

***How ‘Byzantine’ were the early Ottomans?
Bithynia in ca. 1290-1450***

Osmanskii mir i osmanistika. Sbornik statei k 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia A.S. Tveritinovoi (1910-1973) [The Ottoman World and Ottoman Studies. In memoriam of A.S. Tveritinova (1910-1973)], eds. I.V. Zaitsev and S.F. Oreshkova (Moscow, 2010), pp. 215-239

NB I list the pagination for both the main body of the text and the footnotes

[p. 215] In 1916 Richard Dawkins published his famous book “Modern Greek in Asia Minor”. The Greek dialects described were soon to disappear: in 1921-1922 after the protracted First World War and the following “population exchange” between Greece and the modern Turkish state, the Greek dialects of Asia Minor had all but vanished. The study of Dawkins remains perhaps the most accurate transcription of the lost speech of the Greek inhabitants of Asia Minor, while in their homeland, whose tongue descended from the Byzantine population of Anatolia. Though his study mostly focused on the Greek vernacular in Cappadocia, nevertheless Dawkins briefly mentioned other obscure Greek dialects. One of them was in Bithynia, in the villages of Demirtaş and Abuliond near Bursa. The dialect was notorious for its peculiar Genitive plural form in -ροῦ (e.g. ἀφτοναροῦ instead of αὐτῶν)¹. Despite the imperfect transcription, this instance alone allowed Dawkins to suggest that this dialect was a remnant, or at least inherited features, of the speech of the native Byzantine population. Did this show an extant Greek Anatolian population in the former Ottoman ethnic melting-pot of Bithynia? That sounded impossible.

[p. 216] To understand the boldness of Dawkins’ conclusions, one should recall what Bursa was in the nineteenth century. The city was one of the chief Ottoman economic centres, famous for its flourishing silk industry; and as such attracted many Greek craftsmen who settled in Bursa during the last periods of Tourkokratia. I do not know whether the Greeks in Bursa developed a special dialect; despite the scantiness of

[p. 215] ¹ R.M. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary* (Cambridge, 1916), pp. 37, 125, 143-144.

evidence, it would be far safer to suggest that the numerous Greek population in Bithynia belonged to a larger Greek area in the Marmara, with Constantinople as their centre. To choose this obscure though once prosperous village from all other Greek settlements in Bithynia and to describe its tongue as a descendant of a forgotten Byzantine vernacular required an outstanding historical intuition. So exactly how intense were the Ottoman conquests and the consequent Ottoman settlements in Bithynia? What were the relations between the Byzantine Greek population and the newcomers?

The Turkish conquest of Anatolia was a gradual process. After the battle at Mantzikert in 1071 the central Anatolian plateau became the cradle for the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm. The Byzantines still retained the rich lowlands in Western Anatolia and all the coastal regions of the peninsula. However, after the fall of Constantinople in 1204 to the participants of the Fourth Crusade Byzantium disappeared. The weakness of the Byzantine successor states allowed the Seljuks to get access to two important ports in Asia Minor: Antalya which they conquered in 1207; and Sinop, surrendered by Alexios I Grand Comnenus, the founder of the Empire of Trebizond, in 1214. From that moment on, the eastern border of the Nicaean empire, and then of the restored Byzantium, faced only the Seljuks: there were no other Christian or Muslim states on the empire's borders after 1214.

Let me first describe the geographical limits of the Byzantine-Seljuk border as it was in the 1250s. To the north, Tios, Amastris and Kromna as far as Thymaina near Kerempe Burnu were Byzantine possessions²; while Kastamonu and Safranbolu were centres of the Seljuk part of Paphlagonia³. In Bithynia, Klaudiopolis (Bolu) may have been in Seljuk hands

[p. 216] ² Georgii Acropolitae *Opera*, eds. A. Heisenberg et P. Wirth, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1978), i, p. 18, l.3 (hereafter Akropolites); Georges Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, ed. A. Failler, tr. A. Failler and V. Laurent, 2 vols in 5 parts (Paris, 1984-2000), i, p. 405, ll.14-18 (hereafter Pachymeres); K. Belke, *Paphlagonien und Honorias* [Tabula Imperii Byzantini, 9] (Vienna, 1996), pp. 161-170, 241-242, 276-278. On Amastris, see also J. Crow, S. Hill, "The Byzantine fortifications of Amastris in Paphlagonia", *Anatolian Studies* 45 (1995), pp. 251-265. On Thymaina, see Pachymeres, ii, p. 359, l.17; Belke, *Paphlagonien*, pp. 274-275. That the eastern limits of the Empire of Nicaea reached Rhodes, Tripolis and the Cape Karambis (Kerempe Burnu), is mentioned by the Emperor Theodore II Laskaris: *Theodori Ducae Lascaris Epistulae CCXVII*, ed. N. Festa (Florence, 1898), letter 44, p. 57, ll.32-36.

³ The most accurate map of the Byzantine possessions in Paphlagonia can be found in I. Booth, "Michael VIII Palaeologos and the Sangarios frontier 1280 to 1282", *Archaeion Pontou* 49 (2002), pp. 320, 328. See also: J. Crow, "Alexios Komenenos and Kastamon: Castles and Settlements in Middle Byzantine Paphlagonia", in

since the end of the twelfth century⁴, but the strategically important region of Tarsia [p. 217] (near Adapazarı), on the main road from Bithynia to Paphlagonia, was certainly Byzantine⁵. The border ran along the river Sangarios, the left bank of which was Byzantine; moreover, Byzantine fortifications (like Kabeia (Geyve)⁶) were situated on the river's right bank⁷. The Emperor Michael Palaiologos created a wooden wall on the right bank of Sangarios in 1281, in order to protect the region of Tarsia and the bridge of Justinian against the Turks⁸.

Thus, Nicaea, the 'capital' of Byzantine Asia Minor, had a very dangerous location, in close proximity to the border. That is why this important city was surrounded by many fortresses, such as Angelokomis (İnegöl), Belokomis (Bilecik) and Melangeia/Malagina (Yenişehir)⁹. The Byzantine fortification line almost surrounded Bithynia, stretching as far as Achyraios (Balıkesir)¹⁰ and further south to Kalamos¹¹. This part of the Nicaean border is the most obscure; we know more about Nicaean castles situated further south, in Lydia, with its centres Sardis and Philadelphieia (Alaşehir). This was the richest part of the Nicaean

Alexios I Komnenos, eds. M. Mullet and D. Smythe [Belfast texts and translations, vol. IV, part 1] (Holywood, 1996), pp. 12-36.

⁴ C. Cahen, *The Formation of Turkey. The Seljukid Sultanate of Rûm: Eleventh to Fourteenth Century* (Harlow, 2001), p. 44; C. Foss, "Byzantine Malagina and the Lower Sangarius", *Anatolian Studies* 40 (1990), pp. 173-174.

[p. 217] ⁵ Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. I.A. van Dieten (Berlin, 1975), p. 640, ll.13-15; p. 641, ll.40-42; Belke, *Paphlagonien*, pp. 264-266; A.A.M. Bryer, "David Komnenos and Saint Eleutherios", *Archeion Pontou* 42 (1988-1989), pp. 171-186. Foss suggests that Plousias/Prousius was probably lost by the Byzantines after 1225-1231, but no source confirms his point of view: C. Foss, "Byzantine Malagina and the Lower Sangarius", *Anatolian Studies* 40 (1990), pp. 173-174. Cf. Booth, "Michael VIII Palaeologos", pp. 322-323.

⁶ Pachymeres, i, p. 535, ll.1-2.

⁷ Pachymeres, i, p. 407, ll.16-20; p. 633, ll.12-17; ii, p. 363, ll.9-10, 24-25.

⁸ Pachymeres, i, p. 635, l.29 – p. 637, l.3; p. 406, n 3; pp. 632-633, n 7; ii, p. 363, ll.9-14. On the bridge of Justinian over the Sangarios, see M. Whitby, "Justinian's Bridge over the Sangarius and the Date of Procopius' *De Aedificiis*", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 (1985), pp. 129-136; W.M. Ramsey, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), p. 460.

⁹ Pachymeres, ii, p. 453, l.25 – p. 455, l.15; on Melangeia/Malagina, the region and its town, see Foss, "Byzantine Malagina", pp. 161-172. On the history of the city of Nicaea, see C. Foss, *Nicaea: a Byzantine Capital and its Praises* (Brookline, Mass., 1996), pp. 57-87.

¹⁰ Akropolites, i, p. 37, l.7; p. 185, l.24; p. 278, l.22; Pachymeres, i, p. 657, ll.12-18; *Theodori Ducae Lascaris Epistulae*, letter 180, p. 231, l.9; L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure. Études de géographie ancienne* (Paris, 1962), pp. 385-386.

¹¹ Akropolites, i, p. 28, l.4; p. 185, l.23; p. 294, l.23; *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1981), pp. 105, 106 note 4; Not. 10, p. 313, ll.127-128; P. Golubovich, "Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum seu relatio apocrisariorum Gregorii IX de gestis Nicaeae in Bithynia et Nymphaeae in Lydia, 1234", *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 12 (1919), p. 464 (29); Ramsey, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 129; Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure*, pp. 66-69; J.S. Langdon, *Byzantium's Last Imperial Offensive in Asia Minor. The Documentary Evidence for and the Hagiographical Lore about John III Dukas Vatatzes' Crusade against the Turks, 1222 or 1225 to 1231* (New York, 1992), p. 23.

empire; Magneseia (Manisa) and Nymphaion were the chief residences of the Emperor John III Batatzes¹². Philadelpheia, like Nicaea, was located near to the frontier zone.

However, the chief Byzantine strongholds lay further south, on the river Maeander. The valleys that surrounded the river were some of the richest territories of the Nicaean empire; Pachymeres called this land “the second Palestina”¹³. The Byzantines possessed not only the right bank of the [p. 218] Maeander, but also the lands on the left bank, in the old province of Karia¹⁴. The chief Nicaean strongholds south of the Maeander were Antioch-on-Maeander¹⁵, Miletos¹⁶, Melanoudion¹⁷ and Mylasa (Milas)¹⁸.

The extant Byzantine documents provide us with a picture of a prosperous and densely populated state. What lay further east, beyond the Byzantine borders? Unlike Byzantium, the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm was a relatively new formation. Though founded soon after the brilliant Seljuk victory at Manzikert in 1071, the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm was only one of many Turkic states that appeared in the recently conquered Byzantine lands. It was only in 1174-1175 and in 1228-1241 that the Seljuk state in Rūm absorbed other Turkic states in the peninsula and the vast territories, which were almost as large as the

¹² Ducas, *Istoria Turco-Byzantinā (1341-1462)*, ed. V. Grecu (Bucharest, 1958), p. 33, ll.13-14; H. Ahrweiler, “L’histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317), particulièrement au XIII siècle”, *Travaux et Mémoires*, 1 (1965), pp. 42-47; C. Foss, “Late Byzantine fortifications in Lydia”, in *ibidem*, *Cities, Fortresses and Villages of Byzantine Asia Minor* (Aldershot, 1996) [Variorum Reprints Series], article VI, pp. 298, 307-311.

¹³ Pachymeres, i, p. 403, ll.22-23.

[p. 218] ¹⁴ Pachymeres, i, p. 405, l.2; p. 591, l.30.

¹⁵ Akropolites, i, pp. 15, l.23; p. 16, l.10; Pachymeres, i, p. 591, l.30; H. Barnes, M. Whittow, “Medieval Castles”, *Anatolian Archaeology* 2 (1996), pp. 14-15; M. Whittow, *Social and Political Structures in the Maeander Region of Western Asia Minor on the Eve of the Turkish Invasion*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1987) [unpublished D.Phil. thesis], i, pp. 156-165.

¹⁶ Pachymeres, i, p. 593, l.3. The documentary sources also mention it as ‘the fortress of Palation/Palatia’ (τὸ κάστρον Παλατίων, modern Balat): *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, eds. F. Miklosich and J. Müller, 6 vols. (Vienna, 1860-1890), iv, pp. 290-295; vi, pp. 157-158, 162-163, 166, 168-177, 182-183, 188-191, 195-201 (hereafter MM); *Βυζαντινὰ ἔγγραφα τῆς Μονῆς Πάτμου*, eds. E.L. Branouse and M. Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, 2 vols. (Athens, 1980), i, pp. 121, 128, 226, 232, 238, 244, 283, 300; ii, pp. 137-140, 153, 158-159, 171-172, 214-215 (hereafter BE).

¹⁷ Pachymeres, ii, p. 239, ll.8-10; MM iv, p. 291, vi, pp. 166, 201, 213, 234-235; BE i, p. 226, 232, 259-269; ii, pp. 177, 214.

¹⁸ MM iv, p. 291; vi, p. 166; BE i, p. 226. On the other Byzantine fortifications along the river Maeander (for example, Mastaura, which was located 5 km north-east of the modern Nazilli), see C. Foss, “Archaeology and the ‘Twenty Cities’ of Byzantine Asia”, *American Journal of Archaeology* 81 (1977), pp. 467-486; Whittow, *Social and Political Structures in the Maeander Region*, i, pp. 72-192; ii, pp. 193-265; H. Barnes, M. Whittow, “The Oxford University/British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Survey of Medieval Castles of Anatolia (1992). Mastaura Kalesi: a preliminary report”, *Anatolian Studies* 43 (1993), pp. 117-135; *ibidem*, “The Oxford University/British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Survey of Medieval Castles of Anatolia (1993). Yılanlı Kalesi: preliminary report and new perspectives”, *Anatolian Studies* 44 (1994), pp. 187-206.

Sultanate itself at the moment of the conquest. Not all of these territories were incorporated into the Seljuk state after a violent and oppressive military campaign: some accepted Seljuk rule willingly. We know very little of how the Seljuks re-organized the conquered territories; but the evidence suggests that the sultans used the most simple and convenient way: they replaced the *amir*, governor or other power but did not usually eliminate the previous dynasty or its aristocracy.

The bulk of the aristocracy at the Seljukid court was Turkish by origin¹⁹ and Turkish titles were used together with Arab and Persian ones²⁰. But the ruling dynasty adopted Iranian names such as “Kay-Kāwūs”, “Kay-Qubād”, and “Kay-Khusraw” which were derived from the names of the legendary shāhs of the Kayanid dynasty in Īrān, the founders of the Persian Empire²¹. This was not accidental. The vast bureaucratic apparatus with its strong Persian influence in both language and culture was the chief tool with which [p. 219] the sultans ruled over their vast realm in Anatolia. The paradox was that the Turks, especially the nomadic ones, who were fellow kinsmen of the Seljuks, did not provide major support for the Seljuk sultans.

Thus, the Seljuk state in Rūm was multi-ethnic. Its subjects were Greeks, Syriac people, Armenians, Turks, Kurds, Arabs and Persians. Of these, the Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, Kurds and Arabs had been settled in Asia Minor before the Turkish conquest; whilst the majority of the Turks and Persians were mostly a new population. Though dispersed throughout the peninsula, the nomadic Turks largely concentrated in the border zone, or, as the Tuks called it, the *uc*.

Each ethnic group historically had its own niche in the Sultanate. The Turks were nomads half-independent of the central government; the Greeks and the Armenians represented a partly rural and partly urban population, as did the Syrians and Arabs in the

¹⁹ Р.М. Шукров, “Тюрки на православном Понте в XIII-XV вв.: начальный этап тюркизации?” // *Причерноморье в средние века* 2 (1995), с. 70-71.

²⁰ В.А. Гордлевский, *Государство Сельджукидов Малой Азии* (Москва; Ленинград, 1941), с. 59.

²¹ R. Shukurov, “AIMA: the blood of the Grand Komnenoi”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 19 (1995), pp. 176-178.

south-east of Asia Minor. As for the Persian and Arab townsfolk, they moved to Anatolia after the Seljuk conquest. This immigration, mostly from Central Asia, was so large that Persian became one of the spoken languages of the Sultanate and the term ‘Tājīk’ was applied to the sedentary population²². The Persian influence on Anatolia was so significant that not only official documents, historical records and literary works were written in this language but even the sermons of the Mevlevi *derwīşes* were composed in Persian and Greek²³.

When historians describe invasions of the early Ottomans, they usually suggest a somewhat dichotomic picture, namely that the Turks had conquered the remaining Greek lands: “The Turks against the Greeks”. As I will try to demonstrate the ethnic situation was far more complex.

Let me start from the Greeks, or, as they were called, the *rūmī*, in Asia Minor under the Seljuk rule. Doubtlessly they preserved their Byzantine identity: we read in the dedicatory inscription in Karşı Kilise, Gülşehir, in Cappadocia, certainly in Seljuk territory: “...under the reign of the [emperor] Theodore I Laskaris, in the year AM 6720, in the fifteenth indiction, April 25”²⁴, i.e. 25 April 1212. This means that the Greek population in Cappadokia, whilst under the authority of the Seljuk Sultan, nevertheless recognized the Byzantine emperor as their chief suzerain. In some inscriptions, both the sultan and the emperor were commemorated, as was the case in the inscription of the church of St George of Beliserama (Cappadocia): “...[during the reign] of the most high, the most noble great sultan Mas‘ūd, when the lord Andronikos II [reigned] over the Romans” ([ἐπὶ] μὲν τοῦ πανηψηλοτ[άτου] μεγαλογένους μεγάλου σουλτάν[ου Μα]σούτη, ἐπὶ δὲ Ῥωμέων βασιλέβοντος κυ(ροῦ) Ἀν[δρονίκου]). The date of the inscription should be placed

[p. 219] ²² Cf. Kerîmüddin Mahmud Aksarayî, *Müsâmeret ül-abbâr. Moğollar zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*, ed. O. Turan (Ankara, 1944), p. 172.

²³ The founder of the brotherhood, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, wrote in Turkish as well as in Greek (A.-M. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chappel-Hills, 1975), p. 312). However, the vast majority of Rūmī’s works (as well as those of his son Sulṭān Veled) were composed in Persian.

²⁴ C. Jolivet-Lévi, *Études Cappadociennes* (London, 2002), p. 289.

between 1283 and 1295²⁵. We also know that some Byzantine aristocratic families (the [p. 220] Komnenoi²⁶, the Tornikioi²⁷, the Gabrades²⁸ and the Mavrozomai²⁹) belonged to the high Seljuk nobility. Even when Muslims, they nevertheless preserved their family names, which means that they remembered their Byzantine ancestry. Moreover, the Greek population *per se* was not entirely restricted to the chief cities of the Sultanate. Sometimes we find Greek villages or towns in the frontier zone, alongside the Turkish nomadic tribes³⁰. But we must remember that the position of the Rumi Greeks who retained their

²⁵ N. Thierry, M. Thierry, *Nouvelles Églises rupestres de Cappadoce. Région du Hasan Dağı* (Paris, 1963), p. 202 ; V. Laurent, “Note additionnelle. L’inscription de l’église Saint-Georges de Bélisérâma”, [p. 220] *Revue des Études Byzantines* 26 (1968), pp. 367-371; P.M. Шукуров, “Иагуны: тюркская фамилия на византийской службе” // *Византийские очерки* (Санкт-Петербург, 2006), с. 210-217.

²⁶ In 1140 John Komnenos, son of *sebastokrator* Isaac Komnenos, took the side of the Seljuks. He married a daughter of one of the sultan’s retainers. About him, see: Choniates, *Historia*, p. 34, l.4 – p. 36, l.71; Ioannis Cinnami *epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), p. 21, l.3 – p. 22, l.4 (hereafter - Kinnamos); K. Barzos, *Ἡ Γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, 2 vols (Thessaloniki, 1984), i, pp. 480-485.

²⁷ A certain *amir* Tornik helped Kılıç Arslan III (1204 – March 1205) to seize the throne at the end of 1204, after the death of the Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Süleymān (1196-1204). Ibn Bibi, who writes about this fact, adds that *amir* Tornik came from Tokat: *Histoire des Seldjoucides d’Asie Mineure, d’après l’abrégé du Seldjouknāme d’Ibn-Bibi: texte persan*, ed. M.Th. Houtsma (Leiden, 1902) [Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seldjoucides, iv], p. 23 (hereafter Ibn Bibi), H. Duda, *Die Seltshukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi* (Kopenhagen, 1959), p. 36 (a) (hereafter Ibn Bibi (Duda)).

²⁸ For Ikhtiyār al-Dīn ibn Gawrās who was governor in Konya in 1189 and had some possessions in the Seljuk Pontos, see: ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Salāh ed-dīn*, ed. C. de Landberg, 2 vols (Leiden, 1888) i, p. 451; ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Hasan ‘Alī Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh*, 11 vols. (Beirut, 1998), x, p. 219; Michel le Syrien, *Chronique*, ed. and tr. J.B. Chabot, 4 vols (Paris, 1899-1910), iii, p. 388 (French translation); iv, p. 725 (Syriac text); C. Cahen, “Seljukides, Turcomans et Allemends au temps de la troisième croisade”, in *ibidem*, *Turcbyzantina et Oriens Christianus* (London, 1974) [Variorum Reprints Series], article IX, p. 26; *idem*, “Une famille byzantine au service des Seldjuques d’Asie Mineure”, in *ibidem*, *Turcbyzantina et Oriens Christianus*, article VIII, p. 147-149; A.A.M. Bryer, “A Byzantine Family: the Gabrades, c.979 - c.1653”, in *idem*, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos* (London, 1980) [Variorum Reprints Series], article IIIa, p. 181, n 10. About other Gabroi/Gavroi in the Seljukid Sultanate in the twelfth–thirteenth century, see also: P.M. Бартичан, “О византийской аристократической семье Гаврас”, *Palma-banasirakan bandes: Историко-филологический журнал Армянской Академии Наук СССР*, выпуск 1987 г.: № 3, с. 190-200; № 4, с. 181-193; выпуск 1988 г.: № 1, с. 163-177.

²⁹ The descendants of Manuel Maurozomes, who was the famous *amir Kuminūs Mafruzūm*, the father-in-law of the Sultan Kay-Khusraw I, are found in the Konya inscription, dated in 1297: John Komnenos Maurozomes, his son John Komnenos and his grandson *amir* Michael Komnenos. On them, see P. Wittek, “L’építaphe d’un Comnène à Konia, *Byzantion* 10 (1935), pp. 505-515, *idem*, “Encore l’építaphe d’un Comnène à Konia, *Byzantion* 12 (1937), pp. 207-211; Barzos, *Ἡ Γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, ii, pp. 496-502; D. Korobeinikov, “A sultan in Constantinople: the feasts of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I”, in *Eat, Drink and Be Merry (Luke 12:19) – Food and Wine in Byzantium. Papers of the 37th Annual Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, in Honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, eds. L. Brubaker and K. Linardou (Aldershot, 2007) [Society for the Promotion of the Byzantine Studies: Publications, vol. 13], pp. 93-108; S. Métivier, “Les Maurozōmai, Byzance et le sultanat de Rūm. Note sur le sceau de Jean Comnène Maurozōmès”, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 67 (2009), pp. 197-208. On Manuel Maurozomes as sultan’s father-in-law, fl. 1200-1226, see: Choniates, *Historia*, p. 626, ll.47-52; Ibn al-Athīr, x, p. 295; Ibn Bibi, pp. 26, 129; Ibn Bibi (Duda), pp. 38, 131 (note 83), 330-331; Ibn-i Bibi, *El-Evāmīrū’l-‘Alā’iyye fī’l-umūrū’l-‘Alā’iyye*, ed. A.S. Erzi (Ankara, 1956), pp. 80, 305; Yazıcızāde Ali, *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçuk (Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Tarihi)*, ed. A. Bakır (Istanbul, 2009), pp. 219, 444-445.

³⁰ Cf, for example, the descriptions of Laodikeia/Denizli in the thirteenth century: Akropolites, i, p. 143, l.23 – p. 144, l.15; p. 295, ll.2-1; Abū al-Hasan ibn Mūsā ibn Sa’īd al-Maghribī, *Kitāb al-Jughrafiyā* (Beyrut, 1970), p. 185; *idem*, *Baṣṭ al-arḍ*, MS Bodleian Library, Seld. superius 76, fol. 61a; C. Cahen, “Ibn Sa’īd sur l’Asie Mineure Seldjuquide”, in *ibidem*, *Turcbyzantina et Oriens Christianus*, article XI, pp. 42-43; X. de Planhol, “Le cadre géographique: le pays de Laodicée-Denizli”, in J. Des Gagniers, P. Devambez, L. Kahil, R. Ginouvès,

Christian beliefs was completely different from that in the old Byzantine Empire. The Byzantines, in particular the emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos, sometimes called [p. 221] the Rumi “our Persian enemies”, thus making no distinction between the Rumi and the Seljuks³¹. Indeed, the Greeks in Asia Minor dressed like Turks; if they used a weapon, it was a Turkish sabre, not a European sword; moreover, their vernacular, with many Turkish and Persian loan words, diverged more and more from the tongue of the Byzantine Greeks. Without Byzantine education, the vernacular gained. We can trace this process from the evidence of various sources. For example, Choniatēs did not manage to understand the *Rumi* Greeks’ spelling of the Turkish name of Ak-Saray as τὰ Ῥάξαρα, the reduced form of which is Τάξαρα (‘the city of Ak-saray’), and mistakenly inverted an additional article τὰ: ὁ Μασοῦν... παρενέβαλεν εἰς τὰ Τάξαρα, ἃ ἔστιν ἡ πάλαι λεγομένη Κολώνεια (‘Mas’ūd entered the city of Ak-saray, formerly known as Koloneia’)³². This is the case in the dictionary which was composed by al-Malik al-Afdal al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī (1363-1377), the Rasūlid sultan of Aden, who was thought to have been a distant relative of the Mengücek dynasty (fl in Erzincan, Divriği and Kemah from the twelfth until the thirteenth century). This dictionary contains entries in five principal languages: Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek and Armenian. As to Greek, without doubt the entries pointed to the Cypriot-Anatolian vernacular: consider the forms *oilōs* (إيلوس ‘sun’) instead of ἥλιος, *ghlōsan* (غلوسن) instead of γλώσσα, *ghamrōn* (غمرون, ‘son-in-law’, ‘bridegroom’) instead of γαμβρός, obviously from Cappadocian γαμβρός, in which [b] had dropped out; consider

Laodicée du Lycos, le Nymphée: campagnes 1961-1963 (Québec and Paris, 1969) [Université Laval, Recherches archéologiques, série I: fouilles], pp. 391-413.

[p. 221]³¹ “Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν τῷ περιωνύμῳ βουνῷ τοῦ Αὐξεντίου κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν Χαλκηδόνος βασιλικῆς μονῆς τοῦ Ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαῆλ, ἧς κτήτωρ ὁ βασιλεὺς Μιχαῆλ πρῶτος τῶν Παλαιολόγων”, in *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках православного Востока*, изд. А. Дмитриевский, в 2-х тт. (Киев, 1895), i: Τυπικά, часть 1: Памятники патриарших уставов и ктиторовские монастырские типиконы, с. 791; “Τυπικὸν of Michael VIII Palaiologos for the Monastery of the Archangel Michael on Mount Auxentios near Chalcedon”, tr. G. Dennis, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders’ Typika and Testaments*, eds. J. Thomas, A.C. Hero, with assistance of G. Constable, (electronic version [<http://www.doaks.org/typ000.html>], 1999), p. 1231; А.А. Коробейников, “Михаил VIII Палеолог в Румском султанате”, *Византийский временник* 64 (89) (2005), с. 82.

³² Choniatēs, *Historia*, p. 53, ll.45-46.

also the Anatolian Turkish loan words, unattested in Greek in the fourteenth century:

dāgharjūkī (داغرجوکی, ‘small leather sack’) from *dağarcık*; or *takās* (نکاس, ‘goat’) from *teke*³³.

However, the best example of the existing bilingualism in Asia Minor was the poetry of Maulana Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (AH 605-672/AD 1207-1273), the great Persian mystic. Despite his nickname ‘Rūmī’, which literally meant ‘Byzantine’, he was of Persian origin from Balkh in Central Asia. At an early age he traveled with his father who finally settled in Konya. There he had founded the *derviş* brotherhood of Mevlevi, known to the Europeans as ‘Whirling *dervişes*’. His spiritual writings are immense as well as his excellent [p. 222] poetry. The bulk of his writings were in Persian, but some of his verses were addressed in three languages (Persian, Turkish and Greek) to the city dwellers of Konya, for example:

کالی تیش آفانوس ای افندی چلبی
نیمشب برنام ما نا گرامی طلبی
که میه بوش و عصا که من کالو بروس
که عصا و نیزه، که خربنج عربی

Kālī tish-i āpānūsū ay efendī chelebi
Nīmshab bar nām-i mā tā garāmi ṭalabī
Ke siyah pūsh u ‘aṣā ke man kālīyerūs
Ke ‘ammāma u nīze ke gharibam ‘arabī

Good luck be upon you, o efendī chelebi
[Who is] at night seeking love in my name
Me who is dressed in black and [has] a stick of a monk;
Or [sometime] a turban and spear of an Arab stranger

The first line is Greek (Καλή τύχη ἀπάνω σου, ἔϊ, ἀφέντη τσελεμβή), though *celebi* is a Turkish title for a gentleman. The second line contains the Greek word καλόγερος

³³ *The King's Dictionary. The Rasūlid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*, trans. T. Halasi-Kun, P.B. Golden, L. Ligeti, E. Schütz; ed. P.B. Golden (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2000) [Handbuch der Orientalistik, Achte Abteilung: Zentralasien, Bd. 4], pp. 20 (Introduction), 99, 110, 134, 168, 181; *MS facsimile* (private possession, Yemen), fols. 189, col. B, l.16; 190, col. B, l.19; 192, col. B, l.14; 195, col. B, l.6; 196, col. B, l.13. On the ‘Mencik’-Mengücek ancestry of the Rasūlids, see: P.B. Golden, “The World of the Rasūlid Hexaglot”, in *The King's Dictionary. The Rasūlid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*, p. 22 note 80; C.E. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties. A Chronological and Genealogical Manual* (Edinburgh, 2004), pp. 108-109.

(‘monk’). Other verses were Persian. The use of Greek in this multicultural society was not exceptional: Jalāl al-Dīn’s son, Sultan Veled, himself an excellent poet, even exclaimed “I am going to speak Greek, so that you listen [to me], my rose-coloured beauty” (Ν’ εἶπω ἔδῶ ῥωμαϊκά, ν’ ἀκοῦς ἐσὺ, καλὴ ῥοδινή). The language is Greek but the poetical form is Persian³⁴. These Greek-Turkish language encounters left their trace even in the Modern Turkish language. In the clearest form these are attested in the Turkish Pontic dialect; but similar features, though to a lesser extent, can be found in Ottoman as well. The simplest example of the Greek influence is the emphasizing in pronunciation of the Turkish capital as *Ánkara*, instead of the expected *Ankará*; *Kastámonu* (Castra Comnenon) instead of *Kastamonú*. The archaic features of the modern Turkish dialects in the Pontic region allow B. Brendemoen to advance a theory according to which the Turkish dialect of the tribal confederation of *Aq-qoyunlu*, founded on the territory of the Empire of Trebizond, was bilingual: it had a Turkish nucleus (as far as the speakers were of Turkish origin), greatly influenced by their Greek neighbours. The Turks were isolated (for a while) from other Turks in the Greek environment in the Empire of Trebizond³⁵. Thus, these Turks of the Northern range of the Pontic mountains preserved some archaic features. They also could have borrowed some Greek [p. 223] forms such as the diminutive suffix in **–opo** (from Greek **–opulos**)³⁶. However, we meet the same suffix in Konya, far from the Pontos: the daughter of Jalal al-Din Rumi, Malika Hatun, was called **efendipoulo**, ‘daughter of efendi’ in the Persian sources. I have little doubt that such linguistic situation prevailed also in the frontier zone of western Asia Minor. What about the second component of our dichotomic picture, the Turks?

[p. 222] ³⁴ R. Burguière, R. Mantran, “Quelques vers grecs du XIII^e siècle en caractères arabes”, *Byzantion* 22 (1952), pp. 63-80.

³⁵ B. Brendemoen, *The Turkish Dialects of Trabzon: Their Phonology and Historical Development*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden, 2002), vol. i: *Analysis*, pp. 265-291. See also: Р.М. Шукуров, “Имя и власть на византийском Понте (чужое, принятое за свое)” // *Чужое: опыты преодоления. Очерки из истории культуры Средиземноморья*, под ред. Р.М. Шукурова (Москва, 1999), с. 222-227.

[p. 223] ³⁶ B. Brendemoen, “Greek and Turkish language encounters in Anatolia”, in *Language Encounters Across Time and Space*, eds. B. Brendemoen, E. Lanza, E. Ryen (Oslo, 1999), pp. 353-378.

There, the ethnic situation was no less complex. The Turkish population of Asia Minor before the Ottomans consisted of two groups: the vast majority belonged to the southern Turkic tribes of the Oghuz people. Other, smaller groups were the Cumans or the Kıpçaks, the northern branch of the Turkic people. Besides their different ancestry (the Oghuz and the Kıpçaks had different tribal genealogies³⁷) the difference between the two groups was evident from their speech. While the vernacular of the Oghuz Turks was full of voiced consonants, the Kıpçaks used the voiceless stops. The presence of the Kıpçak phonetic features can easily be traced in various dialects of Asia Minor. As far as Bithynia was concerned, the dialect that demonstrates the strong Kıpçak presence was on the territory of the former Byzantine Paphlagonia, in Kastamonu and Bartın³⁸. The toponymy also shows the Turkmen presence, in particular of the tribes Afşar, Kınık and Salur³⁹.

³⁷ On the Oghuz tribes, see: Rashīd al-Dīn, *Oghuz-nāme*, MS Topkapı Sarayı, Bağdad Köşkü 282, fol. 597a; *idem*, *Die Geschichte der Oghuzen des Rashīd ad-Dīn*, ed. K. Jahn (Wien, 1969), pp. 45-46; *idem*, *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, MS Bodleian Library, Elliott 377, fol. 342; *idem*, *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. M. Rawshan and M. Mūsawī, 4 vols (Tehran, 1994), i, pp. 58-61; Рашид ал-Дин, *Огуз-наме*, пер. Р.М. Шукторовой (Баку, 1987), с. 64-67; Yazıcızāde Ali, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Selçuk*, pp. 24-27; Абу-л-Гази, хан Хивинский, *Родословная туркмен (Şecere-i Terakime)*, изд. А.Н. Кононов (Москва, Ленинград, 1958), с. 30, 1.506 – с. 37, 1.620; с. 50-54 (рус. пер.). On the Kıpçak tribes, see: Baybars al-Manṣūrī al-Dawādār, *Zubdat al-fikra fi ta'rikh al-Hijra. History of the early Mamluk Period*, ed. D.S. Richards (Beirut, 1998) [Bibliotheca Islamica, 42], pp. 4-5; P. B.Golden, “The Polovci Diki”, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3-4 (1979-1980), pp. 296-309; O. Pritsak, “The non-‘wild’ Polovtsians”, in *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966*, 3 vols (The Hague and Paris, 1967), ii, pp. 1616-1623; *idem*, “The Polovcians and Rus”, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982), pp. 321-80; D. Korobeinikov, “A Broken Mirror: the Kıpçak World in the Thirteenth Century”, in *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages: Avars, Bulgars, Khazars, and Cumans*, ed. F. Curta with the assistance of R. Kovalev (Leiden and Boston, 2008), pp. 402-406.

³⁸ А.П. Векилов, *Турецкая диалектология* (Ленинград, 1973), с. 81 (the Kıpçak phonetic forms such as [-v-] instead of [-ğ-] of standard Turkish, e.g. *bovrurmak* instead of standard Turkish *bağurmak* ‘(to cry)’; [-y] instead of [-ñ], e.g. *napacasay* instead of *ne yapacaksan* ‘(what you would like to do)’), cf. Z. Korkmaz, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses der anatolischen Mundarten zu ihrer ethnischen Struktur”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, 2 vols (Ankara, 1995), ii, p. 188; B. Brendemoen, “Turkish Dialects”, in *Language Encounters Across Time and Space*, p. 238; Э.А. Грунина, Раздел 2.7.0 (“Диалекты”), в А.Н. Кононов “Турецкий язык” // *Языки мира: Тюркские языки*, под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой, В.М. Солнцева, Н.И. Толстого (Москва, 1997), с. 410-411; C. Huart, “Un commentaire du Qorân en turc de Qastamonu”, *Journal Asiatique* 18 (XIe série) (1921), pp. 180-181 (the Golden Horde Kıpçak Future tense –*IsAr*, e.g. *alısar* “he/she will certainly take”; *gideser* “he/she will certainly come”, cf. Э.А. Грунина, *Историческая грамматика турецкого языка* (Москва, 1991), с. 170-171); Korkmaz, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızları Üzerine”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 129-133; *eadem*, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 162-164, 170-174, 177-178; *eadem*, “Anadolu Ağızları Üzerindeki Araştırmaların Bu Günkü Durumu ve Karşılaştığı Sorunlar”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 206; *eadem*, “Anatolian dialects”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, p. 258.

³⁹ Korkmaz, “Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu”, in *eadem*, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, ii, pp. 182-187; *eadem*, “Die Frage des Verhältnisses der anatolischen Mundarten [p. 224] zu ihrer ethnischen Struktur”, pp. 190-198; *eadem*, “Bartın ve Yöresi Ağızlarındaki Lehçe Tabakalaşması”, pp. 175-178.

[p. 224] The difference between the two terms ('Turkmens' and 'Turks') did not lie in their language or ethnic divisions⁴⁰, but in their habitat: whilst the name 'Turks' could have been applied to both the sedentary and nomadic population, the Turkmens were almost always nomads. The term 'Turkmens' was scarcely mentioned in the Anatolian Persian sources of the thirteenth century. Such limited usage of the term 'Turkmens' in our sources reflected the historical and geographical situation in Western Anatolia, where the nomads almost always dwelt side by side with the sedentary population, mostly due to the geographical features of the peninsula. For before the conquest of Byzantine Asia Minor the lowlands, the essential part of the nomadic habitat, they were too few in number. Both societies, nomadic and sedentary, could not properly have functioned without economic cooperation and as such never aimed at ultimate destruction of each other. As a result, we hardly find any territories in Asia Minor which were entirely occupied by the nomads. The symbiosis between the nomads and the sedentary population in Anatolia differentiated it from that in Mongolia or in Central Asia, in which the nomadic element was much more dominant. In Asia Minor, even in the no-man's-lands of the boundary zone, one could have found a mixture of population: nomadic, semi-nomadic and sedentary.

We need therefore to look more closely at the structure of the *uc*.

Oddly enough, the modern perceptions of the Byzantine-Seljuk frontier zone in the second half of the thirteenth century are primarily based on the study of Ottoman sources composed at the end of the fourteenth century, i.e. one hundred years after the events under consideration⁴¹. As a result, the [p. 225] frontier zone is seen as a narrow borderland

⁴⁰ The Turkmen language as such (including the language of the groups of the Turkmens in Asia Minor and 'Irāq), began in the end of the thirteenth century at the earliest: Б.Ч. Чарыяров, О.Н. Назаров, "Туркменский язык" // *Языки мира: Тюркские языки*, с. 412-426.

⁴¹ The Byzantine sources mentioned the dates of the Turkish conquest of Western Asia Minor; occasionally they described, usually very briefly, the circumstances of the surrender; but when they stop, the Turkish ones do not begin. There were at least two simultaneous, but independent, Ottoman historical traditions. Both began in the end of the fourteenth century at the earliest; and both were largely based on oral tradition. Yahşi Fakih (Yakhshī Faqīh), whose chronicle was composed in 1389-1402, and whose data came from the oral tale of his father, the *imām* İshak Fakih (Ishāq Faqīh), as well as Yahşi's successors such as 'Āşıkpāzāzāde or the important anonymous chronicle *Tawārikh-i nasal-i āl-i Uthmān Ghāzī*, which survived in the manuscript in the Bodleian Library (Rawl. Or 5 olim Bodl. Or. 65), belong to the first group: V.L. Ménage, "The Beginnings of Ottoman historiography", in *Historians of the Middle East*, eds. B. Lewis and P.M. Holt (London, 1962), pp.

inhabited mostly by the nomads. The classical description of such a perception was given by K. Hopwood:

“The *uc* was a debatable land, under the control of nomadic groups. Sedentarists could only be protected by the presence of forts, to which they could retire on the arrival of the nomads, and at which strong defensive forces could be concentrated. The upper reaches of the river valleys of western Anatolia lay on the crucial divide between arable and grazing land. The extent of each zone was ultimately determined by environmental factors, but temporary changes in the balance of power between the transhumant and the sedentarist could temporarily advance the extent of each zone”⁴².

However, if we look at the sources that were composed in the thirteenth century, we see that the picture was much more complex. Āqṣarāyī, our main source for the frontier

172-173; V.L. Ménage, “The Menakib of Yakhshi Faqih”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 26 (1963), pp. 50-54; H. İnalcık, “The Rise of Ottoman historiography”, in *Historians of the Middle East*, pp. 152-155; E.A. Zachariadou, *Ιστορία και θρύλοι των παλαιών σουλτάνων (1300-1400)* (Athens, 1991), pp. 38-44, 116-213.

The second group includes the poem *İskendernâme* by Ahmedi (by 1410), the writings of Şükrullâh Zâkî (1456-1459), Karamanî Mehmed-paşa, Mehmed Konevi (both Mehmeds worked around 1480) and Ruḥî, who wrote in the 1490s: V.L. Ménage, *Neshri's History of the Ottomans (the sources and development of the text)* (London, 1964) [London Oriental Series, 16], pp. xiv-xv; İnalcık, “The Rise of Ottoman historiography”, pp. 155, 159-167 (Ruḥî's work is thought to have been survived in the MS Bodleian Library, Marsh 313, published by H.E. Gengiz, Y. Yücel, “Rûhî Târîhi”, *Belgeler* xiv, sayı 18 (1989-1992), pp. 359-472; other Ottoman historians of the second group were published (in Modern Turkish characters) by N. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri* (Istanbul, 1947)). According to Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, the Ottoman narratives concerning the reign of Ertoğrul (d. c. AH 679/1280) and his son Osman I (‘Uthmân I, AH 680-724/1281-1324) are for the most part legendary (M.F. Köprülü, [p. 225] *Les origines de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1935) [Études orientales publiées par l'Institut français d'archéologie de Stamboul, iii], pp. 7-17; the statement of Köprülü was the response to the uncritical use of the early Ottoman sources on the part of H.A. Gibbons in his *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1916)). Nothing can change the pessimistic, yet correct, statement of Cemal Kafadar that “the only pieces of writing that survive from the days of Osman are not on paper but on coins” (C. Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1995), p. 60). On the early Ottoman sources, see also: H. İnalcık, “Osmanlı Beyliği'nin Kurucusu Osman Beg”, *Belleten* 71, sayı 261 (2007), pp. 522-523.

Neither tradition witnesses, though both mention, the Turkish conquest of the Byzantine strongholds in Asia Minor, the last important of which was Nikomedeia in 1337. As far as the history of the decline and fall of Byzantine Asia Minor between 1295 and 1337 is concerned, the Ottoman historical writings should be used with caution, as these took final shape at the end of the fifteenth century. For example, we do not possess the authentic text of Yahşi Fakih whose chronicle survived only in the *Tevârikh-i al-i 'Osmân* of ‘Âşıkpâşâzâde. The latter began his writings when he was 86 years old: ‘Âşıkpâşâzâde, *Tevârikh-i al-i 'Osmân*, ed. ‘Alî Bey (Istanbul, AH 1332/AD 1913), p. 35. The supposed date of ‘Âşıkpâşâzâde's birth is 1400 (F. Babinger, “Chronologische Miscellen. III. Wann starb ‘Asyqpasazade?”, in F. Kraelitz, P. Wittek, eds., *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, 2 vols (Vienna, Hanover, 1926; repr. Osnabrück, 1972), ii, pp. 315-316; Ménage, “The Beginnings of Ottoman historiography”, pp. 174-175), so the alleged text of Yahşi Fakih in ‘Âşıkpâşâzâde, which the scholars now possess, was finished between 1486 and 1490. ‘Âşıkpâşâzâde ended his chronicle in events of 1482, see the *stemma* in: İnalcık, “The Rise of Ottoman historiography”, p. 155.

The great Byzantine historical works, that of Pachymeres (d. *circa* 1310) and that of Gregoras (died in Constantinople between 1358 and 1361), still described, *inter alia*, the history of Asia Minor until the first decade of the fourteenth century. Then Asia Minor almost disappeared from the pages of the Byzantine historical writings. The last great Byzantine historical work that belonged to the genre of “classicalising history”, the *Histories* of the Emperor John VI Cantacuzene (1347-1354; died in 1383 as monk Joasaph), was almost entirely centred on the Balkan events in 1320-1356, with some additional episodes until 1362.

⁴² K. Hopwood, “The Byzantine-Turkish Frontier c1250-1300”, in M. Kohbach, G. Procházka-Eisl, C. Römer, eds., *Acta Viennensia Ottomanica* (Vienna, 1999), p. 155. Cf. Heywood's critique of the concept of a narrow *ghazî* frontier that had been advanced by P. Wittek: C. Heywood, “The Frontier in Ottoman History: Old Ideas and New Myths”, in *ibidem*, *Writing Ottoman History: Documents and Interpretations* (Aldershot, 2002) [Variorum Reprints Series], article I, pp. 231-244.

Türkmens, applies the term *uc* to large territories, sometimes those including the chief Seljuk cities, like Akşehir or even Konya, the capital of the Sultanate. Let me list two examples, of which the first one concerns the Nicaean-Seljuk border and the second describes the Pontic border of the Empire of Trebizond.

In 1261,

“[the Sultan Rukn al-Dīn and his ministers] deigned to confer full authority to govern the province of the *uc* (*amārat-i wilāyat-i uy*) to [p. 226] Tāj al-Dīn Ḥusayn and Nuṣrat al-Dīn, the children of the *ṣāhib* Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī⁴³... Their retainers were appointed in Kütahya, Sandıklı, Ghurghurūm and Akşehir”⁴⁴.

Of these locations within the *uc* zone, Kütahya and Sandıklı were indeed the centres situated not too far from the Nicaean border (50-90 km); whilst Ghurghurūm (near Beyşehir) and Akşehir were situated in close proximity to Konya. The distance between Ghurghurūm/Beyşehir and Denizli can be calculated as 230 km (in reality, considering the complex road system in the mountains, this figure should be higher, up to 300 km), whilst the road that connected Konya and Beyşehir was no more than 80 km long. It seems that the *wazīr*’s sons controlled a very important road from Kütahya to Beyşehir (min 300 km) and all the lands west of it to the Nicaean border.

If we turn our attention to another principal Seljuk source, the chronicle of Ibn Bibī, we find the same picture. For example, in 1280 one of the rebel Seljukid princes was captured in the *uc* of Amasya⁴⁵. The expression ‘the *uc* of Amasya’ means the Trebizond-Seljuk boundary zone, from Amasya to Limnia (east of Samsun), the fortress on the

[p. 226]⁴³ The famous Seljuk statesman, also known as Ṣāhib Atā. He died on 25 Shawwāl AH 687 (22 November 1288): *Histoire des Seldjoudes d’Asie Mineure par un anonyme*, ed. F.N.Uzluk (Ankara, 1952), p. 72 (Persian text); p. 49 (Turkish translation); *Tārīkh-i al-i Saljūq dar Anāṭūli*, Compiled by Unknown Author, ed. N. Jalālī (Tehran, 1999), p. 115; Aksarayī, p. 150; I prefer the date given by Aksarayī, for the date of the week (Monday) coincides with the day of the month (25 Shawwāl). According to the common practice in the disintegrating Sultanate of Rūm, Afyonkarahisar, Denizli, Sandıklı and Ghurghurūm, which originally formed an *iqṭā’* of Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī, became hereditary possessions of his offspring, who established the *beylik* of the Ṣāhib Atā oğulları under the protection of the Germiyanogulları. The beylik was annexed by the Germiyanogulları in c. 1341. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties*, p. 225.

⁴⁴ Aksarayī, p. 74.

⁴⁵ Ibn Bibī, p. 336; Ibn Bibī (Duda), pp. 323-324.

western border of the Empire of Trebizond at that time⁴⁶. The distance between Amasya and Limnia was also long, no less than 120 km⁴⁷.

These two examples, taken from two different sources, clearly demonstrate that the Seljuk frontier zone, unlike the Byzantine one, was a very large territory that extended as far as, or even included, the chief Seljuk cities like Konya or Amasya.

If the *uc* land occupied large territories and encompassed Seljuk cities, that also meant that the nomads were hardly a predominant element of the population in the *uc*. Indeed, as far as the southern sector of the Nicaean-Seljuk border is concerned, one finds here the important trade routes under the protection of the karavan-sarays⁴⁸, prosperous cities and towns and, [p. 227] interestingly, the peasant population⁴⁹. One should remember that the large tribal confederations, be these the Turkish tribal groups in Asia Minor in the thirteenth-fourteenth century, the confederations of Ak-koyunlu and Kara-koyunlu in Eastern Anatolia in the fifteenth century or various Qızılbaş groups in the same area in the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries,

⁴⁶ Limnia remained under the rule of the emperor of Trebizond until 1369, when it was visited by the Emperor Alexios III Grand Komnenos (1349-1390): Μιχαήλ τοῦ Παναρέτου περὶ τῶν Μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν, ed. O. Lampsides, *Archeion Pontou* 22 (1958), p. 77, ll.7-9. Limnia was situated in the delta of the river Yeşilirmak (the Byzantine Iris), near the modern village Taşlıkköy: A.A.M. Bryer, D. Winfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*, 2 vols. (Washington DC, 1985), i, pp. 96-97; S.P. Karpov, *Ital'ianskiiye morskiiye respubliki i Iuzhnoie prichernomor'ie v xiii-xv vv.: problemy torgovli* (Moscow, 1990), p. 89; A.A.M. Bryer, "Greeks and Türkmens: the Pontic Exception", in *ibidem*, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*, article V, pp. 129-130.

⁴⁷ Cf similar example: Ibn Bibi, p. 311; Ibn Bibi (Duda), p. 298: Elbistan is mentioned as boundary zone.

⁴⁸ The karavan-sarays located in the *uc* zone are as follows:

1. Ak Han, built by a certain Kara-Sunqur ibn 'Abd Allāh in AH 651 [3 March 1253 – 20 February 1254] near Goncalı, 7 km northeast of Denizli, on the road to Çivril. K. Erdmann, *Das Anatolische Karavansaray des 13 Jahrhunderts* 3 vols (Berlin, 1961-1976), N 19, i, pp. 67-72; ii, pp. 93-94; iii, p. 205;
2. Pınarbaşı Han, on the crossroads Denizli-Akşehir and İsparta-Afyonkarahisar; date: c. 1220; *idem*, N 12, i, pp. 54-55; iii, p. 204;
3. Çardak Han, north of Acı Göl, between Denizli and Dinar; date: after 1230; *idem*, N 15, i, pp. 59-61; iii, p. 204;
4. Çakallı Han, 10 km north of Kavak, between Amasya and Samsun; date: Seljukid era; *idem*, N 22, i, pp. 77-79; iii, p. 205;
5. Eğret Han, 200 m north of Afyonkarahisar on the road to Kütahya; date: first decade of the thirteenth century; *idem*, N 42, i, pp. 152-154; iii, p. 204;
6. Yeniceköy Han, 20 km south of Kütahya, on the road to Afyonkarahisar; date: first half of the thirteenth century (?); *idem*, N 48, i, pp. 162-163; iii, p. 204.

[p. 227] ⁴⁹ See the descriptions of three cities in the *uc* zone – Amasya, Konya and Malatya – in *The Geographical part of Nuzhat-al-Qulub, composed by Hamd-allāh Mustawfi of Qazvin in 740 (1340)*, ed. and transl. G. Le Strange [E.J.W. Gibb Memorial series, xxiii, part 1-2] (Leiden, London, 1915), i, pp. 95-99 (Persian text); ii, pp. 96-99 (English translation). Cf. Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State*, pp. 126-127. On the dependence of the nomads on the agriculturalists, see A. Khazanov, *Nomads and the outside world* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 81-84.

“were not extremely pastoral nomads, and their chiefs were not merely leaders of nomads, but had legitimate sources of personal wealth and power: not only livestock, but agricultural land and commonly city-based trading houses. In addition, chiefs received income through tax collection”⁵⁰.

One can better understand the balance of power between the transhumant and sedentarist elements in the *uc* zone through considering the data on the life of the nomads in Eastern Anatolia in the sixteenth century. These nomads were the backbone of the nomadic state of the Ak-koyunlu until 1507-1508 when Shāh Ismāʿīl Ṣafawī (1501-1524) of Īrān conquered the state. Soon afterwards, however, the former western lands of the Ak-koyunlu were incorporated into the Ottoman Empire after the famous battle at Çaldıran on 2 Rajab AH 920 (23 August 1514) when the Sultan Selim I Yavuz (1512-1520) defeated the Ṣafawī army. The newly conquered lands were soon entered into the Ottoman tax registers (1518)⁵¹. As the chronological period between the fall of the Ak-koyunlu and the final Ottoman conquest was very brief (between 1507/1508 and 1516), we are able to restore the realities of the nomadic confederation on the basis of the comparatively recent evidence: the Ottoman tax registers. I will compare the number of Ak-koyunlu with the data of the first large Turkish confederation, the Turks of Denizli, which flourished in the thirteenth century.

The remaining tribes of the confederation of Ak-koyunlu are described in the Ottoman documents as Boz-ulus. The confederation consisted of 4,994 households in 1540, of which 4,568 were families, whilst 462 were *mücerred* [p. 228] (bachelors)⁵². Mustafaev, who calculates the average number of the members of a family as 5 persons,

⁵⁰ R. Tapper, *Frontier Nomads of Iran. A Political and Social History of the Shahsevan* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 11-12.

⁵¹ III.M. Мысрафаев, *Восточная Анатолия: от Ак-кочюнулу к Османской империи* (Москва, 1994), с. 10-13, 28-49; J.E. Woods, *The Aqqoyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire* (revised and expanded edition: Salt Lake City, 1999), pp. 163-172; F. Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): tarihleri, boy teşkilatı, destanları* (Istanbul, 1992), pp. 127-130; cf. the chapters of H.R. Roemer, “The Türkmen dynasties” and “The Safavid period”, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, 7 vols (Cambridge, 1968-1991), vi, pp. 183-188, 209-225.

[p. 228] ⁵² F. Demirtaş, “Bozulus hakkında”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 7 (1949), p. 53, 59 (the additional *bānes* of the Dhūʿl-Qādiriyye/Dulkadırlı Turks). Cf. Ö.L. Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Mali Esasları* (Istanbul, 1943), pp. 143; partly reprinted in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, eds. H. İnalcık, S. Faroqhi, B. McGowan, D. Quataert, Ş. Pamuk, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1994), i, p. 37.

believes that the confederation was as numerous as 23,000 people (the figure is almost ten times lower than that given by Ibn Saʿīd⁵³ for the Turks of Denizli)⁵⁴.

The winter pasturelands (*kışlak*, *qışblaq*) of the Boz-ulus were the so-called Beriyye: the territories between Mardin, Diyarbakır and Siverek. Their summer pastures (*yaylak*, *yāylāq*) were situated north of the river Murat (north-west of Lake Van) and reached the environs of Erzurum⁵⁵. The territory which the tribes of Boz-ulus occupied in 1540 was almost the same as the pasturelands of the Ak-koyunlu confederation in the fifteenth century⁵⁶. The shortest distance between the *yaylak* and the *kışlak* of Boz-ulus was 150-210 km.

It should be noted that the confederation of the Turks of Denizli under a certain Mehmed-bey, hostile to both Byzantium and the Seljuk government, appeared in 1260⁵⁷. In AH 660 (26 November 1261 – 14 November 1262) the Īlkhān Hūlegü (1256-1265) commanded Mehmed-bey to visit the Īlkhānid court (which was a usual Mongol demand to confirm the submission of a vassal ruler). The bey refused, and the angry Īlkhān ordered the Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıç Arslān IV (to whom Hūlegü had given a Mongol detachment) to subdue the rebel. Rukn al-Dīn was victorious; Mehmed-bey was defeated on the plain of Dalaman, captured and finally killed in the fortress of Burlū (Burghulū, Uluborlu) on the sultan's return to Konya. However, the 'state' of Mehmed-bey was spared and 'Alī-bey, Mehmed's son-in-law, became the master of the Turkmens of Denizli⁵⁸.

⁵³ Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā ibn Saʿīd al-Maghribī, *Kitāb al-Jughrāfiyā*, p. 185; *idem*, *Baṣṭ al-arḍ*, Seld. superius 76, fol. 61a (I give the MS readings): "As we have mentioned, there are the mountains of Denizli (Ṭughūzla) [situated] to the north of Antalya (Antāliyyā). They say that there are approximately two hundred thousand Turkmen tents in Denizli and the surrounding regions. And they (the Turkmens) are called *al-uj* (i.e. the Turks of the *uj*)". Cf. C. Cahen, "Ibn Saʿīd sur l'Asie Mineure Seldjuquide", pp. 42-43.

⁵⁴ Мустафаев, *Восточная Анатолия*, c. 118. The confederation was more numerous during the time of the Ak-koyunlu state. In c. 1474 the confederation had 6,000 households (tents) with 29,000 persons, including 3,000 men, 15,000 women and 11,000 children. The Ak-koyunlu state, which included other tribal confederations, could have had as many as 22,000 horsemen. D. Akkoyunlu, *Akkoyunlular ve Bayburt* (Ankara, 1992), p. 155.

⁵⁵ Barkan, *XV.ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Zirai Ekonominin Hukuku*, pp. 140-142; Demirtaş, "Bozulus hakkında", p. 39; Мустафаев, *Восточная Анатолия*, c. 119.

⁵⁶ Cf the map in: Woods, *Aqqıyınlu*, p. 30.

⁵⁷ Baybars, *Zubdat al-fikra*, p. 73.

⁵⁸ Baybars, *Zubdat al-fikra*, p. 76; Aksarayi, p. 71. Cf. C. Cahen, "Notes pour l'histoire des Turcomans d'Asie Mineure au XIII^e siècle", *Journal Asiatique* 239 (1951), pp. 336-338; *idem*, *The Formation of Turkey*, pp. 190-193; F. Sümer, "Anadolu'da Moğollar", *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1970), pp. 48-49.

There is no doubt that this confederation was very powerful. The territory which was under the control of Mehmed-bey was enormously large: from Laodikeia to Dalaman (150 km), from Dalaman to Alanya (350-400 km), [p. 229] from Alanya to Laodikeia (300 km)⁵⁹. Thus, the bey of Denizli was master of the great mountain range that separates the hills of the Upper Maeander from the Mediterranean shore of Anatolia (Dalaman-Antalya-Alanya)⁶⁰.

Thus, the pastures of Boz-ulus were almost the same as the nomadic routes of the Turks of Denizli in the 1260s (230 km). There is a direct connection between the number of the transhumant households and their cattle on the one hand, and the distance of the nomadic migrations on the other: the bigger the livestock, the longer the route⁶¹. I thus conclude that the Turks of Denizli numbered the same as or rather fewer than the later tribes of Boz-ulus: 15,000-20,000 persons. Of these, roughly one third at the most were capable warriors whilst another two thirds were women, elderly people and children. Thus, the Turks of Denizli, one of the largest nomadic confederations near the Byzantine border, could have had no more than 4,000-6,000 fighting men⁶².

My calculation can be confirmed by the Ottoman tax registers. According to these, the Turks in the sub-province of Tekke, which occupied approximately the same territory as the Turks of Denizli in the thirteenth century (Denizli-Dalaman-Alanya), numbered 8,816 and 5,601 households (*hane*) in 1520-1535 and 1570-1580 respectively⁶³. Of these figures, the number 5,601 (approximately 25,000 men, women and children) is the more

[p. 229] ⁵⁹ I count the distance very roughly; one should remember that the twisted roads in the mountains make the journey between these locations much longer.

⁶⁰ These Turks were probably descendants of the nomads around Mt Kadmos in Lykia in the twelfth century: P. Armstrong, "Seljuks before the Seljuks: nomads and frontiers inside Byzantium", in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. A. Eastmond (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 278-279.

⁶¹ Мусрафаев, *Восточная Анатолия*, с. 119. Cf. R. Tapper's remarks on the growing size of the nomads of Shahsevan: R. Tapper, *Pasture and Politics. Economics, conflict and ritual among Shahsevan nomads of northwestern Iran* (London, 1979), pp. 92 (table 12), 94, 246-247. On the connection between the increasing of the nomadic production base and opening new pastures, as well as the possibility of comparing large nomadic groups in different regions by the particular type of their migration routes, see Khazanov, *Nomads and the outside world*, pp. 38, 79.

⁶² On the population strata of the Ak-koyunlu confederation in c. 1474, see *supra*, note 54.

⁶³ *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, i, p. 35. On the very low increase of the nomadic population in a particular territory due to the stagnant economy throughout the centuries, see Khazanov, *Nomads and the outside world*, pp. 69-71.

reliable, as in the first half of the sixteenth century many nomads of Eastern Anatolia, the theatre of the long-lasting conflict between the Ottomans and the Şafawids, migrated westward. By the end of the sixteenth century many of them either became sedentary or were settled by the Ottoman administration in the Balkans⁶⁴. Noteworthy is the fact that the Turks of the sub-province of Menteşe who lived further west in the triangle Dalaman-Denizli-Menderes, on the lands which in the thirteenth century were part of the Byzantine empire, numbered as many as 16,912 *hane* in 1570-1580⁶⁵. Their great number in comparison to the Turks of the sub-province of Tekke demonstrates how economically important and attractive were the rich, well-watered Byzantine lowlands along the Maeander for nomadic society. The same was also true for Bithynia.

If one accepts the notion of the boundary zone as a large territory that encompassed cities and towns, one should agree with the famous statement of [p. 230] the Turkish historian Mehmed Fuad Köprülü that still perfectly describes the realities of the *uc* zone:

“The marches were not simply regions containing summer and winter pastures reserved for the nomadic and semi-nomadic Turkmen tribes. In addition to the summer and winter pastures reserved for each tribe there were also a great many villages, small towns, and even small fortified positions at strategic points. Furthermore, somewhat behind the border were some rather large, but not very numerous, cities. These well-defended cities which had been captured from the Byzantines served as the capitals of the march beyliks. And just as there were both Christian villages and Muslim villages in the Turkish area, the population of the cities was also a mixture of Christians and Muslims”⁶⁶.

It should be noted that the migration routes were precisely established, and as far as the central government managed to control the territory where the nomads wandered, the state laws (for example, Ottoman ones) prohibited them from deviating from the established routes in their seasonal migrations⁶⁷. In other words, as long as nomadic society was

⁶⁴ *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, i, pp. 34-37, 40-41.

⁶⁵ *idem*, p. 35.

[p. 230] ⁶⁶ M.F. Köprülü, *The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*, tr. G. Leiser (New York, 1992), pp. 81-82. See also Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, pp. 125-126.

⁶⁷ Мустафаев, *Восточная Анатолия*, с. 119. For the very precise routes of the Boz-ulus seasonal migrations, see Barkan, *XV.ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukuku ve Mali Esasları*, pp. 140-142. Cf Khazanov, *Nomads and the outside world*, p. 38, who suggests that “when we look at the nomadic routes

organized and controlled, it did not necessarily represent a permanent threat for a sedentarist society; co-existence was always possible. If a Turkish ruler, no matter how many nomadic or sedentary people were under his rule, nevertheless wanted to increase his independence, he had, first and foremost, to establish control over the vast network of fortresses, bridges and small towns on his territory.

The *uc* zone suffered profound changes in the second part of the thirteenth century. The changes were largely connected with the Mongols: the thirteenth century itself was the time of the great Mongol conquests. When the Mongols finally subdued Rūm in 1243, they weakened the sultan's power as much as possible. The period of the 1260s – the 1290s was marked by the domination of the semi-dependent Rūm lords. The question of governance was also complicated by the infiltration of the Mongols into the Seljuk state apparatus. Deprived of effective control over their finances, army and households, the sultans soon became puppets of the Mongols.

The Mongol conquests also shifted the ethnic balance in the peninsula. Many Turkish nomads fled before them from Central Asia to Anatolia; moreover, the Mongol troops occupied the best pastures of the Anatolian plateau. From the 1260s the number of the Turks that migrated to the Byzantine borders increased sharply. Most importantly, the Turks began to form large permanent tribal confederations. The biggest one seemed to have been the Turks of Laodicea/Denizli in 1260-1262. Other confederations were those of the (1) *ağaç-eri* which occupied the plains between Malatya and [p. 231] Maraş as far as the north-eastern border between Rūm and Cilician Armenia⁶⁸, (2) the Germiyanogulları (a mixture of Kurdish and Turkish tribes mentioned for the first time near Malatya and

of the large subdivisions of a nomadic group, these routes seem to be more stable than those of the other, smaller subdivisions in the same group”.

[p. 231] ⁶⁸ They are recorded as early as in 1254, and again in 1256 and 1258. Ibn Bibi, pp. 284-285; Ibn Bibi (Duda), pp. 270-271; Gregorii Barhebraei *Chronicon ecclesiasticum e codice musei Britannici descriptum conjuncta opera ediderunt... J.B. Abbeloos et T.J. Lamy*, 3 vols (Paris, Louvain, 1872-1877), ii, pp. 729-732; Smbat Sparapet, *Taregirk'*, ed. S. Agēlean (Venice, 1956), p. 230; Smbat Sparapet, *Chronicle*, tr. R. Bedrosian (New Jersey, 2005), p. 108; A.G. Galstian, *Armianskie istochniki o mongolakh* (Moscow, 1962), p. 49; Cahen, *The Formation of Turkey*, pp. 184, 193; Sümer, “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, p. 46.

Mayyāfāriqīn (Silvan) in 1240-1241⁶⁹, then near Kütahya from 1277⁷⁰), (3) Karamanoğulları (between Ermenek, Mut, Silifke and Anamur)⁷¹, (4) the Turks of Kastamonu (who robbed Michael Palaiologos in 1256⁷²) and, finally, (5) the Turks of the Pontos, of whom the most prominent was the tribe of *çepni* (recorded for the first time near Sinop in 1277)⁷³. Of these confederations at least three (the Germiyanogulları, of Kastamonu, and of Denizli) occupied lands in proximity to the Byzantine border. The military pressure on the Byzantines increased as the Turks, whose territory was ravaged by the Mongols, tried to compensate by the occupation of Byzantine lands.

The Nicaean defence of the Anatolian possessions against the Turks was based on three elements: the provincial garrisons or *themata*, which were situated in the frontier towns and castles; the nomads of Turkic and Cuman origin who were allowed to settle on Nicaean soil⁷⁴ and, finally, the *akeritai* (the “inhabitants of the mountains”⁷⁵) who were smallholding soldiers in the frontier zone, exempted from taxation on condition of military service. Moreover, the most prominent of these were granted state revenues (*pronoiai*) and money grants from the Nicaean emperors⁷⁶. However important during [p. 232] the Nicaean period, from the 1260s onwards the *akeritai* were no match for the Turks now

⁶⁹ Ibn Bibi, pp. 229-232; Ibn Bibi (Duda), pp. 218-221.

⁷⁰ Ibn Bibi, p. 326, 332; Ibn Bibi (Duda), p. 314, 319-320; *Histoire des Seldjoucides*, 1952, pp. 69-73, 77 (Persian text); pp. 47-50, 54 (Turkish translation); *Tarikh-i al-i Saljuq dar Anātūli*, ed. Jalālī, pp. 112-115, 119; Sümer, “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, pp. 46-47; *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*, 11 vols. (Leiden, London, 1960-2002), s.v. “Germiyan-oghulları” (hereafter *EF*).

⁷¹ For a brief moment between 1265 and 1271, until the arrival of the confederation of the Germiyanogulları from Malatya, the Karamanoğulları seem to have been neighbours of Byzantium in the region of Afyonkarahisar: *Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe*, eds. E. Combe, J. Sauvaget and G. Wiet, 16 vols (Cairo, 1931-1964), xii, 4540, p. 94; *EF*, s.v. “Karaman-oghulları”; F. Sümer, “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, p. 50; К.А. Жуков, *Эгейские эмираты в XIV-XV вв.* (Москва, 1988), с. 14.

⁷² Akropolites, i, p. 136, ll.8-25; Коробейников, “Михаил VIII Палеолог в Румском султанате”, с. 81.

⁷³ Ibn Bibi, p. 333; Ibn Bibi (Duda), p. 321; Bryer, “Greeks and Türkmens”, pp. 125, 132-133; R. Shukurov, “Between Peace and Hostility: Trebizond and the Pontic Turkish Periphery in the Fourteenth Century”, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9, N 1 (1994), pp. 47-62; P.M. Шукуров, *Великие Камнины и Восток (1204-1461)* (Санкт-Петербург, 2001), с. 227-250; Sümer, “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, p. 46; *idem*, *Oğuzlar*, pp. 241-244.

⁷⁴ H. Grégoire, “Imperatoris Michaelis Palaeologi de vita sua”, *Byzantion* 29-30 (1959-60), p. 457; “*Typikon* of Michael VIII Palaiologos for the Monastery of St. Demetrios of the Palaiologoi-Kellibara in Constantinople”, tr. G. Dennis), in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, eds. Thomas, Hero and Constable, p. 1245; Nicephorus Gregoras, *Historia Byzantina*, eds. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, 3 vols. (Bonn, 1829-1855), i, p. 36, l.16 – p. 37, l.9 (hereafter Gregoras); Langdon, *Byzantium’s Last Imperial Offensive in Asia Minor*, pp. 19-21; C.J. Halperin, “The Kipchak connection: the Ilkhans, the Mamluks and Ayn Jalut”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 63 (2000), pp. 233-236.

⁷⁵ Pachymeres, i, p. 29, l.21; p. 31, l.17.

⁷⁶ Pachymeres, i, p. 29, ll.21-26; p. 31, ll.15-20.

organised in powerful confederations, strong enough to resist, sometimes successfully, even the Mongol *tiimens*. The only appropriate response on the part of the Byzantines was military reform.

Such reform was conducted by Michael VIII Palaeologus in 1264-1265 who changed the status of the *akritai* into that of the *pronoia* holders. The people who had previously paid no taxes lost their status. The part of the land property of each individual whose yearly revenues were estimated at 40 *hyperpyra*, was converted into *pronoia*, a military fief, or, more precisely, a grant of state revenues from a land in return for the military service of the holder. The holders were now obliged to perform military service for the income from their estates, which were declared the state land and which were thus reduced to 40-*hyperpyra* parcels. The other lands that were not declared as *pronoia* were now taxed⁷⁷. The reform brought about the changes in the status of the *akritai*: those who were tax-free holders of the state land and formed irregular military units during the reign of the Laskarids became *pronoia*rs. From then on, the incomes from the *akritai* lands were earned by the state; and the *akritai* received a fixed part from these revenues (40 *hyperpyra* per person per year)⁷⁸. They became mobile *themata* troops that could be used in various military campaigns in Asia Minor or in the Balkans.

Until the 1290s the Byzantines managed to maintain their defence system. However, under the ineffective rule of Michael's son and successor Andronicus II the Byzantine army, which more and more relied on the mercenaries and the impoverished *pronoia*rs, whose wages were poorly paid, deteriorated. After the severe winter of 1298-

[p. 232] ⁷⁷ Pachymeres, i, p. 31, l.27 – p. 33, l.9; M.C. Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204-1453* (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 54-57. On the double status of *pronoia* as the grant of the state revenues from taxation, on the one hand, and as the allowance to collect taxes from, or to govern, the territory of the *pronoia*, on the other hand, see: К.В. Хвостова, *Социально-экономические процессы в Византии и их понимание византийцами-современниками (XIV-XV вв.)* (Москва, 1992), с. 37-50. On the abolition of the tax immunity in Byzantium as a form of confiscation of the land, see: она же, “Земельная собственность в поздней Византии (XIV-XV вв.): реальные отношения и их понимание византийцами-современниками эпохи”, *Византийский временник* 51 (1990), с. 10.

⁷⁸ On the difference between smallholders and *pronoia*rs, see Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, p. 157: “The smallholding soldier is usually viewed as someone who held a more or less direct grant of land as compensation for or on condition of military service... He is essentially distinct from the *pronoia* soldier, who generally had a much higher social position and only an indirect connection to the land from which his income was derived”.

1299⁷⁹ the Turks had crossed the Byzantine borders along the Maeander; in 1300-1301 Andronikos II received news of constant Turkish attacks on the Byzantine possessions in Asia Minor⁸⁰. Facing ineffective and disorganised Byzantine resistance, the Turks had occupied [p. 233] the lowland between the Maeander and the Hermos rivers by 1302; by the end of 1304 the whole coastline to Adramittium, save Phocae, a Genoese possession, was in their hands. The northern sector of the Byzantine border defences was broken after the defeat of the Byzantine army by the Ottomans, on 27 July 1302, in the battle at Bapheus (Koyun Hisar) near Nikomedeia⁸¹, and the Turks had appeared on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphoros by 13 December 1302⁸². The later attempts by Andronicus to use foreign mercenaries, the Catalans, ended in disaster: the Catalans rebelled and threatened the very existence of the Empire in 1305-1311. New Turkish states emerged on the former Byzantine lands: the emirates of Osman, Karesi, Candar-oğulları, Saruhan, Aydın, Menteşe, Teke and Germiyan⁸³.

We should remember that in the beginning of their history the early Ottoman groupings were smaller than these large confederations. According to the Ottoman historical tales, their *beylik* (principality) had been established by a tribe consisting of only 400 tents (according to the data of the first group of the Ottoman historical writings)⁸⁴, which, if we accept the calculation of the Ak-koyunlu in c. 1474⁸⁵, meant no more than

⁷⁹ Pachymeres, ii, p. 305, ll.17-27.

⁸⁰ In his letter, dated April 1299 – October 1300, the Patriarch Athanasios I (1289-1293; 1303-1309) asked Andronikos II to leave Thessaloniki, where his daughter Simonis married Stephen Milutin of Serbia, for Constantinople, in order to organize resistance to the Turkish invasions: *The Correspondence of Athanasios I, Patriarch of Constantinople: Letters to the Emperor Andronicus II, members of the Imperial Family, and Officials*, ed. A.-M. Talbot (Washington DC, 1975), p. 2, ll.2-14; p. 4, ll.25-26, p. 307. Cf. Pachymeres, ii, p. 335, l.4 – p. 337, l.6; Gregoras, i, p. 204, ll.23-24. Pachymeres mentions Halley's Comet of which appeared on 1 September 1301 and which foreshadowed not only the traditional Turkish invasions into various provinces in Anatolia but the complete loss of the Byzantine Asia Minor.

[p. 233] ⁸¹ Pachymeres, ii, p. 359, ll.4-7; p. 365, l.13 – p. 367, l.32.

⁸² *The Correspondence of Athanasios I*, p. 76, l.1 – p. 78, l.12; R. Muntaner, *Crònica*, ed. M. Gustà, 2 vols (Barcelona, 1979) [*Les Millors Obres de la Literatura Catalana*, 19-20], ii, 202, p. 71 (hereafter – Muntaner).

⁸³ MS Bodleian Library, Marsh 313, fol. 39 (the fullest account in the Ottoman sources); S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamisation, from the XIth through the XVth century* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1971), pp. 403-408; Жуков, *Эгейские эмираты*, с. 14-27.

⁸⁴ *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Asikpāšāzāde*, ed. F. Giese (Leipzig, 1928, reprint: Osnabrück, 1972), p. 6 (hereafter 'Asikpāšāzāde (Giese)); Mehmed Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihān-nümā (Neşri Tarihi)*, ed. F.R. Unat, M.A. Köymen, 2 vols (Ankara, 1987), i, pp. 60-61.

⁸⁵ 6,000 tents = 29,000 persons = 3,000 men + 15,000 women + 11,000 children (see *supra*, note 54).

2000 persons, of whom 500 were fighting men. Oddly enough, this average number of 500 is very close to what the Ottoman sources of the second group say about the first Osmanlı in Asia Minor: the founder of the dynasty, Ertoğrul/Ertoğrul (d. c. AH 679/1280), father of Osman I (1281-1324), initially had only 340 fighting men (*nefer kişisi*)⁸⁶. They moved from the territory between Erzincan and Erzurum, near Pasin ovası and Sürmelü at a period so remote that it was lost to Ottoman consciousness. If the later commentaries on the early Ottoman sources are correct, this movement took place when the Mongols appeared in Armenia, sometime in the 1230s. The future Ottoman Turks moved via Karaca Dağ in the vicinity of Ankara⁸⁷ to the Byzantine-Seljuk border: Sultan-öyüğü and Söğüt⁸⁸. The Ottomans remembered that their first territory stretched as far as Bilecik and İne-Göl, which were Byzantine frontier fortresses of Belokomis and Angelokomis respectively⁸⁹. There is [p. 234] little doubt that the population was mixed Greek and Turkish. The Ottoman sources often mention the cases of cooperation between the Byzantines and the Turks: for example, it was the *takvar* of Bilecik, i.e. the Byzantine governor of Belokomis who allowed Osman to use the environs of the fortress for summer pastures⁹⁰. We also find the Christian auxiliary troops, the *martolos* (from the Greek ἁμαρτωλός, ‘a sinful one’), in Ottoman service in the 1280s.

⁸⁶ MS Bodleian Library, Marsh 313, fol. 29; Gengiz, Yücel, “Rûhî Târîhi”, p. 375. On the two groups of the Ottoman historical works, see *supra*, note 41.

⁸⁷ On the location, see: İncalcık, “Osmanlı Beyliği’nin Kurucusu Osman Beg”, pp. 479-480.

⁸⁸ Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, i, pp. 56-69.

⁸⁹ *Die Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken (Tavârih-i âl-i ‘Uthmân) in Text und Übersetzung*, ed. F. Giese, 2 vols (Breslau and Leipzig, 1922-1925), i, pp. 5-6; Anonim, *Tevârih-i âl-i Osman*, F. Giese neşri, ed. N. Azamat (Istanbul, 1992), p. 9; ‘Âşikpâşâzâde (Giese), pp. 7-9; Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihân-nümâ*, i, pp. 63-73; *Düsturnâme-i Enverî*, ed. M.H. Yınanç (Istanbul, 1928), pp. 79-82; R.P. Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Ann Arbor, 2007), pp. 35-53, 71-80.

[p. 234] ⁹⁰ *Tavârih-i âl-i Osmân*, MS Bodleian Library, Rawl. Or 5 olim Bodl. Or. 65, fol. 7 (4v); ‘Âşikpâşâzâde (Giese), pp. 8-9; Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State*, p. 126; İncalcık, “Osmanlı Beyliği’nin Kurucusu Osman Beg”, p. 499.

The Ottoman expansion started from the conquest of Karaca Hisar in 1288⁹¹. In 1302 Osman defeated the Byzantine army at Bapheus near Nikomedeia⁹². However, the Ottomans, despite their victory at Bapheus, did not immediately gain much Byzantine territory though in the spring of 1304 their raids reached Chele⁹³. In the battle at Bapheus they destroyed the Byzantine field army but the fortresses that surrounded Nicaea and Prousa were still to be conquered. The text of Pachymeres suggests that by the spring of 1304 Osman occupied the lands between Nicaea and the fortresses of Angelokomis (İnegöl), Belokomis (Bilecik), Plataneia (between Nicaea and Prousa) and Melangeia/Malagina (Yenişehir), situated south of Nicaea⁹⁴. The road from Nicaea to the Gulf of Nikomedeia, near the fortresses of Herakleion (Ereğli), Neankomis (near Helenopolis (Hersek)) and Pythia (Yalova), was blocked by the Ottomans. The dwellers of Nicaea could have received supplies from Byzantium only by the difficult and unsafe road that ran from Kios (Gemlik) to Kroulla (Yenigürle) and then to the Lake of Askania (İznik Gölü)⁹⁵. Osman also ravaged the environs of Prousa and Pegai⁹⁶. But of all these cities and towns near Nicaea, in the spring of 1304 the Ottomans managed to conquer only Belokomis and the surrounding fortresses⁹⁷. The Ottoman sources indicate which Byzantine castles were taken. According to ‘Āṣīkpāšāzāde and Neşri, Bilecik (Belokomis), Yar-hisar, İnegöl (Angelokomis) and Yenişehir (Melangeia) were conquered by Osman in

⁹¹ ‘Āṣīkpāšāzāde (Giese), pp. 12-13; Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, pp. 71-73; İnalcık, “Osmanlı Beyliği’nin Kurucusu Osman Beg”, pp. 500-503. On the first Ottoman settlements by 1299, see Şükrüllâh Zaki, in T. Seif, “Der Abschnitt über die Osmanen über die Osmanen in *Şükrüllâh’s* persischer Universalgeschichte”, in *Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte*, 3 vols (Hanover, 1925), ii, p. 81; *Tavârikh-i âl-i Osmân*, MS Bodleian Library, Rawl. Or 5, fols. 7 (4v), 17 (9v); MS Bodleian Library, Marsh 313, fols. 29-39; Gengiz, Yücel, “Rûhî Târihi”, pp. 375-383; ‘Āṣīkpāšāzāde (Giese), pp. 5-16; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-nüma*, i, pp. 78-79, 87-88, 104-105; Laonicus Chalcocondylas, *Historiarum demonstrationes*, rec. E. Darcó, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1922-1927), i, p. 12, l. 20 – p. 13, l. 17; Zachariadou, *Ἱστορία καὶ θρόνοι*, pp. 76-85; C. Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1481* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 18-19; R.P. Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington, 1983), p. 20; *ibidem*, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, pp. 35-80.

⁹² Cf the comparison of the text in Pachymeres with the data of the early Ottoman sources: H. İnalcık, “Osmân Ghâzi’s Siege of Nicaea and the Battle of Bapheus”, in *The Ottoman Empire (1300-1389). A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon, 1993), pp. 77-99.

⁹³ Pachymeres, ii, p. 453, ll.25-28. Chele (Şile) is located on the Black sea shore east of Bosphoros.

⁹⁴ Pachymeres, ii, p. 453, l.28 – p. 455, l.2.

⁹⁵ Pachymeres, ii, p. 455, ll.2-15.

⁹⁶ Pachymeres, ii, p. 457, ll.15-19.

⁹⁷ Pachymeres, ii, p. 457, ll.10-14.

AH 699 (28 September 1299 – [p. 235] 15 September 1300)⁹⁸, and though the date is inaccurate, it seems that by 1304 these four fortresses became the nuclei of the early Ottoman state.

What kind of settlement had the Ottomans established on the newly conquered lands? This is not an easy question. First, we have to admit that the numbers of the invaders were relatively small. The strongest Turkish confederation near the Byzantine border, the Turks of Denizli, numbered 6,000 warriors at the most in the 1260s. In 1304 the confederation of three beys (Yakub I Alişir Germiyanoglu, Sasa and Mehmed Aydınoğulları) numbered no more than 8,000 horsemen and 12,000 infantry⁹⁹. As the mediaeval sources are very unreliable as far as figures are concerned, I suggest that in the light of all we know about Turkish nomadic units at that time the confederation's army was no more than 8,000-10,000 capable warriors, most of whom were horsemen. The Ottomans had no more than 5,000 horsemen in 1304 though they were earlier supported by the Turks from Maeander and Paphlagonia¹⁰⁰. In other words, I cannot envisage a significant increase in the numbers of any particular Turkish confederation. The Byzantine army under Michael VIII Palaiologos (8,000 heavily armed troops¹⁰¹) was rather bigger than the Nicaean one (6,000, excluding *themata*)¹⁰². The Catalans in 1303-1304 had approximately the same number of soldiers (6,500)¹⁰³. From the military point of view the campaigns of Michael VIII and later of the Catalans against the Turks in Asia Minor were successful, though the Byzantines' political failures turned their victories into defeat.

[p. 235] ⁹⁸ 'Āšīk-pāšāzāde (Giese), pp. 14-20; Neşri, *Kitāb-ı Cihān-nümā*, i, pp. 96-105; Zachariadou, *Ἱστορία καὶ θρύλοι*, pp. 138-146.

⁹⁹ Muntaner, ii, 205, p. 76.

¹⁰⁰ Pachymeres, ii, p. 457, l.1.

¹⁰¹ Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, p. 37.

¹⁰² П.И. Жаворонков, "Военное искусство Никейской империи" // *Византийские очерки* (Москва, 1996), c. 151: the statement is based on Akropolites, i, p. 139, ll.1-14. Oddly enough, this number is partly supported by the Chronicle of Morea, which lists 1500 Hungarian and 300 German mercenaries as well as 600 Serb, 1500 Turkish (i.e. Seljukid) and 2000 Cuman cavalry in Nicaean service: Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, p. 37; *Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*, ed. P.P. Kalonaros (Athens, 1940), p. 162, ll. 3766-3772; *The Chronicle of Morea, τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*, ed. J. Schmitt (London, 1904), p. 250-251, ll. 3766-3772.

¹⁰³ Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army*, p. 78.

If so, the Ottomans, whose numbers were small when their expansion began, were unable to destroy all Greek settlements in Bithynia. It is the Ottoman cadastres, the so-called *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri*, the Land Registers of the province of Hüdavendigâr that show us the type of settlement that the Ottomans established in the province. The first cadastre was written in 1487; additional cadastral surveys were made in 1521 and in 1573¹⁰⁴. Though composed 200-300 years after the first Ottoman conquests on the Byzantine border, the cadastres contain a mine of information concerning the land possessions under the first Ottoman sultans. More importantly, the surveys covered the territory of both the former Seljuk frontier zone and the once Byzantine lands: from Balıkesir to Ankara and from Iznik to Kütahya. The surveys clearly show that the Greek population barely survived on the [p. 236] territory of the former Seljuk frontier zone (with the notable exception of Söğüt¹⁰⁵); whilst the Greek villages in the former Byzantine lands, even those around Bilecik (Belokomis), Yar-hisar, İnegöl (Angelokomis) and Yenişehir (Melangeia), were numerous¹⁰⁶. The villages were listed as the private domains and *waqfs* (land endowments given for pious or charitable purposes) of the first sultans. It seems that those lands, originally Byzantine imperial domains or large monastic possessions, became the sultans' private property after the Ottoman conquest¹⁰⁷; their extant Greek population was now under the direct protection of the sultans. If so, the Ottomans were not particularly generous: they obviously wanted to continue to receive income from the recently conquered Byzantine lands (just as the Byzantine lords did before them); but the status that they granted to the non-Muslim population for a while contributed to the survival of the Greeks under Ottoman rule in the turbulent boundary

¹⁰⁴ Ö.L. Barkan, "Hüdavendigâr Livası Sayım Defterleri", in *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri*, eds. Ö.L. Barkan and E. Meriçli (Ankara, 1988), pp. 13, 66.

[p. 236] ¹⁰⁵ I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La population non-musulmane de Bithynie (deuxième moitié du XIVe siècle – première moitié du XVe siècle)", in *The Ottoman Empire (1300-1389)*, p. 11.

¹⁰⁶ Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La population non-musulmane de Bithynie", pp. 9-12, 20-21.

¹⁰⁷ *idem*, p. 18.

zone. Even the *çiftlik waqf*¹⁰⁸ near Söğüt, established by Osman I and Bayezid I (1389-1402) ‘for the [memory] of the soul of Ertoğrul’, their ancestor, seemingly the earliest Ottoman pious foundation¹⁰⁹, listed three *ellici kâfirleri*, literally ‘three *ellici* infidels’ as the cultivators of the *çift*¹¹⁰. The term ‘*ellici*’ meant a special category of the peasant population, usually Greek, though the true meaning of the term ‘*ellici*’ still remains hidden¹¹¹. Given the fact that the category of the ‘*ellici*’ had become extinct by the time of the first Ottoman cadastre survey in Bithynia¹¹², it seems that the mention of the three Greek *ellici* peasants should be attributed to the time of Osman I.

We should also remember that the Byzantine presence in Bithynia did not completely disappear after 1307. Prousa fell in 1326; Nicaea in 1331; Nikomedeia in 1337; Chele/Şile in 1396; and the fortresses on the road between Nikomedeia and Chrysopolis (Kartalimen/Kartal, Pantychion/Pandik, Dakybiza/Gebze and Brounga/Hereke) were in Byzantine hands from 1402 until 1421. Let me consider, just to show the difference between the post-Seljuk and the post-Byzantine lands in Bithynia, two particular cases in the cadastral surveys. The first one is Göynük, which was situated in the Seljuk frontier zone; the Ottomans managed to conquer the city only after 1361. The survey shows no Greek population in the vicinity of the town of Göynük. Its toponymy is predominantly Turkish, with plenty of ‘professional’ settlements (like Köstekler ‘those who make/are with chains’ or Bektaşlar ‘the Bektaş dervishes’¹¹³) or the villages that were inhabited by the former tribal groups [p. 237] (Kınık¹¹⁴, Doğan¹¹⁵, Bayandur¹¹⁶, Çepni¹¹⁷). One village is

¹⁰⁸ The endowment of the revenues for pious purposes from the *çift*, the unit of agricultural land, which usually varied in size from 56400 to 141000 square metres. Cf. H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age, 1300-1600* (London, 1973), p. 219.

¹⁰⁹ İnalcık, “Osmanlı Beyliği’nin Kurucusu Osman Beg”, p. 482.

¹¹⁰ *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri*, pp. 283-284.

¹¹¹ Beldiceanu-Steinherr, “La population non-musulmane de Bithynie”, pp. 15-17. The term was derived from the number ‘*elli*’, ‘fifty’, and can be translated as ‘this/those of fifty’.

¹¹² *idem*, p. 16.

¹¹³ *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri*, pp. 518, 536, 541, 595.

[p. 237]¹¹⁴ *idem*, pp. 542, 549, 596.

¹¹⁵ *idem*, p. 595.

¹¹⁶ *idem*, pp. 521, 542, 584, 596.

¹¹⁷ *idem*, p. 561.

called ‘Firengi’¹¹⁸, namely ‘the Franks’, but I do not know how to explain it. The name of the village Falanoz is obviously Greek; but the cadastre records no trace of the Greek population there¹¹⁹. A *çiftlik* (land parcel, that formed a unit for taxation) is called Vasil-oğlu (‘a son of Basil’), but the cadastre specifies that its masters were the commander of the irregular troops (*yayabaşı*) Seydi-bey and his brother Türkmen¹²⁰. So far I failed to find other traces of the Greek population in the environs of Göynük.

If we turn to the description of the *mahalles* (districts) of the town of Göynük, we will also find no Greek population. Moreover, some *mahalles*’ names suggest that they had been founded by the former nomads, descendants of the participants of the great nomadic revolt of Baba Ishāq that took place near Samosata in Eastern Anatolia in 1239-1240¹²¹. It seems that the Greek-Turkish coexistence came to an end at the beginning of the fourteenth century, when both the town and the environs of Göynük, like other territories in Eastern Bithynia, suffered heavily from an influx of nomads from Paphlagonia¹²².

The case of Bursa was different. The Ottomans tried to capture Bursa as early as 1307, but their initial attack failed. After blockading it for many years the starved city was to surrender to the Ottomans on 6 April 1326 and to pay a heavy tribute of 30,000 *florī*. The Byzantine commander whom the Turkish sources called *takvar* was allowed to leave Bursa for Istanbul but his chief adviser, a certain Saroz, who was responsible for the surrender, remained with the Ottomans¹²³. The Greeks were apparently removed to a district below outside the fortress where we find them in the *kadi* registers of the fifteenth

¹¹⁸ *idem*, pp. 532, 594.

¹¹⁹ *idem*, pp. 555, 582.

¹²⁰ *idem*, p. 555.

¹²¹ *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabirî Defterleri*, p. 507: *Mahalle-i Babaylar*; I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, “Göynük, ville refuge des communautés Baba’î”, in *Res Orientales*, VI: *Itinéraires d’Orient. Hommage à Claude Caben* (Bures sur Yvette-Louvain, 1994), pp. 241-255, esp. p. 250: *Mahalle-i Baba’ler, Mescid-i yayabaşı İhyâs*. On the revolt of Baba Ishāq, see A.Y. Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l’hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIII^e siècle* (Ankara, 1989), pp. 36-80.

¹²² Pachymeres, ii, p. 359, l.4 – p. 365, l.12; D.A. Korobeinikov, “The Revolt in Kastamonu, c. 1291-1293”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 28 (2004), pp. 87-117; Д.А. Коробейников, “Восстание в Кастамону в 1291-1293 гг.” // *Византийские очерки* (Санкт-Петербург, 2001), с. 74-111.

¹²³ ‘Āshīkpāšāzāde (Giese), pp. 28-30; *EF*, s.v. “Bursa”; Zachariadou, *Ἱστορία καὶ θρόνοι*, pp. 110-111; H.W. Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany, NY, 2003), pp. 56-57.

century¹²⁴. In the reign of Orhan I (1324-1362) the police superintendent (*subaşı*) of the city was a certain Koskos, obviously a Christian Greek¹²⁵. The policy of the Ottoman sultans who established new *mahalles* made Bursa a predominantly Muslim city within the lifespan of two generations; the Greeks survived, but remained a considerable minority. What makes the case of the city of Bursa similar to that of Göyük is the presence of the *mahalles* [p. 238] which were founded by the former nomadic groups, like the ‘Tatars’ (i.e. the Mongols)¹²⁶.

However, if we look at the environs of Bursa, the picture is quite different. One might have expected that the Ottomans managed to blockade Bursa by wiping out the Greek population from the surrounding villages, but the cadastre’s data does not support this view. Indeed, the city was encircled with villages with Greek names. Moreover, in many villages the Greeks and the Turks shared land possessions, which points out to the slow and peaceful infiltration of the Turks into the Greek society as well as successful conversion of the Greeks to Islam. For example, the *timar* village of Kestel (from *castellum*) had 9 Muslim and 7 Greek houses in 1487¹²⁷. Some of the Greek villages, like Kalamine, were the possessions of the Greek wives of the Ottoman sultans. In particular, Kalamine was possession of Gülçiçek Hatun, a Bithynian Greek, wife of the Sultan Murad I and mother of the Sultan Bayezid I¹²⁸. One should remember that the Ottomans came out from the frontier zone, which, as I have mentioned, was remarkable for its mixture of population, both nomadic and sedentary, and which could have been controlled only through the network of fortresses, towns and other strategically important positions. The Ottomans followed the same practice in Bithynia. The chief reason why the cities like Bursa or Nicaea were forced to surrender cannot be explained by sharp ethnic changes in

¹²⁴ *EI*², s.v. “Bursa”; Beldiceanu-Steinherr, “La population non-musulmane de Bithynie”, pp. 10-11.

¹²⁵ M.T. Gökbilgin, “Murad I. Tesisleri ve Bursa İmareti Vakfiyesi”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 10 (1953), p. 233; Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, pp. 86-90.

[p. 238] ¹²⁶ *Hüdavendîgâr Lîvası Tabîr Defterleri*, p. 1.

¹²⁷ *Hüdavendîgâr Lîvası Tabîr Defterleri*, p. 10; Beldiceanu-Steinherr, “La population non-musulmane de Bithynie”, p. 20.

¹²⁸ *Hüdavendîgâr Lîvası Tabîr Defterleri*, p. 61. See also: Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, p. 153.

the surrounding territory. The blockade was not tight: we know that the metropolitan Nicholas of Bursa managed to contact Constantinople in 1318 on the subject of his diminished revenues¹²⁹. It seems that these big cities, which were unable to maintain themselves without trade, finally capitulated because the Ottomans controlled the network of fortresses on the chief supply routes.

If so, this suggestion can explain one interesting fact. Despite many Christians in the administration, members of the Byzantine aristocracy in the Ottoman ruling class (like Köse Mihal, Evrenos-bey, Maurozomes in Biga in 1354¹³⁰), and landholding and taxation organised on the Byzantine system¹³¹, the Ottomans showed astonishingly little interest in Byzantine culture, which was by nature urban. However, it was the cities that suffered profound changes after the Ottoman conquest. That is why the borrowings between the late Byzantine and early Ottoman historical writings were minimal, and reduced to the short [p. 239] chronicles¹³². One might have expected that the early Ottoman sultans would accept the title *qayṣar* (the Caesar) of the Byzantine emperors as they laid claim to the Byzantine lands, but they did not. The title of the Sultan Murad I was “the great emir, king of the kings of the Arabs and the Persians, protector of the territories of Allah, guardian of the worshippers of God, champion of the class of justice and benevolence, Sultan son of Sultan, Murad son of Orkhan”¹³³. Mehmed II Fatih conferred on himself only the title “the great *authentos* (‘ruler’) and the great emir” in his Greek charters¹³⁴. The

¹²⁹ J. Darrouzès, *Les Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople* (Paris, 1977), i, fasc. 5: *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, N 2086, pp. 62-63; MM i, pp. 80-81; *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel*, eds. H. Hunger, O. Kresten (Vienna, 1981), i: *Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315-1331*, N 55, pp. 356-359.

¹³⁰ Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, pp. 55-94, 131-132.

¹³¹ С.Ф. Орешкова, “Византия и Османская империя: проблемы преемственности” // *Византия между Западом и Востоком. Опыт исторической характеристики*, под ред. Г.Г. Литаврина (Санкт-Петербург, 1999), с. 478-494.

[p. 239] ¹³² Д.А. Коробейников, “Восточные источники Лаоника Халкокондана. Эпизод 1. Походы Баязида I Йылдырыма в Малой Азии” // *Византийские очерки* (Москва, 1996), с. 152-168.

¹³³ Gökbilgin, “Murad I. Tesisleri ve Bursa İmareti Vakfiyesi”, pp. 223-224; Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, pp. 86-87.

¹³⁴ See, for example: MM, iii, p. 293.

Ottomans indeed employed the title *qayşar* in the sixteenth century¹³⁵, but consider the context:

“His majesty [the second] Iskandar, the banner of the Possessor of knowledge, the Saturn of sublimity of the sphere, [the one who belongs to] the rank of Khosrau, the palace of supremacy and power of Nushirwan, the throne of justice, the rule of the Caesar, Jamshid of the realm (lit. – place), Khurshid of the world, the khaqan, the one who distributes the crowns, the possessor of the countries, the sultan, the one who sits on the throne, the *şāhibqirān* (lit. - the one who is under the lucky combination of stars), the padishah of the kingdom, the successful one”¹³⁶.

The Byzantine title is buried under the Persian formula. And when the sultan Mehmed II entered Constantinople and visited the Church of Saint Sophia, he pronounced the verses of an unknown Persian poet:

The spider serves as gatekeeper in the halls of the Khosrau’s dome
The owl plays martial music in the palace of Afrasiyab¹³⁷.

Was he aware of the Byzantine inheritance that he now possessed? I have no doubts. But, like his ancestors in the Seljuk frontier zone, he expressed this awareness in the categories of Persian culture.

¹³⁵ З. Абрахамович, “Османский султан как восточноримский император (*кайсер-и Рум*)” // *Turcica et Ottomanica. Сборник статей в честь 70-летия М.С. Мейера*, сост. И.В. Зайцев и С.Ф. Орешкова (Москва, 2006), с. 103-105.

¹³⁶ Feridun-bey Ahmed, *Münşaat-i Selatin*, 2 vols (Istanbul, AH 1274, AD 1857), i, p. 4; on the titles listed in Feridun-bey’s work, see: H. İnalcık, “Power relationships between Russia, the Crimea and the Ottoman Empire as reflected in titulature”, in *Passé turco-tatar, présent soviétique. Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen (Turco-Tatar Past, Soviet Present. Studies Presented to Alexandre Bennigsen)*, eds. Ch. Lemerrier-Quelquejay, G. Veinstein, S.E. Wimbush (Paris, 1986), pp. 192-199.

¹³⁷ Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, ed. with English translation H. İnalcık and R. Murphey (Minneapolis and Chicago, 1978) (= Aya Sofya MS 3032), fol. 51a; E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. F. Fernández-Armesto, 8 vols (London: The Folio Society, 1990), viii, p. 240; cf. A.A.M. Bryer, “Gibbon and the later Byzantine Empires”, in *Edward Gibbon and Empire*, eds. R. McKitterick and R. Quinault (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 101-116, esp. p. 110, note 33.