. The entrance, a monumental gate in the Seljuk manner with a window in its upper part suggesting a second storey, is placed on the lateral axis of the building and is fashioned of carefully drafted, relief-carved limestone with bichrome voussoirs with joggled joints forming the gateway arch. Otherwise, the building is constructed of rubble masonry with the exception of the door and window frames of the rooms around the central courtyard and the room at the south-west corner, which is revetted with ashlars and contains a well-preserved stone mihrab. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the rooms were covered with vaults and it is assumed that they were roofed with thick wooden beams covered with earth. Located in a green and well-watered valley of gardens and vineyards at some distance from a fortified castle that dominates the district, the palace was probably the country residence of Taşkin Paşa,

23 See the sections on ceramics and woodcarving, pp. 341–4 and 350–1, below. For the typology of beylik tomb architecture, see Ank, Anadolu; for the Hüdavend Hatun Türbesi, Gabriel, MTA, i, pp. 144–8; for the tomb of Murad II, Gabriel, Une capitale turque, pp. 116–18; Ayverdi, ÇSMD, pp. 321–7; for the Yeşil Türbe, Gabriel, Une capitale turque, pp. 94–100; also Ayverdi, ÇSMD, pp. 101–18.
Figure 8.17 (a, b) Taşkınpaşasarayı, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp, plan (Boğazici University, Aptullah Kuran Archive) and general view (Bildarchiv/image archive Das Bild des Orients, Berlin, photo K. Otto-Dorn)
the builder of the mosque complex in the village of Damsa Köyü, about 3 kilometres distant. Although lacking a dated inscription, it would appear on both historical and stylistic grounds to date to the first half of the fourteenth century.24

Among commercial buildings that survive from the beylik and early Ottoman periods are a number of bedestans or covered bazaars of a type that originally served (as the term indicates) as market halls for textiles, and later became general emporia for luxury goods. Although bedestans are mentioned in a number of thirteenth-century vakfiyes in such a way as to suggest that they were independent buildings, only one example, dating from the very end of the thirteenth century, the much repaired bedestan of Beyşehir built by Eşrefoğlu Süleyman Bey as a vakıf for his mosque, has survived to the present day. Vakfiyes list Turkoman-period bedestans among income-producing properties of pious foundations in Karaman, Niğde, Manisa and Tire. The still extant fourteenth-century bedestan of Tire, one of the vakıfs of the jurist İbni Melek, is a rectangular hall with four axial entrances, covered with eight cupolas arranged in two rows, and shops ranged around the outside. In contrast to the bedestan of Beyşehir, but in the manner of later Ottoman bedestans, it has rooms ranged around two sides of the interior as well.

A number of early Ottoman bedestans still survive in Bursa and Edirne as well. The bedestan of Edirne, among the finest in Turkey, was built by Çelebi Mehmed as a vakıf for the Eski Cami. It consists of a long rectangular hall with clerestory windows, covered by fourteen domes arranged in two rows. The interior of the hall, which is enclosed on all four sides with small stalls, can be entered, like the Tire bedestan, through four axial gateways. On the exterior, the bedestan is ringed by shops. Built of alternating courses of brick and stone, with monolithic relief-carved window arches, the building has an attractive appearance and in terms of planning is archetypical of Ottoman commercial buildings of this sort.25


25 For the bedestan of Tire, see Mustafa Cezar, *Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical Period and the Ottoman Construction System* (Istanbul, 1985), pp. 162, 184–6; Rieftahl, *Southwest Anatolia*, p. 34; Ayverdi, ÇSMĐ, pp. 196–9. As to references to bedestans in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century vakfiyes, see Cezar, *Commercial Buildings*, pp. 161–2; for the bedestan of Niğde, the vakfiye of Ali Bey Karamanoğlu (1415) for the Ak Medrese of Niğde mentions a bezzazlar çarşısı, and the wording of the documents points to its location as being that of the present bedestan near the Sungur Bey Camii. The present building is an arasta (covered market), which Gabriel thought dated to the seventeenth
Another type of commercial building, especially well represented at Bursa, is the *han*. Although the term is sometimes used synonymously with caravansary to designate a halting place built at stages along the main trade routes, in an urban context *han* is used to describe a kind of market building, usually devoted to trade in a particular commodity, or for merchants from a particular country or region. Generally square or rectangular in plan, *hans* are of two or more storeys and are characterised by a central courtyard enclosed by porticos. Rooms used for storage or as shops are set behind the porticos of the first storey while in the upper storeys similar rooms, often used as living quarters, are to be found. As these were primarily commercial buildings rather than caravansaries, little provision was made for the stabling of animals. External walls are pierced by windows and living quarters are provided with fireplaces. Access to the central courtyard is often through an imposing portal flanked by rooms for the gatekeepers in charge of the building. Outstanding examples in Bursa from the early Ottoman period include the so-called Bey Han (Emir Han) built by Orhan Gazi, dating to the mid-fourteenth century, and the early fifteenth-century Geyve Han and İpek Han, which were vakıfs of Mehmed I’s Yeşil complex.

Under the emirates and early Ottomans there was no equivalent to the great caravansary building programme which the Seljuks had undertaken a century earlier for the development of the commercial routes across Anatolia. Those caravansaries that were built are for the most part modest in both scale and execution. In terms of planning, they perpetuate the three types – hall, courtyard and courtyard-hall – which distinguish the Seljuk caravansary. For example, a pair of ruined courtyard caravansaries at Balat (Miletus), said to date to the early fifteenth century, consist of open courtyards enclosed by stables and rooms for travellers. An irregularly laid-out structure of Karamanid date in the fortress of Alanya is thought to be a caravansary of the courtyard-hall type. It has a rectangular courtyard with rooms for travellers ranged around three sides of the interior and a large vaulted hall for animals and storage at the back. The Menteşeid Üçgöz (Karapaşa) Hani at Peçin consists simply of a rectangular hall covered by barrel vaults with a doorway at one end. The oldest surviving Ottoman caravansary, the Issız Han (Fig. 8.18) on the shore of Lake Apolyont, 5 kilometres east of Ulubad on the road to Bursa, belongs to the same type. Its inscription dates it to 797/1394 and identifies the builder as Celaleddin Eyne Bey bin Felekeddin. Built of alternating courses of
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Figure 8.18 (a, b) Issız Han, Ulubad, plan and general view of entry façade
(Photo Nurcan-Zeynep Abacı)
brick and stone, it is entered through one of the narrow ends via an eyvan-like portal flanked by a pair of rectangular rooms. The interior is divided by heavy stone piers into a central nave and side aisles and is illuminated by small windows high in the walls. Vaults are constructed of brick, as are a pair of huge hearths on stout, monolithic columns in the central nave surmounted by enormous brick chimneys. The great Yeni Han on the Tokat–Sivas road, with its peculiar plan consisting of an arasta or street of shops with stables placed symmetrically behind it on either side, despite an inscription which mentions Abu Said Bahadur Han and states that it was built in 730/1329–30, is in its present form substantially an Ottoman building, probably dating to the first half of the seventeenth century.26

Materials, decoration and patronage

As noted above, not only do the pace and scale of architectural activity in the period of the emirates vary over time, but as between regions, specifics of form and planning do as well. Regional variation is characteristic of structure and materials as well. In this regard, the beylik-period architecture in central and east Anatolia is often characterised by a striking continuity vis-à-vis the preceding Seljuk period. In the principalities of Karaman and Eretna, for example, the principal building material continues to be carefully drafted stone set over a rubble core as in the Sungur Bey Camii in Niğde or the Yakutiye Medresesi in Erzurum. Brick is usually reserved for vaults and domes and for minarets, although at times it is used in quite dramatic ways, as is the case with the drum of the Gündük Minare in Sivas. Only rarely are buildings constructed substantially or entirely of brick. An instance of this is the Hasbey Darülhuffazı (824/1421) in Konya, and even here the brick walls are faced on three sides with cut stone, while the main façade is covered with a veneer of marble carved in an elaborate relief of geometric star entrelacs and braided motifs. This use of marble to revet façades or at least the portals of buildings, an innovation in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century architecture, is encountered elsewhere in central Anatolia, in the façades of the tomb of Aşık Paşa (c.733/1333) in Kırşehir and the portal of the Hatuniye Medresesi (783/1381–2) in Karaman.

26 For the caravansary of Alanya (if indeed that is what it is), see Riefstahl, Southwest Anatolia, p. 92; Seton Lloyd and D. Storm Rice, Alanya (‘Ala‘iyya) (London, 1958), pp. 30–1; Cezar, Commercial Buildings, p. 162. For the Yeni Han, see Gabriel, MTA, ii, pp. 167–8; Cezar, Commercial Buildings, pp. 148–9. The Issız Han is discussed in Umberto Scerrato, ‘An Early Ottoman Han near Lake Apolyont’, Atti del secondo congresso internazionale de arte turca (Naples, 1965), pp. 221–34.
Although drafted stone is the building material of choice in central and eastern Anatolia, it would be wrong to see fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Turkish architecture as simply a late continuation of the Seljuk tradition in this regard. The architecture of the west Anatolian beyliks in particular – Menteşe, Aydın, Saruhan, Osman – located in regions rich in Antique and Byzantine monuments and closely linked to the Mediterranean world, is strongly influenced in terms of materials by local building traditions. Thus, in place of drafted stone, construction is more frequently of alternating courses of brick and rough-cut stone, occasionally with facades of decoratively bonded brick work similar to those encountered in late Byzantine churches. Arches, vaults and saw-tooth moldings are in brick. Carefully drafted stone was used for column bases, capitals and doorjambs, where finely worked marble and sandstone were used. Cut stone was also used on the facades of porticos and eaves. Roofs were frequently covered with tiles such as are still to be seen on many of the monuments of İzni. Wood was used for window shutters, doors and tie beams. Rather more frequently than in central Anatolia, marble veneer, often spolia from Antique monuments, was applied to facades in the Roman and Byzantine manner in order to enhance the appearance of buildings constructed of otherwise rather common materials. Outstanding examples include the Ulu Cami (712/1312–13) and Aydınoğlu Gazi Mehmed Bey Türbesi (734/1334) of Birgi, the İsa Bey Camii (776/1375) at Ayasoluk (Ephesus), the Firuz Bey Camii (797/1394) of Milas and the İlyas Bey Camii (806/1404) in Balat (Miletus), and, in the Ottoman lands, the Ulu Cami (c.802/1399–1400) and Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20) of Bursa and the Yeşil Cami (794/1391–2) of İzni. Occasionally, bichrome (ablak) stone decoration as found in contemporary Mamluk architecture is encountered as well, as in the relieving arches over the windows of the west façade of the İsa Bey Mosque in Ayasoluk and the portals of the Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne.

Decoration is usually confined to entrances, doorways, mihrabs and other focal points. Decorative brick bonding was used in buildings such as the Orhan Gazi Camii in Bursa and the Nilüfer İmaretî in İzni (790/1388–9) in a manner at times strikingly reminiscent of Byzantine work. Relief-carved geometric strapwork and vegetal arabesques are frequently found on portals and window frames, as is the case in the Yeşil Cami in Bursa and the Ishak Bey Camii in Balat (Miletus). Relief-carved stuccowork continues an Anatolian tradition and can be seen in the mihrabs of the Yıldırım Camii and Şehadet Camii in Bursa. Finely worked stucco with vegetal reliefs is also applied to the niche- and fireplace-containing walls of the tabhane (hospice rooms) of buildings such as the Yıldırım Camii and Yeşil Cami in Bursa. Faience
continues to be used for the decoration of *mihrabs*, and is applied to interior and exterior façades in the form of dados or, in some instances, to highlight specific architectural features. Nowhere is it to be seen to better effect than in the *Yeşil Cami* and *Yeşil Türbe* in Bursa and the Muradiye Camii in Edirne. Although only occasional traces survive, painting on plaster (*kalem işi*), usually consisting of vegetal compositions and inscriptions, was used to decorate interiors and can be seen to advantage in the Muradiye in Edirne. Finally, carved and painted wood fittings are frequently found, as, for example, the wooden doors and shutters of the *Yeşil* complex in Bursa and of the Üç Şerefeli Cami in Edirne.

Fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century builders are particularly noteworthy for their experiments in planning and in the construction of vaulting, especially in western Anatolia. Foreign mosque plans are adapted to local needs as in the case of the İsa Bey Cami of Ayasoluk, based on the Great Mosque of Damascus, while the plan of the old Seljuk hypostyle *ulu cami* is rationalised and regularised in the Ulu Cami of Bursa and the Eski Cami of Edirne, with their multiple-domed bays of equal size. Porticos on the entry façades of mosques (*son cemaat yeri*) and courtyards before the prayer hall become with increasing frequency standard features of mosque planning. Although *medrese* architecture continues types defined in the thirteenth century, tomb architecture is striking for its variety as well as for its scale and sumptuousness. New formal arrangements such as the zaviye-mosque make their appearance in response to the growth of popular religious fraternities and changes in social structure. And bold experiments with domes of ever larger diameter are a striking feature of the period. The origin of this development would seem to be largely indigenous and is probably to be sought in Seljuk domed architecture of the thirteenth century. In western Anatolia, this initial interest in the construction of large domes seems to have been further stimulated by a desire in mosque architecture to emphasise the importance of the *mihrab* niche by placing an ever larger hemispherical vault before it (as in the Ulu Cami of Manisa), and by a desire to create an ever more unified interior space, as in the Üç Şerefeli Cami of Edirne with its enormous *mihrab* dome presaging the Ottoman imperial mosques of the later fifteenth and sixteenth century.

The patronage of architecture in the Anatolian beyliks, including the Ottoman principality, follows patterns already well established in the Seljuk state and in other Islamic lands in that it is closely associated with the ruling
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27 See the section on ceramics, pp. 339–46, below.
28 See the section on painting, pp. 322–4, below.
29 See the section on woodcarving, pp. 346–51, below.
houses of these states and with the important emirs constituting their ruling elites. Participation in these activities by members of the *ulema*, merchants and members of the artisan classes was restricted, no doubt, by the modest resources members of these groups had at their command. In the emirate of Aydin, for example, it was the *beys* of the principality, beginning with Gazi Mehmed Bey (1304–34) at Birgi, who are most notable as builders. Particularly outstanding was Gazi Mehmed Bey’s son Isá Bey, who was initially governor of Ayasoluk (Ephesus) and later ruler of the entire principality. His foundations included a mosque and tomb in Birgi, a *zaviye* in Tire, and a pair of mosques (one being the great Isá Bey Camii), a tomb and a fountain in Ayasoluk. Among royal women, significant patrons include Han zadé Hatun (d. 1387), daughter of Gazi Mehmed Bey, Azize Hatun, the wife of Isá Bey, Gürcı Melek, daughter of Umur Paşa, and Hafsa Hatun, the daughter of Isá Bey and wife of the Ottoman ruler Bayezid I. Hafsa Hatun’s foundations include a mosque, *zaviye* and fountain in Tire, a fountain in the nearby village of Bademiye and a fountain in Birgi. Other patrons include various emirs of the *beys* of Aydin and members of the *ulema*, such as the jurist Ferişteoğlu Ībni Melek, builder of a *medrese* and the *bedestan* of Tire.30

In the Ottoman principality, it is again members of the ruling house, in particular the Ottoman sultans themselves, who are the most active builders. Although Murad II is the most lavish of early Ottoman builders in terms of scale and quality, he appears, rather surprisingly, to have been surpassed in terms of the overall quantity of his foundations by Orhan Gazi, who was especially active as a patron in towns such as Bursa, İznik and Bilecik. In terms of typology, it is mosques, in particular modest village mosques, that constitute Orhan Gazi’s most numerous foundations, a fact not surprising, perhaps, given that his territories were only recently taken from the Byzantines. These were followed by educational and charitable foundations, *medreses*, and by *tekkes*, *zaviyes* and *imarets*. Although less active as patrons of building, Murad I’s, Yıldırım Bayezid’s and Çelebi Mehmed’s most ambitious foundations – the Hüdavendigar, Yıldırım Bayezid and Yeşil complexes and the Ulu Cami of Bursa – far surpass those of Orhan both in size and in the excellence of their materials and workmanship. It is Murad II’s complexes in Bursa and Edirne, however, the two Muradiyes and the Üç Şerefeli Mosque, that represent both in scale and, as regards the latter, in innovation, a climax to the early Ottoman period as a whole.

Significant patronage was also provided by other members of the Ottoman dynasty, including Orhan Gazi’s brothers Alâeddin Bey (d. 1331) and Çoban Bey, and his son Gazi Süleyman Paşa; Murad I’s sons Yakub Çelebi and Yahşi Bey; and Bayezid’s sons Ertuğrul and Musa Çelebi. Similarly, royal women, including Orhan’s wife Nilüfer Hatun, Gülçüce Hatun (the wife of Murad I and mother of Bayezid I), Devlet Hatun (d. 1414, the wife of Bayezid I and daughter of Germiyanoğlu Yakub Bey, who was also the mother of Mehmed I), and Hafsa Sultan and Selçuk Hatun (both daughters of Mehmed I) were important patrons of architecture. Among the early Ottoman emiral families, it was the Çandarlı who were the most outstanding builders through several generations beginning with Halil Hayreddin Bey, followed by Ali Paşa, İbrahim Paşa, Halil Paşa and Mahmud Çelebi. Their most important foundations are located in Bursa and İzmir. Likewise Kara Timurtas Paşa and his sons Oruç Bey, Umur Bey and Ali Bey were noteworthy patrons of architecture in Bursa, Edirne, Kütahya, Dimetoka and Manisa. Several members of the ulama seem also to have been important builders. They include the first Ottoman şeyhülislâm, Şemseddin Mehmed Fenari (d. 1431), Hafızeddin Mehmed Efendi (d. 1424), the Hanifi jurist, and Amasyalı Sufi Bayezid, the tutor (lala) of Mehmed I. Finally, a scattering of foundations can be identified as being the work of members of the commercial and artisan classes, including the merchants Hacı Şihabeddin, who founded the Seyyid Nasir Mescid and Zaviye (before 855/1451), Hoca Sinan, who built the Boyacı Kulu Köprüsü (before 836/1443) in Bursa, and a Bezirgan Bedreddin, who built a caravansary near Denizli. As regards architects and artisans, Hacı İvaz Paşa, the architect of the Çelebi Mehmed Camii in Dimetoka and the Yeşil complex in Bursa (who was also for a time Mehmed I’s grand vezir), built mosques in Ankara, Bursa and Tokat, while Nakkaş Ali, the decorator of the Yeşil Camii, built the mosque bearing his name inside the Hisar in Bursa.

The arts

The arts of the century and a half between the beginning of the fourteenth and the middle of the fifteenth century are very unevenly represented in the corpus of surviving artefacts, although a lack of objects is occasionally compensated for to a degree by other sources. While a number of finely carved wood furnishings and architectural fittings survive, and fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century pottery and ceramic developments are fairly well understood from excavated materials and the glazed tile decoration preserved in situ in architectural monuments, only a scattering of objects representative of the arts of the book
and of the textile arts have been preserved. Literary sources are of some help in reconstructing a more complex picture of the silk industry than known and dated objects might suggest, and scattered examples of manuscript illumination and architectural painting can be of some assistance in supplementing the very limited picture of book illustration in the period that could be had from the single known example that has come down to the present day. Metalwork remains a little explored area concerning which there has been considerable speculation in light of the number of significant objects in brass, bronze, steel and precious metals that survive from the Seljuk period. It is likely, therefore, that metalwork of artistic merit was produced in the beylik period, but until now only a handful of dated objects, including a silver inlaid bowl in the Mamluk style inscribed with the name and titles of Murad II, today in the Hermitage in St Petersburg (Hermitage NT 359), have been identified.31

Painting

Only four illustrated manuscripts of diverse provenance, disparate content and uneven quality survive from thirteenth-century Anatolia, far too few to permit discussion of a school of Anatolian Seljuk book painting. Manuscript illustration is even less well known with regard to the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and although rather unconvincing attempts have been made to attribute a group of paintings in the Istanbul Albums depicting demons, monsters, dervishes and nomads to eastern Anatolia,32 in fact not a single work can be attributed to the Turkoman emirates of the east. Literary sources refer to an atelier of painters at the Ottoman court in Edirne in the second quarter of the fifteenth century and praise the skill of the painter Husamzada Sunullah, but none of his work survives. An illuminated double frontispiece dated 838/1434–5 and dedicated to Murad II in a treatise on music, the *Maqasid al-Alhan* of Abdülkadir b. Gaybi al-Maragi,33 hints at the high quality of contemporary work at Edirne.34 That the atelier continued to function into the third quarter of the fifteenth century is clear from the copy of the *Dilsizname* of Badieddin al-Tabrizi in Oxford.35

33 Topkapı Sarayi, r 1726.
35 Bodleian Library, MS. Ouseley 133.
the colophon of which states that the manuscript was produced at Edirne in 860/1455–6.36

Only a single manuscript, a text of the İskendername of Ahmedi, copied in Amasya in 819/1416 (Fig. 8.19), three years after the author’s death, serves to document the existence of Ottoman book illustration prior to the reign of Mehmed II. Although the manuscript is illustrated with twenty paintings, only three of these (folios 117v, 295v and 296v) are actually painted on the pages of the manuscript and so can be assumed to be contemporary with the copying of the text. All seventeen of the remaining illustrations are cut from two earlier manuscripts, one apparently with paintings in the mid-fourteenth century Ilkhanid style associated with the so-called small format Shahnames and the other in the Inju style of Shiraz. All the miniatures, both originals and those pasted into the text, are in poor condition, so it is difficult to establish their stylistic features. In terms of subject, the three original paintings depict groups of gold-nimbed riders set on blue or green grounds speckled with gold dots. Although Grube has seen a late Byzantine inspiration for these paintings, their most striking quality is perhaps their sheer primitiveness and lack of sophistication in terms of both composition and execution. The paintings do, nonetheless, betoken a demand for illustrated manuscripts at Amasya during the reign of Çelebi Mehmed, when the city enjoyed a considerable cultural and political prestige, and attest to the presence there of a painter of at least modest talent.38

Although only three of the paintings in the Bibliothèque Nationale İskendername can be considered contemporary with the date given in its colophon, those paintings reused from earlier manuscripts are nonetheless enclosed in decorative frames of bold leafy and floral patterns characterised by the same gold speckled backgrounds as the three original paintings, suggesting that they are work of the same moment. It is interesting to note that these framing compositions, examples of the art of illumination (tezhip), bear a passing resemblance to some of the painted decoration in contemporary architectural monuments. This latter, generally executed on dry plaster in a kind of fresco a secco, is referred to generically as kalem işi, or brushwork painting. Although the technique must have been quite widely used in both beylik

37 Bibliothèque Nationale, suppl. Turc 309.
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and early Ottoman times, little of this work has survived the ravages of age and damp or the restorer’s or whitewasher’s brush. Nonetheless, fragments of such decorative programmes are still found in a number of fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century buildings. The earliest surviving Ottoman examples are in the drum of the dome of the mid-fourteenth-century Kirgizlar Türbesi in
Howard Crane

İznilk. Coloured red, black, yellow and green, they depict not only such classic motifs as arabesques of rumi leaves and blossoms on slender spiral stems, but unfamiliar elements such as vases and columns as well.

With this single exception, all other surviving examples of early Ottoman kalem işı would seem to pertain to the first half of the fifteenth century and can in most cases be dated with considerable precision. Significant examples have come to light in the Yeşil Cami (822/1419–20 with work on decoration continuing until 827/1424), as well as in the tomb of Şehzade Ahmed (c.1430) and the Hatuniye Türbesi (853/1449) in Bursa, in the Beylerbeyi Camii (832/1429) and Üç Şerefeli Cami (847–51/1443–7) in Edirne, and in the Yahşi Bey Camii (c.1440) in Tire. The finest surviving examples from the period, however, are located in the prayer hall and fountain court of the Edirne Muradiye (839/1436). Of the three painted layers, only the first can be dated to the period in question. Its iconography includes naskhi, thuluth and kufic inscriptions set against leafy arabesques and floral scrolls, ogival medallions filled with vegetal arabesques set against dense floral backgrounds, a paradisiac garden of cypress trees and flowering bushes on a flat ground (Fig. 8.20) and geometric interlace patterns placed in a floral ground. Forms are outlined in black on a red ground and are infilled in white, azure and yellow. That the paintings are contemporary with the founding of the mosque is established by the fact that the blue underglaze painted tiles of the prayer hall dado, which can be securely dated to the mid-fifteenth century by the presence of analogous tiles in the mihrab, overlap the painted decoration. Because so few examples of early kalem işı survive, it is not possible to say much about its stylistic development in the early Ottoman period. While later examples from the Classical period, such as the painted decoration of the Selimiye Camii in Edirne (1569–74), resemble contemporary textiles, earlier examples would seem to show a greater affinity to the art of illumination.39

Textiles

Although the production of luxury textiles in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia is confirmed by numerous references in contemporary travels, histories and documents, little survives from the time in the form of actual woven fabrics. It is clear that silk production had for some time been associated with several places in Anatolia. In a well-known passage of his Travels, for

39 For kalem işı, see Elisabetta Gasparini, Le pitture murali della Muradiye de Edirne (Padua, 1985); Yıldız Demiriz, Osmanlı Mimarisi’nde Süsleme, I, Erken Devir (1300–1453) (Istanbul, 1979), pp. 23–4, and under specific buildings.
example, Marco Polo informs us that silk fabrics of crimson and other colours, as well as many other kinds of cloth, were woven in Anatolia, and earlier the Seljuk historian Karim al-Din Aqsara’i, in an enumeration of tribute gifts sent from the Seljuk court in Konya to the Ilkhanid ruler in 1258, mentions Antalya brocades (kamkha-i Antali).\(^40\) Writing in the early fourteenth century, al-‘Umari records that the principality of Akira (presumably Ankara) to the south of Sinop, on the northern border of the domains of Orhan Gazi, produced large quantities of silk which was the equal of Byzantine brocade and cloth of Constantinople.\(^41\) Other sources imply that silks were produced in Aydın in the early fourteenth century and that red silk stuffs were manufactured in

\(^{40}\) Marco Polo, The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East, tr. and ed. Henry Yule (London, 1921), 1, p. 43; Karim al-Din Aqsara’i, Müşâmeret ül-ahbâr: Moines Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi, ed. O. Turan (Ankara, 1944), p. 62.

\(^{41}\) Al-‘Umari, Masalik al-absar, Al-‘Umari’s Bericht über Anatolien, ed. F. Taeschner (Leipzig, 1929), p. 43.
 Alaşehir (Philadelphia), then still under Byzantine control, during the reign of Murad I. Concerning more common textiles, Mustaufi states that cotton was produced in Sivas, Ankara, Erzincan, Konya and Malatya, and Ibn Battuta takes note of an unparalleled cotton cloth with borders of gold, renowned for the strength of its weaving and the quality of its cotton, named for the town of Ladik (the ancient Laodicea) in the upper reaches of the Menander near Denizli.

Just when the silk industry was established in Bursa is uncertain, although it seems clear from the fact that Orhan Gazi built a bezazistan (drapers’ market) in his capital in the middle of the fourteenth century that the textile trade must already have been of some importance. Such was certainly the case when Bertrandon de la Broquières passed through the city in 1432, for he notes that all sorts of silk materials as well as cotton stuffs were for sale in the bazaar of Bursa, although he does not state that the silks were actually produced locally. That the manufacture of silk textiles was already established in Bursa by the end of the fourteenth century, and its products were being exported to Europe, is confirmed by Schiltberger, who compares the city’s silk trade and industry with that of Damascus and Caffa and adds that its products were sent from there to Venice and Lucca.

The raw silk used in the local manufacture of luxury textiles was not produced in Bursa itself, but was imported from the districts of Gilan and Mazandaran, south of the Caspian Sea in Iran. From there it was transported for the most part overland via Tabriz, Erzurum, and Erzincan to Bursa, where Persian traders established direct contacts with local and foreign merchants. Because of the strong demand for silk brocades, velvets and satins, and because the state treasury derived substantial revenues from the silk trade, it appears that the Ottomans pursued a conscious policy of establishing Bursa as a major entrepôt for Persian silk, and that this aim was at least in part the motivation behind the extension of their political and military authority eastward in the direction of Amasya, Tokat and Erzincan, and south toward Malatya, that is, along the silk routes out of Iran.

42 Mustaufi, Geographical, pp. 95, 98, 102.
44 Schiltberger, Bondage and Travels, p. 34.
Although tantalising references to the silk trade in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia are to be found in the various literary sources, when it comes to actual woven textiles, almost nothing survives which can be securely attributed to the period. That this should be the case is at first glance, perhaps, surprising, given the existence of the enormous collection of royal garments and other textile pieces totalling some 2,500 items housed in the Topkapı Museum in Istanbul. Comprising ceremonial garments and embroideries, the collection had its origins in the Ottoman custom of bundling up the belongings of a deceased ruler or prince and preserving them in the palace treasury. Although this practice assured the preservation of these textiles, it in no way guaranteed that a proper recording of their date and ownership would be kept. Not surprisingly, inaccurate inventory lists, the mixing up of labels among bundles at times of periodic inspection and the often speculative attributions made by court officials resulted in a situation in which little reliance can be put on the court records concerning these materials. Despite this, the Turkish art historian Tahsin Öz, in a pioneering study of Turkish woven fabrics based on this collection, attributed to the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries a group of ten white cotton and silk kaftans, all with large floral patterns surrounded by long serrated leaves in silk and silver thread. In the light of present research, however, his attributions must be regarded as speculative at best.

To this questionable body of material there can be added a single silk brocade, found today in the treasury of the twelfth-century monastery of Studenica in Serbia, where it is held by popular tradition to have been the funeral pall of the Serbian king Stefan Prvovenčani, donated by Olivera-Despina, the younger daughter of the Serbian Prince Lazar, who was taken by Bayezid I as his wife after the battle of Kosovo in 1389. The organisation of the textile into a succession of stripes patterned alternately with geometric, floral and cloud band motifs and bands of calligraphy is distinct from that of the vast majority of later Ottoman textiles, but is frequently encountered in fourteenth-century luxury fabrics from Persia, Egypt, North Africa and Spain. Two inscriptions in thuluth on the pall repeat the invocations ‘the wise and just Sultan’ (al-sultan al-‘alim al-‘adil) and ‘Sultan Bayezid Han, may his victory be glorious’ (Sultan Bayazid Han ‘azza nasruhu), and when interpreted in the context of both the

Broquière’s comments, see Voyage d’Outremer, tr. Kline, p. 84; for Schiltberger, Bondage and Travels, p. 34. For the statement that by the end of the fourteenth century Bursa already possessed an industry in silk fabrics, see İnalcık, ‘Harir’, El2, iii, p. 216. For the Ottoman policy of promoting Bursa as a major entrepôt for Persian silk, see ibid., p. 212; Nurhan Atasoy and Julian Raby, İpek: The Crescent and the Rose: Imperial Ottoman Silks and Velvets (London, 2001), pp. 155–9.
historical and stylistic evidence, would appear to refer to the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I. Although several of the motifs, most notably the flowers and cloud bands, derive from Chinese sources, and it is not impossible that the piece was produced by Chinese weavers for a Near Eastern patronage, the late Richard Ettinghausen argued persuasively that owing to its historical inscription, the richness of its decoration and its royal connections, the Studenica silk must be regarded as the outstanding example of late fourteenth-century Turkish textile arts.\footnote{46}

**Carpets**

As compared with contemporary Turkish textiles, carpet weaving in fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century Anatolia is considerably better documented both by extant pieces and representations of carpets in contemporary European painting.\footnote{47} That fine carpets were made in thirteenth-century Anatolia is attested by Marco Polo (\textit{tepedi ottimi e li piu belli del mondo}), who passed through the region in 1271,\footnote{48} and by the Mamluk historian and geographer Abu‘l-Fida, who states on the authority of Ibn Sa‘id (d. 1274) that Turkoman carpets were made in Aksaray.\footnote{49} Ibn Battuta, writing in the early fourteenth century, confirms this remark, asserting that, ‘There are manufactured there [in Aksaray] the rugs of sheep’s wool called after it, which have no equal in any country and they are exported from it to Syria, Egypt, Iraq, India, China and the lands of the Turks.’\footnote{50} In addition, Bertrand de la


\footnote{48} Marco Polo, \textit{The Book of Ser Marco Polo}, 1, p. 46.


\footnote{50} Ibn Battuta, \textit{Travels}, II, pp. 432–3.
Broquière remarks that in 1432 he witnessed the way in which carpets were woven while travelling near İznik.\footnote{51}{Bertrandon de la Broquière, \textit{Le Voyage d'Outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière}, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), p. 86.}

The so-called Konya-type carpets are widely accepted as being of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century date. Examples of this type were first discovered by F. R. Martin in 1905 in the Alaeddin Camii in Konya. Additional fragments were subsequently found by R. M. Riefstahl in the Esrefoğlu Camii in Beyşehir and in Fustat (old Cairo), the latter confirming Ibn Sa'ïd and Ibn Battuta's statements that Anatolian carpets were exported to Egypt. The Konya pieces, three very large though damaged carpets and five smaller fragments, are all today in the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul,\footnote{52}{Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi, 678, 681, 684, 685, 688, 689, 692/3.} while two of the Beyşehir pieces are in the Mevlana Museum in Konya and the third is divided between the Keir Collection in London and a private collection in Germany. Eight Fustat fragments of the Konya type are dispersed among the National-museum in Stockholm, the Röhsska Konstlöjdsmuseum in Göteborg and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. On the whole, these carpets are sufficiently well known as to require only some general comments. As a group they are characterised by wide borders with monumental pseudo-kufic characters or large stars, which contrast strongly with the field patterns composed of single small geometric motifs arranged in staggered rows, some isolated and others connected. The austerity of their design is reinforced by their sombre colour scheme of five to eight tints, including a medium and a dark shade of blue, a medium and dark red, yellow, ivory and dark brown. The carpets are entirely of wool but are not very finely woven, having an average density of seventy-seven symmetrical ‘Turkish’ knots to the square inch. Erdmann noted that given the dimensions of the three damaged full carpets from the Alaeddin Camii, the largest measuring some 2.85 by 5.50 metres, these could not have been the products of nomad or village weavers, but must have been done in urban workshops, since the looms on which they were woven had to have been more than 2.5 meters in width. Just where these workshops were located remains an unanswered question. Speculation as to whether these are the products of some sort of court workshop is inconclusive, though there is every reason to suppose that they were produced by weavers who catered to the needs of the ruling elite. While their provenance is generally agreed to be central Anatolia, the precise date of the Konya-type carpets remains something of a mystery. Indeed, they have been placed anywhere from the early thirteenth to the early fifteenth century. That rugs of this sort must
have been produced well into the fourteenth century seems confirmed by \textit{t}\text{"i}em 688 (Fig. 8.21), the pattern of which has been shown to derive from a type of Yuan silk damask found in Egyptian tombs dating to \textit{c.} 1300, while one of the Beyşehir fragments with a design of pendant palmettes in staggered
rows turned alternately left and right may even date to the early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{53}

It is likely that production of Konya-type carpets overlapped chronologically that of a second type of Turkish carpet, designated by Erdmann the Anatolian animal carpet. These latter were apparently much admired in the west, to which they seem to have been exported in large quantities, for representations of animal carpets had already begun to turn up in the work of Sienese and Florentine painters in the first half of the fourteenth century, where they appear as coverings on floors, on the steps of thrones of the Madonna, on altars and tables, and hanging from balconies and windows. Since one must assume that the animal carpets would have been in production in Anatolia for some time before they found their way to Italy, it is probable that carpets of this sort had their origin no later than the last decades of the thirteenth century.

The rugs represented in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Italian, Spanish and Netherlandish painting were carefully studied years ago by Wilhelm von Bode, Ernst Kühnel and Kurt Erdmann,\textsuperscript{54} and are characterised by fields divided into rows of rectangles or squares with bevelled corners, in each of which is represented abstract and angular animal forms. The rectangles themselves are separated from one another by broad borders, the ornamental treatment of which in most paintings is either unrepresented or unintelligible. Typical fourteenth-century motifs include single birds or quadrupeds such as lions standing in the field rectangles. An example of the former can be seen in Niccolo di Buonacorso’s \textit{Marriage of the Virgin} (c.1370) in the National Gallery in London (Fig. 8.22), while stylised lions are depicted in the field squares of a fourteenth-century Sienese painting of the \textit{Annunciation} formerly in the Schlössmuseum in Berlin, as well as in a contemporary painting of the \textit{Marriage of the Virgin} by Giovanni di Paolo in the Galleria Doria in Rome. Later fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century paintings depict carpets with field panels filled with pairs of angular birds flanking severely stylised trees as in a \textit{Marriage of the Virgin} by Sano di Pietro in the Pinacoteca Vaticana in Rome and

\textsuperscript{53} For a discussion of the connection between ibraries and the Yüan silk damasks from Egypt, as well as of the Beyschir carpet with pendant palmettes today divided between the Keir Collection and the private German collection, see Agnes Geijer, ‘Some Thoughts on the Problems of Early Oriental Carpets’, \textit{Ars Orientalis} 5 (1963), 82–3.

in a *Madonna and Child* by Giovanni di Paolo in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (41.190.16). In addition, from the early fifteenth century we find painted representations of carpets in which pairs of animals are presented side by side in a single rectangle as in a painting by Fra Angelico entitled *Enthroned Madonna with Saints* in the Museo di San Marco in Florence, or alternatively, in which two animals are shown in combat. The most famous depiction of
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this latter theme is to be found in Domenico di Bartolo’s *The Wedding of the Foundlings*, a fresco in the Hospital of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, dating to between 1440 and 1444. Significantly, in some of these depictions of later carpets the animals represented alternate from panel to panel.55

A number of painted representations of Anatolian animal carpets, documents which are of particular value because many of the paintings can be dated with some precision, have been catalogued and the authenticity of these representations has been verified by reference to fragments of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Anatolian animal carpets found at Fustat and today in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Statens Historiska Museum in Stockholm and elsewhere. Nonetheless, surviving carpets and carpet fragments of this type are exceedingly rare. Three animal carpets or carpet fragments in Turkish museums56 with zoomorphic motifs recalling those of the carpet depicted in a painting of the *Madonna and Child with Saints* by the fifteenth-century Catalan artist Jaume Huguet (Museo de Arte de Cataluna, Barcelona) are said to belong to this group and have been assigned a fifteenth-century date, although that attribution has not met with universal acceptance.57 In addition, a recently acquired carpet in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (1990.61), with animal motifs similar to those depicted in a late fourteenth-century Sienese School painting of the *Marriage of the Virgin* in the National Gallery in London, has been dated to the fourteenth century.58 However, the two most famous carpets of this type, one from an Italian, the other from a Swedish church, are to be found in European museums. The first (Fig. 8.23), a fragment purchased for the Berlin Museum by Wilhelm von Bode in 1890 from a Rome antique dealer and said to come from a church in central Italy, is surely one of the most widely discussed carpets in the whole of rug literature. Its field is divided into two large rectangles, each containing an octagon on which a stylised blue dragon and phoenix outlined in red

---


56 *-scalm 566, Istanbul Vakıflar Halı Müzesi*, no. 1036, Konya Mevlana Müzesi, no. 841.


struggle against a yellow ground. The motif has origins in Chinese art and bears a striking resemblance to that on the carpet depicted by Domenico di Bartolo in Siena (referred to above), suggesting an early fifteenth-century date. The second carpet, known as the Marby Rug (Statens Historiska Museum 17786), was discovered by C. J. Lamm in a church in Marby in Jämtland, western Sweden, and is characterised by an overall field composition similar to that of
the Berlin carpet but with confronting cocks placed symmetrically on either side of a stylised tree, again against a yellow ground.

Woven in symmetrical ‘Turkish’ knots, Erdmann saw the Anatolian animal carpets as being related in terms of structure, colour range and wool quality to later Bergama carpets and hence localised their production to western Anatolia in the period between the end of the thirteenth and the middle of the fifteenth century. This was a region which until only recently had been under Byzantine rule, and it is possible therefore that some of the zoomorphic motifs found on the carpets were influenced by Byzantine textile design, although it is well established that silks with animal patterns had long been produced in the Islamic Near East where they were held in high regard for several centuries. From western Anatolia, with close commercial links to Genoa and Venice, animal carpets could have found their way to Italy without difficulty. Curiously, no examples of animal carpets with field compositions of the sort encountered in the Berlin and Stockholm rugs or depicted in the majority of Italian painted representations – that is, one or more stylised animals in square or rectangular field compartments – has been preserved in Anatolia itself, suggesting that these carpets may have been more popular in the west than in the land of their origin, where geometric and foliate forms may have been favoured. Indeed, it has even been suggested that Anatolian animal carpets were made up primarily for export and hence reflect a western rather than a Turkish taste. It should be noted, however, that depictions of animal carpets with stylised beasts in octagonal frames not unlike the Berlin and Marby rugs also appear in fourteenth-century Ilkhanid book illustration, as for instance in the painting of Zahhak Enthroned, today in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, from the mid-fourteenth-century Great Mongol Shahname, and that a well-known fragment of a field octagon containing a stylised bird found today in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (27.170.89) came from Fustat.

Finally, there is evidence that already in the fourteenth century two other types of rug were being woven in Anatolia alongside the Konya carpets and animal carpets. The first of these is known today from a surviving piece from Beyşehir (Riefstahl’s Beyşehir XII, today in the Mevlana Müzesi, Konya), dated to the early fifteenth century, as well as from fragments of similar carpets recovered from Fustat, while the second is documented by a handful of representations in Italian painting of the second half of the fourteenth century. These latter, including a pair of frescos of the School of Giotto, one at Assisi and the other in Santo Spirito in Prato, dating to the first half of the fourteenth century and a third fresco of the Annunciation of the Virgin in the church of Santa Maria
Nouvella in Florence from the end of the fourteenth century, depict carpets characterised by a division of the field into rectangles in a manner similar to the animal carpets, but different from the latter in that the rectangles are filled with geometric patterns rather than with zoomorphic motifs. The Beyşehir carpet and Fustat fragments, on the other hand, have fields patterned with staggered rows of geometric and geometrisied floriate motifs on a blue ground (Fig. 8.24). As such they should be seen as precursors of the later so-called Holbein carpets of Bergama and Uşak of the mid-fifteenth to late sixteenth century. That such carpets are unrecorded in European painting and, in so far as is known, are not preserved in any European collection suggests that, just as the zoomorphic carpets may well have been made for export, the geometric rugs were possibly manufactured for a domestic market. Perversely, if such is the case, the nature of the evidence has ensured that the carpets made for a foreign taste are today better known than those fashioned for local consumption.

Ceramics

The common ware glazed pottery types associated with the Seljuk period in Anatolia continued to be produced into the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Finds at İznik, for example, including sgraffito wares, slip painted earthenwares covered with clear as well as turquoise or brown glaze, and black underglaze painted wares under a turquoise glaze, all types known from Kalehisar, Beyşehir and elsewhere in Anatolia, suggest that the techniques for their production had been introduced into Bithynia by the Ottomans in the early fourteenth century. In addition to these, a new, distinctively Turkish glazed common pottery makes its appearance in the fourteenth century. Known as 'Miletus ware', it is characterised by a red or buff earthenware body covered by a white slip painted in cobalt blue, turquoise, green, purple and black usually under a clear lead glaze. Motifs range from simple stem, leaf and flower motifs to geometric patterns and naturalistic bird forms set in leafy fields. Because

59 For the Assisi and Prato frescos, see Kurt Erdmann, Oriental Carpets: an Account of their History, tr. Charles Grant Ellis (Fishguard, 1976), figs. 17, 18; for the fresco in Santa Maria Nouvella, Florence, see Erdmann, History, fig. 25.

Figure 8.24 Proto-Holbein carpet from Beyşehir (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, no. 841) (Photo Walter B. Denny)
fragments of this pottery were first found on the islands of the Aegean, the earliest published accounts referred to it as 'Island Ware'. Quantities of it were also found by Th. Weigand in the course of his excavations at Miletus (Balat) and, given that area’s long history as a centre for the production of pottery, it was assumed to be a local product despite the fact that no kilns were found with which its manufacture could be associated. In fact, ‘Miletus wares’ have subsequently turned up at many sites, not only in Anatolia but also in the southern Balkans, including Afyon, Amasya, Antalya, Athens, Bergama, Bursa, Edirne, Istanbul, Karaçahisar, Konya, Malatya, Sardis, Selçuk, Seyitgazi, Silifke and Yalova, and more significantly, kilns and wasters have been found at Kütahya, at Akcaalan near Ezine in the Troad, and at İznik. The İznik kilns, excavated by Oktay Aslanapa in the 1960s, make clear the fact that the latter town, in particular, was an important centre for the production of ‘Miletus ware’. It must be assumed, nonetheless, that common wares of this sort were produced over a wide area in western and central Anatolia and perhaps the south-eastern Balkans as well.\(^\text{61}\)

Although the various sub-groupings of ‘Miletus wares’ await systematic classification, it is nonetheless clear that the term covers a range of stylistic and technical types and undoubtedly refers to a lengthy production. Its appearance in post-conquest contexts in Istanbul establishes the fact that it continued in use into the early decades of the sixteenth century, but the date of its initial production remains ill defined. In terms of decoration, the geometric and radial designs of the ‘Miletus wares’ suggest possible links with fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Syrian pottery, while some of the plant motifs seem to have links to fourteenth-century Chinese blue-and-white porcelain. It is significant that Byzantine influence seems to be entirely absent from its painted decoration. ‘Miletus ware’ would thus appear to be an unsophisticated and mass-produced pottery of a local west Anatolian ceramic industry ranging in date from the mid-fourteenth to the early sixteenth century. It is important to note, however, that neither in technique nor in style does this pottery have anything in common with the luxury frit wares, which begin to be produced in İznik under court patronage from the latter half of the sixteenth century.\(^\text{62}\)


The use of faience as architectural decoration in the Anatolian emirates, while continuing a Seljuk tradition, is with the exception of a handful of monuments far less ambitious than in the preceding century. As can be seen from the mihrab of the Ulu Cami of Birgi (712/1312–13) (Fig. 8.25), in terms


Figure 8.25 Mihrab, Ulu Cami of Birgi, 712/1312–13 (Boğaziçi University, Aptullah Kuran Archive)
of technique, colour scheme and motifs, there is little to distinguish beylik-
period work from that of the thirteenth century. Other notable examples of
Seljuk-style cut tile used for beylik-period architectural decoration are the
interior of the dome of the tomb of Gazi Mehmed Bey (734/1334) at Birgi,
the pendentives of the mihrab bay of the Isa Bey Camii (776/1375) at Ayasoluk
and the mihrab of the Hasbey Darülhuffaz (824/1421) in Konya. Turquoise
or green glazed brick is worked into geometric patterns on the shafts of the
minarets of the Yakutiye Medresesi (710/1310–11) in Erzurum and the Ulu Cami
(778/1376) of Manisa, and on the drum of the Güdük Minare (748/1347) in Sivas.
On the whole, however, as compared with the glories of Seljuk architectural
faience of the previous century, the beylik period is one of scattered efforts
and decline, mirroring perhaps the diminished resources available for such
purposes.

The earliest Ottoman use of faience and glazed brick for architectural deco-
ration dates back to the end of the fourteenth century and is to be found on the
shaft of the minaret of the Yeşil Cami (780–94/1378/9–91/2) in İz尼克, which is
completely revetted with cut tile and glazed bricks. Despite the minaret’s cata-
strophic restoration using modern Kütahya tiles in the early 1960s, it remains
clear that the İz尼克 minaret continues in the tradition of Seljuk glazed brick
and faience decorated minarets of the thirteenth century. Its shaft, covered
with a zigzag pattern of glazed bricks, is framed by borders of intersecting
octagons and braided and geometric star patterns, and is surmounted by a
balcony carried on moulded faience muqarnas. The dominant colour is green,
to which fact, obviously, the mosque’s name is to be attributed, but tiles of
turquoise, cobalt, purple and yellow were used as well.

Although monochrome tiles in turquoise and cobalt were used a few
years later in the decoration of the Yıldırım Bayezid’s mosque and hospi-
tal (c.793–802/1390–1399/1400) in Bursa, the most magnificent ensemble of
early Ottoman ceramic decoration is to be found in the mosque and tomb
of the Yeşil complex (822–7/1419–24) of Mehmed I. Tile-revetted areas in the
mosque include the mihrab niche, dados around the main and side eyvans,
the flanking tabhanes, the two mahfils at the back of the fountain court,
and the upper-storey imperial tribune (hünkar mahfili) and flanking ante-
chambers and balconies. In the case of the tomb, both exterior and interior are
enriched with faience decoration. On its exterior, broad expanses of turquoise
faience contrast dramatically with the epigraphic tympana above the windows
and the exuberant calligraphic and vegetal decoration of the portal niche
(Fig. 8.26), while the interior, dominated by a splendid faience mihrab, is
enriched as well by a turquoise dado with great arabesque medallions,
and a magnificent tiled cenotaph atop a high plinth (Fig. 8.27). The tiled revetments of the Yeşil complex are noteworthy not only for the scale on which the work was carried out, but also for the range of techniques used in the project. Indeed, three techniques can be identified. Two of these, veneers of monochrome glazed turquoise, green and blue tile and cut-tile faience mosaic, hark back to the Seljuk tradition of ceramic architectural decoration of the thirteenth century. To these, however, a new technique was added, one that has its origins in Timurid Iran. Known as *cuerda seca* (‘dry cord’), it involved the decoration of a single tile in glazes of several colours, a technique made possible by outlining the design on the ceramic body in thin lines using a greasy black pigment. Glazes of different colours applied within these contours were thus prevented from running together.
It is significant that the *cuerda seca* technique was unknown to either the Seljuks or the Ottomans before the construction of the Yeşil complex. As such Mehmed’s foundation must be seen, not only in its scale and sumptuousness, but also in terms of technology, as an important point of departure in the history of Ottoman art. While *cuerda seca* tiles are not encountered in Anatolia before this date, they had already, as early as the 1360s, been used in Timurid Central Asia in the decoration of the tombs of the Shah-i Zinda in Samarkand, where, after 1385, they were juxtaposed with work in cut-tile mosaic, possibly introduced to the Timurid capital by craftsmen brought from what had been Seljuk Anatolia and Ilkhanid Azerbaijan. The juxtaposition in Mehmed’s foundation of *cuerda seca* tiles with ceramic techniques long established in Anatolia thus suggests the involvement of craftsmen familiar with Timurid tilework, a supposition confirmed by a Persian inscription on the mosque’s mihrab identifying it as ‘The work of the Masters of Tabriz’.

Further evidence for the involvement of Persian craftsmen in the decoration of the Yeşil complex is to be found in a signature on one of the tomb’s wooden doors, stating that it is ‘The work of Ali bin Hacı Ahmed of Tabriz’, and in an inscription dated 827/1424 over the mosque’s imperial tribune containing the name of Ali bin İlyas Ali, who apparently functioned as the overseer of the entire decorative programme. This latter person, known from other sources
as Nakkaş Ali (Ali the Designer), was a native of Bursa who had been carried off
to Transoxiana by Timur in 1402. There he evidently became familiar with the
Timurid style and in time, returning to Bursa, was instrumental in transmitting
aspects of Timurid design and visual culture back into his homeland. It is also
noteworthy that, according to the historian Aşıkpaşazade, the sultan’s vezir,
İvaz Paşa, who was both administrative overseer and architect of the Yeşil
complex, brought craftsmen from Acem, that is from Iran, to work on it.

Timurid influence is also suggested by the range of colours employed in
the tilework of the Yeşil complex and by the style of its decoration. Thus,
in addition to the turquoise and eggplant purple of Seljuk tilework, yellow,
green, white and a matt red are used. Likewise, new and richer styles of deco-
roration make their appearance, in particular spiralling leafy compositions with
convoluted cloud bands and the stylised lotus blossoms sometimes referred to
as hatayı or Cathayan. Deriving directly from the orientalising international
Timurid art of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, these elements are
played off against arabesques of split leaf palmettes and elongated pointed
foliage connected by slender, undulating stems in the rumi style, and geom-
etric borders and bands of calligraphy. Indeed, the entire aesthetic of Mehmed’s
tomb is Timurid in the manner of Samarkand and Herat. And yet if foreign
influence is strongly felt in design, in range of colours, in glazing techniques
and in decorative motifs, it is significant that the tiles themselves are indis-
putably the work of local potters, for in their fabrics of red earthenware cov-
ered with white slip and lead glaze, they have no connection whatsoever with
the white frit tiles of Iran, but rather, are identical to contemporary ‘Miletus
wares’.

Thus, the ambitious use of glazed ceramic as architectural decoration, which
had fallen into decline in fourteenth-century Anatolia, experienced a sudden
revival at the beginning of the fifteenth century. That this revival was the work
of an atelier of foreign craftsmen who identified themselves as the ‘Masters
of Tabriz’ is clear both from epigraphy and from the tile-making techniques
that they used. It is further apparent that the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ were not only
involved with Mehmed I’s great building programme, but continued in the
service of the Ottoman sultans for the next half-century. Although some of
their work is to be found in Bursa, in the mosque and medrese of the Muradiye
complex (828–30/1425–6), beginning around 1429 the key focus of their activity
appears to have shifted to Edirne. Here they were involved in the decoration
of the Şahmelek Camii (832/1429), and most significantly in Murad’s two key
monuments in that city, the Muradiye Camii (839/1436) and the Üç Şerefeli
Cami (847–51/1443–7). In the former, tiles are used to revet the enormous
mihrab and the dado running around the three sides of the mihrab bay. The former, executed largely in cuerda seca tiles, bears such a striking resemblance to the mihrab of the Yeşil Cami in Bursa that there can be little question but that it too is the work of the same craftsmen.

At the same time, the Muradiye testifies to significant changes in the technical range of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’. The use of cut tile seems to have been abandoned by them after 1425, while in the Muradiye a new type of cobalt blue-and-white underglaze painted tile is introduced. This latter is encountered most strikingly in the dado of blue-and-white hexagonal and turquoise green triangular tiles (Fig. 8.28) and is worthy of note for several reasons. First, these are the earliest examples not only of underglaze painted tile but also of blue-and-white ceramic to be produced by the Ottomans; and second, they are the earliest Ottoman ceramics to be produced with white frit bodies. Significantly, the frit fabric, while similar in appearance to that of later İznil wares, was produced using an alkaline frit technology typical of Iran rather than the lead frit that is typical of later İznil pottery.
Among the 479 blue-and-white hexagonal tiles of the dado, 53 distinct painted types can be identified. A number of these are geometric and radial compositions derived from the repertoire of Islamic design, but the majority are inspired by Chinese blue-and-white wares of the Yuan and early Ming periods. Chinoiserie forms encountered on these tiles include a type of distinctive lobed and pointed leaf with pairs of spikes on either side familiar from fourteenth-century Chinese porcelain, and lotus flowers, often outlined in the Chinese manner on slender, sometimes curved or undulating stems, inspired by early fifteenth-century Chinese blue-and-white wares.

Curiously, the tiles of the dado friezes are a later addition to the mosque. This is shown by the fact that fragments of the painted (kalem işi) decoration which originally covered the full elevation of the walls of the mihrab bay have been found behind the dado tiles, making it clear that the latter were not part of the Muradiye’s original decoration but were applied at some later date. Just when that might have been is uncertain, but the blue-and-white hexagonal tiles must have been produced by the same workshop as the mihrab and hence be of approximately the same date as the mosque since moulded muqarnas prisms in the frame and the border frieze of the cuerda seca mihrab are done in underglaze blue-and-white.

The ‘Masters of Tabriz’ were also involved in the decoration of Murad II’s Üç Şerefeli Mosque, where they were commissioned to produce eighteen tiled tympana for the windows of the courtyard. Only two of these have survived. That they were the work of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ is apparent from their frames of running floral scrolls that are similar to those framing the dado in the Muradiye. The fields of the two surviving lunettes are practically the same, consisting of dramatic inscriptions in soaring thuluth script interlaced with smaller inscriptions in an angular kufic, set against a background of spiral stems and rumi leaves. Here the Tabrizi potters have abandoned the cuerda seca technique and substituted for it a new polychrome underglaze painted colour scheme in turquoise, cobalt blue and manganese purple which, however, replicates to some degree the cuerda seca colour scheme.

The workshop of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ continued to function into the years following the conquest of Constantinople, as is clear from the presence of two similar tympana in the courtyard of the Fatih Mosque in Istanbul, built between 1463 and 1470. While reminiscent of the Edirne panels in design, they are notably different in one respect, namely the inclusion of yellow in the palette of underglaze painted colours. That the workshop of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ survived as late as the end of the 1470s seems apparent from an examination of the so-called Tomb of Cem Sultan (884/1479) in Bursa, for although the
workmanship of the blue and purple underglaze tiles in the dado borders and tympana is of distinctly lesser quality than is that of the Muradiye tiles, their designs – split palmettes in the borders, geometric motifs and palmettes on the octagonal tiles of the tympana – clearly continue in a design tradition having origins forty years earlier. Following the completion of the Tomb of Sultan Cem, the production of underglaze painted frit tiles comes to an end in western Turkey until revived in the second decade of the sixteenth century. By that time, however, the workshop of the ‘Masters of Tabriz’ was no longer in existence, for not only are the colour scheme and design of these tiles, now associated with the potteries of early sixteenth-century İzni, distinct from those of the Tabriz potters, but the technology is one based on the use of the lead frit preferred by Turkey rather than the alkaline frit used by the Iranian craftsmen and their followers.

Woodcarving

Woodcarving occupies an important place among the Turkish arts of Anatolia. Careful workmanship was lavished on architectural fittings and furnishings, including minbers, lecterns (rahle), doors, window shutters, columns, capitals, beams and consoles. Generally, these furnishings are fashioned of hard woods, most especially of walnut, but also of apple, pear, cedar, ebony and rosewood. While in general the woodwork of the beylik and early Ottoman periods follows closely the tradition of the preceding Seljuk period, a few new departures do manifest themselves in both technique and style. These include not only the incorporation into the wood craftsmen’s repertoire of pattern new motifs such as the hatayı blossom from the international Timurid style, but also the first tentative use of wood and bone inlay, a technique which appears in Cairo at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century and which was to become especially important in the Ottoman art of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Of the techniques most commonly employed by the woodworker, either alone or in combination with one another, the simplest involved the relief carving of various motifs and profiles into a single plank. It was a technique used especially for smaller architectural fittings such as shutters and the doors of *minbers*, but required wood of high quality, without defects, and had as a drawback the tendency of furnishings fashioned in this manner to warp or split as they dried. To counteract this tendency, a second technique, that of tongue-and-groove construction (*kündekari*), was used. Tongue-and-groove construction seems to have developed in the twelfth century and appears in Anatolia at about the same time as in late Fatimid Egypt and Syria. Favoured for the construction of *mihrabs* and doors with their broad, flat surfaces, *kündekari* furnishings and fittings are made up of tongue-edged panels of polygonal or stellate shape carved with arabesque relief, which are then fitted into grooved frames. Because the grain of the panels runs in directions different from that of the frame, warping is retarded and cracking or splitting counteracted. True *kündekari* places high demands on the joiner’s skill, however, and as a result a third technique, sometimes referred to as false *kündekari*, was developed, whereby whole planks were carved in relief with the stellate and polygonal patterns of true *kündekari* and were then mounted on the framework of a *minber* or other piece of furniture with pins. In some rare instances, strips of wood imitating in appearance the narrow frames of true *kündekari* panels were nailed or glued into the channels between the relief carving on these planks as well. Although the visual effect is that of true *kündekari*, this ‘false *kündekari*’ suffered from the same warping and splitting as furnishings cut from a single plank.

A surprisingly large number of outstanding fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century *minbers* and wooden architectural fittings bear inscriptions giving the names and titles – *neccar* or *derüdger* (carpenter) or as *nakkaş* (decorator) – of the craftsmen who made them. In some cases, these inscriptions serve to identify families through which the craft was transmitted. Muzafferreddin b. Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, who fashioned the *minber* of the Ulu Cami of Birgi in 722/1322 at the command of Mehmed Bey, the emir of Aydın, for example, was apparently the son of the carpenter (*neccar*) Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, who carved a lectern (*rahle*) of an unspecified date in the thirteenth century now in the Islamic Museum in Berlin (No. 1.584). In other instances, several works can be attributed by these inscriptions to a single craftsman. Thus, Hacı Muhammed b. Abdülaziz bin al-Daki is known for two wooden *minbers*, that of the Ulu Cami of Manisa, made by order of the Saruhanid ruler Çelebi Ishak b. İlyas in 788/1376–7 following the design (*kataba khattahu wa rasama naqshahu*)
of a certain Yusuf b. Fakih, and that of the Ulu Cami of Bursa, executed at the command of Sultan Bayezid b. Murad Han in 802/1399–1400. The nakkaş Abdullah b. Mahmud worked in Kastamonu and Ankara during the second half of the fourteenth century and is known for four works spanning a quarter-century: a wooden cenotaph for the mausoleum of Ahi Şerafeddin in Ankara dated in Receb 751/September 1350; the doors of the mosque of İbn Neccar in Kastamonu dated 9 Zilhicce 758/23 November 1357; the doors of the mosque of Mahmud Bey at Kasaba Köyü in the vicinity of Kastamonu, dated Ramazan 768/May 1367, and those of the Mahmud Bey Camii at Ilısu, dated 776/1374–5.

An outstanding example of a beylik minber done in the true kündekari technique is that of the Sungur Bey Camii in Niğde (736/1335–6), now in the Diş Cami in the same town, the work of Ebubekr b. Muallim. False kündekari work can be seen in the unique wooden mihrab of the mosque of Taşkınpaşa in Damsa Köyü dating to the middle of the fourteenth century, today in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara, and the minber of the Ulu Camii of Çorum, dated 10 Safer 706/22 August 1306, signed by two craftsmen who identify themselves by their nisbas as having links with Ankara, Davud bin Abdullah and Muhammed bin Ebubekr. Earlier work by the latter is found in the minbers of two late thirteenth-century mosques in Ankara, the Arslanhane Camii and the no longer extant Kızıl Bey Mescidi (the latter minber today in pieces in the Ethnographic Museum). From a technical point of view, the minber of the Taşkınpaşa Camii in Damsa Köyü (mid-fourteenth century) (Fig. 8.29) and the inner door of the Türbe of Hacı Bayram Veli from Ankara (early fifteenth century), both today in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara, are of special interest for the fact that they combine bone and wood inlay. In the former the inlay is found in a pair of rosettes in hexagonal frames in the spandrels of its gateway, while in the latter it is used in the stars and polygons filling the geometric strapwork on its face.

The earliest example of Ottoman woodcarving is a shutter of the Orhan Camii in Gebze, dating to the mid-fourteenth century. Consisting of three walnut panels in a frame of the same wood, it is a rather unambitious example of true kündekari, carved in a single plane of relief. This arrangement into three panels, so typical of beylik and Ottoman shutters and doors, is encountered also on the leaves of the main door of the Bayezid Paşa Camii in Amasya (817/1414). While the upper panels of the two leaves are filled with calligraphy, the large rectangular panels in the middle of each leaf is inscribed in its upper part and filled with an infinite pattern based on a twelve-pointed star below. Finally, the bottom panels are decorated with infinite patterns of palmettes. Like
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Figure 8.29 Minber bone inlay, Taşkın Paşa Camii, Damsa Köyü, Ürgüp (today in the Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara) (Photo Walter B. Denny)
the Gebze shutter, the Amasya doors are made of walnut, which, however, is worked in two broad planks and is carved in a rounded relief.

It is the doors and shutters of Çelebi Mehmed’s Yeşil complex in Bursa that from the technical, artistic and historical point of view must be regarded as the outstanding examples of the woodcarver’s art from the period. The doors of the Yeşil Türbe (Fig. 8.30) are especially noteworthy, not only because they can be approximately dated by the portal inscription on the tomb (Cemazıyelevvel 824/May 1421), but because they are inscribed with the name of the woodworker who fashioned them, Hacı Ali bin Ahmed al-Tabrizi, no doubt one of the Persian craftsmen brought to Bursa by İvaz Paşa, the architect of the
Yeşil complex, to work on Mehmed’s foundation. Fashioned from walnut in true kündekari, the doors follow the standard formula, being divided into three panels set in an inscribed frame. The upper panels are filled with geometrized patterns of rosettes carved with leafy arabesques, while the lower two are constructed of geometric star arrangements. Although different in detail from the doors and window shutters of the Yeşil Cami, the latter are for the most part sufficiently similar to the former both in technique and in specific motifs to suggest that all are the work of the same master.

Conclusions

The century and a half from the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century – the beylik and early Ottoman periods in Turkish art – is a moment of transition from, on the one hand, the artistic traditions of the Anatolian Seljuks which had been given their classical expression in the thirteenth century, and, on the other, the first Ottoman court style developed under Mehmed II in the 1460s and 1470s, following the conquest of Constantinople. Both as regards architecture and the arts, it is a period of experiment and eclecticism, tendencies reinforced by the political divisions of Anatolia among ambitious and competing emirates that sought to use the arts to enhance their political legitimacy and prestige, and promote an image of power and authority. While in central Anatolia traditions inherited from the Seljuks retained their hold through most of the fourteenth century, in western Anatolia notions carried over from the Seljuks were joined to ideas, techniques and vocabularies derived from the Byzantines, from Mamluk Egypt and from the Iranian world. Although the material resources available to the Anatolian emirates put limits on the scale and ambition of their architectural programmes and on their involvement in the luxury crafts, it is nonetheless true that among the many modest efforts of fourteenth-century architects and craftsmen, occasional monuments of true originality and taste were produced. By the early fifteenth century, this experimentation had led to a significant flowering of the arts in the Ottoman principality in particular, where a new, increasingly architectonic architecture was supplanting the old façade-style building of the Seljuks, a new white frit glazed ceramic tradition made its appearance, and the first stirrings of the arts associated with the illustrated manuscript book can be discerned. While carpet chronology is still fraught with unresolved problems, it appears that the Konya-type carpets had gradually given way to the new Anatolian animal carpet and to geometric types such as the proto-Holbeins of European painting. As regards the silk industry, a conscious Ottoman policy
of state encouragement appears to have set Bursa on the course to becoming a major centre of the luxury textile trade.

The experiments of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries were finally, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, to give rise to a new, officially inspired and imperially sponsored art and architecture in the second half of the fifteenth century. With the transfer of the capital to Istanbul and the resettlement of the city with populations brought from Anatolia and the Balkans, architectural programmes, which in scale and ambition were only hinted at by the monuments of Bursa and Edirne, were undertaken by Fatih and his successors. The Fatih complex, with its regular planning and imposing dimensions, and the New Palace of Mehmed II on Seraglio Point were metaphors for a new, bureaucratised and hierarchical, universal order. At the same time, the process of borrowing and experimentation, the sifting through of vocabularies and typologies inherited from the past, taken over from neighbouring cultural traditions and incubated in the emirates over the previous century and a half reached a moment of synthesis. While parts of this inheritance were discarded, others became central features of a new style, promoted by imperial patrons, shaped and refined by designers associated with the imperial Nakkaşhane (design studio), and realised in the work of a host of skilled architects and craftsmen who could draw on the material resources of what had now become a world empire.
It is no easy task to write the social, cultural and intellectual history of Turkey between 1071 and 1453. Although the period is a long one, the material in the official chronicles is relatively limited. While we do possess information for the political history, the same unfortunately cannot be said for the social, cultural and intellectual life of the period since most of the sources we do have, the majority of which have been translated into western languages, deal with political history. Despite this difficulty, however, valuable information can be obtained from various sources, including travel books, even if their number is limited, literature, epics and hagiographies which shed light on different aspects of the subject. It nevertheless remains true that, presuming new sources do not come to light, it will continue to be very difficult to construct a clear or complete picture of the social and cultural life of the period with the exception, perhaps, of subjects such as science, literature, Sufism and art.

If we exclude the vakfiye (endowment deeds of vakıfs, pious foundations) of the Seljuk and Ilkhan periods copied in the Ottoman period, it is clear that archival material of the type found in the Ottoman archives and which was without doubt also produced both in Seljuk Anatolia and in the period of Ilkhan domination has unfortunately not survived from those earlier periods. Such documents must either have disappeared during the plunder and destruction of the first period of the Mongol invasion or, together with those documents

1 The various types of local sources for Anatolia in the Seljuk period were made known and analysed many years ago by Fuad Köprülü in a detailed article, Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları I’, Belleten 7, 27 (1943), 379–425.

produced by the Ilkhans, were burnt and destroyed in the course of the various uprisings and pillaging by the Turkomans who sought revenge against the Seljuk and Mongol administration. This is a substantial loss for the history of the period and creates a gap in our knowledge which cannot be filled. It is this lack of sources which led some historians, such as V. Gordlevsky for example, to attempt to analyse various economic and institutional aspects of the Seljuk and beylik periods by working backwards from the Ottoman period and by using Ottoman documents as an analogy for earlier practices.

In this chapter we shall examine the social, cultural and intellectual life of the period under five main headings. After giving a historical introduction to the political history of the period, setting the subject in its historical context, we shall consider social and ethnic structure; religion; science; thought; and intellectual life.

From Asia Minor to Turkey

Anatolia, the site of the modern Turkish Republic today, has been known by many names over the centuries. Anatolia (the country where the sun rose) in ancient times, it was known as Asia in the Roman and the first Christian periods, and then as Asia Minor. For the Arabs in the early Middle Ages it was Bilad al-Rum (the land of the Rum). The Europeans in the later Middle Ages called it Turchia because in that period much of the region had passed under Turkish domination and had been largely settled by Turks. It was also more commonly known by the names used for the provinces which it had formed in the Roman and Byzantine periods. In the classical Ottoman period these two names, Anatolia (Anadolu in Turkish) and Bilad al-Rum, were used for two large eyalets (administrative divisions), Eyalet-i Anadolu and Eyalet-i Rum.3

During its history, Anatolia underwent four important political, ethnic, socio-cultural and religious transformations, in other words fundamental civilisational and cultural changes, in succession: Hellenisation, Romanisation, Christianisation and finally Islamisation. From the beginning of the nineteenth century it underwent another period of change, westernisation, for which some use the term çağdaşlaşma (muasırlaşma in Ottoman Turkish), ‘becoming

3 Turks today use both the ‘Anatolia’ of the classical period, in the form Anadolu, and the ‘Turchia’ of the Middle Ages in the form Türkiye. They never use the names Asia Minor or Bilad al-Rum. In the end, as we can see, the name Türkiye took over in the official name of the modern-day Turkish state, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, the Turkish Republic. Anadolu is more geographic, Türkiye more political, ethnic and cultural in meaning. The old Roman term, Asia Minor, is generally preferred by western historians.
contemporary’, a period which represents the most important civilisational and cultural change in Turkish history since the acceptance of Islam.

In the eleventh century, at the time of the appearance of Turkish invaders, Anatolia was under the rule of the Eastern Roman Empire, as the Byzantine Empire was known. Byzantium was locked in a political struggle with the Sassanid Empire in Iran which resulted in frequent and lengthy wars between the two states. These wars, which ended with victory sometimes for one side, sometimes for the other, negatively affected the internal politics of both empires, and served to weaken them both. Although these wars were motivated by a desire to capture territory and to establish dominion, they were perhaps driven even more by a desire to take control of the trade routes linking east and west and to secure commercial revenue-producing sources, for the economic base of both empires rested on the typical classical agricultural economy. Apart from the wars with the Sassanids, the Byzantine Empire also suffered endless and draining succession struggles among the ruling families, and the frequent changes which resulted from these rocked Byzantium and left it further weakened internally. By the eleventh century when the Turks arrived, Byzantium was no longer the strong empire which it had been in the time of Justinian (527–65) or Heraklios (610–41).

As is well known, the Roman emperor Constantine the Great (311–37) began one of the most important transformations in the history of the Mediterranean basin by bringing Christianity under his protection. This, and the declaration of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire in 391 in the time of Theodosios, resulted in the spread of Christianity, backed as it was by political force. This transformation was speeded up by the establishment of the city of Constantinople and, immediately after the death of Theodosios in 395, resulted in the separation of the empire into two. Now Anatolia was officially a Christian region under the control of the Eastern Roman Empire.

The ethnically very mixed population of Anatolia was by no means, however, all Orthodox, and there were various small churches described as ‘heretical’ to be found there. The Byzantine central administration applied heavy financial, political and religious pressure to these churches, in particular imposing high levels of taxation on them. While such pressure was designed to ensure their disappearance, it produced completely the opposite result: the members of these churches usually chose to come to an agreement with the invaders

and to join them in fighting against the Byzantines. Thus in the Ummayad and Abbasid periods the members of these ‘heretical’ churches in general gave their support to the Arabs in the military campaigns they undertook into Anatolia.

The first step in the process of the familiarisation of Anatolia with the Turks and Islam was the battle of Dandanakan in 1040. This battle, fought between the Gaznevids and the Seljuks, resulted in the settling of the Seljuks in Iran and the consequent founding of an empire, that of the Iranian Seljuks. A new Seljuk state was created in Anatolia by Seljuk expansion from Iran, and it was this state under the Seljuks, called Anatolian or Turkish Seljuks by modern Turkish historians, which affected almost every political, ethnic, social and religious aspect of this process of familiarisation. Of the four periods of transformation listed above, this was one of the most radical in the history of the region. In political terms, it pushed the frontiers of Byzantium back to western Anatolia; in ethnic terms, it drove different Turkish groups, the most significant being the Muslim Oğuz (Turkomans), into the region where they settled and began a process of Turkification; in social terms, it created a totally new society in Anatolia; and in religious terms it became symbolic of Islam, the religion they brought with them and which they made the religion of the area.

The Turkish invasion of Anatolia, undertaken with the aim of settling there, was not the result of any Seljuk policy of conquest or expansion, but was driven by internal political developments within Iran and was, for this reason, an event brought about by necessity rather than one of the ‘Turks’ own choosing. We know that the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt in Turkish) in August 1071 was not a battle into which the Great Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan (1063–72) entered with the intention of invading Anatolia, but was an encounter forced upon him by the attack of Emperor Romanos Diogenes at the time of the military campaign against the Fatimids. Therefore, at the end of the battle Alp Arslan came to an agreement with Romanos Diogenes. The sultan released the emperor whom he had taken prisoner, restored all his rights to him and did not take over the territory.

---


To understand the invasion and conquest of Anatolia by the Turks, it is necessary to see it in relation to the policy adopted by the Seljuk administration of Iran in its attempt to impose control over and settle the Turkoman tribes who represented a threat to regional order as they moved constantly from Central Asia into Iran and caused disruption. In order to rid themselves of these troublesome tribes, the Seljuk rulers made no attempt to prevent their organising raids into Anatolia, then under Byzantine control; on the contrary, they even encouraged them.

Following the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt), Turkoman leaders (beyşs) such as the Artuk, Saltuk, Danışmand and Mengücek beyşs, conquered lands in Anatolia and set up a number of small states there: the Saltuks in Erzurum, the Mengüceks in the region of Erzincan and Sivas, the Danışmands in the region of Tokat, Niksar and Malatya, and the Artukid state around Mardin and Harput. Following the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt), Turkoman leaders (beyşs) such as the Artuk, Saltuk, Danışmand and Mengücek beyşs, conquered lands in Anatolia and set up a number of small states there: the Saltuks in Erzurum, the Mengüceks in the region of Erzincan and Sivas, the Danışmands in the region of Tokat, Niksar and Malatya, and the Artukid state around Mardin and Harput. The Danışmand conquests in Anatolia created great admiration among the Turks of the time and was the subject of a large anonymous epic called the Danışmandname which described the conquests.

Apart from these small beylik, the major state which occupied almost all of Anatolia with the exception of the Aegean and Marmara regions was created by the Turkoman beyşs, relations of the Great Seljuk dynasty in Iran. Kutalmış’s unsuccessful claim to the sultanate in Iran resulted in his being unable to take refuge in Iran, and his being driven from there into Anatolia. Kutalmış’s son Süleyman did not intend to remain permanently in Anatolia, hoping instead to settle matters with his relations in Iran. The Iranian administration was, however, determined not to allow them back into Iran.

Driven out of Iran, the Turkomans were thus forced by the political situation to settle permanently in Anatolia. In 1081 Süleyman took Iznik (Nicaea) from the Byzantines and made it his capital, and thus established the Anatolian

7 Apart from several articles written about these states, there are only two monographs, both written by Turkish historians: O. Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi: Saltuklar, Mengückler, Sökmeniler, Dilmacıoğulları ve Artukullar’ın Siyasi Tarih ve Medeniyetleri (Istanbul, 1973); F. Sümer, Selçuklular Devrinde Doğu Anadolu’da Türk Beylikleri (Ankara, 1990).
Seljuk state. Three years later, Antakya was taken. The Turks were now permanently settled on Anatolian soil, never to leave.

The establishment of the Seljuk state was not a particularly easy process. While the Turks struggled with Byzantium on the one hand, they also fought the Danişmends, another Turkish state which had control of part of central and eastern Anatolia, on the other. The reign of Kılıç Arslan I (1092–1107), the son of Süleyman, was one of conflict with the Byzantines, the Danişmends and the crusaders. Surrendering to the crusaders who besieged İznilk in 1096, this courageous sultan withdrew eastwards. In 1106 he took Malatya from the Danişmends and in 1107 he conquered Mosul, but he was eventually defeated by Emir Çavul and drowned in the Habur river. His son Mesud (1116–56) took Konya from the crusaders and made it the centre of the state. His successor, Kılıç Arslan II (1156–92), who, too, fought against the crusaders, inflicted a heavy defeat on the Byzantines at the battle of Myriokephalon (Karamikbeli in Turkish) in 1176. With this battle the permanent settlement of the Turks was secured. The dream of the Anatolian Seljuks to return once more to Iran and to take control of the state there was ended. Another important development in the same period was the Seljuk removal of the Danişmend state in 1178, which resulted in more than two-thirds of Anatolia coming under Seljuk domination. Before the death of Kılıç Arslan II the state was divided between his sons in accordance with the old Turkish tradition. It was during the period of struggle between them for supremacy that the third crusade of 1189 occurred. Despite this, the Seljuks successfully defended their territory against the crusaders. In the end İzzeddin Keykavus I (1210–20) emerged successful from the power struggles with his brothers and ascended the Seljuk throne alone. In 1204 the crusaders of the fourth crusade captured Constantinople and set up the Latin state there, forcing the Byzantines into exile in the region of İznilk.

During the reigns of İzzeddin Keykavus I and, in particular, of his brother Alaeddin Keykubad I (1220–37), the Anatolian Seljuk state made considerable political and economic advances. Taking the harbours of Sinop on the Black Sea coast and Antalya (Attaleia) on the Mediterranean, the Seljuks obtained control of important trade routes. With the ensuing revenue from international trade, the Anatolian Seljuks were able to increase further the social and economic

---

11 Historians are not agreed on the date of the establishment of the Anatolian Seljuk state, some, for various reasons, regarding it as having been set up in 1075, some in 1081.
13 For the various phases of the history of the Anatolian Seljuks see Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, and Turan, Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye.
affluence of the region, which had in any case by now reached a certain level of prosperity. It is at this time that the Sufi and philosopher Shihab al-din al-Suhrawardi and, after him, the famous Andalusian mystic Muhieddin Ibn Arabi came to Anatolia.

This period of affluence did not, however, last long. Under the despotic and incompetent rule of Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II (1237–43) the order of the Anatolian Seljuk state began to break down. After the great Turkoman rebellion, the Babai revolt of 1240, which represents an important turning point in medieval Turkish history, the Mongols moved easily into Anatolia and the period of an independent Anatolian Seljuk state came to an end. Wishing to benefit from this situation, the Vatican sent Dominican and Franciscan missionaries to Anatolia with the aim of converting the shamanist Mongols to Christianity and imposing this religion once more on the region. One of these Dominican missionaries, Simon de Saint-Quentin, has left an interesting account of the social and religious life of the Mongols in Anatolia in this period. This period was one of successive political and social crises and revolts in the Seljuk lands of Anatolia. It was in this environment that the famous mystic Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi lived in Konya.

After 1277 the Mongols took over the administration in Anatolia. Escaping from Mongol pressure and pursuit, the Turkoman tribes fled towards the Byzantine frontiers in the west where they began to set up small states on the lands they conquered. The Byzantines had neither the strength nor the time to oppose them. Among these little states were the beyliks of Menteşe, Aydin, Karasi and Germiyan. Of these, Menteşe and Aydin successfully fought...
with the Byzantines and the Venetians in the Aegean. Another beylik was established on the south-western borders of Byzantium: the Ottoman beylik which was to be transformed into the empire of Süleyman the Magnificent in the sixteenth century.

From the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Ottoman beylik, thanks both to its convenient geo-strategic position on the Byzantine frontier and to the successful policies of its first leaders Osman (?–c.1324), Orhan (c.1324–62) and Murad I (1362–89), advanced rapidly along the road to becoming an empire. Launching raids motivated both by spiritual and material aims, by the gazi ideology and booty, this beylik benefited from the political and economic weakness of Byzantium and of that in the Balkan peninsula, and expanded its territory both in Anatolia and in the Balkans. As a result, its administration and socio-economic structure were strengthened and by the middle of the fifteenth century a powerful empire was in the making. At this point an energetic and young sultan, Mehmed II (1444–6, 1451–81), became the leader of the empire. Taking Constantinople in May 1453 and making it his capital, Mehmed II removed the one-time great Eastern Roman Empire to which he was at the same time heir and caused shock waves both in the Islamic world and in the west.

A complex and varied ethnic structure: the local elements (Greeks, Armenians, Suriyanis, Kurds), the Turks and the Tatars (Mongols)

We do not have statistics or definitive documentary historical data for the ethnic structure of Anatolia either before or after the arrival of the Turks. It has always been asserted that the population had declined as a result of the Muslim Arab raids. This is true, and was a natural consequence of the deaths caused by raiding, or of flight to the west. But this decline did not

---


20 For the Ottoman Empire in the first period of the classical age see H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age 1300–1600* (London, 1973).
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persist for long. It is certain that when the Turks came, a similar process must naturally have occurred, even if not to the same extent. At the time of the Turks’ arrival the people of the region, called Rum in the Muslim sources, were composed of the original local population which had intermixed with the Greek population of the towns of western Anatolia and had become Christian. This population without doubt constituted the most significant element. An important percentage of the population was made up of villagers who had settled in the countryside and were engaged in agriculture. They must certainly have spoken and written a form of what is today modern Greek. Called rumca in Turkish, it carried traces of the remnants of the old Anatolian languages. In eastern Anatolia, a large part of the population consisted of Gregorian Armenians and Monophysite Jacobites. Further south, in the region of Mardin, were the Suriyani, Syriac-speaking Christians.

A further dimension of the ethnic mix of medieval Turkey was the Kurdish population in Anatolia. Kurds are known to have lived in the region which was known as Kurdistan, a geographical term in early Islamic sources for an area stretching across parts of Iran, Iraq and Anatolia. The vast majority of them had converted to Islam long before, at the time of the Arab conquest, and a section of them were Yazidi.22 For this reason it can be suggested that a few of the Turkish tribes who settled in eastern and south-eastern Anatolia intermixed with the different Kurdish tribes there and, over time, became absorbed into the Kurdish majority and became Kurdish. While in areas of Kurdish majority, Turks began to speak Kurdish, so, too, in regions where the majority was Turkish, Kurds would have begun to speak Turkish and to have become Turks. That this happened is clearly indicated by a similar process taking place in various areas today, aided by practices such as intermarriage and urbanisation. The vast majority of the Kurds in these regions carried on a tribal existence and were engaged in animal husbandry. Some lived in the mountains and survived by plundering.23

Turning to the Turks, the movement to and settlement in Anatolia of the Oğuz, also called Turkoman, who were the ancestors of the Turks of

---


23 For this subject see, for example, Th. Bois, ‘Kurds et Kurdistan (période islamique)’, EI2, V, pp. 452–9.
modern Turkey and had only recently become Muslim, began after the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt). Such settlement was not initially undertaken with the aim of settling permanently. After a time, however, the region became their new ‘homeland’. It is important to remember that the majority of these Turks were from the Muslim Oğuz.24 This population, driven from Iran by the Great Seljuk rulers, had no difficulty in finding suitable lands to settle on in this new homeland. The inner and eastern parts of Anatolia in particular provided both pastures where they passed the winter season with their flocks of sheep, and cool summer pastures.

The Byzantines did not react greatly to the Turkish entry into Anatolia which, beginning in the east, moved slowly westward, both because they were already familiar with the Guz (Oğuz) Turks who served in the Byzantine armies as mercenary soldiers alongside the Christian Kuman (Kıpçak) from the Balkans, and because they benefited from their help in the political struggles which broke out frequently among them. Moreover, non-Orthodox elements of the population of the region, who disliked and resented the Byzantine administration, were well disposed towards these foreign warriors who occupied the land and were not concerned with their religion. Indeed, they even encouraged them to settle there. There is no doubt that these two factors must have played an important role in easing and speeding up the Turkish conquest of Anatolia.25

Western and Turkish historians disagree over various questions concerning the ethnic and demographic change which occurred with the settlement of the Turks in Anatolia. The most important of these is the demographic number of these new Anatolians. The second is the question of whether these Turks were entirely or only in part nomads.26 Both western and Turkish historians have investigated the arrival and settlement of the Turkomans in Anatolia in two phases: before and after the Mongol invasion.27 In the first phase, which begins with the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt), the Turkomans flowed en

24 The best work to date on the Oğuz, that is the Turkomans, is still the book by F. Sümêr, Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları (Istanbul, 1972; repr. 1981). For the history of the Oğuz before they came to Anatolia see S. Grigorevic Ağacanov, Oğuzlar, tr. from Russian by N. Ekber and A. Annaberdiyev (Istanbul, 2002).
25 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 204; Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane, p. 164.
26 There is a clear divide on these two matters between the Turkish historians and the older generation western historians. If examined carefully it is possible to understand that various preconceptions against the Turks in western public opinion played an important role in these views and in the Turkish reaction to them.
27 See, for example, M. H. Yinaç, Türkiye Tarihi, Selçuklu Devri: Anadolu’nun Fethi (Istanbul, 1944), pp. 166–9; Cahen, ‘La première pénétration’, pp. 68–9; Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 143–54; Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane, pp. 101–9; Togan, Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş, pp. 191–200; Turan, Selçuklu Zamanında Türkiye, pp. 1–44, 213–16.
masse into Anatolia and began to settle. Not all of those who came were nomads, for among them were Muslim Turks who had become urbanised while in Central Asia. When these people arrived they settled in the towns in Anatolia and continued to pursue their professions there. Even in this early period the Turkish population quickly began to reach a majority in relation to the local population in Anatolia. In the second phase, which began with the Mongol invasions, a mass of nomads arrived from the regions of Transoxania, Khorasm, Azerbaijan and Erran. Many urbanised Turks arrived, too, fleeing together with the nomadic population before the Mongols and taking refuge in Anatolia. This period coincides with the reigns of İzzoeddin Keykavus I and Alaeddin Keykubad I.

It has been suggested that the Turks came to Anatolia at a date much earlier than the battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt). Some western historians, however, such as Claude Cahen, have adopted a more cautious approach. They accept that in the first phase the Turks in Anatolia, while not yet reaching a figure greater than that of the local population, did attain fairly large numbers, but agree that the Turkish demographic superiority over the local population occurred and increased in particular after the Mongol invasion, that is, beginning in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

The fact that western sources began to refer to Anatolia as ‘Turchia’ after the third crusade of 1189 led by Frederick Barbarossa indicates that Anatolia had by now become a Turkish region and that a process of ‘Turkification’ and, of course, parallel with this, one of ‘Islamisation’, had begun there. There is no doubt that this was a process begun by the Turkoman, whose numbers gradually increased, particularly in the rural areas, although the towns also had a share in this process. We are not in a position to give precise figures today for the numbers of the Turkish population in Anatolia in the invasion and

29 See, for example, R. N. Frye and A. Sayılı, ‘Selçuklar’ dan evvel Orta Şark’ ta Türkler’, Belleten 10 (1946), 97–111. Even today, some of the younger generation of Turkish historians have written that in the period before Christ Turks settled in Anatolia and that these were proto-Turks (see, for example, V. Sevin, ‘Mystery Stelae: Are Stone Images Found in Southeastern Turkey Evidence of Early Nomads and a Lost Kingdom?’, Archeology (July/August 2000), 47–51; V. Sevin and A. Özfirat, ‘Hakkâri Stelleri: Doğu Anadolu’da Savasçı Çobanlar’, Belleten 243 (2001), 501–18). Even if it is said that there are new archaeological finds related to this subject, no concrete proof has yet been presented.
settlement period or for the local population, and there is no great likelihood that we will be able to in the future. If we possessed the **tahrir defterleri** (survey registers) which no doubt existed in the Seljuk period, as was noted above, we would be in a position to provide such figures. However, although we do not have definitive data for the non-Muslim population being smaller than the Turkish population, particularly before the Mongol invasion, it is certain that after this invasion the Turkish population slowly rose, overtaking that of the non-Muslims, to attain demographic superiority.\(^{32}\)

There is a further question related to this subject: whether the Turks who came and settled in Anatolia in both these periods were, or were not, Muslims. Various traces in the sources show that while the great majority of Turks had either been Muslims for some time or were recent converts, there were also Uyghurs and Kipcaks, even if in small numbers, who had not abandoned Buddhism or Manichaeism, as well as Christian Turks who had converted to Nestorianism while still in Central Asia. There were still Nestorian Turks in the Ottoman period. Thus even in the sixteenth century one comes across groups (**Taife-i** or **Cemaat-i Gebran**) registered in **tahrir defteri**s as Christian populations despite having Turkish names. Western and Turkish historians have put forward various theories about these names. It seems highly probable that they were Turks who had joined the Nestorian sect and become Christian while still in Central Asia or who had perhaps become Orthodox after crossing into Anatolia. With the exception of these non-Muslims groups, however, the vast majority of the Turks in Anatolia were Muslim. The local population, on the other hand, was Christian, the great majority being Orthodox while some belonged to other Christian sects.

Gradually over time it is clear that an ethnic mix developed in both urban and rural areas of Anatolia as the two populations, the Muslims Turks and the Christian locals, began to live together. Even without definitive evidence on the subject, it is still not difficult to argue for the existence of mixed families, however limited in number, which came about particularly with the practice of taking girls from the Christian population.\(^{33}\) Echoes of this are found in the many examples of such marriages in the epic romances such as the **Battalname** and the **Danışmandname**. It is clear that this ethnic mix must have had a decisive role in the conversion to Islam.

---


Another perhaps more important ethnic mix in the Turkey of the thirteenth to the fifteenth century was related to the Mongols, who were referred to as Tatars in Latin sources of the period. As well as occupying almost all the regions suitable for nomadism in Central Asia, Mongol tribes in the post-1256 period, the end of the occupation of Anatolia, also settled in the winter pastures and the wide grasslands of the region. Known as ‘Özler bölgesi’ because of the streams which ran into the Kızılırmak river, this region of well-watered valleys was ideal for nomads who could spend their winters there and could graze their herds on the extensive pasture land there in the summer. Like the Turks, the Mongols were divided into two major branches, or wings (kol): the Bara’unkar (the right wing) and the Ca’unkar (the left wing). The nomadic Mongol tribes who belonged to the Ca’unkar settled between Kayseri, Sivas and Çorum, in a region which today includes the vilayet (district) of Yozgat. 

Those from the Bara’unkar settled on the lands stretching as far as Eskişehir. Information on the customs and traditions of the Mongols, on their beliefs and their daily life in this period, is given by the Dominican priest Simon de Saint-Quentin whose work, *Historia Tartarorum*, covers the years between 1245 and 1248.

The tribes belonging to the Ca’unkar and the Bara’unkar established villages in the places where they settled and gave them names, some of which still survive today, for example, Tayfur, Topçu, Göçekhisla, Ağcaköy and Çaloğlu in the district of Yozgat. In the thirteenth century, after they had become Muslim, all these Mongol tribes which were known by the name Kara Tatars (Black Tatars) continued to live in the same areas until Timur’s entry into Anatolia in 1402. Although Timur took some of them off with him to Iran, the majority remained in Anatolia and intermixed with the Turkoman.

**Society**

*Observations and problems*

While a large number of the Turkish Muslim population which came to Anatolia was nomadic, as we have said before, some gradually settled on the steppe lands and in empty Byzantine villages, which had either never been settled or had been deserted, or in villages which were inhabited by the local populations. These villages, the majority of which still exist today, are known


35 Simon de Saint-Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum*. 
by their old names, even if the pronunciation has changed somewhat. Other
villages were founded by the new incomers. We know these, too, from their
names. Unfortunately there is little information relating either to the vil-
lages occupied by the incomers or for the villages in the thirteenth to fifteenth
centuries. For this reason it is not possible to say anything about the socio-
economic structure of the villages or about the villagers of this period, or
about population figures or types of production. In contrast, however, we are
better informed about the population figures and the economic situation of
these villages in the Ottoman period. Thanks to the tahrir registers, we know
the names of those who paid tax and the amounts involved. The considerable
body of research on the sancaks (Ottoman provinces) conducted over the past
twenty to twenty-five years has produced a great deal of data. By analogy
with this material, we can speculate about the social and economic structure
of these villages in the earlier period, from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries.
However, any assessment must remain speculative and cannot be regarded as
in any way definitive.

This is in stark contrast to the wealth of information to be found on the
great medieval Islamic cities of Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Basra,
Beyhak, Tabriz, Merv, Balkh, Bukhara and Samarkand, for example, about
which the many chronicles and geographical works provide much data. There
were even accounts specific to certain cities written by Muslims. Unfortunately
such sources are scarce, however, for the towns of Anatolia in the eleventh
to fifteenth centuries. There are only a limited number of short entries to
be found in the chronicles of this period and in one or two travel accounts.
Furthermore, these towns have today completely lost any vestiges of their
medieval structure. For this reason we are not in a position to be able to guess
at what these towns were like by examining their modern-day manifestations.

36 For these see in particular Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Dahiliye Vekâleti, Son Teşkilât-ı
Mülkiyyede Köylerimizin Adıları (Istanbul, 1928); C. Türkay, Başkanlik Arşivi Belgelerine
Göre Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Oymak, Aşiret ve Cemaatler (Istanbul, 2001); O. Sakin, 16.
Yüzyılda Anadolu’dan Türkmenler ve Yörüklər (Istanbul, 2006). The old village names, which
had existed for a very long time, have been changed either by various governments, or
by the local administration, or as a result of the application to rename their villages by
the villagers who did not have any historical understanding about the past. Such names
have thus gone through a meaningless historical destruction.

37 Examples of such research include N. Göyüng, XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı (Ankara,
1991); F. Emecen, XVI. Asırın Manisa Kazası (Ankara, 1989); M. A. Unal, XVI. Yüzyılda
Harput Sancağı (Ankara, 1989); I. Miroğlu, Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520–1566)
(Ankara, 1990); M. Öz, XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda Canik Sancağı (Ankara, 1999); M. İlhan,
Amid (Diyarbakır), 1518 Detailed Register (Ankara, 2000); H. Doğru, XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda
We are, however, lucky in one respect for we have for the fourteenth century, the period known as the beylik period, the Rihle, the travel book of the Moroccan traveller Ibn Battuta.\(^{38}\) For the Ottoman period the sources, as for the villages, are more extensive and we have tahrir, muhasebes (accounts) and evkaf defters (vakıf registers) as well as şeriyye sicilleri (court registers). Despite this, however, we do not have material for the Anatolian Muslim cities of the Ottoman period in any way comparable to such records as those of local administration or from the church and monastery archives which shed light on the socio-economic, religious and cultural position of the towns and cities in Europe of the medieval and early modern period. Apart from this scarcity, we are also faced with a further problem: the quality of the data provided by the sources we do have. The information in the Seljuk and beylik and Ottoman sources for the religious establishments and social classes and groups, both Muslim and non-Muslim, is extremely meagre, for the majority of our sources are official state registers produced for strictly pragmatic administrative needs.

Any conceptualisation of the religious, social and cultural structure of the Anatolian cities of the Turkish period depends to a great extent on an understanding of the historical roots of the subject. It is important to remember that even if there were some general similarities between the European and the Anatolian cities of the Middle Ages and the early modern period, there were significant differences both from a social and a physical point of view. Such differences can be seen clearly, for example, in the work of Henri Pirenne on the medieval cities of Europe.\(^{39}\)

**The semi-settled/semi-nomadic populations**

The physical, demographic and social dimension of Turkish settlement which to an important extent changed the face of Anatolia from the ethnic and religious point of view, was on the one hand connected to towns and villages because of this newly settled Turkish population, but, on the other, was equally connected to the semi-settled, semi-nomadic sections in that it speeded up the transition to a settled way of life. When considering these Turks, it is important to stress the term ‘nomad’. There is no doubt that, as has been noted above,


\(^{39}\) For a comparison of the structure of medieval towns see, for example, H. Pirenne, *Les villes du moyen âges* (Brussels, 1927).
a large majority of the Turks were nomadic Oğuz tribes who were known as Turkoman. These Turks settled in valleys with streams in the inner and central regions of Anatolia which very much resembled the steppes of Central Asia. The majority of these tribes, like the Turkish tribes in Central Asia whose political leaders were at the same time their shamans, were guided by individuals who were both religious (baba, ata, dede or abdal) and political leaders and who for this reason had a religious-mystic character. Research in Ottoman tahrir registers and on toponymy has shown that many of the villages in Turkey were named after such leaders, having the word baba, ata, dede or abdal at the beginning or end of their names, as they still do even today. This shows that the Turkish tribes remembered the names of those who had guided them and that when they adopted a settled way of life they gave the names of these leaders to the villages they established. It was sometimes these individuals who, thanks to religious charisma, usually took the lead in revolting or struggling with the central administration over such issues as taxation, or who headed the settling of mass populations migrating over great distances. The two best-known examples are the Babai revolt under Baba Ilyas-ı Horasani in 1240, and the migration to and settlement in the Dobrudja led by Sarı Saltık which took place shortly afterwards.

Such revolts demonstrate that the Turkoman tribes were a source of political troubles for both the Seljuk and the Ottoman administration. For this reason, the central administration in both periods followed a policy of dividing the Turkoman tribes and settling them far from each other in areas which had no connection between them in order to forestall the spreading and strengthening of any trouble which they could not control. This policy of enforced migration (sürgün) was used for Kurdish tribes and, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the nineteenth century, Kurdish tribes from eastern and


41 See note 36 above.

42 For this, and for a large bibliography, see Ocak, La révolte de Baba Resul. An expanded and revised edition of this book was published in 2000, Babâiller İlyasi: Aleviğinin Tarihsel Aîyapısı Yahut Anadolu’da İslam-Türk Heterolojisinin Teşekkülü (İstanbul, 2000).

43 For the latest work on this subject, which contains an extensive bibliography, see A. Y. Ocak, Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslam’ın Balkanlardaki Destanı Öncüsü (Ankara, 2002).
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south-eastern Anatolia were settled in regions of central Anatolia such as the plains of Konya, Haymana and Kırşehir.

In spring the Turkoman and the Kurds migrated to the summer pastures to graze their herds and lived until winter in tents which they produced. During the moving between summer and winter pastures clashes and fights often broke out with the settled population because of the damage caused by the nomads’ camels or flocks of sheep to the orchards, gardens and fields they passed through, or even because of the pillaging of villages and towns. Despite these seasonal movements, the Turkoman and Kurds were not entirely nomadic, living solely in tents and passing their lives in moving with their herds of sheep, goats, oxen and camel between the winter and summer pastures. In winter, they settled in well-watered valleys protected from the cold and snow in villages which they themselves had established or which already existed. In the spring, a section of the population remained in the village engaged in animal husbandry and field agriculture. They then sold their produce in established markets and with the proceeds bought the manufactured goods they needed: weapons, pots and pans, clothes, harness sets and some woven products for clothes. The most famous examples of these markets were Ziyaret Pazarı and Yabanlu Pazarı. The majority of these villages had no mosque, there being only an adobe or basic stone mescid built in a very simple style. For this reason none of these mescids survives today. The medreses found in the large towns did not exist in these villages either.

Apart from the Turkomans and Kurds, the rural population was also made up of the nomadic Mongol tribes who invaded Anatolia in 1246. These tribes were shamanist. After a certain time they began slowly to accept Islam as a result of the missionary activity of the Turkoman babas. Like the Turkoman, the Mongols settled in the steppes of Anatolia and set up their own villages or settled in the Turkoman villages where they intermixed with the Turkoman population. Thus these Mongol tribes, called Tatars, moved from a nomadic existence to a semi-settled life and the Mongol population began partly to occupy itself with agriculture. Today many villages in the inner regions of Turkey from Sivas to Eskişehir were set up by the Mongols and still have their names from that period.\footnote{See A. Y. Ocak, ‘Bazı Menâkıbnâmelere Göre XIII.–XV. Yüzyillardaki İhtidâlarda Het- erodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü, Osmanlı Araştırmaları (Journal of the Ottoman Studies) 2 (1981), 31–42, which discusses the sources on this subject.}

\footnote{The only monograph to date on Yabanlu Pazarı is F. Sümer, Yabanlu Pazarı: Selçuklu Devrinde Milletlerarası Büyük Bir Fuar (Istanbul, 1985).}

When the Turkoman began to settle in Anatolia, they came into contact in the rural areas with the Byzantine villagers and with their way of life and culture. Owing to the climatic conditions of the Anatolian steppe and the difficulties of irrigation round the villages, the agricultural activity of the Byzantine villagers on small areas of low productivity was limited. They produced a restricted variety of crops such as wheat, barley, oats, vetch and millet. Apart from this, they grew small quantities of fruit and vegetables in gardens on the banks of streams. Animal husbandry was another important aspect of this agricultural activity. Each peasant family had the amount of land which it could plough with a pair of oxen. Part of this land was left fallow.

The location of the villages could change over time according to different factors such as water resources, climatic changes, political conditions, drought and plagues. As everywhere else, the villages paid taxes in cash or kind on their production. The taxes, the amount of which was set by the state, were collected by state-employed tax-collectors who were under the prefectura / the governors (valis).

After the tenth century, the Byzantine villagers became unable to pay the taxes which gradually increased. In time the bureaucrats in the central administration began to take over village lands and villagers were reduced to dependency on these bureaucrats. Thus the villagers descended into the position of being ‘semi-serfs’ working on their own land as share croppers or to avoid starvation. The conditions in which the Byzantine villager existed in the period of the Turkish conquest in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were thus harsh. Further, in the period of the first Turkish conquests, the Byzantine village populations, especially in eastern and central Anatolia, deserted their homes and lands and, with the Byzantine administration being driven westwards, were left exposed to great difficulties.

This, then, was the situation of the rural areas of the Byzantine Empire at the time when the Turks began to settle in Anatolia. A large part of the newly arriving semi-settled, semi-nomadic Turkoman population adapted quickly to the rural structure which they found, settling either in Byzantine villages which already existed or in villages which they set up themselves. They learnt to farm, they began to raise livestock: in short, they became a settled village population. We must note here the importance of not forgetting the unknown number of Turkish villagers who came together with the Turkoman from Central Asia.

The Byzantine villagers, who speedily abandoned their homes during the period of the first conquests and fled to the regions in the west or were moved
there by the Byzantine administration, began to observe and to be reassured by the policy followed by the Anatolian Seljuk state towards the local population. In an intelligent move motivated by the desire to revitalise agriculture, some of the sultans returned their former lands without obligations to the Byzantine villagers taking refuge in western Anatolia, helped them with provisions, animal harnesses and seed in order to ensure production, and, even more significantly, exempted them from taxation for a period of fifteen years. This policy was not slow in producing results and the Byzantine villagers began to return again to what was now Seljuk land.

The village population in Seljuk Anatolia was thus made up of the mass of these semi-settled, semi-nomadic Turkoman who came to Anatolia and became villagers, Turkish villagers who migrated from Central Asia, and the Byzantine villagers. Some, even in the Byzantine period, established themselves on empty land suitable for settlement and prospered. Evidence for this comes from the Ottoman tahrir registers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We can see from these tahrir registers that an important section of the tents which were permanently used as winter settlements were transformed over time into villages. It is clear that these types of winter settlements which were called ‘yurt’ and became villages were places suitable for both animal husbandry and agriculture, and that they were not chosen by chance.

We can presume that the agricultural life of the Turkish villages in Anatolia in the twelfth to the fifteenth century and the social status dependent on it was, perhaps with some changes, the same in the beylik and Ottoman periods.

49 There is still no monograph on the villages and villagers of medieval Anatolia. The sources are extremely poor on this subject. From this point of view the history of Byzantine villages in the same period is more fortunate. For some information on Anatolian village life and villages in the thirteenth to the fifteenth century see M. Akdağ, Türkiye’nin İktisadi ve İctimai Tarihi, 2 vols. (İstanbul, 1971–4), 1, pp. 24–8; Y. Koç, Selçuklular Döneminde Anadolu‘da Köylüler ve Köylü Döveller’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Üygarlığı I, ed. Ocak, pp. 293–8.
50 It can be seen that part of the Ottoman rural organisation, called the çift-hane system by Halil Inalcık (H. Inalcık, The Çift-hane System: the Organization of Ottoman Rural Society, in An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914, ed. H. Inalcık and D. Quataert (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 143–54), was nothing other than a continuation of the system in the rural areas in the Byzantine period.
For this reason, when we compare it with the status of the villagers in the Ottoman period, we can easily say that, apart perhaps from a lessening of tax and the use of various methods to encourage production, the position in the Seljuk and beylik periods was not very different from that in the Byzantine period.

We can also say that agricultural practices which were used throughout the twelfth to fifteenth centuries continued without the slightest change from those employed in the Byzantine Empire: ploughs, oxen or buffalo were used for agriculture, as they were for the entire Ottoman period, and the same types of crops, such as wheat, barley, oats, vetch and rye, were sown and reaped using the same methods. It has been argued that rice production was brought into Anatolia by the Turks and that there is no record whatsoever of rice production in the Byzantine period. We know that viniculture was undertaken in various suitable locations, for example on the edges of villages and towns, and that it was fairly widespread.

It is not difficult to imagine, therefore, that as a result of all these developments the number of villages in Anatolia rose in comparison with the Byzantine period and that this was reflected in agricultural production. It is necessary to note here that these villages were defined as miri land within the Seljuk landholding system, that is, the state was the owner of the land upon which these villages were established and where the villages engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry, and the state, as part of the miri system, gave the right of possession of the villages and the right of collecting tax on the produce of the villages to soldiers and administrators as ikta in return for service. We must further recall that a percentage of these villages was turned into vakıf either by members of the Ottoman royal house or by high bureaucrats over the twelfth to the seventeenth century, that is throughout the Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman periods.

**Town and townspeople**

Old towns with new owners and newly founded towns

It is an established historical fact that from the end of the eleventh century onwards almost all the Anatolian towns which over time had become Roman in the classical period and then Byzantine, with the exception of those in the west, gradually became Turkish in a process which began in the east and spread westwards. It is important not to forget that these towns were very different both structurally and socially in the Christian period from what they
had been in classical times. The majority of these towns, shrinking over time for various reasons, had been transformed for ease of defence into fortified towns (*kastron*).

When the Turks arrived, Byzantine towns were generally of this type. A significant number of Turks settled in the Byzantine towns in Anatolia. Gradually the organisation of these towns changed, partly as a result of this new settlement, and, with the consequent increase in population, extended beyond their walls. It is reasonable to assume, too, that with this new order, new settled areas must also have been created within the walls. For example, we know that the application of the principle of Muslims and non-Muslims living in separate *mahalles* (neighbourhoods) began. These *mahalles* were separated from each other by a wall. In certain towns, a second outer wall was put round the original outside wall in order to protect the settled area which had expanded beyond the castle.

Famous towns of the former Roman-Byzantine period such as Konya (Iconium), which was the capital of the Seljuks and, later, of Karaman, Amasya (Amaseia), Sinop, Sivas (Sebasteia), Kayseri (Caesarea in Capadocia), Kırşehir (Mocissus), Eskişehir (Dorylaion), Ankara (Ancyranum), and even Antalya (Attaleia) can be given as examples of Roman-Byzantine towns which were settled by the Turks. Here buildings such as mosques, *medreses*, *tekkes* (dervish lodges), markets and baths were constructed in order to revive the prosperity of these towns.

Claude Cahen rejects the thesis adopted by various western Byzantinists that Turkish settlement damaged these old towns, and that this was the reason for an economic, and therefore social, backwardness which completely paralysed all commercial life. According to Cahen, while it is true that initially these towns underwent a shock, they quickly recovered and became more prosperous than before thanks to vigorous trading activity.\(^{51}\) For example İzzeddin Keykavuş I and Alaeddin Keykubad I took great care to encourage international trade, both by the conquest of Sinop, by İzzeddin Keykavuş, and that of Antalya by Alaeddin Keykubad, and by the granting of concessions to Venetian and French merchants.\(^{52}\) There is no doubt that the Anatolian sultans regarded the strengthening of economic life as the way to secure their wealth in this new homeland. For this reason they built fortified places in which to stay called caravansarys (*kervansarays*) at set distances on the trade routes to ensure the

security of these routes and to allow the caravans to travel safely. Some of these caravansarys are still standing today, even if most of them are now in ruins.53

Apart from revitalising old Roman-Byzantine towns, the Turks also set up new towns such as Alaiye (modern Alanya), Kubadie, Akshehir, Beysehir and Seydisehir because of either their suitable locations, their strategic importance or their proximity to the trade routes. These new towns were built either near to or on the sites of former towns which had been abandoned in the Byzantine period. For example, Donuzlu (modern Denizli), built in the second quarter of the thirteenth century immediately to the south of the abandoned town of Laodikeia, near Hierapolis, was a new town of this type.

Towns which had been important either politically and commercially or culturally in the period of the Seljuks, the Ilkans, the Saltukids and the Menguecks, such as Erzurum, Erzincan, Ahlat, Van and Bitlis in eastern Anatolia, or Amid (Diyarbakir), Urfa, Mardin and Ayntab in south-eastern Anatolia in the period of the Ayyubids and the Artukids, lost their position in the thirteenth century in the period of the Anatolian Seljuks to towns such as Sivas, Tokat, Kırşehir, Konya and Kayseri, and became towns of second-rate importance. From the last quarter of the thirteenth century when the Anatolian Seljuk state began to weaken and pass under Ilkhan domination and the beyliks rose in central, southern and western Anatolia, the towns of central Anatolia declined in importance and, in the second half of the fourteenth and in the fifteenth century those of western Anatolia became dominant. This development, which occurred in parallel with the changing political control moving from the east to the west, was, of course, inevitable.

These towns were administered by officials such as the naib, vali, müşrif, nazir or muhtesib, appointed from the centre by the sultan or the bey, and by a number of civilian individuals, such as the emir-i ıddiyan, hacegan, ehl-i fütüvet and ehl-i hiref, who worked with them as representatives of the people and whose functions and names changed according to circumstance and to the period.54

One difference between these Anatolian towns and those in other Muslim countries was the presence there in the thirteenth to the fifteenth

54 For more information on the town life of medieval Turkey see Akdağ, Türkiye’nin İktisadi ve İstimal Tarihi, 1, pp. 12–24. For more detailed research based on new material see T. Baykara, ‘Türkiye Selçukluları’nda Şehir/Kent ve Şehirçiler/Kentliler’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygurlığı I, ed. Ocak, pp. 275–92. This article gives detailed information and an analysis of Seljuk urbanisation in the period under discussion.
Social, cultural and intellectual life, 1071–1453

century of partly Sufi co-operative organisations which were called ahilik and which originated in all probability in western Iran. It is known from Sufi texts called fütüvvetname found among the ahis that the fütüvvet organisation of the medieval Islamic world played a significant part in the emergence of this organisation. Ahilik was an association which united craftsmen in the Anatolian towns and had a semi-Sufi identity. For this reason only Muslim craftsmen were ahis. We do not have much information about them until the Mongol period (the second half of the thirteenth century) when the famous Ahi Evren was alive. More information becomes available from the fourteenth century and we owe much of it to the famous Moroccan traveller Ibn Battuta.

It is well known that, like the members of the fütüvvet which became important in times of political and social strife in the large towns of the medieval Islamic world, the ahis in Anatolia, too, had a say in the administration of the towns at times in which the central administration was weak. It has thus long been accepted that they played an important part in the process of the establishment of the Ottoman state.

Townspeople

There was no great difference, therefore, between the towns of Anatolia and those classic Islamic cities of the Middle East or even Central Asia in terms of either their physical structure or their social and economic organisation. Their general characteristics rapidly emerged: just like Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Beyhak, Tabriz, Merv, Balkh, Bukhara and Samarkand, they became cosmopolitan centres with a bureaucracy and were composed of different ethnic, religious, social and professional groups. Here Christian, Jewish and Muslim populations lived together. But, despite this mixed nature, they were Muslim towns and an Islamic character predominated, the result of trade

55 It is known that the ahilik of the medieval Islamic world was tied to the fütüvvet institution. Such an institution is not met with outside western Iran. The area where this institution was widespread from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century was Anatolia. For more information on the ahilik see F. Köprüülü, Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar, 3 vols. (Ankara, 1966; repr. 1976), pp. 207–16; Köprüülü, ‘Anadolu’dar İslamiyêt, pp. 386–7; Köprüülü, Les origines de l’empire ottoman, pp. 128–9; F. Taeschner, ‘Beitrag zur Geschichte der Achis in Anatolien’, Studia Islamica 4 (1931), 1–47; G. G. Arnakis, ‘Futuvva Tradition in the Ottoman Empire: Ahis, Bektashi Derviches and Craftsmen’, Journal of Near Eastern Studies 12 (1953), 232–56; Claude Cahen, ‘Sur les traces des premiers Ahis’, in Mélanges Faao Köprüülü (Istanbul, 1953), pp. 81–91; Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 105–200, 337–41; Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane, pp. 154–60, 316–20. It is not necessary to mention here the many publications which have appeared over the past twenty years, the majority of which are apologies for ahilik, which exalt it and which are of no importance.


57 Köprüülü, Les origines de l’empire ottoman, pp. 107–12. Later a section of Turkish historians greatly inflated the importance of this subject.
and commercial relations with the Arab world and, particularly, with Iran. Further, urban Turks, moving into Anatolia from Central Asia and settling there, brought to these towns the traditions of the cities in the regions of Transoxania and Khorasm, such as those mentioned above, where they had previously lived. This cultural tie with the cities of Central Asia continued almost throughout the entire Ottoman period.

The majority of the Muslim population in the towns of Anatolia was undoubtedly made up of Turks. Turkish migrations, which increased from the thirteenth century, strengthened this shift to a Turkish majority in the urban centres. Although some Turkoman still remained outside urban life, sources from the Ilkhan (Mongol) period talk of Turkoman who had begun to trade, settling, for example, in Sivas.58

In large centres such as Konya, Sivas and Kayseri, there were also, naturally, ulema, merchants and bureaucrats of Arab and Persian origin. Ibn Battuta talks of having spoken with such ulema and bureaucrats in the towns of Anatolia where he travelled in the first half of the fourteenth century.59 Apart from the ordinary people, those elements of urban life which remained unchanged through Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman times were the ulema and the bureaucrats; religious employees such as the imams, the hatibs and the müezzins; the müftüs, the kâds and the müderrises, who had both a legal and a religious identity; the seyyids and the şerifs who were descended from the family of the Prophet, and, in particular, the şeyhls and the dervishes who were members of the Sufi tarikats, an extremely widespread institution in the period. The non-Muslims, either in large or small numbers according to the towns (Greeks, Armenians, and lesser numbers of Jews and European traders), formed a further unchanging population in some Anatolian towns such as İzmir, Konya, Bursa, Sivas and Kayseri in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. If we look at the information in Ibn Battuta, we find that in some towns in the fourteenth century Greeks, in other towns Armenians, outnumbered the Turks.60 There were a large number of Jews in trade centres such as Konya, Antalya, Sinop and Sivas.61 The increasing importance of Bursa after the Ottoman conquest gained it a reputation as an international centre in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We know that side by side with a large Muslim population of Turkish origin, Muslims of Arab and Persian extraction, Greeks, Jews, and even Armenians lived in fairly large numbers there. They were settled in the different quarters called mahallesi. The

58 See, for example, Z. M. Kazvini, Athar al-Bilad wa Akhbar al-İbad (Beirut, 1960), p. 537.
59 Ibn Battuta, Tuhfat al-Nuzzar, i, pp. 224–62, for various references.
60 Ibn Battuta, Tuhfat al-Nuzzar, i, p. 239.
mahalle, which is not found in medieval European cities, was always a basic element of classic Islamic towns, particularly in the Middle East.62

The centres of social life: the vakıf associations

The best-known documents of the process of Turkification, and at the same time of Islamisation, of Anatolia are the foundation documents of the vakıfs which became of great importance in the towns at almost the same time as Turkish settlement and which continued to be so in the centuries that followed. As is known all the socio-religious associations in the Islamic world were based from the Ummayad period onwards on an understanding and application of the vakıf. The theoretical basis for the vakıf institution, various examples of which can be found in the same regions before the arrival of Islam, rested on an Islamic principle which can be summarised as presenting a part of the capital of the rich for the help of the poor purely for the approval of God without looking to any reward in return. But it is not possible to say that throughout a long historical process this was the only motive to play a role, and it is certain that the long-term protection of the economic interests of those establishing a vakıf and of their families was also seen as an important factor.63

The vakıf was a financial-administrative mechanism for such social assistance and financial activities as constructing and running buildings with social and religious functions such as medreses, hospitals (şifahane), mosques, or mescids, zaviyes (or, depending on the time, the place and the functions which they performed, tekiyyes, hanekahs, dergahs and asitanes), baths (hamams) and caravansarys (kervansarays), collectively known as an imaret (or much later külîye); for giving scholarships to students, treating the sick, giving financial help to mühtedis (converts to Islam), and healing injured animals. The Turkish Anatolian towns in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, and of course later, continued this traditional structure. There are many documents in the Ottoman archives showing how this system worked. The most important of these documents are the vakfiyeler, the title deeds of vakıfs, which were set up in the sancaks (provinces), the equivalent of the il system, the

62 This urban structure, based on the mahalle in the centre of which were found, and are still found in the towns of Turkey today, a mosque or a mescid and the remains of a tekke which continued to exist but with its function now changed, persisted throughout the entire Ottoman period to today.

administrative unit in Turkey today, and evkaf defterleri which include the vakıf registrations.\textsuperscript{64}

On account of its significant role in the social structure, a fairly systemised vakıf law was developed in Islamic law. This also recognised the legality of non-Muslim vakıfs in an Islamic country. Thus the vakıfs of churches and monasteries which existed on land that passed from the Byzantines to the Seljuks, to the beyliks and then to the Ottomans continued unaltered and their administration was left to these institutions.

Even if no comprehensive, detailed monograph has yet been published on the vakıfs of the period we are investigating, still some vakıfs belonging to the Anatolian Seljuk period have been published by scholars such as Zeki Oral, Muallim Cevdet, Ahmet Temir and, in particular, Osman Turan, and, in more recent times, by Refet Yinanç and İsmet Kayaoğlu. But the majority of these are copies from the Ottoman period of the very few vakıf title deeds from the Anatolian Seljuk period which have survived to our day.\textsuperscript{65}

When these documents from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century are examined one sees that the vakıfs were divided into three categories as regards the sources of their income. The first was the type of vakıf which was created from the income sources of individual goods and property, and in vakıf law was defined as ‘sahih vakıf’, true vakıf. The second, as in Ottoman vakıfs, was that not based on individual property but created from units dependent on villages, land and other similar sources, and on various taxes, and these were called ‘yarı sahih yarı ırsadi vakıflar’, ‘half true half ırsadi vakıfs’. The third category was the ‘ırsadi vakıflar’ which were established on the basis of real estate rather than individual wealth, which was made up of villages, arable land, pasture lands or other similar land, which passed into the possession of an individual by means of a grant or by some other means, and which over time turned into ırsadi vakıfs which were defined as ‘gayr-i sahih vakıf’, ‘false vakıfs’.

\textsuperscript{64} The Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi which is found today in Ankara has a large, rich collection of documents made up of this type of register, particularly for the Ottoman period. For detailed, new research on this archival material see H. Yüksek, ‘Anadolu Selçukluları’nda Vakıflar’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I, ed. Ocak, pp. 309–28.

\textsuperscript{65} Of the vakıf deeds in private hands or in the various archives, the most important of which is the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi, hardly any are original. Moreover, those which are recorded in the registers of the above-mentioned archives are extremely badly made copies. Most of them are careless copies made by the evkaf katıpleri, the vakıf scribes, of vakıf deeds in the hands of the trustees of vakıfs, after the establishment of the Evkaf Nezareti, the Ministry of Vakıfs, in 1826.
We do not have the statistical data for how many mosques, mescids, medreses, zaviyes and türbes (graves, tombs), hamams (baths), bedestans (markets), bridges, fountains and so on there were in these vakıfs in the Anatolian towns in the centuries we are discussing. Apart from the monumental buildings defined as vakıf which remain standing today, it is not always possible to prove that those which are not so defined and are in ruins or have been lost were vakıf buildings. However, thanks to archival sources we are more fortunate for the Ottoman period. As a result of the work conducted on archival documents on the sancaks of the classical Ottoman period, we have access to the registrations of the majority of these vakıf organisations, even for those which no longer exist today. In this context it is important to remember that a percentage of the organisations which passed into the Ottoman archival registers came from the Seljuk and beylik periods and operated in the Ottoman period: they thus originated in the earlier period, in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries.

We still do not know precisely the role and importance of these organisations in the spread and establishment of Islam in Anatolia, or, therefore, in the creation and development of Islamic culture: in short, we are to some extent ignorant about their socio-cultural history. For this reason, we are still unable to give a satisfactory, definite and detailed answer to questions regarding, for example, the contributions of vakıf organisations of this type to Muslim social life and culture in Anatolia in the Anatolian Seljuk, the beylik and even the Ottoman periods.

Mosques which formed part of vakıfs were clearly important in the locations in which they were found for they were open to all Muslims regardless of status or affiliation. As is well known, the mosque had been the most characteristic unit of the Muslim urban landscape since the beginning of Islam. It was both a holy place essential for collective worship and a type of forum, a social space where all subjects, including politics, were debated, to which news was brought by Muslims arriving from foreign countries, and where the conversation of the ulema was listened to and lessons attended. It was also a place where those who had no home or family could from time to time stay for short periods. These characteristics equally applied to the Anatolian mosques in the Seljuk, beylik and Ottoman periods.

One of the most significant socio-religious institutions in the towns and cities in Anatolia in this period was certainly the Sufi foundations which were known by names such as zaviye, tekiyye, dergah, asitane, hanekah, and buk,

depending on their location, size and function. These buildings, which were in origin where Sufi members of various *tarikats* (Sufi orders) lived, were at the same time buildings where travellers of every faith and culture, both Muslim and non-Muslim, could stay without paying. This was one of the conditions for their existence which was written into a *vakıf* deed.

In the history of the Turkification and Islamisation of Anatolia, these institutions played at least as important a role as the mosques and *mescids*. While these institutions differed according to the nature of the *tarikats* to which they were tied, they shared the same general characteristics. In the rural *zaviyes*, the dervishes worked during the day on their fields or were occupied with animal husbandry and other such agricultural activities; in the evenings they organised *sema* religious ceremonies and *zikr* assemblies and conducted Sufi education of the disciples (*mürid*). 67 Much research has been produced since the publication of the well-known article by Ö. Lütfi Barkan on their role in the Islamisation of towns and villages where there was a mixed population of Muslims and non-Muslims, and a great many documents on this subject have survived from the Ottoman period.

**Culture and religion**

In the context of the history of Islam in Anatolia, the religious life of Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries has not been much researched. Neither the very well known article by F. Babinger nor that of F. Köprülü (much better researched and based on much richer material which attacked theories put forward by Babinger) covered every aspect of the subject. These articles should perhaps be regarded more as representing an important beginning to the investigation of this topic. It is nevertheless interesting to note that despite the considerable amount of time which has passed since their publication, no more comprehensive or methodological research has been undertaken. 68 Here we shall try to give a general picture of the main problems to be found in trying to deal with this subject.

67 For the historical significance of these Sufi institutions and for a general assessment see A. Y. Ocak and S. Faruki, ‘Zaviye’, *IA*, xiii, pp. 468–76.

As is well known, Anatolia, from before the Roman dominion and throughout it, was a region which had a very rich and varied panoply of pagan cults which had survived from ancient times and had roots stretching back over thousands of years. Affected by various outside influences, these cults had developed their own, particular forms. By the time the region was taken over by Byzantium, it had already been under the influence of Christianity for some considerable time. Despite this, the Orthodox faith, which became the official religion of the empire, was unable fully to penetrate the most remote corners of Anatolia over the first few hundred years of the empire’s existence. Even in the sixth century when Byzantium was at its height, Christianity was not able completely to overthrow the pagan cults but was only able to mask them. As true pagan cults worshipping various gods from former times continued to exist, even Christianity itself cannot be said to have been more for many ‘Christians’ than a basic and crude Trinity of God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. These ‘Christians’ pursued their beliefs in their old gods and various saints who were either imagined or real people by adapting them to Christianity. It is known that the first Christian priests who carried out missionary activities in various parts of the empire were only successful in making a new religion there by providing a new interpretation of the old beliefs and by making this interpretation acceptable. This approach produced various types of popular Christianity created from an amalgam of Christianity and pagan cults which continued to exist and to be practised.69

One of these was that of the dualist churches which came into existence as a result of the influence of the Manichaeists. Having been declared heretics in the Zoroastrian Sassanid Empire, they had fled from Iran and taken refuge in Anatolia where they had, in appearance, become Christian.70 In its political struggle with Byzantium, Iran encouraged the propagation and spread of Zoroastrian propaganda in Anatolia. Followers of religions which appeared as a reaction to Zoroastrism, such as eastern Mazdaism and Manichaeism, were forced to flee from Iran into Anatolia where Christianity came forcibly into contact with them. Over time and under the influence of these Iranian religions, new Christian sects with a dualist character based on the concepts of goodness and evil of the gods, such as Marcionism (‘Marika’ in

70 From the many recent publications on this subject see, for example, M. Roquebert, Histoire des Cathares: hérésie, croisade, inquisition du XIe au XIVe siècle (Paris, 1999); Y. Perrin Stoyanov, The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy (New Haven, 2000), and note 104 below.

This amalgamation of religious ideas resulted gradually in the formation among the various ethnic-religious groups such as the Greeks, Armenians and Suriyanis in Anatolia of independent ‘heretical’ churches outside the Orthodox fold. At the same time, the Orthodox faith itself also underwent changes. In particular, new separatist sects such as the Jacobites and Nestorians appeared as a result of the influence of various old Greek and Hellenistic schools of philosophical thought. These were labelled ‘deviational’, heretical, by the Orthodox church and by the Byzantine administration which claimed control of it.\footnote{For Orthodoxy and other sects in the Ottoman Empire see O. Clément, \textit{Byzance et le Christianisme} (Paris, 1964); J. Guillard, ‘L’hérésie dans l’empire byzantin des origines au XIIe siècle’, \textit{Travaux et Mémoires} 1 (Paris, 1965), 299–324; Jarry, \textit{Hérésies et factions}; V. E. Kaegi, \textit{Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium} (Chicago, 1982); R. Janin, \textit{La géographie ecclésiastique de l’empire byzantin}, vol. III: \textit{Les églises et les monastères} (Paris, 1969).} Although the Byzantine government, faced with these separatist religious currents, took forceful measures to strengthen Orthodoxy, and, forcing the various ethnic groups in Anatolia to accept the church, sought to use the church as a means to ensure the compliance of the population, this policy produced the opposite effect and Anatolia instead became the setting for various religious struggles.

Thus, when the Turks began to settle in Anatolia in the eleventh century they encountered a highly heterogeneous religious environment. The regions of inner and eastern Anatolia were divided into the small churches we have described, which had arisen as a reaction to Orthodoxy and which, for various political, social, economic and cultural reasons, were spread among the ethnic groups, apart from the Greeks. A point which must be stressed here in particular is that this religious division played an important role in the easing of the Turkish conquests in Anatolia and in their diffusion, and, therefore, favourably assisted their settlement in the region. Let us once more stress that the local population, exasperated by the state’s attitude which opened the way to separation of religious views and crushed by high taxation, were not particularly willing to oppose the Turks.
The state and the Muslim population

The assertions of some of the older generation of western historians that the Turkish states in Anatolia followed a policy of enforced Islamisation of the local population have long since been disproved by western historians such as Claude Cahen, Bernard Lewis and Marshall G. Hodgson, and Turkish historians such as Fuad Köprülü and Osman Turan. Young western historians now generally approach this subject with greater care and objectivity.

The process of Turkification and Islamisation from the end of the eleventh century encompassed a wide area from the Byzantine frontiers to the borders of Iran, from the shores of the Black Sea to the lands of the Ayyubid state. This area was divided between the Anatolian Seljuk state in the west, the Danışmends in the centre, and the Mengüceks, the Saltukids, the Artukids and others in the east. Each one of these followed a clear religious policy in the regions under their own control. The target of this religious policy was two groups, that is, the Muslims and the non-Muslims.

These states aimed rapidly to make the nomadic and settled Turkish populations productive by giving them land – valleys, plains and summer pastures – to settle in the eastern, south-eastern and central regions of Anatolia. There is no doubt that the vakıf foundations were highly significant in realising this extremely important policy. Even though the foundation dates of the vakıf buildings of the states mentioned above which have survived are not known today, it is clear that the conquest and settlement movements which came immediately afterwards followed a line progressing from east to west. Looking at the existing architectural works, it is possible to say that in the east, the region of Lake Van, and in the centre, the inner section of the Kızılirmak (Halys) river were the places settled first and, in parallel with this, Turkified and Islamised.

It is clear that the states which we are discussing had control over a large Muslim population, the majority of which was made up of Turks. All these states, as a continuation of the Great Seljuk state, identified themselves with Sunni Islam. Babinger’s assertion, mentioned above, that the Anatolian Seljuks were Shi’i, was not based on any historical evidence and has not so far been proved. Although the Anatolian Seljuk rulers had a Sunni Islamic culture and education and knew Arabic and Persian well enough to write poetry in these languages, neither they nor the population were particularly strict in religious interpretation, being neither conservative nor fanatical. It is for this reason

73 See note 27 above for bibliographical references.
74 Babinger, ‘Der İslâm in Kleinasien’.
that contemporary Arab opinion viewed the Turkish understanding of Islam with suspicion and the Turks’ ‘Muslim-ness’ was questioned.\textsuperscript{75}

In order to legitimise their rule within the Islamic world and develop the urban centres under their control, the Anatolian Seljuk rulers and the Turko-Man leaders of the beyliks laid the ground for attracting Turkish, Persian and Arab men of learning and religion, Sufis, poets and writers to work and write for them. Many members of the \textit{ulema}, such as Abdülmeclid b. İsmail Herevi (d. 1142), Muhammad Talakani (d. 1217), Yusuf b. Sa'id el-Sijistani (d. 1241–2) and Ömer el-Ebheri (d. 1265), therefore came from Iran and the Arab regions and settled in Anatolia in the Anatolian Seljuk period. One prominent figure in the time of the Sökmenids was the scholar of religious law in Ahlat, Abussamed b. Abdurrahman (d. 1145). Further, there were Turkish scholars settled in various Arab regions who had been trained in Seljuk \textit{medreses} in Anatolia. All these men played an important role in the strengthening of the Sunni policy of the state.

During the period of their establishment, the Ottomans took over and continued this tolerant Sunni policy. As is well known, the first Ottoman rulers adopted a tolerant stance towards the Kalenderis, Hayders, Vefais, the Bektasîs and other Sufi circles which did not fit well with Sunnism, granting them many vakıf and benefiting greatly from their support, particularly in the conquest of the Balkans. This tolerant policy of the early rulers continued until the beginnings of Safavi Shi’i propaganda in Anatolia at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

\textit{Religious leanings and mezhps: the establishment of Sunnism in Turkey in the Middle Ages}

There is no doubt that from the time of the Seljuks of Iran the political administrations’ protection of the official policy of Sunnism was a factor in the strengthening of Sunnism among the other \textit{mezheps} in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{76} As a newly established state in the centre of the Islamic world with a non-settled population of non-Arab origin, the Iranian Seljuks were initially compelled to guarantee their political legitimacy by making themselves accepted and, thus, to back Sunnism. At the same time, the great majority of the Turkish groups

\textsuperscript{75} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, p. 204; Cahen, \textit{La Turquie pré-ottomane}, p. 164. Despite the hundreds of years that have passed since then, the Turks in Turkey are still today not counted as good Muslims in a section of Arab public opinion.

\textsuperscript{76} Some assertions have been made that the political administrations forced the population to be Sunni in order to protect the official policy of Sunnism. Based on no historical foundation or data, these assertions have not so far been proved.
chose Sunnism when they began gradually from the tenth century to convert to Islam because they came into contact with the circles in Transoxania in which Sunni Islam was the most powerful religion, and even if they initially met with various problems, they had no great difficulty, at least in elite circles, in adopting it.

Thus as a natural result of these historical developments the great majority of this Muslim population in Anatolia of Central Asian origins followed Sunni Islam. One can safely say that throughout Anatolia in the Seljuk and the Ottoman periods the Hanefi branch of Sunnism was dominant in education and teaching, and particularly in law, even if in some places in the south and the south-east Shafi‘ism was widespread. The cities and towns, that is, places which had a developed culture and the areas in their vicinity, in other words regions which had contact with written culture, were normally locations where Sunnism predominated. This also naturally applied to the villages which were close to these centres and which had continuous relations with them. It cannot have been the case, however, taking into consideration the conditions of the time, that the Sunnism of the rural areas was bound to the bookish or medrese-based Sunnism of the city. What we can say, looking at examples which still exist today, is that, even if not to the same extent as in heterodox circles, traditional beliefs and customs were dominant to some degree, at least in a widespread and strong saint cult. Despite the passing to a strict Sunnism in the sixteenth century in the Ottoman period and the attainment of an advanced level of literacy, the fact that this position has not changed even today legitimises this view. Nevertheless, the assertion that all the rural portion of the population belonged to a heterodox Islam remains unsupported by any historical data.

In any case, the vast majority in Anatolia did in principle adopt Sunni Islam and Hanefism. Thus, if Shafi‘ism is put to one side, the other Sunni mezheps (Hanbali and Maliki) did not find fertile ground in Anatolia. Even if from time to time over the centuries scholars and Sufis of these two mezheps travelled to the region, or even settled or lived there for long periods working as high-ranking bureaucrats or in the educational life of the medreses, these mezheps were not widespread. It has been suggested that this was the result of the Turks’ contacts with Hanefi circles in Central Asia during the period in which they were converting to Islam, which thus enabled this mezhep better to put down roots and firmly establish its culture. A further, equally important reason was that this mezhep was more rational and more able to meet the Turks’ practical needs; in other words it was better adapted to Turkish social structure.
The Shi‘i question in medieval Turkey

The subject of the religious trends and mezheps outside Sunni Islam is one that is little understood from the point of view of Turkish religious history and which has hardly been researched at all. There is a considerable lack of information on it in the sources for the Seljuk and beylik periods in Anatolia. Despite much research having been done on the period in general, many specific questions remained unanswered. One of these is the question of Shi‘ism in Anatolia.\(^77\) While it has long been known that a substantial proportion of the Turkoman who came into Anatolia, particularly with the nomadic movements of the thirteenth century, had an understanding of Islam which did not fit well with Sunni Islam, and that some Turkoman were active in political and social movements and in religious and Sufi trends, the insufficiency of the written sources on this subject for the period mean that it is not clearly or completely understood to what extent, where and in which circles these trends were influential. But using clues and data concerning the position today, some hypotheses can be produced about the type and content of these movements.

However insufficient the sources may be, it is still possible to see traces of Shi‘i-Ismaili influences among the semi-nomadic Turks, regardless of the Sunni policy of the political administrations which officially protected it, influences which were not considered by researchers until the recent past. We must remember that the Turkoman who were present in northern Syria and south-east Anatolia from the eleventh century had lived for a considerable period side by side with the Ismailis and had even intermixed with them.\(^78\) Thus al-Jawbari, an Arab who travelled among them at the beginning of the thirteenth century claiming that Ali’s soul had passed to him, wrote that he wandered among the people without being found in any way odd.\(^79\) In this context the dominance of a strong messianism in the revolts against the Mongols in Anatolia in the following years, including the Babai revolt in 1240 and the Cimri revolt which succeeded it, is striking.\(^80\)

Although we can presume that the Ilkhan ruler Öljaitü Hudabende’s (1304–16) acceptance of the İmamiye mezhep resulted in a environment favourable to


\(^79\) See ‘Abd al-Rahim b.‘Umar al-Jawbari, *Al-Mukhtar fi Kashf al-Asrar wa Hatk al-Astar*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Karaçeleybizâde), no. 253, f. 39a. Claude Cahen was one of the first scholars to refer to this source.

the spreading of Shi’ism in Anatolia, the subsequent rapid shift of the Ilkhans to Sunnism must have hindered any such development. Further, the Anatolian Turkoman rulers, who were, as we have said, dominated by strong messianic beliefs, did not enter this mezhep despite being in close contact with Shi’i-Ismaili influences, but rather preserved their old pre-Islamic beliefs under an Islamic veneer. With the development of Bektaşi and Kızılbaş movements in the fifteenth century among those Turkoman and Kurdish tribes in Anatolia who are known to have been the object of probably strong Ismaili influence in the thirteenth century and of Hurufi propaganda which was highly influenced by Ismailism in the fourteenth century, the Anatolian branch of heterodoxy appeared.81

Despite the existence of such influences we have no proof of the diffusion of either Ismaili Shi’ism or Imamiye (Twelver Shi’ism) in Anatolia in this period. Thus, no Shi’i groups belonging directly to either of these branches existed in Anatolia, even in the following centuries.

There were, however, Yazidi circles which were sufficiently numerous to be involved in a series of political incidents which broke out in the east and southeast of Anatolia in the second half of the thirteenth century. Developed in the twelfth century by şeyh Adi ibn Musafir (d. 1162) with the aim of defending the Ummayad Caliphs, in particular Yazid I, by opposing the extremism of the Shi’i mezheps, the Adeviyye mezhep gradually changed its character among the mountain Kurds in the south-east of Anatolia and, combining with former local beliefs, became an extreme heterodox mezhep. In the time of the grandsons of şeyh Adi ibn Musafir the mezhep took the name Yazidiye from Caliph Yazid and its followers began to be known as Yazidis. They joined with the Turkoman and fought together against the Mongols who were occupying Anatolia. Yazidi identity as it exists today emerged fully at the end of the fourteenth century.82

The mezhep did not extend beyond the south-east of Anatolia and there is no trace whatsoever of the existence of Yazidism in the western parts of Anatolia today.

The state and non-Muslims

Here, even if only briefly, it is necessary to touch on the religious policy which the political administrations followed towards the non-Muslim population in Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. A non-Muslim subject population


82 For the Yazidis see note 22 above.
of significant size, even if less than in previous periods, and made up of Orthodox Greeks (Rum), Gregorian Armenians, Georgians, Suriyans, Nestorians, monophysite Jacobites and others lived in the lands over which these states ruled. The Turkish rulers were therefore well aware of the need to protect and look after their non-Muslim subjects in order to preserve social order, thus allowing the Turkish population, the vast majority of which was seminomadic, to adapt to their new life in the new lands and to become productive. This depended on not destabilising the existing social and economic structure.

With this aim in mind, therefore, almost all the Seljuk sultans left the non-Muslims undisturbed as far as possible. They did not strictly enforce the law related to the *ahl al-dhimma* (the non-Muslim population) which was firmly implemented by other Muslim countries, and adopted a policy designed to assure ease of relations, a policy known in the Ottoman period as *istimalet* (persuasion). After his military expedition into the Menderes valley in the west of Anatolia in 1196, Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, for example, settled a large group of Rum villagers whom he brought to Akşehir from the Menderes valley, gave them materials and equipment for arable agriculture, and exempted them from tax for a considerable period.83 In the east the Artukid ruler Balak Gazi deported the Gerger Armenians who had revolted against him to the region of Hanazit, but adopted a tolerant policy towards them thereafter and interfered as little as possible in their religious life. The sources show that the period of one of the Artukid rulers, Necmeddin Alp (1152–76), was one of the most prosperous for the Christians of the region. Similarly, the reigns of Emir Saltuk (1145–76) and the Ahlat ruler Sökmen II (1128–83) were periods in which the Christians of eastern Anatolia lived peacefully. Further, the Danışmends who, as is clear from the famous epic romance known as the *Danışmendname*, were tightly tied to the *cihad* and *gazi* ideology, behaved very tolerantly towards the Christians, so much so that according to the account given by Michael, the Suriyian historian of the period, they were overcome with grief at the death of Gümüştekin Ahmed Gazi in 1104.84 From the first conquests on, the Christian population, particularly those belonging to the ‘heretical’ churches in the rural regions, did not feel great hostility towards the Turks, and, as explained above, regarded the wars which the Turks won against the Byzantines as punishing Byzantium, which looked down on and oppressed them.

83 See Turan, Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye, p. 292.
The Anatolian Seljuks and Turkoman beyliks were able, thanks to their more flexible application of the law relating to the *ahl al-dhimma* in comparison with other contemporary Muslim states, to incorporate the non-Muslim populations of Anatolia into their own economic and social system. This policy towards the non-Muslims occasioned some criticism. The famous Sufi Muhieddin Ibn Arabi complained in a letter he wrote to İzzeddin Keykavus I that

the sultan, who is the shadow of God on earth, must raise the honour and the glory of Islam, he must work for the total domination of the infidels, churches must be destroyed in towns in which the Muslims rule, the bells in those which are not destroyed must be rung very softly, Christians must not mount horses or donkeys using saddles, they must not carry weapons, they must respectfully stop in places when Muslims pass, they must not go around in Muslim clothes, and they must not use Arabic seals.\(^{85}\)

Despite any such criticism, there is no doubt that this realistic and intelligent policy was a factor which strengthened the existence of these states. From a political point of view it successfully removed possible Byzantine claims over the Christian population living under Turkish rule. In other words, the non-Muslim population which had begun to live under Turkish control must from then on have largely disregarded Byzantium as its protector and refuge.

It can be said that the period of Mongol occupation which began in reality in Anatolia in 1246 ensured a more varied environment for non-Muslims when compared with earlier periods. When they took the Anatolian Seljuk state under their rule, the Mongols were still shamans and for a time they remained indifferent to both Islam and Christianity. Wishing to benefit from this situation, the Armenians approached the Mongols. It is probable that the Mongols were both attentive to the Rum and used the Georgians as soldiers in their armies in order to weaken the influence of the Seljuk administration over the population and to ensure their own better relations with the local inhabitants. Thus the Christian groups succeeded to an extent in securing new privileges from the Mongols and in using them against the Turks. As an example we can point to the restoration of various bishoprics removed by the Turks. But this novel situation which began with the Mongol occupation continued only until

\(^{85}\) For a summary of the text of the letter see Karim al-Din Aqsara’i, *Müsâmeret ʾul-ahbâr: Moğollar Zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*, ed. O. Turan (Ankara, 1944), Persian text, p. 328; cf. Togan, *Umumı Türk Tarihine Giriş*, p. 213. Togan interprets this letter as a sign of Ibn Arabi’s fanaticism, although we think it useful in this context to recall that Ibn Arabi lived in Andalusia in a period when Catholic oppression of the Jews and the Muslims during the *reconquista* was increasing, and that he came to Anatolia from there.
their acceptance of Islam, for Gazan Han’s conversion and official recognition of Sunnism in 1296 speeded up the spreading of this new religion among the nomadic Mongol tribes. These tribes, who had followed their shamanist way of life since their arrival on the Anatolian steppe, generally likened the Turkoman babas to their own shamans, as Fuad Köprülü said, and for this reason they started to convert to Islam through the Turkoman babas whom they felt close to, and began gradually to settle on the land.

_The vibrant Sufi environment of medieval Turkey: the entry and spread of Sufism in Anatolia_

After the completion of the conquest of a large part of Anatolia and the stabilising and strengthening of the political and social environment, that is, approximately from the beginning of the thirteenth century, the dervishes and şeyhls, members of various Sufi movements and tarikats, entered Anatolia and began to settle. These Sufis found there a favourable environment for the spreading of Sufism, while the political leaders in turn received valuable spiritual support which strengthened their presence and legitimised them in the eyes of the population.

These mystics, Sufis, şeyhls and dervishes coming from a different circle and with a different outlook, speaking different languages and wearing different clothes, came in with the nomadic waves discussed above, and settled. Those from the towns settled in urban centres, and those from rural regions, in the countryside. Thus both high (urban) and popular (rural) Sufism began to be brought into the Anatolian lands from other parts of the Islamic world. High Sufi circles generally had a strong moral character in which the understanding of ascetism (zühd ve takva) was very influential. Only Mevlana would be an exception to this. In this context we should call to mind among others Muhieddin İbn Arabi (d. 1241), his successor Sadreddin Konevi (d. 1274), and their disciples, and the members of the Kadiriye and the Rifaiye tarikats.86

A further Sufi group was that which was known as Horasani because the majority of its members followed a Sufi understanding that was dominant in Transoxiana, Iran and particularly in the region of Horasan. Fuad Köprülü stressed the important fact that this group at one time had a great influence in the Middle East, and in particular among the Sufi movements in Anatolia. The extent of this influence was such that even today many Turkish families link their own roots to this region. There were

many different Sufi trends present in this group. Among its most famous proponents were Evhadeddin Kirmani (d. 1237), who came to Anatolia and lived there, Fahreddin Iraki, the father of Mevlana Bahaeddin Veled (d. 1238), Burhaneddin Tirmizi (d. 1240) and Necmeddin Razi (Daye) (d. 1256).

The şeyhs and dervishes associated with various tarikats which were part of these Sufi movements were active in important centres of the period such as Ahlat, Erzurum, Bayburt, Sivas, Tokat, Amasya, Kırşehir, Kayseri, Konya and in the neighbouring regions, and created a very lively Sufi environment in Turkey in the thirteenth century. These captivating figures, wandering the markets dressed in their unusual clothing and with their remarkable appearance, preaching, singing religious songs, organising animated religious ceremonies in the tekkes and zaviyes which they established, and expounding novel ideas about creation, God, humanity and the universe, must have greatly attracted the attention of the people.

This process resulted in the emergence of a 'popular' Islam which, centred on saint cults and emphasising saintly exploits, legends and beliefs known in medrese circles as superstition (hurafe) or heresy (bid‘at), differed from medrese Islam based on fıkıh (fiqh, Islamic canonical jurisprudence). The interpretation and practice of these two forms of Islam, as in every Muslim country, both co-existed and competed over the centuries. It is obvious that Anatolia could not remain unaffected by this sociological process which occurred in a similar way in all the lands into which Islam spread. The Balkan conquests in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries took with them the same understanding of Islam, which was then enriched by new elements from this region. This popular Islam, centred on a saint cult, is still strong in Turkey today where it retains the same characteristics.

**Tarikats and Sufi circles**

It would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that Sufism, which we have shown to have been entirely brought from outside into medieval Turkey with the migrations at the beginning of the thirteenth century, included nearly all the Muslim groups in that period and alone represented Islam. In other words, Islam in Anatolia meant Sufism. The Mongol occupation of Central Asia and, shortly afterwards, of Iran and Iraq unsettled many mystics, Sufi şeyhs and dervishes, and drove them into Anatolia which was made attractive to them by the Anatolian Seljuk state’s establishment and development there. The most important of these groups were the urban Sunni tarikats of Central Asian origin such as the Kübreviye and Yeseviye, and of Iraqi origin such as the Sühreverdiye and Rifaiye. The tarikats of these countries, which were able to
appeal to both rural and urban circles, such as the Hayderiye, Kalenderiye and Vefaiye, the majority of which remained outside Sunnism, also surged into Anatolia. 87

This second group of tarikats was much better able to establish itself among the numerous nomadic caravans driven forward by the Mongol invasions, and among the rural sections of the Turkoman communities in the thirteenth century because, as these people had either only recently accepted Islam or, because of their semi-nomadic way of life, were only superficially Islamised, they had been unable to assimilate to Islam to the extent that the settled population had. In any case, for these people Sufism probably meant little more than a form of social life, rather than being a means of attaining any mystic goals. The great majority of them, such as the Vefaiye, Kalenderiye and Hayderiye, were tarikats which could easily accommodate the local pre-Islamic beliefs and traditions.

Kübreiye, an important urban Asian tarikat founded by the important Sufi Necmeddin Kübra (d. 1221), was brought into Anatolia by famous individuals such as Sadeddin Hamevi, who had been intellectually raised by Necmeddin Kübra, Seyfeddin Bakharzi and Baba Kemal-i Hocendi. 88 These men escaped before the Mongols and took refuge in Anatolia together with their disciples. Among them we should note in particular Necmeddin Razi (Daye) and Bahaeddin Veled who were largely responsible for the spread of the Kübreiye in Anatolia.

Necmeddin Razi came to Kayseri where he met Alaeddin Keykubad I. From there he moved to Sivas where he wrote his famous work Mirsad al-İbad. Bahaeddin Veled settled first in Karaman, and then moved to Konya where he remained until his death. Bahaeddin Veled, who was a very respected scholar, aroused much interest there and had many disciples. He was particularly influential over his son Celaleddin Muhammed, especially in relation to Sufi


education. The very widespread view that Celaleddin Muhammed encountered Sufism after he came to know Şems-i Tebrizi and through his influence is incorrect. Celaleddin Muhammed himself acknowledges in the work of Eflaki (author of Manakib al-Arifin, written for Mevlana’s grandson Ulu Arif Çelebi) the extent to which his father Bahaeddin Veled was an influence on him. Bahaeddin Veled had at least as wide a circle of followers as his halife (an officially ordained successor or deputy of a Sufi şeyh) Burhaneddin Muhakkık-ı Tirmizi who came with him from Balkh.

The Sufi tarikat which was established by Abu Najib al-Suhrawardi (d. 1167) and was developed and spread by his nephew Shihab al-din Abu Hafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi (d. 1234), possessed a strong Sunni character and was widespread and developed in Anatolia. Among the works written by Shihab al-din Abu Hafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi, ‘Awarif al-Ma’arif won great renown and became one of the most widely read Sufi works in Anatolia. It had considerable influence on Sufi works written in Turkey both at that time and later. Even if these urban tarikats which represented high Sufism were not as widespread in Anatolia as the Rifaiye and Kadiriye, yet the books written by their founders very much influenced high Sufi circles and were textbooks for centuries.

Two important tarikats, the Nakşibendiye and Halvetiye, which again had Central Asian origins and Sunni leanings, were added in the later centuries to those tarikats coming from outside. These played a very important role in political, social and religious spheres in the beylik and Ottoman periods, both in Anatolia and in the Balkans, and have survived until today.

Alongside these tarikats which came into the region from outside, new tarikats developed in Anatolia from the end of the thirteenth century. Among these one of the most striking was the Mevleviye, or Celaliye as it was known at that time. This tarikat began to spread quickly in the Turkoman beyliks in the west of Anatolia after the death of Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, thanks to the considerable efforts in the fourteenth century of his son Sultan Veled
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and grandson Ulu Arif Çelebi. This urban tarikat, which gained influence in the Ottoman Empire only after the mid-fifteenth century, showed great development in the seventeenth century and experienced the most successful period of its history in this and the following centuries.92

Another local tarikat which was at least as important in the history of Anatolia as the Mevleviye and was even more widespread in the rural areas was the Bektaşi, which developed in a completely different environment and with a totally different social base, and had a different Sufi outlook. This tarikat was not linked directly to either the time or outlook of the thirteenth-century Turkoman şeyh Hacı Bektaş-i Veli from whom it took its name. Beginning from the period when it was officially established in the sixteenth century, it was one of the most influential tarikats in the Ottoman period in rural and even urban sectors of Anatolia and the Balkans.93

The influential Sufis of medieval Anatolia

Muhieddin Ibn Arabi and vahdet-i vücuda (monism)

After a period in the Seljuk capital Konya, Muhieddin Ibn Arabi settled in Damascus at the invitation of the Ayyubid prince al-Malik al-Ashraf in 1223 and lived there until his death in 1241. It was here that he wrote a part of his works.94 The ideas of Vücuda or vahdet-i vücuda (wahda al-wujud) (monism), which first began to appear in the doctrines of Sufis such as Bayazid Bistami (d. 874) and Junayd Baghdadi (d. 910) and which reached a turning point with the famous pronouncement ‘ana al-haqq’ (I am the truth) of Mansur-e Hallaj (d. 922), became a systematic theosophic definition thanks to Muhieddin Ibn Arabi, even if he


never used this term. The idea of \textit{vahdet-i vücut}, often incorrectly confused with pantheism, was in essence a very complicated idea and difficult to explain. It can be summarised roughly as meaning that everything in the universe is a manifestation of God who is the single creator, and since existence is God, all existence is in truth nothing other than his existence. This system, which attained a broad synthesis as a result of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi’s knowledge of philosophy, calligraphy, religious law (\textit{fıkıh}), \textit{hadith}, \textit{tesfir} (commentary on the Quran), literature and various occult sciences of the time, became so influential that it affected not just the Sufi understanding of the period but also Sufi interpretation in almost the entire Islamic world down to today. For this reason it is probably correct to define Muhieddin Ibn Arabi as the greatest Sufi of all time.

Apart from his two very well known works \textit{Fusus al-Hikam} and \textit{al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya}, his treatises (\textit{risale}) and his other works which numbered around a hundred, later works attributed to him also appeared. Even if Muhieddin Ibn Arabi was accused in his own time of atheism (\textit{zendeka ve ilhad}) by Islamic \textit{ulema} and a section of conservative Sufis and was even remembered as the most infidel \textit{şeyh} (\textit{el-Şeyh el-Ekfer}) because the expressions in his works are obscure and difficult to understand, he was popularly known as \textit{el-Şeyh el-Ekber} (the greatest \textit{şeyh}) and every section of the population showed great respect towards him, as people do even today. It was his adopted child and \textit{halife} (caliph, successor), the famous thirteenth-century Sufi Sadreddin Konevi, who secured fundamental prestige for Muhieddin Ibn Arabi in Anatolia and ensured the spreading of his thought by making it comprehensible through the commentaries he wrote on his works.\footnote{Lami’i Çelebi, \textit{Nafahat Al-UNS}, pp. 632–4; O. Ergin, ‘Sadreddin el-Kunawi ve Eserleri’, \textit{Şarkiyat Mecmuası} 2 (1957), 63–90; W. C. Chittik, ‘Sad al-Din Künawi on the Oneness of Being’, \textit{International Philosophical Quarterly} 21 (1981), 171–84.} Owing to the efforts of Sadreddin Konevi, the thought of this great Sufi influenced all Sunni and heterodox circles in Anatolia in the Seljuk period and had a significant impact on both the elite circles and the popular classes.

Together with Sadreddin Konevi, others too represented the \textit{vahdet-i vücut} school of thought in Anatolia, among the best-known of whom were Müeyyedüddin el-Cendi, Sadeddin el-Fergani and Afifeddin el-Tilemsani. They, and the disciples they trained, opened \textit{zaviye}s in important cultural centres of the period such as Konya, Sivas and Erzincan, and spread the \textit{vahdet-i vücut} school of thought through their training of disciples, commentaries on the works of the \textit{şeyls} and the composition of their own works. The Middle East thus quickly came under the influence of this school of thought, which moved
from there into other areas. But for us what is fundamentally important is that
the thought of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi did not remain restricted only to the high
echelons of Sufism, but was also successful in influencing popular Sufism, and
the success of such a complex theosophic system as vahdet-i vücuda should be
stressed.

The impact of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi’s thought was, moreover, felt beyond the
various Sufi and popular circles, for, thanks to its not being well understood
and being interpreted in an extreme fashion as akin to pantheism (thus giving
further reason for its absorption into the confused ideology of various popular
movements, the most typical of which was the sixteenth-century Melami
movement), it remained influential throughout the entire Ottoman period. The Melami tarikat continues to exist and retains a Sufi character which still
has its supporters among some intellectual circles in Turkey today.

Mevlana Celaleddin Muhammed Rumi and divine love (ilahi asḵ) Another
Sufi understanding which attracted a great following in Anatolia was that of
Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi (d. 1273) who turned the vahdet-i vücuda into an exu-
berance of divine love which became the centre of his Sufi vision. Although he
was a member of the school of thought of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi, his popularity
was far greater, for among all the Sufis of the Islamic world, it is Mevlana about
whom most has been said and written.

As a child, Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi fled from Balkh with his father, Bahaeddin
Veled, to the Hejaz and on to Anatolia to escape the Mongol invasions. He received a good education in the important centres of learning of the time,
such as Damascus and Aleppo, and became an expert in the science of the
Shari’a and particularly in the field of fiqh. He also received a Sufi education
from his father. While he developed his own Sufi understanding, the type of
education he received without doubt had a considerable influence, and it was
as a result of this that he developed an understanding which remained faithful
to Sunni Islam.

96 On this subject see H. Z. Ülken, ‘École vudjudite et son influence dans la pensée turque’,
Outline of the Influence of Ibn ‘Arabi on the Ottoman Era’, Journal of the Muhyt al-Din
dans le monde ottoman’, in Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society, ed. Ocak, pp. 97–120.
97 See A. Y. Ocak, Osmanlı Toplumunda Zıdınlar ve Mülhidler Yahut Dairesinin Dışına Çıkanlar,
3rd edn (İstanbul, 2003), pp. 251–327.
98 For Mevlana and his Sufi thought see R. A. Nicholson, Rumi: Poet and Mystic, 1207–73
(London, 1950); A. Gölpinarlı, Mevlâna Celâledîn (İstanbul, 1959), p. 328; B. Fıruzanfer,
Zindagani-i Mawlâna Jalâl al-dîn Muhammad, 3 vols. (Tehran, AH 1354); Vitray-Meyerovitch,
While teaching in Konya in the early days of his career, Mevlana devoted himself to mysticism, influenced by an enthusiastic dervish called Şems-i Tebrizi and no doubt affected also by his father’s teaching. His own natural attraction to mystic learning must also have played a part, for without this the teachings of Şems-i Tebrizi and his father would not have found such fertile soil. Indeed, this is clear throughout the well-known Mevlevi source, the *Manakib al-Arifin*.

Mevlana’s inclusive ideology and his sincere lifestyle deeply influenced both the Muslim and non-Muslim populace, and attracted the high administrative circles, including the ruler of the time, and the intellectual groups. He is also known to have established close friendships with well-known Sufis of the period such as Sadreddin Konevi. His circle thus gradually widened, his Sufi understanding spread throughout Seljuk Anatolia, and he rose to the level of being a holy man (*veli*) revered not just by members of the upper echelons but also by sectors of the population which had different understandings of Islam.

Although works such as the *Mesnevi* (*Masnevi*), *Divan-i Kabir*, *Fihi ma fihi* and *Ruba‘iyyat*, which made the Sufi understanding and thought of Mevlana known, were written in Persian, the influence of his thought was not restricted to the upper echelons of the period but, thanks to important Sufis such as Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa, was also highly influential among Turkoman circles. The famous Turkoman Sufi poet of the fourteenth century, Aşık Paşa, who defended the use of Turkish as opposed to Persian and Arabic in Anatolia, made much use of the thought of Mevlana in his work *Garıbnâme* and showed a great appreciation of him. Yunus Emre, too, talks of him with great admiration.

Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa Another important Turkoman Sufi of Seljuk Anatolia who lived in the same period as Mevlana was Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli (d. 1271). The fact that he hardly appears in any source of the period indicates that he was not widely known in his lifetime. He owes his fame today to the Bektaşi *tarikat*, which bears his name but was actually founded at the beginning of the sixteenth century, although its roots are much older. It is highly likely that, beginning in the fourteenth century, Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli was enveloped in a totally legendary identity and that when the *tarikat* was established this very widespread legendary character was attached to it.
Today the Bektaşıs and the Kızılbaş in Anatolia revere him and hold him sacred not as a historical figure but as a legendary one.\textsuperscript{99} For them Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli is ‘Ali’s reincarnation.\textsuperscript{100}

Yunus Emre (d. 1310) was also an important Sufi who left his mark on Sufism in Anatolia in the Seljuk period and who had a wide influence both in his lifetime and in the following centuries. In contrast to Mevlana, he was raised and lived in the countryside. According to Fuad Köprülü, this great Turkoman şeyh was a follower of Ahmed-i Yesevi (d. 1167) in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{101}

The period of Yunus Emre’s youth coincides with the old age of Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. His works entitled \textit{Divan} and \textit{Risalat al-Nushiyye} have survived to this day,\textsuperscript{102} as have the works of poets who, inspired by his influence and by the admiration they had for him, imitated his style. Like Mevlana, Yunus Emre was a follower of the \textit{vahdet-i vücut} school of thought of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi and, thanks to his poetry making this idea easily understandable, he played an important role in the history of Sufism in Anatolia. He was also considerably influenced by Mevlana.

Aşık Paşa was a very interesting Sufi in the context of the period in which he lived, when medieval Turkey had yet to overcome the social, political and religious upheavals it was experiencing. He was the only Sufi Turkoman from the descendants of Baba İlyas who rose in revolt against the Anatolian Seljuk administration in 1240. He received a good education and was highly influenced by the Sufi environment created by important Sufis such as Mevlana, Yunus Emre and Ahi Evren. It is possible that he felt insecure throughout his life owing to political suspicion of his family’s past. As will be seen below, he was vehemently against the widespread use of Persian and Arabic in Anatolia and strongly advocated writing in Turkish. It was this attitude which led to the writing of the substantial \textit{Garibname}.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{99} On this subject see in particular Mélikoff, \textit{Hadji Bektach}.
\textsuperscript{100} The only scholar to examine this subject in detail is I. Mélikoff, ‘La divinisation de ‘Alı chez les Bektachis-Alevis’, in \textit{From History to Theology: Ali in Islamic Beliefs}, ed. A. Y. Ocak (Ankara, 2005), pp. 83–110.
\textsuperscript{101} See Köprülü, \textit{Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar}, pp. 278–357. This work is still the first and most scholarly biography of Yunus Emre. For other detailed, scholarly biographies see A. Gölpinarlı, \textit{Yunus Emre ve Tâsavvuf} (Istanbul, 1961; repr. 1992); T. S. Halman, \textit{The Humanist Poetry of Yunus Emre} (Istanbul, 1971); Halman (ed.), \textit{Yunus Emre and his Mystical Poetry}, 2. vols. (Bloomington, 1989). Although there are today many works in Turkish on Yunus Emre, most of them are of an amateur and apologetic character.
Sufism and popular Islam

There is no doubt that among the most important social and cultural transformations in the history of Islam was the spreading of organised Sufi tarikats and their influence on the popular understanding of Islam. The most obvious sign of this was the extensive spread of saintly cults among the people almost everywhere throughout the Islamic world, and their dominance over literate, ‘Quranic’ Islam. The existence of one or several saints’ türbes in almost every town and village in most Islamic countries is very striking. Islam in Turkey was no exception to this historical reality and such türbes are still to be found in all settlements of Anatolia today. The türbes of famous holy men who had died in towns and villages where their türbes were located became identified with the place itself. This was one of the typical characteristics of settlement units in Anatolia. A large number of these türbes date to the medieval period and usually indicate the first Muslim settlements in Anatolia.104 They are thus important from a historical point of view.

Combining all aspects of the Islam of the population which had been in the Anatolian towns and villages for centuries, exhibiting Islamic characteristics and incorporating the remains of pre-Islamic beliefs and cults, the türbes can be seen as a centre of religious life. The face of popular Islam was different from that of the mosque. That to be found in the mosques was closer to the Islam of the book (the Quran); that in the türbes was closer to the pre-Islamic beliefs and practices or even those outside Islam. For this reason, the ulema in Anatolia, as in other Muslim countries, initiated a ‘cold war’ from Seljuk times to the present against this popular Islam which they called superstition and heresy (hurafè and bid’at). But this was a war the ulema never won.

Every türbe had its own origins, customs, rules of conduct and purpose for which it was visited going back beyond the Middle Ages.105 These were taken more seriously than some Islamic commands and prohibitions, for those who visited the türbes both expected help from the saintliness of the holy man whose türbe it was, and feared any harm which might befall them. For this reason, most of those who did strictly adhere to the precepts of Islam were very careful not to violate the sanctity and privacy of the türbe.

---

104 This subject has been carefully researched by F. V. Hasluck who used a wealth of data to be found in his work, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1929). See also Vryonis, Decline of Medieval Hellenism, passim. For the Ottoman period the article of Ö. L. Barkan, ‘İstilâ Devrinin Kolonizatörlük Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeleri’, Vakıflar Dergisi 2 (1942), 279–353, is very important.

The Turks who came as conquerors to Anatolia soon became the new inhabitants and citizens of the region. Once the initial fighting and clashes had subsided and the Turks had settled, both sides then recognised and accepted each other’s existence: the locals did not attempt to drive out the Turks, nor the Turks to drive out the locals. As the years passed, they began a process of recognising each other’s culture, including their languages, religions and learning. This was a process which began simultaneously in both the urban and the rural areas, particularly in the villages. The only people to remain aloof from the Muslim urban circles or from the local population were the nomadic Turkomans. The urban and village Turks, however, the Rum, Armenians, Suriyanis and others were not slow to see the inevitability of co-existence, made clear to them in their town and village life, in the markets, at weddings, religious and seasonal festivals, and to see the usefulness of it. The closeness between the Muslim and Christian perceptions of the population eased the process of living together, as did the Seljuk sultans’ policy of friendliness and tolerance to their non-Muslim subjects, a policy which drew a negative reaction from Muslim Arabs. As observed above, the Christianity of the Anatolian population was created from an amalgam of the influences of old pagan cults and local religions with Christianity. A similar process applied, too, to popular Islam. Thus, the formation in the towns and villages of an Islam and a Christianity which tended to superstition, outside the medreses and political government circles, brought the two peoples close to each other.106

The result of Muslim Turks and Christian Rum, Armenians and other Christian groups living together side by side was naturally, over time, a certain exchange in cultural relations. But in this exchange who took what from whom, what was taken and what given, and to what extent it was taken and given has been a subject of debate among Turkish and western historians. Thanks to the considerable progress which has been made in Islamology and Turkology today it is at least now known that the Turks who arrived in Anatolia were not a primitive tribe equipped with only a very basic culture, as was argued by older-generation western historians, a view adopted as the result of either conscious prejudice or innocent superficiality of conviction. It is a historical fact which must be accepted that, in the words of Fuad Köprülü, the Turks came and settled in Anatolia ‘as a group which had synthesised Islamic civilisation, which infused their entire way of life, with Turkish culture and

106 Togan,Umum Türk Tarhine Giriş, pp. 207–11; Vryonis, Decline of Medieval Hellenism, pp. 223–44.
traditions’. They cannot, thus, be seen as merely having been incorporated into and absorbed by the Christian culture of Anatolia. They did not become absorbed, for in Turkey today even the Muslims who are not of Turkish origin or the Christian population, while preserving their mother tongues, still mainly speak Turkish and write in Turkish, and most of the Muslims continue their ties, even if superficially, to Islam. The question, therefore, is not whether the cultural influence was or was not radical enough to change the essential identity of the Muslim Turks. The question is whether such an influence did or did not appear in aspects of daily life, particularly among the ordinary people, in types of food and drink, agricultural activities, housing structure, tools and material used, and in folkloric customs. From a sociological and historical point of view, here, as in all parts of the world, there were two-way influences. This can be seen in various local cultures and beliefs, especially among the lower echelons, where marriage with associated conversion was one of the most important factors reinforcing this two-way cultural exchange.

Shared cults, saintly pilgrimages and seasonal festivals

As a result of the relations with the local population which inevitably began shortly after their arrival, Turkish settlers in different areas came into contact with cults, beliefs and customs which pre-dated Christianity or dated from the Christian period. Even if not to the same degree in every region, they came over time to be aware of aspects of these cults, particularly in the towns, which resembled aspects of their own beliefs, and which attracted their interest. It was the same for the local population. This interest gradually opened the way to the birth of reciprocal exchange in saintly cults which both peoples revered and, thus, to shared saintly cults which both groups appropriated. This fusion around saintly cults which had already developed in Turkey in the Middle Ages attracted the attention of western travellers who came to Anatolia in the Ottoman period and who discussed it in their works.

As is well known, the first, and still the most comprehensive, research on this shared culture was undertaken by F. W. Hasluck. His research produced the most interesting results on this subject. Hasluck, basing his arguments on convincing evidence, shows very clearly that just as, during the period of the conversion of the towns and villages of Anatolia to Christianity, the gods of the classical period, who now became Christian saints, were assured

---

107 See Köprülü, Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar, p. 191 n. 7.
108 For the views of western observers on this subject see, for example, A. Y. Ocak, ‘XIII–XV. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu’da Türk-Hıristiyan Dinî Etkileşimler’, Belleten 214 (1991), 661–73.
109 Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya.
a smooth transition, so too a similar process occurred in the conversion from Christianity to Islam. For example, the graves or tombs of certain Christian saints and particularly of martyrs of the early Christian era over time became saintly türbes among the Turks. These graves and tombs were thus transformed into shared pilgrimage sites of the two populations.110

It is important to remember that the şeyhs and dervishes of the popular Sufi circles, members of the syncretic tarikats which were not tied to Sunnism, such as, in particular, the Kalenderi and the Bektaşı, played a large role in this transformation. They benefited to a considerable degree from the saintly cults existing among the non-Muslim population in their spread of Islam. Thus, over time very many of these cults of Christian saints turned into an Islamic mystic cults. Some of the saintly türbes became, again over time, shared places of pilgrimage among the non-Muslim population. For example, the cult of St Charalambos in the region of Ürgüp was combined with that of Hacı Bektaş, that of St Theodor and St George in the region of Amasya with the cult of Baba İlyas, and, in the same way, the cult of Sarı Saltık joined with the cults of saints such as St Spiridon and St Nikola in various places in the Balkans.111

Another typical example of this joint cultural, religio-social environment of the towns and villages of the Seljuk, beylik and early Ottoman period was the shared seasonal festivals. The most striking example of this is without doubt the spring festival which the Christians celebrated as Aya Yorgi (Hagios Georgios, St George) and the Muslim Turks as Hıdrellez (Hızır-İlyas) on the same day, 6 May, and at which there were very similar customs. It is highly likely that this practice began earlier in the Anatolian Seljuk period. In the towns where they settled the Turks called the green and tree-filled open spaces, known by the name of Aya Yorgi where there was generally a small church, hıdırlık. They traditionally celebrated Hıdrellez in these places. The legends of Aya Yorgi intermingled with the heroic deeds of Hızır-İlyas whose heroic deeds in turn intermingled with the legends of Aya Yorgi.112

Changes of religion: conversions and apostasy

This subject, which forms an important aspect of the socio-religious history of Anatolia, is one of the most sensitive areas for western historians.

110 Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya.
112 A. Y. Ocak, İslâm-Türk İnançlarında Hızır Yahut Hızır-İlyas Kultü (İstanbul, 2006).
Exaggerated theses, beginning with Gibbons and continuing partly with Hasluck, and later Speros Vryonis Jr, have made clear the significance of the subject. In response to these, modern Turkish historiography, which has finally begun to be interested in this area, has not, if one puts to one side certain new research, gone beyond the realms of conservative reaction. There is, therefore, a serious need for research into the influences and results, both in history and today, of the cultural intermixing between Muslims and non-Muslims who have lived side by side in Anatolia since the last quarter of the eleventh century.

One characteristic of the new shared life about which we have spoken above was the political, and gradually increasing demographic, superiority of one side over the other. The political superiority and control of the conquerors gradually forced this shared life to emerge. Over time social order returned. The ‘soft’ approach of the new political hegemony began to attract the attention of the local population to the political and economic advantages which this hegemony ensured for the non-Muslims, even if they found themselves with the status of second-class citizen, described traditionally and legally as *ahl al-dhimma*. It was thus natural that over time a process of conversion to Islam began from the bottom upwards. In some quarters this process was not slow to start. Was there also an opposite process, a process of apostasy? Although it is impossible to know, it is nevertheless possible, however small the numbers involved may have been. In fact, in neither the Turkish nor the Christian sources of the period does one find incidents of apostasy from Islam to the extent that one does of conversion from Christianity to Islam. This is not surprising, for in every place in the world conversions in history are mostly from the bottom upwards, that is, into the religion of those who hold political power and the dominant culture. In this context, the same sociological process must have been at work in Anatolia, too. From the time of the Anatolian Seljuks onwards, we see, in every period, the impact of various social, economic, psychological and religious influences in Anatolian towns, and non-Muslims who had become Muslims. These events even appear in the anonymous epic romances of the period, such as the *Battalname, Danışmendname* and *Saltıkname*. However, if one excludes the Ottoman period, we do not have a great deal of reliable historical data related to conversions in the earlier periods, apart from a limited number of short records. But for the Ottoman period, from the fifteenth century, we find many historical examples in the archival documents, particularly in the *mühimme* registers or the Shari’ia court orders known as the *kadı sicilleri*. Thanks to these records we can learn the names of the converts in the Ottoman period, their numbers, the social groups they came from, their
family structure, what they did before conversion and after, and various other
details.\textsuperscript{113}

There were without doubt many different reasons for these apparent con-
versions which occurred in medieval Turkey. A wide variety of factors can be
listed from ensuring political and economic influence, and increasing social
status – sometimes accomplished through marriage – to conversion with true
religious aims. At least in the centuries in which this process began, there
are no surviving historical records – with the exception of the \textit{devs\i rme} in the
Ottoman period – of non-Muslims being made Muslim either by the state or by
force. To the tolerance shown by the state and the economic benefits assured
to converts as factors which encouraged and eased conversion, it is perhaps
necessary to add the Byzantine inability now to provide either political or eco-
nomic benefits or protection to the non-Muslim population, for Byzantium,
in contrast to the Turks, was in constant retreat. In other words, the fact that
the political power of Christianity in Anatolia had at last been broken was a
further factor in conversion.

It is striking that conversions occurred through Sufi circles, as is generally the
case today. There is a fairly rich hagiography on this subject. The information
in the saintly \textit{menakibnames} (narratives of heroic deeds) gives interesting data
and accounts which can be checked against historical events. Thanks to these
we can see fairly clearly the conversions which occurred in the urban and
rural milies. For example, the \textit{Manakib al-Arifin} and \textit{Vilayetname-i Hacı Bektaş}
are two valuable sources from the point of view of understanding and proving
conversion which occurred in the circles of Mevlana and Hacı Bektaş.\textsuperscript{114}

Coming to the number of conversions, we do not see in any source of
the period under consideration any discussion of mass conversions. In these
sources there are only isolated events which involved those who were mem-
bers of the high strata of society, close to the government. These sources,
which were written from the centre of the state, either remained ignorant of
conversions which occurred among the people in places far from the centre
or gave no importance to them, and for this reason they were not recorded.
We should not, therefore, regard conversion as unimportant simply because it

\textsuperscript{113} For an example of these see B. and L. Bennassar, \textit{Les Chrétiens d'Allah: l’histoire
extraordinaire des renégats (XVIe et XVIIe siècles)} (Paris, 1989); O. Çetin, \textit{Sicillere Göre
Bursa'da İhtidâ Hareketleri ve Sosyal Sonuçları (1472–1909)} (Ankara, 1994); K. Çolak, 'XVI.
Yüzyılda İstanbul'da İhtidâ Hareketleri', unpublished PhD thesis, History Department,
Hacettepe University, 2000.

\textsuperscript{114} For this and similar hagiographic literature in Anatolia see Ocak, 'Bazı
Menâkıbnâmelere', pp. 31–42.
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does not appear in the existing sources. At the same time, however, we should not over-exaggerate it either.

Another highly significant event for the social and ethnic history of medieval Turkey in this regard is the conversion of the Mongols who, taking control of the Anatolian Seljuk state, aimed at ending the Muslim hegemony in the Middle East touched on earlier. The historical importance of this conversion stems from their becoming a part of the Islamic world which they planned to conquer and wipe from the map.

Theological encounters and debates

The existence of Islam and Christianity side by side as the religions of the majority in Turkey in this period opened the way to another dimension of cultural exchange. This was related to the theological encounters and debates between the representatives of the two faiths. The first historical records on this subject are found in the Turkish epic romances such as Ebümüslimname, Battalname, Danişmendname and Saltıkname, which we have mentioned above. These sources are important as they show, although they are not historical texts, that these theological debates began very early in Anatolia and in a very striking manner.

Such a development in the period between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries should be regarded as a natural process. We know of the existence of a type of theological discussion between various Sufis and monks and priests in the Seljuk period, partly from historical texts, partly from the epic romances referred to above. For example, we know that the young Seljuk sultan İzzeddin Keykavus II (1246–8), who was related to the Byzantine royal house through his mother, held theological debates between priests and experts in Islamic canon law.115 It is well known that Mevlana frequently visited a monastery called Ak Manastır or Deyr-i Eflatun near Konya and held theological debates, that among those who joined these discussions were various people from the Christian and Jewish communities, and that from time to time various monks even came from Constantinople to see him.116 According to one anecdote Mevlana advised a Muslim merchant who had insulted a Christian colleague to go immediately and apologise and obtain his blessing. We learn from the Velayetname-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli that Hacı Bektaş-i Veli had relations with the monks and Christian population of Ürgüp and the surrounding region.117

In the early Ottoman period Orhan Gazi is said to have organised heated theological debates in his presence and to have joined in personally.\textsuperscript{118} It is very well known that Börklüce Mustafa, who was close to Şeyh Bedreddin, conducted theological debates with the monks on Chios in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{119} Another well-known example is that of Sultan Mehmed II who, after taking Constantinople, had similar debates with Gennadios (Scholarios). Removing Gennadios from prison, Mehmed appointed him to the position of patriarch, and even wanted him to write a text on Christian theology. Latin writers and Byzantine intellectuals, in particular Georgios Trapezuntios and Georgios Amirutzes, presented similar texts to the Ottoman sultan.\textsuperscript{120}

Intellectual life

The intellectual life of Turkey in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, various aspects of which – knowledge, thought, literature and, partly, Sufism – will be discussed here in general terms, constitutes an important aspect of the history of Turkey. This new intellectual world was created by the arrival in a region, with its own political, social and ethnic structure, of a different society which came in from outside and constructed its own culture with its own beliefs, language and literature in its new homeland. Even if the result was an intellectual and cultural unit developed by those forced into the region from outside, and even if in the end it was Muslim, the process must also have involved the contribution of those from different cultures and regions. Above all, this intellectual and cultural accumulation created its own language anew in the new lands. The language which appeared here would become a new tongue, which we can call the Turkish of Turkey, developing along different lines from the language spoken and written in Central Asia. Partly influenced by Arabic and Persian, it passed through various stages and underwent various transformations to attain the form it has today.

\textsuperscript{118} See, for example, Vryonis, The Decline of Medieval Hellenism, pp. 421, 426; M. Balivet, ‘Byzantins judaïsants et juifs islamisés’, Byzantium 52 (1982), 24–41.


\textsuperscript{120} For these texts and an analysis see M. Balivet, Pour une concorde Islâmo-Chrétien: démarches Byzantine et Latines à la fin du moyen-âge (Rome, 1997).
The method of expression of intellectual life in medieval Anatolia: the language (Arabic, Persian and Turkish)

Although Ibn Bibi writes that there were five languages spoken in thirteenth-century Anatolia (Turkish, Greek, Armenian, Arabic and Persian), he does not say anything about their geographical spread. This is an important indication that the ethnic and social structure of thirteenth-century Anatolia was not yet uniform. There is no record either about the written languages. We know from the works produced in Anatolia which have come down to us that in scholarly and Sufi circles Arabic and, partly, Persian were used. We know, too, that diplomatic documents were written in Arabic and Persian. While W. Barthold says that the official language of the state among the Anatolian Seljuks down to the thirteenth century was Arabic, the contemporary historian Karim al-Din Aqsara’i records that it passed from Arabic to Persian in the palace at the time of Sahib Fahreddin Ali in the same century. It has long been accepted that the spoken language in the Seljuk court was Persian, but this has not been conclusively proved. Although Turkish was probably widespread among the Artukids, Mengücekids and Saltukids who ruled in Anatolia at the same time as the Anatolian Seljuks, we do not have any works in Turkish from these states which have survived to today. It is to be presumed that among them, as with the Seljuks, the intellectual circles probably used Persian and Arabic, at least officially. However, it is extremely likely that in the courts of both the Anatolian Seljuks, the Saltukids, Mengücekids and Artukids and in those of the western Anatolian beyliks, official documents were written in different languages according to the period and conditions, and the state to which they were addressed.

It is possible to guess that there were many works written in Persian in Anatolia in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. The number of Persian works known today is probably very small in comparison with the number actually written. However, it would be incorrect to explain the fact that works


122 For one such document which has survived from the last period of the Anatolian Seljuks and was written by a münși (scribe) see Abu Bakr Ibn al-Zaki, Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadîkat al-Albâb, ed. Ali Sevim (Ankara, 1972).


124 Karim al-Din Aqsara’i, Müsâmeret, p. 64.

were written in Persian and Arabic only by a tie to or admiration felt among Turkish intellectuals for these two dominant languages of Islamic culture of the time, for we well know that the Seljuk sultans and the rulers of Karaman, Germiyan, the Candaroğulları and other Anatolian beyliks strove to attract scholars and men of art and literature to their lands and that these scholars wrote works in their own languages in this competitive environment which was thus created.¹²⁶

There is no doubt that the semisettled groups and the village and urban populations spoke Turkish and that those who came and settled in Anatolia brought with them Turkish oral traditions, legends and poetry, even though these may not have been written down until later. Other, literate people who knew the literary language of Central Asia also came into Anatolia and must have learnt the Turkish which was beginning to develop there, for had they not it would be difficult to explain the original works of literature, Sufism and learning written in Turkish, or translated into Turkish from Persian and Arabic in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹²⁷

In the Anatolian Seljuk period, the use of Persian as the literary written language and the language of diplomacy in official and intellectual circles, and of Arabic for scientific knowledge and learning severely restricted the area dominated by Turkish. For this reason the number of works written in Turkish is small. We can guess, too, but without clear proof, that another reason for this paucity is the destruction caused by the Mongol invasion. Nevertheless, in the fourteenth century Yunus Emre (d. 1320), Aşık Paşa (d. 1332), Elvan Çelebi (d. after 1358) and other Turkoman şeyhs and dervishes turned to writing their Sufi thoughts and ideas in Turkish which was the language of the groups they were addressing.¹²⁸ Turkish, thus, was able to produce its own writers and poets who from the thirteenth century wrote works


¹²⁷ For the question of how Turkish was established and developed in Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries see Muhsin Macit, ‘Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Döneminde Türkçe ve Gelişimi’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uyguruluğu I, ed. OcaK, pp. 481–6.

¹²⁸ Aşık Paşa was one of the foremost defenders of the use of Turkish in Anatolia as shown in his very famous verses: ‘Kamu dilde var-idi zabt u usul/Bunlara düşmiş idi cümle<ulı/Türk diline kimsene bakmaz idi/Türklere hergiz gumūz akınmaz-idi/Türk daki bilmme idi ol dilleri/Ol ince yol uulu menzilleri.’ (In all languages there were regulations and method/All intellectuals were caught up with them [i.e. Arabic and Persian]/Nobody considered the Turkish language/Nobody’s heart flows out to the
in Anatolian Turkish, which we can call western Oğuz Turkish. In particular, the dervishes of Ahmed-i Yesevi and Kutbeddin Haydar who came into Anatolia initiated among their followers the writing of poetry in the Turkish which they spoke. It is therefore hardly contentious to suggest that the greatest contribution to the development of Turkish occurred in this environment, and western Oğuz Turkish, however much of a problem there is with the extant written corpus, made its most important advance with the great Sufi poet Yunus Emre. Apart from Yunus Emre, Hoca Dehhani, Şeyyad Hamza and Ahmed Fakih, who were recognised for the first time by Fuad Köprülü as poets writing in Turkey in the thirteenth century but who are now known to have lived in the fourteenth century, can be accepted without dispute as among the first poets who used Anatolian Turkish as a written language.\textsuperscript{129}

Turkish, thus, first through the poems of these poets and then the translations from Arabic and Persian made in literary, scholarly and religious circles in the regions under the control of the various beyliks such as Karaman, Aydın, Menteşe and Germiyan and finally the Ottomans, and the simple works written especially in Sufi circles for the common people, began gradually to take over in Anatolia in the Seljuk and beylik periods in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. The complete domination of Turkish which occurred during the fourteenth century was brought to fruition by the poems, literature, Sufi compositions and translations which will be discussed below. Furthermore, we should not forget the part played by the Turkoman beys, the majority of whom knew no language other than Turkish, who, thanks to their use of this language for their diplomatic documents, contributed to making Turkish into the excellent and refined diplomatic language that, gradually elaborated from the end of the fifteenth century, it was to become under the Ottomans.\textsuperscript{130}

The tradition that the first active political initiative to replace Persian with Turkish in the diplomatic arena was taken by Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey after his capture of Konya in 1276 is generally accepted. According to this tradition, Mehmet Bey ordered that Turkish should now be written and spoken Turks/Even the Turk did not know those tongues/Those narrow paths, those great destinations.)

\textsuperscript{129} The first person to recognise the scholarly world of these poets was Fuad Köprülü. After Köprülü, further research was conducted and new examples of their poems found and published. For this subject see A. Kartal, ‘Anadolu’da Farsça Şiir Söyleyen Türk Sâirleri’, in Türkler, ed. H. C. Güzel, K. Çiçek and S. Koca (Ankara, 2002), vol. VII, pp. 680–93; A. Kartal, ‘Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Şiir ve Sâirler’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I, ed. Ocak, pp. 493–520.

\textsuperscript{130} See, for example, Irene Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I (Munich, 1967).
everywhere, both in the court and in literature.\textsuperscript{131} While it is debatable whether his initiative sprang from practical motivation as the result of his not knowing a language other than Turkish, or whether it was based on the conscious choice of one language, there is no doubt that Turkish becoming the official language in use in all the Anatolian beyliks was historically significant, especially from the point of view of the political and cultural future of Turkey.

One of the factors which accelerated the process of Turkish becoming dominant as an official language and a language of literature in Anatolia was the translation activity which was continuous from the Anatolian beylik period onwards. The fact that the beys and the populace did not know Arabic and Persian was without doubt influential in the production of translations of works related to religion, culture and literature which attracted their interest. With the collapse of the Anatolian Seljuk state, Persian lost its former position as a written language from the fourteenth century and the literate circles turned their attention to compositions or translations of works which fitted the expectations of the rulers and the people. The translation activity gradually increased to cover a very wide spectrum from, in particular, religious and Sufi books of a popular nature to medical texts, from rhymed and prose literary works to encyclopaedic essays.

Translations began to appear of religious Sufi classics such as the thirteenth-century great Iranian Sufi Farid al-din Attar’s (d. 1299) \textit{Manteq al-Tayr}, \textit{Tadhkirat al-Awliya} and Abu Ishak al-Tha’labi’s (d. 1035) \textit{Qisas al-Ambiya}. These translations prepared the ground for the development of a Turkish which, in the fourteenth century, allowed the creation of popular Sufi works and especially of a rich prose/rhymed \textit{menakıbname} literature. Anonymous folk stories and epic romances such as \textit{Ebumüслиmname}, \textit{Hamzaname} and \textit{Battalname} were also translated in this period from Persian and Arabic. In the fifteenth century, under the Ottoman ruler Murad II, the chronicle of Ibn Bibi was translated by Yalcızcade Ali into Turkish with some important additions.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{131} See Ibn Bibi, \textit{El Evamir’î Ala’iyye}, p. 696: ‘Hic kes ba’d el-yevm der divan u dergah u bargah u meclis u meydan cuz be-zeban-turki suhan ne-guyed’; \textit{Selçuk Name}, ii, p. 209: ‘Bugünden itibaren divanda, dergahta, bargahta, meclisde ve meydanda Türkçe’den başka dil kullanılmaktakur’ (From today no other language than Turkish will be used in the council, in the dervish lodge, in the court, in the assembly and in the square). This day is still celebrated in Turkey today as Dil Bayramu (Language Day).

\textsuperscript{132} See \textit{Tevarih-i Al-i Selçuk}, Topkapi Sarayı Mızesi (Revan) Küütüphanesi, nos. 1390–1392, 3 vols. Let us recall here that behind the translation of this work was the Ottoman administration’s establishment of a political construct as proof that they came from the Kayi branch of the Oğuz in order to oppose the challenge of the Karakoyunlu. A large number of works either translated into Turkish or written in Turkish in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been produced over the years as scholarly editions by
The encouragement of the sultans and the beys played an important role in translation activity, and they paid a great deal of money for these translations. We have today a fairly clear idea about which beys and sultans the small number of surviving works were dedicated to, even if there is dispute in some cases.

What we can say, however, is that scholars and poets, Sufis and mystics who wrote their works under the protection of the Germiyanoğulları, Karamanoğulları and Aydınnoğulları in particular were in the vanguard of the development of Turkish as a written language. Germiyan was particularly important for the extensive use of Turkish in works composed in the areas of literature, Sufism and learned knowledge and in this context the reigns of Yakub Bey, his son Mehmed Bey (d. 1363) and Süleymanşah were productive. Süleymanşah gave support and protection to scholars and poets of the era such as Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, Ahmed-i Dai, Ahmedi and Şeyhi who will be briefly discussed below. After the Ottoman conquest, almost all of these men moved under Ottoman protection. Similar developments occurred one after the other in the other beyliks and, with the total removal of Persian from the literary sphere and Arabic from scientific and Sufi spheres, the dominant position finally passed to Turkish.

The world of education, teaching, knowledge and thought

We must note here at the outset that in the transformation of Christian Byzantine Anatolia into Muslim Turkey the role of Sufism, Sufis and Sufi institutions was just as great as that of the political leaders. But in the period of the establishment and development of the Turkish states of which the most developed example was the Ottoman Empire, the greatest share in the creation and working of the administrative, social and cultural institutions was first and foremost without doubt that of the scholarly institutions, that is, the medreses. This is an extremely important point and one that we need to stress and to understand clearly.

The medreses in Turkey of the twelfth to fifteenth centuries were here, as they had been in the entire Islamic world since approximately the eleventh century.
The main centres of the state’s official education, teaching and scholarly life. The research that will result in a full and sound understanding of both the organisation and functioning of the medreses, which gave education and teaching in the various branches of knowledge of the period under discussion – of their scholarly education, teaching and scholarly life, of the scholars employed there, with their scientific and scholarly activities, and the works they wrote – is still only at an initial stage today. We can gather limited information partly from biographies and chronicles written in Anatolia and neighbouring Muslim countries in the period, partly from vakıf registers and vakıf deeds which have come down to us, even if as later copies, and partly from works written by local or foreign ulema employed in the medreses of the period. Modern research on this subject can provide an outline within the framework of this material, even if it is for the moment only a general picture.

Drawing on data that we have obtained from the structures which have survived, archaeological digs and vakıf records, as well as on the research of art historians, we can glean information about many medreses the names of which we will not list here but which were active in various religious and scientific spheres in Anatolia in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, and about the ulema who lived in them. We know that, as was usual for the teaching in the medreses in accordance with the traditional classification of medieval Islam, knowledge was studied in two major categories, scientific (akli ilimler) and religious (nakli ilimler). It is known that scientific studies included geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, logic, philosophy and medicine; and religious studies was composed of subjects such as interpretation (tefsir), prophetic tradition (hadith), theology (kalam), religious law (fıkıh) and Sufism. Although there was a preference that the books which were read, particularly on religious subjects, in the medreses and the teachers who taught them should be exclusively from the Hanefi mezhep, because the Anatolian Seljuks and

135 For example, see Uzuncısrılı, Anadolu Beylikleri, pp. 228–34; Turan, Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi, pp. 34–40, 74–9, 120–3, 219–24; Turan, Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye, pp. 389–95.
the rulers of the beyliks were members of this mezhep, this was not much enforced. The official education, teaching policy and the law was, however, in accordance with this mezhep. This was a historical choice stemming from the Turks’ acceptance of Islam in Central Asia, and was important not only for the political history of Turkey in that period but also for its social and cultural history, as it had significance for the course of Turkish history in the Islamic period in particular, and for the internal history of the Hanefi mezhep in general.

The state’s being officially Hanefi did not create an obstacle to ulema belonging to other Sunni mezheps being employed in either the bureaucracy or the medreses in Anatolia and we know of many examples of this. Since the ulema who came into the region from outside were from different regions and belonged to different branches of learning, it is easy to understand that there was a very cosmopolitan and international intellectual environment of learning and ideas in the important Anatolian towns of the period, in particular in those which were capitals. The sources give important information about the scholars who came to Anatolia in this period and either gave lessons in the medreses or wrote works on various subjects. We can give as examples Hatib el-Kazvini (d. 1338), one of the well-known scholars in the fields of rhetoric, fıkıh, the method of fıkıh and theology and who was kadi in Tokat-Niksar; Esreeddin el-Ebheri (d. 1265), the famous Iranian philosopher, astronomer and mathematician; Kutbeddin Shirazi (d. 1311), another famous Iranian scholar of astronomy, mathematics, medicine and religion who taught in the Gökmedrese in Sivas, was kadi in Sivas and Malatya and later moved to Kastamonu where he wrote a work called İhtiyarat-ı Muzafferi, dedicated to Muzaffereddin Yavlak Arslan; the famous Hanefi expert in fıkıh, kadi Ebu Said el-Herevi (d. 1142); and Alaeddin Kaşani (d. 1191), author of a famous work of fıkıh called Badai’ al-sanayi. This last figure came to Konya at the time of the Seljuk sultan

---

137 The vakfiye date 598/1202 of the Altunaba Medresesi in Konya imposed the condition that the müderris who worked in the medrese had to be from the Hanefi mezhep. See Turan, ‘Şemseddin Altun-Aba, Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı’; Leiser, ‘The Madrasah’, pp. 176–82.

138 This is an area which has still not attracted the attention of Turkish historians. Future detailed research on the various scholarly works on different subjects which were written in Anatolia will therefore advance our knowledge of the subject and shed further light on the intellectual and scholarly life of the period. Research has been, and is being, conducted to compare the Sufi scholarly environment with the scholarly environment in general in this period.


140 Abdülküddüs Bingöl, ‘Esirüddin Ebheri’, TDVA, x, pp. 75–6.

Mesud I (1116–56) and was sent as ambassador to Nureddin Mahmud b. Zengi. To these we can add, among others, Yusuf b. Said el-Sicistani (d. 639/1241–2), author of works on fikih entitled Munyat al-Mufti and Ghunyat al-Fuqaha, Ali b. Muhammed b. Hibetullah el-Buhari (d. 1169) who lived in Konya, and Muhammed Talakani (d. 1217), a well-known expert on fikih in his time.

Apart from scholars in religious knowledge and learning, we can also list other men active in the fields of science and philosophy who, coming from outside and settling in Anatolia, taught and wrote there. A good example of such scholars is 'Abdüllatif el-Bağdadi (d. 1231) who was a highly talented Islamic scholar and philosopher. We know that he wrote two famous books, al-Hikmat al-'Ala’iyya and Bulgat al-Hikma, in Erzincan. We must also mention here another of these scholars who came into Anatolia, Ebu Abdullah Efdaleddin el-Huneci (d. 1248) who was a member of the Fahr al-din al-Razi school and who, as well as being an expert on Shafi’i fikih, was a judge and a scholar of logic, and one of his students, the famous Siraceddin el-Urmevi (d. 1283). Siraceddin el-Urmevi, too, just like his master el-Huneci, was a scholar of theology and fikih, was a kadi in Konya, and was also at the same time an important philosopher and logician. His work entitled Matali’ al-Anwar on logic was for a long time read as a textbook in the Ottoman medreses. As a final example we must note in particular Nasir al-din Tusi (d. 1274), one of the famous scholars who was for a time kadi in Malatya. It is known that he made various innovations to the theorem of Pythagoras and that he researched into trigonometry.

These men were by no means the only scholars of the time, and the life of teaching, education and learning in medieval Turkey was much more extensive than our brief survey might indicate. With new research we shall probably learn more and be better able to assess the contributions of the intellectual life of this period to religious knowledge, science and philosophy in the classic Islamic Middle Ages.

142 K Ferhat Koca, ‘Kâşâni’, TDVIA, xxiv, p. 531.
147 Mustafa Çağrıncı, ‘Hüneci’, TDVIA, xvi, 3, p. 375.
Literary activity

Writers, poetry and poets in medieval Turkey

The poetic arts of Turkey in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, as was the case in the Islamic world in general in that period, were strongly supported by the spiritual and material encouragement of the sultans and high-level men of state. There is no doubt that their encouragement played a major role in the development of this type of universal literature in the artistic and intellectual life in their own regions. But to say that this encouragement was given only with the aim of developing poetry would be to see only one side of the question. The fundamental motivation of such encouragement was to ensure that the qualities of these leaders – such as heroism, justice and bravery, epithets which the leaders wished to hear applied to themselves – were praised, and thus to maintain and increase their prestige in public opinion, to ensure that their names were not forgotten and to leave their mark among the people, both while they were alive and after their deaths. This, however, was by no means the end of the matter. They appreciated beautifully written poems which appealed to aesthetic and artistic feelings, took pleasure in rewarding such poems and encouraged poets. In this context we have many examples of considerable material and financial gifts and donations made to famous poets, and to some of these poets being appointed to important offices.

This tradition continued among the Anatolian Seljuk sultans and the Turko-Man beys. Ibn Bibi explained why the Seljuk sultans rewarded poets whom they liked, quoting the words of Fahreddin Behramşah from the house of Mengüce and son-in-law of Sultan Rükeddin Süleymanşah: 'If a poem is successful, I shall donate treasuries and treasures, because with this rhymed work my name shall remain immortal in this transitory world. To remain unforgotten in this transitory world and temporary realm and for a name to be remembered forever is a very great honour and to attain it is a difficult achievement.'

It was this mentality which led İzzeddin Keykavus I to bestow Şemseddin Muhammed-i İsfahani the office both of eşraf-i matbah (the head of the palace kitchen) and of inşa-yi has (his private secretary) upon receiving from him a quatrain which he very much liked. As well as such titles, ranks and positions, the sultans and beys also granted highly esteemed honorary titles which had long been known in Islamic countries, such as malik al-shu’ara, on poets whom they liked and admired. Among literary men who were officially

150 Ibn Bibi, El Evamirü’l-Ala’iyye, p. 72, Selçuk Name, i, p. 92.
151 Ibn Bibi, El Evamirü’l-Ala’iyye, p. 202–3, Selçuk Name, i, p. 221.
appointed to this rank were prominent poets of their times such as Abu al-Fada'il Muhi-al-din, Nizameddin Ahmed-i Erzincani and Bahaeddin Kani'i.

Seljuk sultans did not restrict themselves to encouraging poets, but were also from time to time successful poets themselves, as were, for example, Rükneddin Süleymanşah (1196–1204), Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I (1192–6, 1204–10), İzzeddin Keykavus I (1210–20) and Alaeddin Keykubad I (1220–37). The sultans were not alone in this for there were good poets also among the statesmen, such as Muhammed b. Gazi-i Malatya, the vezir of Rükneddin Süleymanşah; Nizameddin Ahmed-i Erzincani and Mecdeddin Ebubekr, scribes of the period of İzzeddin Keykavus I and Alaeddin Keykubad I; the vezir of İzzeddin Keykavus II, Şemseddin Muhammed İsfahani; Nizameddin Hursid, the Pervane of Greek origin of Sultan İzzeddin Keykavus II; and Emir Kemaleddin Kamyar.

Some poems written in the Anatolian Seljuk period in Persian, Arabic and Turkish in the style of mesnevi (poems in rhymed couplets), kaside and rubai (quatrains), an important number of them on Sufi subjects, have come down to us today. The best known among the Persian mesnevis is without doubt the six-volume Mesnevi-i Ma'nevi (Masnavi-i Ma'navi) of Mevlana. Read at the time, in later centuries and in our own day with great admiration and esteem, and by the Mevlevis themselves today with a feeling of great reverence, it was a work about which very many commentaries were written. We must also not forget his Divan-i Kebir (Divan-i Kabir) which was created from gazels (lyric poems) and quatrains (rubai) which were uttered extemporaneously during the sema (the whirling dance during the Mevlevi ceremony). Among this type important examples are the İbtidaname of Mevlana's son Sultan Veled, the oldest source for his father's life and for Melevi beliefs, the Rebabname and the İntihaname in which certain characteristics of the tarikat were discussed. We must also include Sultan Veled's Persian Divan (Collection) which was made up of various forms of poetry, such as kaside, gazel, ket'a, terci-i bend, terkib-i bend, musammat and rubai.

Later in the fourteenth century in the time of the beyliks the most famous Persian mesnevis which were written in Anatolia were the Anis al-Kulub of Kadi Burhaneddin, which was a work of religio-moral character composed of seven sections and which is counted as one of the oldest local sources of Anatolian Seljuk history, the Munis al-Awarif of Naseddin-i Sicistani, and the Uşşakname of the great Iranian Sufi poet Farereddin-i Iraki.

Turning to the poets who composed in Turkish and to their poetry, it is known that Mevlana and his son Sultan Veled also wrote poems in this

---

152 For detailed information, see the citations in note 129.
language. But we must stress that Yunus Emre, who is thought to have lived from the middle of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the fourteenth, and who wrote a Turkish Divan and a mesnevi called Risaletü’n-Nushiyye, has an exceptional place among the poets who wrote in Turkish in this period. His importance lies in his works which explained his beliefs – although they were not original from the point of view of Sufi thought – and his artistic use of Turkish. Yunus Emre played an important role in the establishment of Anatolian Turkish of the period as an independent written language and he even created a Sufi Turkish terminology.

Another poet whose Turkish poems written in this period attract our attention is Dehhani. Some of his poems are found in the important collections of nazire (imitative poetry) such as the Mecmu’at el-Neza’ir of Ömer b. Mezid in the fifteenth century, the Cami’ el-Neza’ir of Eğirdirli Hacı Kemaleddin in the sixteenth, and the Kenz el-Kübera of Şeyhoğlu Mustafa. Fuad Köprülü regards Dehhani as representing the beginning of secular classical Turkish poetry in Anatolia. In contrast to the leanings of almost all the poets of the period towards religious-Sufi subjects, the poems of Dehhani, to judge from the few examples we have in our hands, almost in their entirety resonate with a worldliness and a lively style almost in the manner of Omar Khayyam. Although we know from the Karamanoğulları Şahnamesi of Yarıcani, one of the poets of fourteenth-century Anatolia, that Dehhani wrote a Persian Seljuk şehname of 20,000 couplets in the style of Firdowsi’s Shahname on the order of Sultan Alaed-din Keykubad I, this work has not come down to us. Other poets who should be mentioned as the last of the poets of the Seljuk period are Kemaleddin Hubeys b. İbrahim Tiflisi, and Nasıri, son of Rükneddin el-Urmevi, dervishes of Sultan Veled.

According to the information we have today the earliest recorded poet of the fourteenth century was Gülşehirî. Gülşehirî, a Sufi poet who lived at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth, is known for having made various changes to the famous mesnevi, Mantıq al-Tayr of Farid al-din ʻAttar, and to have translated it into Turkish under the same title. From his works it is very clear that he remained under the influence of the classical Iranian poets such as Sa’di-i Shirazi, Farid ed-din ʻAttar, Hakim Senayi and Nizami-i Genjevi, and in particular Mevlana. He wrote his poetic works with the aim of proving that more beautiful works could be written in Turkish than in Persian. Another Turkish work, again in the style of a mesnevi, is the little treatise called Keramat-i Ahi Evren which gave an account of Turkish miracles of the famous Ahi Evren and the rules of ahilik. Apart from this, there are also some poems in the form of kaside, gazel or single couplets.
One of the fundamentally important poets of the period who was briefly mentioned above was Aşık Ali Paşa. Aşık Paşa, who was the grandson of Baba İlyas-i Horasani, apart from the famous Garibname, was the author of a Sufi mesnevi called Fakrname and other smaller volumes of mesnevis. Other important poets of the period whom we must mention were Şeyyad Hamza, who was most probably an unconventional type of dervish who composed Sufi poems written both in the aruz metre and in the syllabic metre, and works called Yusuf u Zeliha, Dasitan-i Sultan Mahmud and Akval-i Kıyamet; Ahmed Fakih, whose works Çarhname and Kitabu Evsaf-ı Mesacidi’s-Şerife have survived to today; and Mesud b. Ahmed (Hoca Mesud), who was most probably from Germiyan and has a mesnevi called Süheyl ü Nev-Bahar written in a meticulous and lively Turkish.

Ahmedi, another of this period’s most important poets, received a good theological education in Egypt, then returned to Anatolia where he first joined Ayas Bey from the Aydınoğulları and later became a teacher and adviser to Germiyanoğlu Süleymanşah. He then entered the service first of the Ottoman sultan Yıldırım Bayezid, then of his son Emir Süleyman and finally of Çelebi Mehmed. He died in Amasya. Ahmedi, who wrote his works in fourteenth–fifteenth-century Anatolia, is best known for his İskendername. The Mevlid and Dasitan-i Tevarih-i Müluk-i Al-i Osman sections in this work are important, first because they are the earliest Turkish examples of this type of work before the composition of the famous Süleyman Çelebi, and second, because they are the harbinger of the Ottoman history-writing tradition. Ahmedi also wrote another Divan, and he rewrote under the same title and with some changes the mesnevi called Cemsid ü Hursid of the Iranian poet Salman Savaji, which took as its subject one of his classic love stories. Apart from these works in Turkish, Ahmedi wrote other works in Persian. It is accepted that with his verse works, written on various subjects, Ahmedi made a considerable contribution both to the development of Turkish and to the establishment of classical Turkish literature.

Another significant poet was Ahmed-i Dai, from Germiyan, who lived from the end of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the fifteenth and wrote important works in Turkish. Ahmed-i Dai, a thorough master of Turkish and of literary arts, or more correctly poetry, lived through the successive reigns of the Germiyan Yakub Bey II, and the Ottoman sultans Murad I, Emir Süleyman, Mehmed I and Murad II, and dedicated his work to these sultans. Although his contribution to the creation of classical Anatolian Turkish literature was considerable, from the point of view of his literary power, fame and later influence, he lagged behind his contemporary Ahmedi.
Ahmed-i Dai, a highly cultured poet, was the author of as many as fifteen works on various subjects. Of these, two copies of his Turkish Divan are extant. His Persian Divan dated 1413 was dedicated to the vezir Hacı Halil Paşa on the occasion of Çelebi Mehmed’s ascending the throne. His Çengname, which he is said to have written under the inspiration of Emir Süleyman’s drinking gatherings and in which Sufi motifs appear from time to time, is one of the first examples composed on this subject. The work was created in twenty-four sections suitable for a single-stringed eastern musical instrument called çeng and for the twenty-four makams (modes) of eastern music. Another of his works, the Camashname, is an extended translation of the thirty-three-couplet mesnevi of Nasir al-din Tusi (d. 1274) of the same title in the style of Yıldızname (astrological book for predicting the future) which discusses the occult.

A further important poet of the era was the famous scholar, poet, man of letters and statesman Kadı Burhaneddin (one of whose works in Persian, the Anis al-Kulub, was discussed above). A Harezm Turk, he was the ruler of a state named after him which he founded after the collapse of the Eretna state in Sivas in the second half of the fourteenth century. The famous Turkish Divan of Kadı Burhaneddin, one of the most important and typical of the poets of Anatolian classical Turkish poetry, shows a natural refinement, despite the author having passed his life in political struggle. Only a single copy of this Divan has survived.

Şeyhi, whose real name was Yusuf Sinan, was another major poet of the period. A doctor as well as a poet, Şeyhi, who was raised in the fifteenth century in the region of Germiyan, was said to have taken his pseudonym because of his adherence to Hacı Bayram-ı Veli. At first in the service of Germiyanoğlu Yakub Bey II, he then entered the service of Çelebi Mehmed when Germiyan passed under the control of the Ottoman beylik, and then went on to serve Murad II. His importance as a poet was such that he received the title Şeyh el-ṣu’ara (şeyh of the poets). He was the author of the second Hüsrev ü Şirin story written in Anatolia. His famous Harname, written in clear Turkish, is an example of an elegant and subtle social satire. Harname’s subtle witty humour and satire placed it at the forefront of Turkish humour and satirical literature. Şeyhi was one of the major figures who contributed to the development of classical Anatolian Turkish literature, and his Turkish Divan can be counted among the fundamental works of Turkish literature.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ This Divan can be found in the British Library, OR. 4126.
¹⁵⁴ For more detailed information on the poets and poetry of the Seljuk and beylik periods, see Kartal, ‘Anadolu Selçukluları Döneminde Şiir ve Şairler’, pp. 493–520.
Prose

From the names which appear in the sources and from what has survived, we can say that the works produced in prose in Turkish in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries were nearly all treatises and books written on scientific subjects. These were generally either compositions in Persian or Arabic or translated from Arabic to Persian. Almost all of the writers, as noted above, were ulema who came into Anatolia from outside. According to Ateş, the majority of works written in Anatolia in the period to the reign of Alaeddin Keykubad I were books and treatises relating to philosophy and natural sciences, fewer works being written on religion and Sufism.\footnote{155 Ateş, ‘Hicrî VI–VIII. (XII–XIV.) Asırlarda Anadolu’da Farsça Eserler’, 133–4.} For example, the *Pertevname* of the famous Iranian Sufi philosopher Shihab al-din al-Suhrawardi (d. 1196), who was also known as Suhrawardi-i Maqtul in order to distinguish him from the famous Sufi from Baghdad Shihab al-din Abu Hafs al Suhrawardi, was one of the first works of philosophy. His other works include an augury book, *Usul al-Malahim*, which Ebu el-Fazl Hüseyin b. İbrahim el-Tiflisi translated from Arabic into Persian, a book on the interpretation of dreams entitled *Kamil al-Ta’bir* and a work entitled *Bayan al-Nujum* on astronomy. He wrote two books on medicine, *Sihhat al-Abdan* and *Kifayat al-Tibb*, the latter written for the vali of Sivas Kutbeddin Melikşah, one of the sons of Kılıç Arslan II. Of his many works written in Persian and Arabic the most important are *Hikmat al-Ishraq* and *al-Talwihat*, which are the main works on the ishraqi mystic philosophy which he himself established, and *Hayakil al-Nur*, a very well known little Sufi treatise. We know also that he wrote other works in Anatolia.

Another prose work written in this period is *Ravdat al-Manazir*, composed in Persian by Kemaleddin Ebubekr on Islamic theology. The *Rahat al-Sudur wa Ayat al-Surur* of al-Ravandi, completed in 1206 and dedicated to Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, an important prose work of history and a major source also for Iranian Seljuk history, can be counted among the best examples of Persian prose.

With the gradual strengthening of the Sufi movement in Anatolia from the thirteenth century, there is no doubt that prose compositions were written in this environment, as were translations from Arabic to Persian, and the number of religio-Sufi texts written in Arabic and Turkish increased. For example, among the main examples of Sufi prose were the very well known *Kitab al-Ma’arif* of Mevlana’s father, Bahaeddin Veled, the book of the same title by his halife, Seyyid Burhaneddin Muhakkık-i Tirmizi, *Maqalat*...
which was a collection of the sayings of Şems-i Tebrizi gathered together from different places, the Majalis-i Sab’a of Mevlana, another book entitled Ma’arif by his son Sultan Veled, Mirsad al-’Ibad of Necmeddin-i Daye, and Siraj al-Qulub.

We must also note in particular the Manahij al-’Ibad ila al-Ma’ad which was written on the vaḥdet-i vičud doctrine of his master by Sadeddin el-Fergani who was a follower of Muhieddin Ibn Arabi, and Fergani’s commentary on the famous Qaside-i Ta’iyya of the well-known Egyptian follower of the same doctrine, ‘Amr ibn al-Farid. Books such as Fahreddin-i Iraki’s Lema’at and Sadreddin Konevi’s Tabsirat al-Mubtedi wa Tadhkirat al-Muntahi, as well as the latter’s Nusus and Fūkuk (first written as an explanation of the views of Ibn Arabi’s Fusas al-Hiqam), Risalat al-Vujud and Miftah al-Gayb, must also be mentioned, as must the Fihi ma fihi of Mevlana himself, the Persian menakib-name of Sipehsalar Ferudun b. Ahmed entitled Manaqib-i Hadrat-i Khudavandi-gar and known by the short title Risale-i Sipehsalar which is an important source for the life of the family of Mevlana and his circle, and of course the very well known Manakib al-Arifin of Ahmed Eflaki written later on the same subject.

There are various examples in the field of belles-lettres, such as the Rawdat al-Kuttab wa Hadiqat al-Albab of Ebubekr ibn el-Zeki mentioned earlier which includes texts in Arabic and Persian: the Gunyat al-Katib wa Munyat al-Talib of Hasan b. ’Abd el-Mü’min; and the Mektubat of Mevlana which contained letters written for various reasons to different high officials of the Seljuk state.

Among the works in the style of Siyasetnames (books of diplomacy) which immediately come to mind from the thirteenth century are the Persian Fustat al-’Adala fi Qawa’id al-Saltana of Mahmud ibn el-Hatib and Kitab al-Lata’if al-’Ala’iyya which Ahmed b. Sa’d el-Erzincani wrote in Arabic for Alaeddin Keykubad I.

In the beylik period very many prose works were written on a variety of subjects. Among these are Lata’if al-Hikma and Metali’ al-Anwar of Mahmud b. Ebibekr el-Urmevi, and Daqayiq al-Haqayiq of Nasreddin el-Sicistani on the occult. In the field of history the most significant works include Ibn Bibi’s very important source al-’Awamir al-’Ala’iyya, Musamarat al-Akhbar of Karim al-Din Aqsara’i and Aziz b. Ardashir-i Astarabadi’s Bazm o Razm.156

156 For more detailed information on prose in Anatolia in the Seljuk and beylik periods see M. ˙Isen, ‘Nesir’, in Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikler Dönemi Uygarlığı I, ed. Ocak, pp. 521–32.
Conclusion

To sum up the picture of Turkish intellectual life in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries, of which we have tried to give an outline here, we can say that those who came from outside and settled in Turkey in this period, primarily the Turks who gave their name to the region, transformed the lands which had been the cradle of various civilisations over the ages, into a country with a very different society, belief and culture from that which it had had until that point. Over a period of approximately two and a half centuries, ʿulema, Sufis, bureaucrats, poets, men of letters, philosophers, men from every profession and of every type, coming into the region from outside, all Muslims but speaking different languages, tied to different interpretations of Islam, all contributed to the creation and development of every blade of the Anatolian cultural fan, from a new political mentality to a new architecture. Great sultans like Kılıç Arslan II and Alaeddin Keykubad I, great vezirs like Sahip Ata Fahreddin, Celaleddin Karatay and Pervane Muïneddin Süleyman, great Sufis like Mevlana, Aşık Paşa, Yunus Emre and Hacı Bektaş, and great poets and men of letters like Kani‘i, Dehhani, Ahmedi and Şeyhi and many others were the products of this rich and prolific political and intellectual culture created from a synthesis of elements drawn from Central Asia and from every part of the Muslim Middle East. This synthesis produced the most developed language of learning, art and literature of the western Turkish world, creating a version of Anatolian Turkish. This language opened the way to the magnificent political style of Ottoman diplomacy. In short, the intellectual world of medieval Turkey created the basis of the intellectual performance of the Ottoman Empire for the centuries to come.
Glossary

ağā lord; commander
ahi member of a semi-religious order of the late Seljuk and early Ottoman period recruited mainly from among the ranks of craftsmen devoted to the ideals of fūtūvvet; ahilik was an association which united craftsmen in the Anatolian towns and had a semi-Sufi identity
akçe Greek aspron, Latin asper, silver coin used by the Turkish rulers
akın raid
akınçı raider; a corps of light cavalry used for raiding
akıncı raider; a corps of light cavalry used for raiding
akritai Byzantine frontier troops
alp hero, brave man
alp-eren hero, brave men
arasta covered market associated with a mosque
archon high-ranking Byzantine official
asitane dervish lodge
askeri belonging to the military; those who belonged to the military or religious elite and who were granted tax exemption
asper see akçe
aspron see akçe
avarız-i divanîye extraordinary levies
azeb (Arabic azab) unmarried young men; seamen or pirates; in Ottoman army apparently land foot soldiers who were enlisted from the peasants for the duration of a campaign
baba elder of a dervish group; head of a Bektashi lodge
bac tax, toll or market dues
bailo head of a Venetian colony; Venetian representative abroad; Venetian ambassador to Constantinople
balish Mongol tax or tribute
basqaq a Mongol military governor
bâstina hereditary estate in the Balkans, a Slavic term taken over by the Ottomans denoting hereditary title to land
batman measure of weight
battimano see batman
beçestan covered market, part of a bazaar where valuable merchandise was stored
besant term used by Europeans for the gold dinar, and for other units of account derived from the dinar
Glossary

bey  ruler of a Turkish state; commander
beylerbeyi  top Ottoman official in provincial government, head of a beylerbeyilik
botte  a wine measurement varying from place to place
braccia  a cloth measurement, an arm’s length, exact length varied from place to place
buk  Sufi lodge, foundation
buta  a wine measurement
buta de Napoli  a wine measurement
calbano  steelyard balance, see also stadera
camlet  a type of cloth made, possibly, from camel’s fur, and from mohair
canna  a cloth measurement
capsa  a container for soap
casa  see capsa
cebeci  armourer
cebeli  armed retainer
celebi  title of respect; leader of a religious order, particularly of the Mevlevis
cerehor  irregular enlisted warriors
ceribasi  a military commander; commander of detachment of sipahis in the provinces
chanda  a measurement of approximately 10 to 12 palms
çift resmi  tax paid for one çift of land
çiftlik  landholding which could be worked by a pair of oxen
cihad (jihad)  Islamic holy war
cizye  poll-tax paid by non-Muslims
comerchium  customs tax
danisman  an advanced student in a medrese
darulhadis  school where the traditions of Islam are taught
dede  head of a dervish community, in particular the head of the Bektaşi order
defter-i icmal  a summary register of revenue
defter-i mufassal  a detailed register of revenue
dergah  a dervish lodge
devsirme  a levy of Christian boys for service in the Ottoman army or in the palace
dinar  Arab coin, called besant by Europeans, divided into 24 karati
dirhem  Arab silver coin
dizdar  fortress captain
ducat  Venetian gold coin
dux  governor
eh-i hiref  artists or artisans in palace service
emin  agent, superintendent
emir  ruler, lord
emir-dad  chief of justice
eskinci (or eskiinci)  irregular cavalryman
evkafe defteri  vakıf register
fandello  a bundle, particularly used for silk
fikih  (Arabic fiqh)  Islamic canonical jurisprudence
fusta  large galiot, small oared warship
fütüvvet (Arabic futuwwa)  a semi-religious movement; the ethics of such a movement
gaza  a raid for plunder, later came to mean holy war fought for Islam
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gazi  fighter in Gaza

gigliato  a silver coin common in the eastern Mediterranean in the fourteenth century

gulam-i mir  salaried court troops

hacegan  departmental head in the bureaucracy

hadith  prophetic tradition; sayings and practices of the Prophet Muhammad

halife  caliph, successor, officially ordained assistant to a şeyh

Halvetiye  order of dervishes

hamam  public bath

han  caravansary, large commercial building; a market building in a town, usually specializing in the trade of a specific commodity, or a place used by merchants from a specific region or country

hane  a household as a tax unit

hanekah  dervish lodge

haragra  poll-tax paid by non-Muslims

has  crown lands

hatib  the leader of the community at Friday prayers

hisar eri  fortress guard

hatbe  the sermon delivered in the mosque by the hatib

hyperpyron  Byzantine gold coin, divided into 24 karati; it declined in significance during the fourteenth century, becoming a money of account; after the middle of the fourteenth century the hyperpyron in circulation was silver

ikta  a grant of revenue from land made to a military or administrative office-holder

ilchi  Mongol envoy

imam  prayer leader

imaret  soup kitchen; religious and social complex supported by a vakıf

injü  the domain of the Ilkhanate state

ispence  originally a poll-tax paid in the Balkans, taken over by the Ottomans as a customary tax

istimalet  persuasion; Ottoman policy of accommodating the population in newly conquered territory

kadi  judge, chief administrator of a judicial district

kadi sicilleri  court registers

kadırga  oared galleys with single masts and lateen sails

kalyata  large galiot

kantar  a measurement of weight

kapan  balance used for heavy goods such as foodstuffs

kapudan  naval commander

kapukulu ocakları  the salaried troops of the palace

karati  division of a hyperpyron; there were 24 karati to one hyperpyron

kaza  district under the jurisdiction of a kadi

kethüda  Ottoman government official, agent

kıble  the direction of Mecca for praying

komerkion  customs tax

köşk  pavilion

külliye  religious and social complex

künbed  tomb
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lala the person who had been tutor to the reigning sultan as a child
mahalle district, quarter, neighbourhood
mal-i buzurg central treasury
mal-i yam courier service
mangır a copper coin
mazo a bundle
medrese school, Muslim theological college
mekteb school
menahkname narrative of heroic deeds
mescid small mosque
mevlevihane a lodge for Mevlevi dervishes
mezhep religious denomination; school of thought
mihrab niche in a mosque indicating the direction of Mecca
minber pulpit in a mosque
mine common weight and dry measure
miri belonging to the ruler or the state
mizan balance used for cloth and other commodities which were not very weighty
modio see modius
modius a dry measure, varying widely according to location
moggio see modius
mudd a dry measure, varying according to location, used for grain
müderris teacher in a medrese
müftü or müfti jurisconsult
muhtesib market inspector
mukataa tax farm; a source of revenue
mülk freehold ownership
mürid Sufi disciple
müsləlem member of a corps of militia performing military service in return for tax exemption
mustahfız fortress guard
mustaufi revenue accountant
müstevi head of the financial department
nahiye administrative region, district
naïb deputy, representative
naibüs-saltana (na’ib al-saltana) sultan’s deputy
nazir superintendent, particularly of a vakıf
noyan a Mongol commander
nüfüs defteri population register
ocak infantry corps
ordu Mongol court
orta military unit
pani cloth
paroikos dependent peasant, who received land to cultivate, though also having the right to own land
patumani see batman
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piyade infantry
podestà the top government official in Genoese colonies
pronoia care, forethought; in fiscal terms a grant of land which at times involved military service
protostrator one of the highest officials in the retinue of the emperor
qubchur Mongol tax on flocks and herds; poll-tax
qril tay assembly
reaya tax-paying population who were not members of the askeri elite
ribat military station on a frontier, fortified post, lodge for dervishes
rotol a division of weight, division of a kantar
rüsum dues, taxes
rüsum-i urfiyye customary dues
salname yearbook
sancak sub-province
sancakbeyi governor of a sub-province
sanduka sarcophagus, cenotaph
scarlattini fine woollen cloth, usually, though not always, scarlet coloured
sekan military unit
sema the whirling dance and the music performed during a Mevlevi ceremony
sensaraggio brokerage
serasker commander of the army
şeriat (Shari’a) Islamic religious law
şerîyye sicilleri court registers
seruch probably a grain measurement
şeyh sheikh, head; popular religious leader; head of a tribe
seyyid descendant of the Prophet Muhammad
shihna military governor
shinik a capacity measure
şifâhane hospital
simsar the head of the brokers in a market
sipahi mounted soldier holding a timar; a member of the sultan’s cavalry
società business partnership
solak a military unit
solakbaşi the commander of a solak
sommo silver coin used in Black Sea region
stadera steelyard balance with one arm
staperronos cloth measurement
strategos Byzantine commander in charge of a theme and its troops
subaşi commander; a government agent
sürûn deportation
taghar provisioning
tahrir survey of land, population and sources of revenue
tahrir defteri written survey of a province
tamgha Mongol tax on commercial transactions
tarikat Sufi order
tefsir commentary on the Quran
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tekalif-i urfiyye (tekalif-i ʿurfiye)  customary dues
tekfır  local Byzantine ruler
tekke  dervish lodge
temlik  grant of freehold property rights
temas  troops
timar  revenue allotment in return for military service; a Persian term meaning care, forethought, solicitude
timar eri  holder of a timar
topçü  artillery corps
topçibaşı  chief gunner
tüfenkçi  gunner unit
tuman  10,000, a Mongol military division
türbe  grave, tomb
c  frontier region
cç beyi  marcher lord
vakfiye  deed of trust of a vakif
vakf  pious foundation
vakıfname  deed of trust
vali  governor
veli  holy man
vegeta de Napoli  wine measurement
vezir  a minister of the sultan
vilayet  province
waqf  see vakif
yamak  assistant
yargıhubi  Mongol judge
yarlıgh  decree
yaya  footman, infantry
yeniçeri  janissary
yıldızname  astrological book for predicting the future
yoldaş  companion, retainer
yoldaşlık  originally denoted companionship and performing service as a retainer of a military leader; came to mean participation in a campaign and a display of bravery
yük  a load, a weight measurement varying widely according to merchandise and location
yuruk  Turkoman nomad
zaviye  dervish lodge
zeamet  land held in return for military service
zeugarion / jugum  Byzantine designation for the amount of land which could be ploughed by a pair of oxen
zimmi (Arabic dhimmi)  non-Muslim living under Islamic ruler
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as Ottoman vassal state, 43, 45, 128, 217
perception of Turks, 227, 362
and relations with Mongols in Anatolia, 63, 103
relations with Ottoman, 45, 49–50, 120, 122, 126, 132, 136
treaty (1403)
rural life, 370
and Seljuk sultanate of Rum, 11
see also Constantinople
Byzantine navy
rebuilding of, 14, 35
thirteenth–fourteenth century, 30, 31
under Vatatzes, 26
and Venice, 19
weakening of, 16, 35
Caffa, Genoese trading settlement, 252
Cahen, Claude, 229, 230, 365, 373, 383
Cairo
mosques, 290
see also Pustat
Çaka (Teçhas), Turkish emir, 13
Çaldıran, battle of (1514), 137
Çali Bey, Admiral, 224, 251
Callipolis see Gelibolu
Camah, alum production, 242
camels, for transport, 220
Çandarlı Ali Paşa, as patron, 320
Çandarlı family, as patrons, 320
Çandarlı Halil Hayreddin Paşa, Ottoman
grand vezir (d. 1387), 128, 150, 164, 281, 320
Çandarlı Ibrahim Paşa, mosque in Serres, 164, 320
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censuses, Ottoman, 139, 142
of Süleyman I (the Magnificent) (1528–30), 148–9
ceramics, 336–46, 351
cuerda seca, 341–2, 344, 345
cut tile mosaic, 342, 344
faience, 317, 339–41
frit wares, 338, 343, 344
glazed, 340–1
glazed tiles, 297, 340–3
'Miletus ware' glazed common, 336–8
underglaze painted tiles, 344

cerehör (irregular soldiers), 214–15
Cesarini, Cardinal Giuliano, leader of Christian forces, 48
Çetintas, Sedat, 297
Chalkokondyles, Laonikos, Ottoman chronicler, 149, 150
on copper mines, 240
Charalambos, Saint, 402
Charles II, king of Naples, 33
Charles III of Durazzo, overthower of Queen Joanna, 40
Charles of Anjou (1265–85), king, 29, 30
Charles of Valois, 33
China, influence on pottery, 338, 345
Chinggis Han, successors of, 132
China, influence on pottery, 338, 345
Chinggis Han, successors of, 53–7
Chioggia War, 38
Chios, island, 13, 19
Maona family of, 261
monks of, 406
recaptured by Genoa, 35
Turkish merchants in, 259
Chiliara (Kırkağaç), fortifications, 20
Chiliat (Ahlak), siege of (1068), 10
Chonai (Honas), Seljuks at, 25
Choniatcès, Niketas, Greek chronicler, 15, 20, 25, 49, 227, 228
on nomad economy, 230, 236
on resettlement of captives, 238
Chormagœn, Mongol general, 53, 54, 58
Christianity
in Anatolia, 66, 355, 381
missionary activity, 359, 381
in Roman Empire, 355
theological debates with Islam, 405–18
and transition to Islam, 401
see also Orthodox Church; Rome, Church of Christians
in Anatolia, 66, 361
in Balkans, 140, 141
and conversion to Islam, 403
in early Ottoman beylik, 120
as irregular cerehör soldiers, 214
relations with Muslims, 400
taxation of, 238, 255
in Thrace, 146
as timar-holder sipahıs, 199
tolerance towards, 388
Turks as, 140, 364
see also devşirme
chronicles
Anonymous Chronicles, 105, 135
Anonymous-Giese, 190, 151, 163
for beylik history, 105
Byzantine, 104
'Short Chronicles, 104, 145
'Historia Peregrinorum' (1190), 140
of Kantakouzenos, 121
of Karamanoğulları, 105
Ottoman, 105, 108, 117, 152
İskendername (Ahmedi), 132, 322, 418
Selçukname chronicle, 141
Seljuk, 134
see also Aşkpaşažade; Chalkokondyles; Choniates; Diyarname, Ibn Battuta; Ibn Bibi
churches, Christian, converted to mosques, 159, 167
Çifte Minare Medresesi in Erzurum, 76
in Sivas, 71
Cilicia, Armenians in, 89
see also Lesser Armenia
Cimri, and Turkman revolt (1277–8), 70–1, 386
Çirmen, battle of (1371), 38, 127, 159
Clavijo, chronicler, on Erzincan, 273
Clement IV, Pope, 30
Clement V, Pope, 33
Clement VI, Pope, 34
Clermont, Council of (1095), 14
cloth see silk industry; silk trade; textiles
Çoban, Emir, 68, 84, 90
fall of, 92
Çoban Bey, brother of Orhan Gazi, 320
Çoban Sul dus, senior emir, 89
Çobanids
Eretna and, 95
as threat to Mongols, 93
coinage
Antalya, 60
beyliks, 110, 112
© Cambridge University Press
www.cambridge.org
Geramiyan, 113
Isfendiyarogullari, 116
Karasi, 110
copper, 113, 247
mangr (Turkish), 247
counterfeit, 247
hyperpyron (Byzantine), 247
issues
Demirtas, 91
Eretnid, 94, 95, 97
Ghazan Han, 85
Mesud, 86
Orhan, 121, 124
Osman, 124
Rûkneddin, 58–60
Konya, 60
Lu’lu’a (Lulon), 60
moneys (1299–1300), 102
Ottoman, 121, 124
silver, 247
akçe (Turkish), 247
debasement of akçe (1449), 137
dirhem, 247
Ilkhanid dirhems, 102, 119
Seljuk dirhems, 102
Trebizond(ine), 116
variations and exchange rates, 229,
246–8
Venetian ducat, 247
see also mints
Conrad III, king of Germany, 17, 18
Constance, Council of (1414), 48
Constance of Antioch, 17
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, emperor
(905–59), 8
Constantine IX Monomachos, emperor
(1042–55), 8, 9
Constantine IX Palaeologos, emperor (1449),
47, 48
appeals to west, 49
Constantine X Doukas, emperor (1059–67), 10
Constantine of Kostenets, Bulgarian scholar,
176
Constantine the Great, emperor (311–37),
355
Constantino de Groto, merchant, 246
Constantinople, 2, 48
architecture, 351
Fatih Mosque, 180, 345, 352
New Palace (Seraglio), 352
captured by crusaders (1204), 22
Genoese siege of (1348), 35
Ottoman siege (1394–1402), 1, 130, 218,
236
Ottoman siege (1422), 2, 218
recaptured by John V (1379), 39
repopulation by Mehmed II, 244, 258
siege and fall of (1453), 1, 49, 219, 222
naval blockade, 224
taken by John VII (1390), 39
taken by Michael VIII Palaeologos, 28
trade, 252, 254
slave market, 251
Turkish merchants in, 259
Turkish kadi (judge) in, 259
Turkish siege (1383–87), 39
under Latin rule (1204–61), 22–8, 359
copper
exports, 241
mines, 240
Corfu (Kerkyra)
taken by Roger of Sicily, 18, 21
Venetian attacks on, 16
Corinth
besieged by Turks, 44
taken by Roger of Sicily, 18
wall of Hexamillion, 46, 47, 48
Cornaro of Crete, subject of Venice, 33
Corner, Daniel, Venetian ambassador, 262
Coron (Korone), Venetian rule over, 23, 41
Çorum, Ulu Cami, 348
cotton textiles, 326
Crète
insurrection, 14
recaptured by Byzantium, 7
Venetian possession, 43
Venetian trade in Turkoman horses, 232
Crimea, trading settlements, 252
Croatia, Hungarian occupation, 21
Croats, 6
 crusade of Varna (1444), 136, 152, 190
 crusades see Amadeo of Savoy; crusade of
 Varna; Europe; first crusade; fourth
 crusade; second crusade; third
 crusade
Culpan, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
cults, pre-Christian, 401
culture
assimilation, 403
fusion of Byzantine and Ottoman, 2–3
intellectual life, 406–21
Seljuk sultanate, 65
sources for, 353–4
Turkish, 400–5, 422
see also arts; language; literature
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Cuman (Kıpçak), Turkic nomads, 13, 24, 139, 364
  in Balkans, 140
  as Byzantine mercenaries, 362
Deştı-Kıpçak, 54, 63
  in Meander valley, 28
Cüneyd Bey, ruler of Aydın, 4
currency see cash; coinage
customs, pre-Christian, 401
Cyprus
  captured by Richard Lionheart, 21
  Genoese trade in Turkoman horses, 232
  insurrection, 14
  recaptured by Byzantium, 7
Dalmatia, Hungarian occupation, 21
Damascus
  Great Mosque, 286, 318
  Umayyad Mosque, 181
Damsa Köyü (near Urgüp)
  Taşkin Paşa mosque complex, 272, 348
  Taşkin Paşa palace, 311–13
  türbe of Hızır Bey, 307
Dandanakan, battle of, 410
Dandolo, Enrico, doge of Venice
Dehşetname
  see Derturname
Deştı-Kıpçak Mongols, 54, 63
Devlet Hatun, wife of Bayezid I, 320
Devol, treaty of (1108), 15
devşirme (levy of Christian children), 404
  establishment of, 137, 206
  origins of, 124, 126
Diyarbakır
  Turkish occupation of, 123
Dizdar
  Divriği
  Turkish language for, 4
  türbe
  Yıldırım Bayezid mosque, 167
Dobrotić, Despot of Dobrudja
Divriği
  Turan Melik hospital, 298
  Ulu Cami, 286
Diyarbakır, 374
  Akköyunu centre, 273
  independence of, 52
  Ulu Cami, 283
Dizdar (fortress captain), 210
Dobrotić, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
Dobrača (Dobrudja), Seljuk Turks settled in,
  141, 143, 368
  Dokus Hatun, wife of Hülegü, 59
  Dorylaion see Eskişehir
  Doukas, Byzantine historian, 224, 227, 228
  on Timur, 230n.11
Drama, Macedonia, Ottoman control, 151
abandoned, 374
cloth manufacture, 243, 326
Geyhatu’s attack on, 78
Seljuks at, 25
Turkish town, 374
Derman, Cuman nobleman, 140
dervishes, 376, 391
  in Anatolia, 66, 100
grants of land for cultivation, 339
  hospice at Mekece, 120
  Mevlevi, 90, 180, 188
  see also Sufism; zawyes
  destan
  see Derturname
  Deştı-Kıpçak Mongols, 54, 63
  Devlet Hatun, wife of Bayezid I, 320
  Devol, treaty of (1108), 15
devşirme (levy of Christian children), 404
establishment of, 137, 206
optimis, 124, 126
Didymoteichon (Dimetoka)
  architecture, 168–70
  Çelebi Sultan Mehmed Camii, 295
  Fisılı Hamami, 169
  medrese of Uruç Paşa, 170
  Ottoman buildings, 274
  türbe of Uruç Paşa, 170
  Yıldırım Bayezid mosque, 168
  captured by Ottomans (1361), 37
  Turkic peoples of, 140
  Turkish occupation of, 123
Dilsizname, 321
Dimşük Hoca, brother of Demirtaş, 91
diplomacy
  books of, 421
  Byzantine use of, 7, 12
  Turkish language for, 409
Divan-i Kebir (Divan-i Kabir), 397, 416
Diviği
  Ulu Cami, 286
  Diyarbakır, 374
  Akköyunu centre, 273
  independence of, 52
  Ulu Cami, 283
  dizerdi (fortress captain), 210
  Dobrotić, Despot of Dobrudja, 141
  Dobruča (Dobrudja), Seljuk Turks settled in,
  141, 143, 368
  Dokus Hatun, wife of Hüləgü, 59
  Dorylaion see Eskişehir
  Doukas, Byzantine historian, 224, 227, 228
  on Timur, 230n.11
  Drama, Macedonia, Ottoman control, 151
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Draperio, Francesco, Genoese tax farmer, 257
merchant partnership, 242
Duladay, Mongol emir and yarghuchi, 75, 77
Dulgdiroğulları, 95, 96, 97, 268, 273
dülerzade, Ottoman scholar, 170
dunayır, Ulu Cami, 283
dündi Hatun, daughter of Akbuğa, 78
Duşan, Stefan, king of Serbia (1331–55), 33, 35,
36, 37, 144
Düstande, Tartar leader, 168
battle of (1108), 15
Norman blockade of, 12
taken by Philip of Tarentum, 33
earthquakes
(1327), 121
(1333), 145
(1354), 123
Skopje (1963), 158
Thessalonike (1978), 158
Ebu Abdullah Efdaleddin el-Huneci, 414
Ebu Said el-Herevi, scholar, 413
Ehubekr b. Muallim, craftsman, 348
Ehubekr b. el-Zeki, Rawdat al-Kuttab wa
Hadiqat al-Albab, 421
Ebnuselimname epic, 405, 410
Ecil, son of Samağar, 90
economy
avoidance of disruption, 255–6
beiylik of Germiyan, 113
beiylik of Karaman, 115
changes, 229–30
and control of resources, 254–5
and social life, 255–6
in Byzanntium, 31
devastation by Turkic tribes, 49
early Ottoman, 119–20
nomad, 230–4
in Ottoman Turkey, 121
sources for, 104, 228–9
Turkish approaches to, 1–3, 265
see also Bedestan; markets; trade
Edessa, captured by Muslims (1144), 17
Edirne (Adrianople)
architecture, 267, 274
bedestan (covered market), 172, 313
bridges, 175
Cisr-i Ergene bridge, 182
buildings of Murad II, 179–83
captured by Ottomans, 37, 126
fall of, 127
hamams, 182–3
Alaca Hamam, 182
(double), 175
Tahtakale Hamam, 182
Yeniçeri Hamam, 183
markets, 241, 250
Mihaloğlu Imaret, 188
mosques
Bayelerbey Camii, 179–80, 324
Fatih Camii, 159
Gazi Hoca mosque, 179
Great Mosque (Eski Cami), 159, 171–2,
288, 318
Hzur Ağa mosque, 179
Kılıse Cami, 159
Kıraçlı mosque, 179
Kuşçu Doğan mosque, 179
Muradiye Cami, 180–1, 188, 318, 324, 343
Sahmelek mosque, 179, 343
Saracu Paşa meced, 179
Selimiye Camii, 294, 324
Üç Şerefeli Great Mosque (Yeni Cami),
165, 166, 179, 181–2, 292–4, 317, 318, 324,
343, 345
Yeşilce Cami (Imaret of Mezid Bey), 190
Yıldırım Bayezid mosque (Imaret),
167–8, 274
Muradiye Zaviyesi, 295
and Nicaragua, 47
Orta İmaret (Gazi Mihal Cami), 168, 174–5
as Ottoman court, 128
painters at court, 321
Yeni İmaret, 168
Edirne province, Muslim Turks (nineteenth
century), 142
education, 411–14
see also Intellectual life; medreses
Efflaki (chronicler), 58, 63, 66, 228
Manakiş Al-Farin, 393, 397, 404, 421
Eğirdir, 109, 260
Hamidid Dündar Bey Medresesi, 298
Eğirdirli Haci Kemaleddin, Cami ’el Neza’r,
417
Egypt
Seljuks and, 63
and Turkomans in Anatolia, 92
see also Fustat; Mamluk
Ejei (Ajai) brother of Abaqa, Mongol prince,
62, 67, 76, 78
Elbistan, battle of (1277), 67, 69
Elbistan, Durkaladroğlu capital, 273
Elezović, Gliša, 184
Eljigidei, Mongol envoy to west, 55
Eltemir, Cuman prince, 140
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nomad encampment (1175), 231
nomad trade with, 232
Orhan Gazi Camii, 165, 279, 281
Eşrefoil, 267
building programmes, 269
Geyhatu’s attack on, 78
and Mongols, 89
rebellions against Mongols, 73, 76, 79
Eşrefoil, 114
military resources, 107
Ettinghausen, Richard, 238
Euboea (Negroponte)
Byzantine capture, 30
Venetian possession, 43
Eudocia, empress, 10
Europe
alum trade, 42
 crusade against Bayezid (1386), 130
and crusade against Ottomans (1440), 136
exports of cloth to Anatolia, 249–50
paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331
towns, 367
Turkish presence in, 4
see also France; Italy
Evhadeddin Kirmani, Sufism of, 391
evin (vakif registers), 367
Evliya Çelebi, traveller, 164, 166, 168, 169, 188
Evrenos, Ottoman commander, 42, 127, 128, 135, 150, 153
buildings by, 166
conquest of Gümtülcine, 146, 159
hamam in Yenice-i Vardar, 166
hans, 161
mosques, 159, 160–1
türbe (mausoleum), 166
Evrenos family, social status, 205
exports
banned, 263
carpet, 328
grain, 239
of nomad goods, 233
of silk and textiles, 243
slaves, 251
taxes, 253
wine and grapes, 239
Eyice, Semavi, 294, 297
Fahreddin Ali, of Konya, 297, 407
as army commander, 76
building works, 65
Seljuk emir-dâf (chief of justice), 57, 61

Elvan Çelebi, Sufi, 408
Eminüddin Mikail, Seljuk naib-saltana in Konya, 65, 70
Emir Saltuk, 357, 388
Enveri, Düsturname chronicle, 105, 111
Ephesus see Ayasoluk epigraphy
and evidence of Ilkhanid architecture/building, 268
and Ottoman architecture, 274
Epirus
Ottomans and, 41
under Michael I Angelos, 26
Erbil, linen cloth, 243
Erdmann, Kurt, 311, 335
Ereğli (Herakleia), 25
Geyhatu’s attack on, 78
Eretna
as governor in Anatolia, 94–6
lieutenant of Demirtaş, 91, 92
ruler of beylik, 93, 96, 97, 267, 272–3
Eretnids
in Ankara, 125
and Karamanids, 114
Ermenek (Ermenak)
Karamanid mosque, 269
Karamanids at, 114
Tol Medrese, 298
Ulu Cami (1302–3), 283
Erran, 363
Ertuğrul, earliest Ottoman leader in Anatolia, 118
Ertuğrul, son of Bayezid I
as patron, 320
and settlements in Balkans, 149
Erzincan, 272, 374
luxury textiles, 243
Mengüce Turk in, 357
Mongol troops at, 62
Erzurum, 273, 357, 374
Ahmediye Medrese, 298
Çifte Minare Medresesi, 76, 300
as Mongol capital, 90, 99
occupation (1340), 95, 273
Yakutiye Medresesi (1310), 268, 268n.2, 298, H5
Esireddin el-Ebheri, scholar, 413
Eski Bilecik, mosque of Orhan Bey, 165
Eskihehir (Doarylaion), 122, 373
early Ottoman settlement of, 118
Manuel’s rebuilding, 235
market, 245
market traders, 245
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Franks

as vezir, 65, 68, 70, 74, 75
Fahreddin Behramşah, 415
Fahreddin I Iraki, Sufi mystic and poet, 391
Lema‘at, 421
Uygakname, 416
Fahreddin Kazvini, vezir in Rum, 75, 76–7, 98
Fahreddin Mesud, Mongol commander, 78
failence, 317, 339–41
Fakhr al-Din Qazwini see Fahreddin Kazvini
Fallmerayer, J. P., 260
Fakhr al-Din ‘Attar, Manṭiq al-Tayr, 410, 417
Fars, Ilkhan province of, 52
Ferecik (Ferali, Pherrai), 146–8
monastery, 147
mosque, 147
Süleyman Pascha Cami, 159
Ferrara-Florence, Council of (1439), 136
festivals, shared, 402
Fethiye, port, export of wine, 239
Fihi ma fihi, 397, 421
Filibe see Philippopolis
Filov, Bogdan, Prime Minister of Bulgaria, 157
finance, Ilkhan practices, 4
Firdowsi, Shahname, 417
first crusade (1096–9), 14–15, 235, 358
Firuz Ağa, commander of Rumeli Hisarı, 254
Firuz Bey, Mihalöglu sultan, 178
Flisco, Ettore di, Genoese merchant, 260
Florence
paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331, 336
proclamation of Union of the Churches (1439), 48, 136
Florent de Hainault, prince of Achaia, 331,136
folk tradition, in Ottoman chronicles, 117
fortresses, 31, 32
garrisons, 210–11
Rumeli Hisarı, 48, 254
waterside, 210
Fosco, Clive, 124
fourth crusade (1202–04), 22, 24, 147, 358
France
and Ottomans, 130
and Sigismund’s crusade, 43
support for Manuel II Palaeologos, 44
see also Normans
Frankish empire, collective military service, 216
Franks
attack on Turkish merchants, 260
in Byzantine army, 10
Frederic II of Sicily, 28
Frederick I Barbarossa, German king, 18, 19, 21, 363
Fulk, king of Jerusalem, 17
Fustat (Old Cairo)
carpet fragments, 335
Konya carpet in, 329
fütüvet (futuwwa) movement, in towns, 106, 115
Gabriel, Albert, 277
Gagauz people, Seljuk origins of, 141
Galamboc (Golubac/Güçerçinlik), siege of (1428), 225
Galata, Constantinople, Genoese commercial base, 29
Galatia, Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
Gallipoli see Gelibolu
Gangra (Çankırı), siege (1136), 235
Gascony, mercenaries, 40
Gattilusio family, Genoese merchants, 242
gazi (fighter), 104, 192
ideology of, 360
Gaznevids, and Seljuks, 110
Gebze, Orhan Camii, 3
Gaznevis, and Seljuks, 356
Gebze, Orhan Camii, 348
Gedik Ahmed Paşa, 164
Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli)
Catalan mercenary base in, 143
fortifications, 224
Ottoman buildings, 274
Ottoman naval base, 224
slave market, 250
wine imports, 239
Gelibolu, naval battle (1416), 46
Gelibolu, treaty of (1408), 45, 132
Gelibolu Mustafa Ali, Ottoman chronicler, 147
Gelibolu (Callipolis, Gallipoli) peninsula
Byzantine control of, 126, 127
earthquake (1354), 123
Greek Christian villages on, 145
Ottoman occupation (1354), 36, 126, 145
taken by Amadeo of Savoy, 37, 127
Gennadios (Scholarios), 406
Genoa
alliance with Orhan, 123
attacks on Constantinople, 35
and beyliks of Saruhan, 110
Byzantium and, 19, 31
and Chioggia War, 38
conflict with Venice, 35
naval aid to Byzantium, 28, 29
and Ottoman navy, 224
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Genoa (cont.)
recapture of Chios, 35
sources for Turkish economy, 228
and Tenedos, 38
trade, 246
bills of exchange, 248
grain trade, 240
metal trade, 241
with Turks, 261–2, 263
wine trade, 239
treaty with (1281), 28
with Ottomans (1387), 253, 261, 263
treaty with Venice (1232), 27
view of Turks as economic partners, 227

Genoese
as agents to sultans, 261
as tax farmers, 257
George, Saint, 402
Georgi Terter, tsar in Bulgaria, 140
Georgia, Mongols in, 53
Georgians, as mercenaries in Mongol armies, 389
Georgios Amirutzes, 406
Georgios Trapezuntios, 406
Georgius de Hungaria, chronicler, 203
on janissary training, 207, 222
Geraki, fortress, 32
Germiyan, beylik of, 113
alliance with Aydin, 111
alum mine, 242
annexed by Ottomans, 113, 126, 129
architecture, 270
relations with Ottomans, 113, 118, 122
relationship to Seljuks, 113, 267
and Turkish language, 411
Turkish nomads in, 231
Turkoman horses, 232
Germiyan Turks, 70, 89
revolt against Mesud, 76
Germiyanli, Bulgaria, 153
Gevas, tomb of Halime Hatun, 307
Geyhatu, Mongol Ilkhan (1291–95), 81
Mongol governor in Rum, 75, 76
as Mongol Han, 77–81
return to Rum, 78–9, 100
Ghazan Han, Ilkhan (1295–1304)
and Byzantine emperor Andronikos II, 88
conversion to Sunnisim (1296), 390
death, 88
direct rule in Anatolia, 81–8
and insurrection of Suleimis, 84–5, 119
issue of coinage, 85, 118
Gibbons, Herbert, 403
Giresun (Kerasunt)
market, 252
wine exports, 239
Giustiniano, Francesco, 261
Giustiniano, Giovanni, 261
Giustiniano, Ottobono, 260
Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev I, Seljuk sultan
and Byzantine rebels, 24
conquest of Antalya (1207), 254
and non-Muslims, 388
poet, 416
resettlement of Byzantine captives in
Philomilon, 238
and Venice, 26
Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II, Seljuk sultan
(1237–41), 53
death, 54
as governor under Mongols, 54
and Seljuk state, 359
Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev III, Seljuk sultan
(1265–83), 63, 64, 68, 73
confirmed in sultanate of Rum (1282), 73
execution (1283), 267
Gıyaseddin Mesud II, Seljuk sultan in Konya,
72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 111
and Beys¸ehir, 269
and rebellion of Baltu, 83
gold
coins, 247
trade, 241
Golden Horde, 63
and control over Anatolia, 54
migration into Mamluk territory (1262), 61
relations with Byzantium, 30
relations with Ilkhanate, 52
Gordlevsky, V., 354
Gorgorum (Ararim), E¸refo˘glu from, 89
Göynük, taken by Ottomans, 122
grain
production, 372
taxes on, 253
trade and production, 239
Greater Armenia see Armenia; Lesser Armenia
Greece
and challenge to Byzantine emperor, 24
fragmentation of, 144
invasion by Bayezid I, 43, 130
partial Byzantine reconquest, 30
relations with Nicaea, 27
sources, 228
Turkish colonisation, 156
Turkish invasion, 43
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Halil, son of Orhan, 123
Halil Bahadir, Turkoman chief, sack of Konya, 78
Halil Paşa, emir of Gümüş Madeni, 302
Hamadan, 58
hamams (public baths), 245
Hamid, beylik of, 109, 113–14, 267
Hamid Bey, son of Tuqu, 18
Hamid, beylik of, 109, 113–14, 267
Hamid family, and beylik of Teke, 112
Hamidoglu Dündar Bey, 91
Hamidoglu Felekuddin Dündar, Turkoman leader of Uluborlu, 89
Hamidoglu Ishak Bey, 93
Hamza Bey, mosque at Zağra Eskisihar, 170–1
Hamzname epic, 410
Hancin, castle of, 251
Hanevi mescid, 385, 413n.137
hans, 314–16
see also caravansary
Hanzade Hatun, as patron, 319
Harezmshah Celaeddin Mingbarni, Seljuk leader, 53
Harput, Artukid Turks in, 357
Hasan b. Abd el-Mümin, Gunyat al-Katib wa Munyat al-Talib, 421
Hasan Bey, Skopje, 184
Hasan Bey, son of Tuqu, 80, 81
Hasluck, F. W., 401, 403
Hatib el-Kazvini, scholar, 413
Hatir, sons of, 68
Hayderye, tari kit, 384, 392
Hayrabolu (near Tekirdağ), Gülce Hasen Bey Camii, 292
Helena, daughter of John Kantakouzenos, 34
Henry of Flanders, 24, 25, 26
Herakleia (Ereğli), 25, 78

Uzes penetration of, 9
Greeks
in Anatolia, 361
in towns, 376
Gregoras, Greek chronicler, 228
Gregory VII, Pope, 12
Gregory X, Pope, 30
Guiscard, Robert, Norman commander, 11
blockade of Dyrrahchium, 12
Gülcük Hatun, wife of Murad I, 320
Gülşehrî, Sufi poet, 477
Gümüş, 146
Eski Cami, 159, 161, 164
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Orkhon-Jenissej runes, 139
Persian, 407, 410
Ottoman texts in, 120
for poetry, 416
for scientific literature, 420
in Seljuk court, 61, 114, 407
Turkish, 70, 101, 114, 142, 401, 407, 422
in Balkans
in beyliks, 116, 407
for diplomacy, 409
as official language, 70, 409
poetry, 408, 416–19
translations into, 111, 112, 409, 410–11
written, 111, 408
Laodikeia see Denizli
lapis lazuli, 240
Larende see Karaman
Larende, battle of (1291), 78
Laskarid dynasty, 28, 266
Latin states, 17, 18
aspirations for recapture of
Constantinople, 30
Byzantine resentment of, 20
at Constantinople, 22–8
control of Constantinople, 22–8, 359
and grain trade, 239
and Nicaea, 26
Ottoman threat to, 128
and second crusade, 17
Sicilian kingdom and, 29
territories attacked by Bayezid I, 43
trade with Turks, 228–9
Latin
as tax farmers, 257–8
trade with Turks, 261–4
law
on non-Muslims (ahl al-dhimma), 388, 389, 403
secular state, 98
Shari’a, 96, 98
on vakifs, 378
Lazar, Prince of Serbia, 128
lead, exported, 241
Leon, king of Lesser Armenia, 251
Lesbos see Mitylene
Lesser Armenia (Cilicia), 17
independence during Mongol period, 52
Leunclavius, Historiae Muslimarum Turcorum, 152
Levounion, battle of (1091), 14
Lewis, Bernard, 383
Licario, Italian commander, 30
literature, 104, 410–11, 415–19
Germiyani beylik, 113
poetry, 415–19
prose, 420–1
religious texts, 104
Turkish translations from Persian, 111, 112, 409
see also chronicles
Livadia, Navarrese in, 40
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Louis, Saint, king of France, 30
Louis I, king of Hungary, 37
Louis VII, king of France, second crusade, 17
Louis of Blois, claimant to Nicea (Iznik), 24
Lycaonian plain
Karamanid beylik in, 114
wealth of, 115
Lycia, beylik of Teke in, 112
Lydia, Saruhan beylik in, 110
Lyons, Council of (1274), 30

Macedonia
Ottoman settlement of, 154–5
Ottoman suzerainty over, 128
Pecheneg raids, 16
Turkish Christian minority at Zichné, 141
Turkish raids on, 144
Macedonia, Republic of, destruction of Ottoman monuments, 157
Magyars see Hungarians
Mahmud, son of Esen Kuluğ, 92
Mahmud b. Ebubekr el-Urmevi, Lata’ if al-Hikema and Metalli’ al-Anwar, 421
Mahmud b. el-Hatab, Fustat al-’Adala fi Qawa’ id al-Saltana, 421
Mahmud Bey, son of Kerimeddin Karaman Bey, 269
Mamem Celebi, as patron, 320
Makri, Byzantine town, 146
Malatya (Melitene)
conquest by Kılıç Arslan I (1106), 358
Danismends of, 16, 357
Mamluk sack of (1315), 89
Turkish attacks on, 233
Malazgirt (Manzikert), battle of (1071), 1, 6, 10, 51, 356
al-Malik al-Ashraf, Ayyubid prince, 394
Malkoç family, ancestor status, 205
Manistra (Mias), recaptured by Byzantium, 17
Mamluks
artistic influence, 266, 351
and beylik of Karaman, 114
defeat of Mongols (1277), 69
and Demirtaş, 91, 92
in Egypt, 30
expedition against Qal’at al-Rum, 79
invasion of Seljuk Anatolia, 66
relations with Mongols, 73
sack of Malatya (1315), 89
Seljuks and, 66
siege of Sis citadel (1320), 235
in Syria, 52, 61, 63

as threat to Mongols, 67, 93, 95, 96
trade with, 228
victory at Homs (1281), 72
Manakib al-Arifin
mosque, 177–8
Ottoman advance to, 127
Ottoman settlers in, 154
Mane, fortress, 32
Manfred of Hohenstaufen (1258–66), 29, 30
Manfred of Sicily, 28
Mangaphas, revolt of, 234, 236
Manicheism, 364, 581
Manisa, capital of Saruhan beylik, 110
Ilyas Bey Mescidi (1361), 271
Melevihane zaviye (1268–69), 271
tomb of Saruhanoglu Ishak Bey, 271
Ulu Cami, 181, 271, 301, 318, 340, 347
Manurse Halaj (d. 922), Sufi, 394
Manuel I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor (1143–80), 17–20, 236
and Asia Minor, 19
and Turkoman nomads, 231, 233, 236
Manuel II, co-emperor (1373–9), 38, 41
alliance with Ottomans, 133
appeals to west, 43–4
consolidation of lands in the Morea, 45
as emperor, 39–47
letters and Dialogues, 39, 50
and Ottoman rebellions against Murad II, 135
as Ottoman vassal, 43, 45, 217
visit to Europe (1399–1403), 44
Manuel Angelos, domains in Greece, 27
Manuel Kantakouzenos, ruler of Byzantine Peloponnese, 36, 40
Manuel Mavrozomes, Byzantine rebel, 24
manuscripts, illustrated, 321–2
Maona family of Chios, merchants, 54–5
Maqasid al-Alhan, treatise on music, 321
Mar Sarkis, Armenian bishop, murder of, 66
marble, for façades, 316
Marcha di Marco Battagli da Rimini, chronicler, 239
marcher districts, Ottoman military organisation, 204–5
marcher lords
in Bithynia, 194
under Ottomans, 127, 128, 135
Marcionism, 381
Marco Polo, 228
on carpets, 233, 328
campaign in Anatolia, 133
mosques, 169, 172
resettlement of Tatars, 149
as sole ruler, 133
Mehmed II, nominal sultan of Eretna’s
principality (1380), 97
Mehmed II (1451–81), Ottoman ruler, 48, 102, 136, 168
art and architecture, 267
and copper production, 240
defeat of Byzantium (1453), 1, 48
and Genoa, 247
and Ottoman artistic style, 351
and Ottoman empire, 360
repopulation of Constantinople, 244, 258
resettlement of abandoned lands, 239
theological debates, 406
and trade, 254
Mehmed V Reşad (1699–18), Ottoman ruler, 163
Mehmed Bey, brother of Ali Padişah, 92
Mehmed Bey, emir of Aydin, at Birgi, 270, 319, 347
Mehmed Bey (d. 1365), of Germiyan, 411
Mehmed Bey, son of Eretna, 273
Mehmed Bey, son of the Pervane, 87
Mehmed Bey Karamanoğlu, Turkoman chief
denizli (Ladik), 64, 70
and use of Turkish language, 70, 409
Mekece, hospice for dervishes, 120
Melami movement, 396
Melik Pahlavan Ghuri, as tax administrator, 83
Melik Salih Mahmud, Artukid ruler, 284
Melikşah, son of Baltu, 90
menahtnames (accounts of heroic deeds), 404, 410
Mengüce bey, Turkoman leader, 357
Mengüce state, and Islam, 383
Mengüce kids
towns, 374
Turkish language, 407
Menteşe, beylik of, 27, 109, 111–12, 267
annexed by Bayezid, 43, 223
counterfeit Venetian coinage in, 247
Geyhatu’s attack on, 79
independence, 45
market taxes, 253
slave market, 250
tax farming, 257
trade with Latin states, 261, 262
Venetian merchants in, 262
weights and measures, 246
wine imports, 239
Index

Menteşelü, Bulgaria, 153
mercenary
- Byzantine reliance on, 9, 11, 31, 126
- Byzantine use of Turks, 142, 144
- Ottoman use of Balkan Christians, 126
merchants
- complaints in Antalya, 254
- European, 376
- foreign, 261–4
- and markets, 252
- as patrons, 320
- protection for, 245, 259–61
- source material for economy, 228–9
Turkish, 259–61
see also Genoa; trade; Venice
Mesembria
- lost to Bulgars, 33
- retaken by Byzantium, 37
Mesud, son of sultan Izzeddin, 72, 73
Mesud, sultan in Konya, 78
Mesud I Rûkneddin (1116–56), Seljuk sultan, 209, 73, 358, 414
- coins, 247
- Konya, 358, 414
- and revolt of Melik, 80
Mesud II Gıyaseddin, Seljuk sultan in Konya, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 86, 111
- and Beyşehir, 269
- and rebellion of Baltu, 83
Mesud b. Ahmed (Hoca Mesud), Süheyl ü Nev-Bahar, 418
metalwork, 321
- trade, 241–2
Mevleviye (Celiâïye), tarikat, 390, 393
Michael, Suriyani historian, 388
Michael, tax collector in Mylassa, 234
Michael I Angelos (1204–15), 23, 26
Michael VII Doukas, 10
Michael VII Palaeologos (1259–82), 28
- capture of Constantinople (1261), 28
- opposition to, 31
- restoration of Byzantine Empire, 29–31
- and Seljuk sultan Izzeddin, 63, 141
Michael Autoreianos, patriarch of Constantinople, 24
Michael of Epiros, 28
Michael Şîman, Bulgarian tsar, invasion of Thrace, 147
Michael Szilágyi, Hungarian chronicler, 222
Mihajlović, Konstantin, janissary, 206, 209
- on siege of Constantinople (1453), 222
Mihâloğlu family, Bulgaria, 166, 178
- ce status, 205
Mihâloğlu Mahmud Bey (d. 1402), 167
Mihâloğlu Mehmet Bey (1442), 174
Milas, 111, 270
Firuz Bey Camiî, 294, 317
Haci Ilyas mosque (1330), 112
Miletus (Balat)
- pottery, 338
see also Balat
military service, collective, 216
mineral resources
- Anatolia, 240–2, 254
- Balkans, 235
Minnet Bey, Tatar leader, 149
Münetöglu Mehmed Bey, Ottoman governor of Bosnia, 150
mint towns, 100
mints
- at Bursa (1327), 121
- Milas, 111
- moneys in Anatolia (1299–1300), 102
- Sivas, 55, 58
- Söğüt, 118
- Türkman, 246
Mistra, rebellion, 44
Mitylene (Lesbos), island, 13, 110
Venetian attacks on, 16
Modon (Methone), Venetian rule over, 23, 41
Moglena, Pechenegs settled in, 119, 143n.13
Moldavia, Republic of, Gagauz people in, 142
Molendino, Benefatio de, Venetian tax farmer, 257
Molla Vacîd (d. 1434), müdderris (teacher), 300
monasteries
- Ak Manastır (Deyr-i Eflatun), 405
- Athömite, 142
- Balkans, 147, 178
- Orthodox Christian, 186
- Monastır see Manastır
- Monemvasia, fortress, 32
Möngke, election as Great Khan, 56
death (1269), 57
Möngke Temür, Brother of Abaqa, 72
Mongols
- 1243 invasion, 3, 27, 51–3
- administrative legacy, 98–9
- and Armenians, 389
- change of capitals, 99
- collapse of authority in Galatia, 122
- conversion to Islam, 64, 99, 365
- direct rule in Anatolia, 81–93, 102, 359
- and dissension within Ilkhanid state, 73–81
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and dissolution of Ilkhanid state, 97, 125–6
effect on land tenure, 237
and ethnic mix in Anatolia, 365
extent of control in Anatolia, 92
formation of Ilkhanid state, 57–64
gradual settlement of, 369
difficulty of towns, 100
influence on beyliks, 116
and lack of sources, 353, 408
officials and bureaucracy, 98–9
policy towards non-Muslims, 389–90
rebellions against central authority, 81
relations with Seljuks of Rum, 62–3, 66–7,
72–3, 374
and rise of Ottomans, 45, 102
role of military commanders, 99
ruler’s military rein, 192
and successors to Genghis Han, 53–7
under Abuqa Han, 64–73
see also Ilkhanid state; Timur
Monophysete Jacobites, 361, 382
in eastern Anatolia, 361
Morea
Byzantine base in (1261), 142
Ottoman advance to, 130
Morea, Despotate of the, 32, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48
mosques, 279–97
Byzantine influence, 164
colonnaded courtyard, 181
congregational, 283–94
aisled, 283–6
‘basilical’, 286–8
hypostyle, 288–90
development of layout, 292–4
domes, 288–90, 318
half-dome, 183
mescid (small mosque), 161, 164, 177
mescids in villages, 369
minarets, 165, 172, 181, 204, 340
single-domed, 165–4, 165, 170–1, 177, 279–83
porticos, 281–3
Ulu Cami type, 171, 175
vakifs for, 379
zaviye-mosques, 188
zaviye-T-plan, 160, 177, 180, 294–7
Mosul, conquest by Kılıç Arslan I, 358
Müçireddin Mehmed, Mongol agent, and
naibüs-saltana, 72, 73, 83, 87, 98
Mongol emir of Rum, 75, 77
naib in Anatolia, 80, 86
Mudurnu, Yıldırım Bayezid mosque, 170
Müeyyedüddin el-Cendi, Sufi, 395
Muhammed, puppet Ilhan, 94
Muhammed Talakani (d. 1217), scholar, 384, 414
Muhammed b. Ebubekr, craftsman, 348
Muhammed b. Gazi-i Malatyavi, vezir and
poet, 416
muhassebe (accounts), for towns, 367
Mühezzibeddin, Seljuk vezir, 54, 60
Mühezzibeddin Mesud, grandson of the
Pervane, 87
Muhi al-Din ibn Arabi see Muhieddin Ibn
Arabi
Muhieddin Ibn Arabi, Andalusian Sufi mystic,
359, 389, 390–85, 390
Fusus al-Hikam, 395
al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya, 395
and vahdet-i vucud (monism), 394–6
mûhimme registers, 403
mûhtesib, market official, 245
Mu’in al-Din Suleyman see Muineddin
Suleyman
Muineddin Suleyman
execution (1277), 70
and Mamluks, 67
as patron, 65–6, 100
Pervane, 64–70
supporter of Rûkeneddin, 58, 60, 63
mules, for army transport, 220
MURAD, son of Orhan, sancak of Bursa (1331),
108
MURAD I, Ottoman ruler (1362–9), 37, 38, 112,
125, 126–9, 360
capture of Thessalonike (1387), 39
complex and tomb at Bursa, 163, 276
death of, 42, 128
mosque in Bursa, 168
and occupation of Balkans, 126–8
as patron, 319
sources for, 125
and Theodore I Palaeologos, 41–2
and treaty with Genoa (1387), 253, 261, 263
MURAD II, Ottoman ruler (1421–51), 2, 46–8,
133, 134–7
abdication, 136
bridge at Skopje, 178
buildings in Bursa, 276–7
buildings in Edirne, 179, 190, 292
as patron of arts/buildings, 319
rebellions, 135, 175
reconstruction of Filibe, 176
reforms to timar system, 200
at Thessalonike, 188, 244
tomb in Bursa, 310
Musa, son of Bayezid, 45, 450.201, 132–3, 134
Musa Çelebi, 174, 320
attack on Yambol, 165
mosque in Edirne, 288
mistles (mounted infantry), 213
Mushanov, Nikola, architect, 158, 187
Muslims, 142, 364
intermarriage with Christians, 364
relations with Christians, 400
see also Islam; Shi‘ism; Sufism; Sunniism
Mustafa
Turkish pretender, 46, 133, 135, 175
and yasa system, 213
Mustafa, brother of Murad II, 47, 135
Mustafakemalpaşa (Kirmastı), tomb of Lala Şahin Paşa, 309
Mut, tomb of Hocendi or Büyük Tārbe, 306
Muzaffereddin b. Abdülvahid b. Süleyman, craftsman, 347
Muzaffereddin Yavlak Arslan, 413
Myriokephalon, battle of (1176), 20, 358
Mystras, fortress, 32
Nabşi, Mongol commander, 62, 63
Nakjas Ali, architect, 320, 343
Nakşibendîye, tarıkat, 393n.91
Nasceddin-i Sicistani, Münüs al-Awarif, 416
Nasir al-din Tusi, Camashname, 419
al-Nasir Muhammad, Mamluk sultan, 92, 94
Nasreddin Hoca, son of Yavlak Arslan, mustaufi, 77
Nasreddin-i el-Sicistani, Daqaqiq al-Haqayiq, 421
Nasir, son of Rükneddin el-Urmevi, dervish, 417
Nsreddin Tusi, scholar, 414
Nauplia, city of, 42
Nauplia, Gulf of, Venetian naval victory over Genoa (1265), 29
Navarre, mercenaries, 40, 42
Necmeddin Alp, Artukid ruler, 388
Necmeddin Kübra, Sufî mystic, 392
Necmeddin Razi (Daye), Sufî mystic, Mirsad al-Ibâd, 391, 392, 421
Nefise Sultan, wife of Alaeddin Bey, 298
Negroponte see Euboia
Neri Acciaiuoli, lord of Corinith, 40, 401n.173, 41, 42
Neşri, Mevlana, chronicler, 149, 150, 151, 187
and Ottoman architecture, 274
Nestorianism, 364, 382
Nicaea see İznık
Nigde
Ak Medrese, 298
Aлаeddin Camii, 286
Gündoğdu Türbesi, 308
Sungur Bey mosque, 171, 268, 286, 290, 316, 348
tomb of Hüdavend Hatun, 268, 306
Turkoman palace at, 311
Nikaia see İznık
Nikephoros III Botaneiates, Byzantine emperor (1078–81), 11, 13
Nikephoros Gregoras, chronicler, 143
Nikola, Saint, 402
Nikon media see İznıt
Nikepolis, battle of (1196), 43, 130, 217, 251, 288
Niksar, Danişmend Turks in, 357
Nilüfer Hatun, wife of Orhan, as patron, 320
Nis (Niš), Ottoman advance to, 127
Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, Ottoman chronicler, 147
Nizameddin Ahmed Erzincani, poet, 416
Nizameddin Hürşid, Pervane and poet, 416
Nizameddin Yahya Faryumadi, Khurasani bureaucrat, 87, 98
Nizami Genjevi, poet, 417
nokor/noker (Mongol warrior leader), 193
nomad economy, 230–4
trade, 231, 232, 369
nomadism, move away from, 107, 367–9, 371
nomads
encampments, 231, 231n.18
numbers of, 363
seasonal settlement, 369
state control over, 237
warfare, 192
see also Uğuz nomads; Uz
Normans
attacks on Byzantium, 18
in Byzantine army, 10
capture of Bari, 11
expansion of, 8, 16
sack of Thessalonike, 21
and Venice, 12
Novobrdo, Serbian silvermine town, 162
Nureddin b. Caca, 68
Nureddin Mahmud b. Zengi, 414
Nympháion (Nif, Kemalpaşağade) treaty of (1214), 25
treaty of (1261), 28
Oba, Turkoman palace at, 311
açak (infantry units), 213, 214, 216
occult, writings on, 421
Index

˙O˘guz nomads, 5
Orhan, Ottoman ruler (c. 1210–68), 5, 8, 258 n.2
and Shi’i Islam, 385
and taxation, 88
and Turkomans, 88, 89
˙Omer b. Mezid, Mecmu’at el-Neza’ir (d. 1265), 384
Onogurs, 4
Orhan, Ottoman ruler (?–1326), 5
Orban, Hungarian inventor of cannon, 49, 219, 241
ordu (Mongol court), Seljuk missions to, 57
Orhan, Ottoman ruler (c.1324–62), 34, 36, 120–4, 222 n.129, 360
and Balkans, 122–3
as builder (in Bursa), 124, 160, 276, 317, 319
marriage, 123
relations with Genoa, 123, 263
siege of Prusa (Bursa), 236
and theological debate, 406
yaya (infantry), 196
Ortaköy (Ivajlovgrad), Ottoman kaza, 139
Orthodox Church
and Christians in Anatolia, 389, 404
conversion of Bulgars (865), 139
and Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439), 48, 136
monasteries, 186
offers of union with Rome, 29, 30, 37, 47
and separatist sects, 382
Oruç Bey, as patron, 320
Osman, Ottoman ruler (?–c.1324), 118–20, 267, 360
Byzantium and, 88
establishment of markets, 245, 252
expansion, 119
military retinue/entourage, 194
repopulation of towns, 244
and trade with Bilecik (Bekloma), 232
Osmançık, 80
copper mines, 240
Ottoman army, classical, 198–226
archers, 207, 211, 213
armourers, 210
artillery corps, 209–10
cavalry, 208–9
devşirme, 124, 126, 137, 206
fortress garrisons, 210–11
infantry, 121, 125, 221
battle tactics
and influence of holy war (gaza), 104
janissary, 206–8
marcher districts, 204–5
military power, 119, 129, 226
obligations of timariots, 201, 202–4
peasant soldiers and militias, 211–17
azabs, 211–12
cerehors, 214–15
martelesos, 216
Vlachs, 215
voyunks, 215
yayas and müsellems, 212–13
yüniks, 213–14
salaried troops of the court, 217
size of, 204
supply and transport, 220
timar system, 199–202
vassal states, 217
see also Ottoman army; early; Ottoman navy
Ottoman army, early, 192–8
administration and territorial division, 197–8
cavalry (timariots) (timar eri/sipahis), 197, 199–202
infantry, 196
mounted, 194
nomadic tradition, 192
ruler’s retinue, 192–4
timar system of provisioning, 196
Ottoman beylik and Empire, 137, 269, 360
absorption of other, 125–6
administration, 121, 136
annexation of Karasi, 122
art and architecture, 274–7
between Bayezid and Murad II, 131–4
and conversions to Islam, 403
deportations to Balkans, 149–52
economy, 119–20
effect of Timur’s invasion, 45
expansion to east, 122
first expansion of, 119
and intervention in Balkans, 122–3
mass destruction of monuments after fall (twentieth century), 157
Mehmed’s campaign in Anatolia, 133
Murad II’s policy of aggression, 46–8
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Ottoman beylik and Empire (cont.)

occupation of Balkans, 126–8
presence in Mediterranean, 124

protection of merchants, 259–61

rebellions under Murad II, 135
relations with Byzantium, 36, 49–50

religious policy, 384
rise of, 1–2, 102
royal patrons, 319–20
society, 3
treaty with Byzantium (1403), 45, 132, 254

treaty with Genoa (1387), 253, 263
under Orhan, 120–4
under Osman, 118–20, 267

see also Ottoman army; Ottoman navy;

Ottoman Turks

Ottoman navy, 3, 124, 223–6
blockade of Constantinople (1453), 224
deployment, 225
development of, 223–4
river fleet, 225–6
sea battle (1416), 224
shipboard artillery, 219
shipbuilding and dockyards, 224
size of, 224

Ottoman Turks

advance into Thrace, 37
as Byzantine mercenaries, 144
genealogy, 135
historiography, 103–4
and independence from Seljuks (1299), 118
origins of in Anatolia, 118
in Sangarios region, 31
sources for, 106, 134
Sunni Muslims, 120

see also beyliks; Ottoman beylik and Empire

Öz, Tahsin, 327

Pachymeres, George, Byzantine chronicler,

118, 119, 143, 228

Padşah Hatun, wife of Geyhatu, 76
paganism, in Anatolia, 381
painting, 321–4
architectural decoration, 322–4
framed illustrations, 322
illustrated manuscripts, 321–2
palaces, 270, 311–13, 352
Bugar, 118, 178

Palamas, Gregory, chronicler, 124

Panphylia
beylılı of Hamid, 109
beylılı of Teke in, 112

Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16

Pannonia, 7

pantheism, 395

Paolo, Giovanni di

Madonna and Child, 332

Marriage of the Virgin, 331

Paphlagonia, 24

Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16

pajja, title of, 198, 204

pastoralism, 231

in beyliks, 117, 362

Mongol, 62, 365

nomadic Turks and Kurds, 53, 369

patronage, 422

for architecture, 318–20

of poets, 415

Paulicianism, 382

Pechenegs, Turkic nomads, 139
attacks on Constantinople, 13
in Byzantine army, 10, 16
as threat to Byzantium, 8, 16

Pećin

palace of Menteşeoglu Orhan Bey, 270, 311

Çigoz (Karapaşa) Hanı, 314

Pegolotti, merchant, 228

Pelagonia, battle of (1259), 28, 32

Pelagomian Plain, Macedonia, 154

Pelekanon, battle of (1329), 121, 123, 194

Peloponnese, Byzantine, 36, 39, 47

Ottoman invasions, 42, 47, 48

see also Morea

pencik, recruitment of captives as janissaries, 206

Pera

abandoned, 244

Genoese settlement, 250, 263
Turkish merchants in, 259

Pergamon see Bergama

Persia

Anatolian links with, 101
expulsion of Turkomans, 357

fabrics from, 327
raw silk from, 249, 326

Sassanid Empire, 355

Seljuks in, 356

Sufism in, 390

as threat to Byzantium, 6
trade with, 228, 248

Zoroastrianism, 381

Peter, king of Cyprus, 264

Peter IV of Aragon, 35

Peter of Courtenay, emperor of

Constantinople, 26

Petrić, castle, near Varna, 152
Index

Pevsner, Sir Nikolaus, 182
Philadelphia (Alaşehir), 24, 32
Ottoman campaign (1390 and 1391), 39, 129
silk production, 326
Philanthropenos, Byzantine general, 251
Philip II Augustus, king of France, 21
Philip of Swabia, 22
Philip of Tarentum, 33
Philippopolis (Filibe, Plovdiv), 33
Philip of Tarentum, 22
Philippopolis (Filibe, Plovdiv)
architecture, 175–7, 185–8
citadel of Yedi Kule (Heptapyrgion), 176
destruction (1410), 176
hamam, 185
Hüdavendigar Murad Cami (Cumay Cami), 175, 288
Imaret, 186–7
külüye (religious and social complex), 185
market, 250
medrese, 185
Merić bridge, 185
occupied by Barbarossa, 21
Ottoman buildings, 274
türbe of Şihabeddin Paşa, 185, 188
Turks in, 127, 149, 176
philosophy, 420
Phocaea (Phokaia, Foça), 123
alum production, 242
Genoese in, 227, 263
grain trade, 240
Phrygia
beylık of Germiyan in, 113
Byzantine campaign against Turks in, 16
Piccolomini, General, 178
Pierre de Saint Superan, Navarrese mercenary, 40
Pietro, Sano di, Marriage of the Virgin, 331
Pilotti, Emanuele, Cretan merchant, 228, 243
Pippin, son of Charlemagne, 7
piracy
in Greek archipelago, 30
Turkish, 41, 223, 233
twelfth-century, 16
Pirenne, Henri, 367
Pisa
Byzantium and, 16, 19
import of Anatolian silk, 244
Pisidia, beylik of Hamid, 109, 114
place names
Bulgaria, 152–3
Cuman, 140
Macedonia, 154
Mongol, in Anatolia, 365, 369
Slavic, in Thrace, 147
Thessaly, 154
Turkish, 168
in Balkans, 139, 142
villages, 366n36, 368
Pliska, Bulgar palace and ‘Forbidden City’, 138
ploughs, 372
Plovdiv see Philippopolis
poetry, 415–19
aims of, 417
imitative (nazire), 417
mesnevi style, 416
and patronage, 415
in Persian, 416
in Turkish, 408, 416–19
poets, honours and offices for, 415
populations
deportations to settle agricultural lands, 238
early Turkic settlers in Balkans, 139, 143n13
mixed Muslim–Christian, in Thrace, 146
Ottoman deportations to settle Balkans, 149–52
of villages, 375
of towns, 366
see also tax registers
ports
trade through, 233, 239, 250
see also Antalya; Balat; Sinop
Pousgouse, Lake (Beyşehir Gölü), 49
prices
foodstuffs in Anatolia, 229
for slaves, 251–2
for Turkoman horses, 232
prisoners of war, as janissaries, 206
Propontis, coast of, 13
Prousse see Bursa
Psellus, Michael, 9
Qa’an, Great see Genghis Khan; Qubilai
Qa’an, Great see Genghis Khan; Qubilai, Qalawun, Mamluk sultan, 73
Qaraqorum, Mongol centre, 54, 55
Qubilai, Great Qa’an, 79
Querini, Francesco, Venetian envoy, 262
Qutqutu, grandson of Baiju, 61
Quoqur, grandson of Baiju, 69
Raffaele Capello, merchant, 246
Ramon Muntaner, Catalan chronicler, 143
Rashid al-Din see Rısfıddedın
al-Ravandi, Rahat al-Sudur wa Ayat al-Surur, 420
Raymond of Antioch, 17
Index

Raymond of Poitiers, 17
*Rebabname*, poem, 416
religion, 380–2
  in Anatolia, 66, 90
changes under Mongols, 100
Christian and Muslim symbiosis in
  Ottoman beylik, 121
conversions and apostasy, 402–5
  of early Ottomans, 120
‘heretical’ churches in Anatolia, 355, 381
intermarriage between Christians and
  Muslims, 364
Monophysite Jacobites, in eastern
  Anatolia, 361, 382
officials in towns, 376
Ottoman institutions, 121
teaching of in madresses, 412
theological encounters between Islam and
  Christianity, 405–18
see also Christianity; Islam; Manicheism;
  Orthodox Church; Rome, Church of
Resıdeddin, head of *Divan* in Ilkhan, 87
vezir, 90
Reynald of Antioch, 19
Rhodes, 47
rivalry with Menteş beylik, 111
Turkish slave traders on, 259
see also Hospitallers
Rhodopes, Pechenegs in, 139
Rhynndakos (Orhanlı), battle of (1211), 25
rice production, 372
Richard I, Lionheart, 21
Riefstahl, Rudolf, 297, 329
Rifaiye, 309
Roger II, king of Sicily
  ambitions against Byzantium, 18
  and emperor, 16
  and second crusade, 17
Roger de Flor, Catalan Grand Company, 32
Roman Empire, 6
Christianity in, 395
Romania, Bayezid’s campaign (1395), 130
Romanos Diogenes, Byzantine emperor, 10
  defeat at Malazgirt (1071), 1, 10, 356
Rome, Church of
  and Council of Ferrara-Florence (1439), 48, 136
missionaries to Anatolia, 359
  offers of union with Constantinople, 29, 30, 37, 47
Roussel of Bailleul, Frankish commander, 10, 11
Rovine, battle of (1395), 154
*Ruba‘*yyat, 397
Rühi-i Edirnevi, chronicler, 182
Rükneddin see Kılıç Arslan IV
Rükneddin Geyumers (Melik Siyavuş), 72
Rükneddin Mesud I (1166–56), Seljuk sultan,
  201, 358, 414
coins, 247
Konya, 398, 414
  and revolt of Melik, 80
Rükneddin Süleyman II, Seljuk sultan and
  poet, 415, 416
  protection for merchants, 260
rebellion against Alexios Angelos, 234
Rum, Seljuk province of, 3, 51
  administration, under Mongols, 80, 86
  extent of, under Mongols, 52
  as refuge for scholars and mystics, 100
  sale of *divani* (state) lands, 79
  uprisings against Mongols, 89
Rumeli
  beylerbeyilik of, 204
  deportation of Tatars to, 149
  deportation of *timar*-holders to and from,
  199
  slave markets, 250
  *yayı* units in, 213
Rumeli Hisari, fortress of, 48, 254
Russia, 8, 48
  Byzantine influence, 8
Sabas Asidenos, 24
sabre, curved (*kılıc*), 201
Sa’d al-Daula Savaji, Jewish vezir in Rum, 77
  head of *Divan* in Ilkhan, 87
Sadreddin el-Fergani, Sufi, 395
Manahif al-‘Ibad ila al-Ma’ad, 421
Sadreddin Hanevi, Sufi, 392
Sa’di Shirazi, poet, 417
Sadreddin Konevi, Sufi mystic, 390, 395
Tahirat al-Muhaffidi wa Tadhkira
  al-Muntaha, 421
Sadreddin Zanjanî
  opposition to Geyhatu, 79
  as *sahib-i divan*, 83
  as vezir, 79, 80, 81
Sahib Cemaleddin, vezir, Dastgirdani, 87
Sahib Necmeddin, vezir in Anatolia, 80
  saint cults
  shared, 401
  and Sufi Islam, 391, 399
Saint-Quentin, Simon de
  Dominican missionarieds, 242, 244, 252, 359
*Historia Tartarorum*, 365
Index

Scholarly

Scholars, 413–14

Scholarship
role of medreses, 411
in Seljuk state, 383, 408
see also education; intellectual life science
literature of, 420
teaching of, 412
second crusade (1147–9), 17

Selçuk Hatun
as patron, 320
Selçukname chronicle, 141
wife of Aḥaqa, 68
wife of Arghun, 68

Selin I, sultan, 152

Seljuk sultanate of Rum, 3, 11, 51, 98, 356–7
administrative system
compared with Mongols, 98–9
rural, 371–2
arts and culture, 65, 266, 278, 316, 351
architectural influence
glazed pottery, 336
patronage of poetry, 415–16
battle of Malazgirt (1071), 6
compared with beyliks, 116–17
economy
annual repayment of debts, 60
taxation, 252
towns, 243
establishment of caravansaries, 258
expedition to Sudak, 254
extent of, 118
fragmentation of, 16, 54, 56, 99
land tenure, 237
lands of chief officers of state, 60
marine force in Black Sea, 25
military organisation, 195, 197
and Mongols, 54–7
administrative system, 98–9
defeat by, 53–4
integrated into Ilkhanate, 63, 85, 86
relations with, 55, 62–3
tribute to, 254
relations with Nicaea, 27
religion
mosques, 279, 283, 286
religious foundations, 65
and Sunni Islam, 357, 383
tolerance of non-Muslims, 353
as threat to Byzantium, 1, 9, 13
trade treaties with Venice, 261, 262
and Turkoman invasions, 70, 233, 357
Index

Şems-i Tebrizî, dervish, 393, 397
Maqalat, 421
Şemseddin, of Konya, 77
Şemseddin Ahmed Lâkiş, vezir in Rum, 77, 79, 83, 87, 89
Şemseddin Cüveyni (Juaini), Mongol sahib-i divân in Rum, 71
Şemseddin Isfahani, Seljuk vezir, 54, 415
Şemseddin Mehmed Fenari (d. 1431), as patron, 320
Şemseddin Muhammed-i Isfahani, Sahib, poet, 415, 416
Şeyh Bedreddin, religious leader and rebel, 29
Şeyfeddin Bakharzi, Sufi, 3
Şeyh Hızır, building of Büyük Cami, 147
Şeyhi (Yusuf Sinan), poet, 419
Harnam, 419
Hüsrev i Şirin, 419
Şeyhoffu Mustafa, scholar, 411
Kenz el-Kâbéra, 417
şeyhs, 376, 391
Şeyyad Hamza, poet, 409, 418
Akval-i Kayamet, 418
Dasitan-i Sultan Mahmud, 418
Yusuf a Zeïha, 418
Şeyyid Burhaeddin Muhabik-kî Tirmizi, Kitab al-Ma‘arif, 420
şeyids, 376
Shaïf ism, 385
Shahname manuscripts, 322, 335
şamanism, Mongol, 368, 389
Şams al-Dîn Juaini see Şemseddin Cüveyni
sheep, nomad herds, 231
shield (kalkan), 201
Şihab al-dîn Abu Hafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi, 393
Şihab al-dîn al-Suhrawardi (Suhrawardi-i Maqûl), Iranian philosopher, 359
Pertevname, 420
Şi‘ism
in Anatolia, 4, 384, 386–7
Imamiye (Twelver), 387
İsmailis, 386, 387
shipbuilding, Antalya, 243
Sicily, 29
fall of Angevins, 30
siege warfare, 129, 195, 218, 222–3
and need for infantry, 196
siege engines, 222, 222n.129
Turkomân, 325–6
Siena, paintings of Anatolian rugs, 331
Sigismund, king of Hungary, 43, 225
crusade, 43
Şihabuddin Paşa (Kula Şahin Paşa), buildings in Filibe, 185
Siirt
brass production, 243
linen cloth, 243
Şikari, chronicle of Karamanoğullar, 105
silk industry, 243–4, 321, 324, 351
brocades, 325, 327
silk trade, 249, 327
exports, 243–4, 326
silver
inland bowl, 321
trade, 241
silver mines, 91, 240
Sinaneddin Ariz, chief adviser to Demirtaş, 90
Sinanuddin Yusuf Paşa (Sinan Paşa), beylerbey of Rumeli, 179
Sinop (Sinope), 25, 26, 373
copper mines, 240
Index

David Komnenos as ruler, 24
dynastic tomb of İsfendiyaroğlu, 271
market, 252
mosques
Aslan Camii (1351–52), 271
Fatih Baba Mescidi (1339–40), 271
Kadi Camii (1364), 271
Saray Camii (1375), 271
Saray Mescidi, 279
Ottomans and, 45
port, 116, 358
resettlement of, 258, 373
Sipahi Bayezid, Turkish merchant, 259
Sipehsalar Ferudun b. Ahmed, Maşûqî-i Hadrat-i Khudawandigar, 421
Siraceddin el-Urmevi, scholar, 414
Sirmium, Hungarian occupation, 21
Sis, citadel, Mamluk siege (1235), 235
Şişman dynasty, in Bulgaria, 140
Sivas (Sebastia), 65, 96, 373
alum mine, 242
besieged (1298), 84
buildings, 272
Ghazan Han’s hospice, 272
Gök Medresesi, 298
Güdük Minare (1247) (tomb of Şeyh Hasan Bey), 272, 308, 316, 340
international market, 248
largest Mongol city, 93, 267
Mengüce Türk in, 357
Mongol pillaging around, 53
population, 376
sacked by Timur (1400), 97
woollen goods, 243
Şıa ta’lînames (mirrors for princes), 421
Şiyavuş (Melik Şiyavuş, Rükneddin), brother of Gıyaseddin Mesud II, 78
rebellions, 80, 81
Skopje (Usküp)
Alaca İmaret, 184, 187
Ali Menteşeli quarter, 151
bedesten (covered market), 185
bridge over Vardar, 178
buildings of Murad II, 184–5
fall to Ottomans (1391), 129
fire (1689), 178
han (Suli An, Sulu Han), 184
kılıç (religious and social complex), 184
monastery of St George, 178
mosque, 178
Ottoman settlements, 149, 351–2
restoration of Ottoman buildings, 158

Serbian centre, 144
slave market, 250
slaves
taken in Turkoman raids, 233–4
taken in war, 251–2
trade in, 350–2
Slavs, 7
in Balkans, 12, 138
settled in Asia Minor, 6
Smerderevo, Serbia, 217
Smyrna in Izmır
society, 265–7
Sofia, capital of beylerbeylik of Rumeli, 204
under Ottomans, 128
Söğüt
early Ottoman settlement at, 118
tomb of Ertuğrul Gazi, 309
Sökmen II, Ahat ruler, 388
Sop, ethnic group, 139, 1541.51
Sözen, Metin, 278
Sozopolis (Uluborlu), retaken by Byzantium, 37
Spiridon, Saint, 402
Sratrişir dynasty, Cuman origins of, 140
Stanimak, Greek Christian settlement, 176
Stara Zagora (Eski Ziyağra), Ziyağra Eskihisar, Béroé, 140
Eski Cami, 170
Stefan Dušan, king of Serbia (1311–55), 31, 35, 36, 37, 144
Stefan Lazarević, Serbian despot, 45, 217
Stefan Prvovenčani, king of Serbia, 327
Stephen of Blois, 15
Stipion (Stipone), Bulgaria, 167
stone, for building, 316, 317
stucco, relief carved, 317
subas / amir / zaim, 197
political power of, 204
şayhâbîs as, 212
Sudak, Crimea, Seljuk expedition, 254
Sufism
and ahilik, 375, 1750.55
among Turkomans, 386
in Anatolia, 390–1
and conversions to Islam, 404
and education, 411
ilahi aşk (divine love), 396
influential Sufis, 394–8
Mongols and, 391
and popular Islam, 399
prose works, 420–1
socio-religious foundations, 379
Sunni tolerance of, 384
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Sufism (cont.)

tariqats, 376, 380, 390
and theological debate, 405
in towns, 390, 393
and use of Turkish language, 408, 409, 410,
411
vähdet-i vücuda (monism), 394–6
see also dervishes
Süge, prince, in western Iran, 82
Sülemin, grandson of Bayezid I, 82
revolt (1298–99), 86, 84, 86, 102
Süleyman, son of Bayezid I, 132–3
Emir of Edirne, buildings, 159, 170, 171–2
relations with, 45
Süleyman I (1081–92), Seljuk sultan, 13, 357
Süleyman I (the Magnificent), Ottoman ruler
(1520–66), 163
census (1528–30), 148–9
and mosque at Skopje, 178
Süleyman Celebi, mosque in Edirne, 288
Süleyman Han, Cobanid puppet governor, 95
Süleyman Ivliayrâğlu

copper trade, 241, 246, 247
Süleyman Paşa, son of Orhan, 36, 123, 145,
197
conquest of Ferecik, 147
as patron, 320
Süleyman Paşa, Turkoman from Kastamonu,
89
Süleymanşah, ruler of Eşrefoğulları, 91
Süleymanşah, ruler of Germiyân, 270, 300, 411
Sultan Veled, son of Çelebeddin Rumi, 76, 88,
391, 416
Ma‘urrif, 421
sultans, place in battle, 221
Sultanşah, son of Bału, 90
Şumnu (Şumen), Bulgaria, 152
Sungur Çavuş Bey, governor of Philippopolis,
176
as builder, 177
Sunnism, 120, 187, 384–5
Hanefi branch, 385, 413n.137
in Seljuk sultanate, 357, 383
under Mongols, 100
Suriyannis, Syriac-speaking Christians, 361
Sutlu, Mongol commander, 86
swords, 194
cuirasses (Christian), 218
Syria

cultural influence, 182
Hülegü’s campaign in, 59, 61
Mongol raid (1271), 62
Timur’s advance into, 43
under Mamluks, relations with Ilkhanate,
52, 61, 63
uprisings against Mongols, 89
Szekler peoples, in Transylvania, origins of,
138
Tabriz
Karakoyunlu capital, 273
Mongol court at, 59, 60
Tabriz, Masters of, 342, 343, 345–6
Tacekiz Mutez, Mongol agent, 60, 65, 72,
98
medrese, 65
Tadhkritat al-Awliya, 410
Taghaçar, governor of Rum, 49
Taghachar, governor of Anatolia, 78, 81
opposition to Geyhatu, 79
Taghâr-Temür, Chinggisid prince in
Khorasan, 94
tahrir defterler (land registers), 142, 228,
237
as evidence of Turkish colonization in
Balkans, 195
evidence of nomad settlement, 371
and population estimates, 366
Thrace, 145
for towns, 387
Tajiu, son of Tuçu, 80, 81
Tamara, princess of Georgiia, 56
Tana, Venetian trading settlement, 252
Tancred, 159, 168

tariqats, 402
Süfi, 376, 380, 390, 391–4
in towns
Sunni, 391
Tarsus, recaptured by Byzantium, 17
Taşköprüzade, Ottoman scholar, 170
Şâja‘î al-Nâ ‘manîyya, 180
Taştımur Hâta’î (‘Tashînîr Khîta’î’),
Mongol governor of Rum, 84
governor in Anotlia, 80
Tatar Pazarcik, Thrace, 149
Tatars
 resettlement of, 149
settlements near Edirne, 214
see also Golden Horde
Taurus mountains, trade routes, 115
Tavas, and Turkoman raiders, 235
tax collection
abuses by collectors, 20, 22
Mongol system, 98, 101
tax concessions
for resettled captives, 238
for trade, 262, 263
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tax exemptions
for military service, 196, 210, 213, 214, 215, 216
for supplying armies, 220
tax farming, 75, 256–8
tax registers, Ottoman
Albania, 134, 156
for Balkans, 148–9
Bulgaria, 139
Köprültü, 154
Philippopolis (Filibe), 176
Thessaly, 193
Üsküp (1454), 151
see also defter-i mufassal; evkaf defter s (vakıf registers); şehriye sicilleri (court registers); takvir defter s (land registers)
tax revenue, for Philippopolis külliye, 186
taxation
in Diyarbakır, 88
in Konya, 77
by Mongols, 71, 80, 83, 88, 98
Nizameddin’s regime, 87
Seljuk sultanate, 65
taxes
awrız-i divanıye (extraordinary levies), 238
Balkans, 235
cift (on Muslim agricultural workers), 238, 235
cizye (poll-tax on non-Muslims), 75, 238
gümrük (customs), 255
ispence (on Christian peasants in Balkans), 238, 255
on land, 237–8
on mineral resources, 240
pre-Ottoman, 255
rišum (tithes), 238
tamgha (Mongol commercial tax), 71
on trade, 252–4
on villages, 370
on yayal land, 213
Teke, beylik of, 109, 112, 267
absorbed by Ottomans, 126
independence, 45
Tekirdağ (Rodosto), market, 250
Tenedos, island, 36, 38
offered to Venice, 38
Terterid dynasty, in Bulgaria, 140
Tevarih-i Al-i Osman (Hadidi), 147
textiles, 243, 324–8
cotton, 326
linen, 243
trade, 249–50
see also carpets and kilims; silk

Thébes
Catalans in, 32
Navarrese in, 40
taken by Roger of Sicily, 18
theme system, 7
decline of, 9
revival of, 13
Theobald of Cepoy, 33
Theodor, Saint, 402
Theodora, daughter of John Kantakouzenos, 34
Theodore I Palaeologos, Byzantine emperor, 37, 41
conflict with Venice, 42
death (1407), 45
and Turks, 41
vassalage to Murad I, 42
Theodore II, son of Manuel II, 45, 47
Theodore II Laskaris (1254–8), 28
Theodore Angelos (1215–4), Emperor of the Romans, 26
and Nicea, 27
Theodore Laskaris
Byzantine rule in Asia Minor, 24
as emperor in Nicea, 24–5, 26
Theodore Mangaphas, Byzantine rebel, 24
Theodosios, emperor (d. 391), 355
Theologos (Selçuk)
grain trade, 240
markets, 250, 253
wine imports, 239
Thessalonike (Selanik), 9, 26
buildings, 188–90
Bey Hamami, 158, 188
Eski Cami, 188
han, 146
Pazar Hamami (restoration), 158
captured by Turks (1387), 41, 128
fall of (1410), 2, 47, 136
Norman sack of, 21
Ottoman advance on, 128
Ottoman siege and capture of (1430), 2, 47, 136, 218, 225
Ottoman siege of (1411), 133
recovered by Byzantium (1403), 132
repopulation of, 244
Zealot revolt, 34
Thessaly, 41, 190
Catalans in, 32
Ottoman colonization, 153–4, 172
third crusade (1189–92), 21, 363
Thrace, 34
Baldwin’s lands in, 23, 24
Index

Thrace (cont.)
Catalans in, 32
destruction of, 145
Ottoman advance into, 123
Ottoman settlement of, 145
Pecheneg raids, 16
Turkish settlers in, 143–5

timar system, 196
civil holders of timars, 199
deportation of timar-holders between
Anatolia and Rumeli, 199
duties of timariots, 200
gulam recruits to, 200, 202
income of timars, 202
obligations, 201, 202–4
status of sipahis, 200
taxation, 255
timar-holder sipahis, 199–202
weaponry, 201
see also sancak>

Timur
advance into Syria, 43
and battle of Ankara (1402), 2, 45, 130
and beyliks, 109, 113, 114
campaign in Anatolia, 132, 230n.11
cultural influence, 266, 243
and Ottoman settlements in Balkans, 150, 155
sack of Sivas (1400), 97
Timurtas, Mongol governor, 114
and beylik of Hamid, 114
tin, imported, 242

Tire
Aydınoğlu Mehmed Bey Camii (1326–27), 270
belestan, 313
Hafsa Hatun mosque, 270
Karahasan Camii, 281
Kazirazde mosque, 279
tomb of Suleyman Sah b. Gazi Mehmed
Bey (1149–50), 270
Ulu Cami, 288
Yahş Bey mosque, 180, 324
Tirhala, defter (1454–55), 199
Tirhala, Greece, Christian timar-holders, 199

Tirnovo
Bulgarian palace, 178
hamam, 178
Ottoman buildings, 178–9
Toda’un, Mongol commander, 68, 69
Tokat
Danismend Turks in, 357
as Ilkhanid city/centre, 267
Nureddin b.Sentimur Türbesi, 308
Pervane’s hanekah in, 65
pre-Ottoman zaviye, 160
seized by Izzeddin, 58
under Ilkhanids, 268
Toluids, 57
tombs and graves (türbesi), 162, 163, 305–11
cylindrical shafts, 307
domed (canopy) type, 305
open canopy, 170
polygonal shafts: 305–8
porches, 306
of saints, 399, 402
square, 308–10
tower type, 305
see also Bursa: türbes
Tondrakis, 382
Τοξοτ (artillery), 209
toponyms see place names
Tourkopolouli (baptized Turks), in Byzantine
service, 143
tovicas, raider officers, 205
towns, 372–5
administration, 374–5
architecture, 267–77
Byzantine, 373
decline of Seljuk, 374
destruction of, 243
ethnic mix in, 375
fortified (kastron), 373
high Sufism in, 390, 393
industries, 243
market buildings, 245
as markets, 243, 373
new Turkish, 374
non-Muslims in, 383
planning, 374
population, 375
repopulation of, 244, 258
Roman-Byzantine, 372–3
separate Muslim and non-Muslim
mahalles, 373, 376
sources, 366–7
Turkoman settlers in, 365
see also caravansarys
trade
between nomads and sedentary
population, 232, 369
beylik of Aydın, 111
beyliks, 109–10, 116, 117
bills of exchange, 248
caravansarys, 258–9
cash for, 248
Index

costal beyliks, 112
international markets, 248–50
with Latin states, 228–9
manipulation of markets, 263–4
in metals, 241–2
routes from Konya, 115
Seljuk, 358
slaves, 250–2
taxes on, 252–4
Turkish merchants, 259–61
see also exports; imports; merchants
Trailles, fall, to Menteşe, 236
Transoxiana, 363
cities, 376
Sufism in, 390
Sunni Islam in, 385
travel
disruption of, 234
freedom of, 109
Trebizond (Trabzon), 13
Alexios Komnenos as ruler, 24
annexation by Theodore Laskaris, 25
Byzantine ‘beylik’ of, 116
Christian kingdom of, 52
survival of, 103
trade, 252
tribute
gifts of silk, 325
to Ilkhanid court, 60, 68
paid to Mongols, 54, 98, 229, 254
Trikkala, western Thessalian plain, 172
Tübingen, Ilkhan silver dirhem at, 118
Tüfenkçi (gunner unit), 219
Tugancuk, 91
Tuna province, Muslim Turks (nineteenth century), 142
Tunisia
French crusade against, 30
Great Mosque of Qairawan, 290
Tuqi, son of the Celayir lâge Noyan, 68, 69, 78
Turahan, Ottoman commander, 47
Turan, Osman, 383
türbes see tombs and graves
Turhan Bey, Gazi, buildings in Thessaly, 190
Turin, treaty of (1381), 38
Turkic peoples
ancestor cult, 163
in Balkans, 138–43
Turkish emirates see beyliks
Turkoman revolt (1277–8), 70–1
Turkoms and agriculture, 234–40
effect of raids on, 234–7
pastoralism, 53
economic approaches, 265
established in Anatolia, 356–8
leaders as shamans, 368
marcher lords under Ottomans, 126, 128, 130, 135
and Mongols, 64, 89, 359
nomad economy, 230–4
numbers of settlers, 362
raids against Mongols, 79
as threat to Mongols in Anatolia, 69–71, 88, 100
urban settlers, 363, 376
westward move into Anatolia, 230, 361
yıght (military retinue), 193
Turks
alps (warrior leaders), 193
in Balkans, 4
co-existence with inhabitants, 400
culture, 400–5
earlier settlers, 363–4
and landholdings, 237
as merchants, 259–61
perception of economic destruction, 227–8
raids on Byzantine territories, 13, 20, 25, 233–4
rebellions against central administration, 368
settlement of nomads, 367–9
state policy towards non-Muslims, 387–90
tribal leaders, 368
Turkification and imposition of Islam, 360, 364
urban migrants, 363, 376
Turks, Inner Asian, kagan’s military retinue, 192
Tzympe, Gallipoli, Ottoman occupation (1352), 36, 145
uc (marcher districts), 204
Uighurs, 192, 364
ulema
in Anatolia, 384
and heresy and superstition, 399
as patrons, 319, 40
in towns, 376
Ulu Arif Çelebi, 393, 394
Ulubad
alum production, 242
Ottoman seizure of, 121
Index

Uluborlu see Burglu
al-’Umari, chronicler, 92, 106, 228
on alum mine, 242
economic data, 239, 240
on nomad herds, 231
on Orhan’s army, 196
on silks, 325
on weights and measures, 246
on Yakub b. Alişir, 113
Umur Paşa, emir of Aydın, 231
Urbai Hatun, daughter of Berke Han, wife of
Umur Paşa, emir of Aydın, 251
as patron, 320
Ünal, Rahmi Huseyin, 7
Usta Müsselheiddin, architect of Great Mosque
at Edirne, 182
Uz, Turkic nomads, 9, 139
in Byzantine army, 10
vakıf-ı vâcus (monism), 394-6, 398
vakıfname/vakfiye (trust deeds of religious
foundations)
for bedestans, 313
Seljuk, 228
as source material, 377, 378
vakıfs (pious endowments)
evâfile (registers), 367
foundation charters, 148
and Islamization, 383
mechanism, 377
for medreses, 412
for mosques, 379
official documents from, 104
in Ottoman beylik near Söğüt, 120
Ottoman period, 379
Thessaly, 173
in towns, 377-80
types, 378
of Ulu Cami in Edirne, 172
Van, Lake, Mongol advance to, 53
Van, town of, 374
Varna, battle of (1444), 48, 137, 152, 190, 221
Vaspurkan, Byzantine annexation, 7
Vatopedi, Athonite monastery, 142
Vefaıe, tarikat, 384, 392
Velâyetname-i Haci Bektaş, 404, 405
Venetians, as tax farmers, 257
Venice, 228
attack on Aegean islands, 19
in Balkans, 33
and capture of Constantinople, 22-3
and Chioggia War, 38
counterfeit coinage, 247
and fourth crusade, 22
import taxes in Anatolia, 253
loss of Constantinople (1261), 28
mercantile influence, 26, 35
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