

»These are the narratives of bygone years«: Conquest of a Fortress as a Source of Legitimacy

Dimitri Korobeinikov*

In 1502 or 1503 Kemāl paşa-zāde (d. 1534), also known as Ibn-i Kemāl, the future Şeyh'ül-İslam (chief Muslim judge) under Sulaymān the Magnificent, described the world of Byzantium which the Ottomans had conquered. There, he reproduced the realia of the »fortress past« of the Ottomans. Ibn-i Kemāl described Byzantium as a commonwealth of fortresses, each headed by a *tekvur* (»emperor«), which was at odds with historical accuracy. This pointed to the period of the second half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century as a time of transition, when the cities in the frontier zone in Anatolia were sometimes reduced to the size of a fortress, and their inhabitants were forced to find a new location. The extant tales about the initial fortress, from which a new state formation (*beylik*) had begun, and the stories about the conquests of the chain of neighboring fortresses, per se reflected the growing importance of the small cities as chief colonization centers in the boundary zone in Asia Minor. The vision of the »fortresses' past«, still remembered at the time of Sulaymān the Magnificent, even affected the imperial aspirations of the Ottomans and their self-representation as the new masters of the conquered lands.

Keywords: Ottomans, Byzantium, Karamanoğulları, Karamanids, Asia Minor, Ak-koyunlu, Sulaymān the Magnificent, Ibn Kemal, Bender inscription, Cilician Armenia

The Ottoman Memory

In 1502 or 1503 a professor (*müderri*) at the medrese of 'Ali Beg in Edirne, Kemāl paşa-zāde (d. 1534), also known as Ibn-i Kemāl, the future Şeyh'ül-İslam (chief Muslim judge of the Ottoman Empire) under Sulaymān the Magnificent (1520-1566), wrote his famous *History of the Ottomans*. His work was considered as a Turkish counterpart of the *Hasht Bihisht*, the history of the Ottoman dynasty in Persian, of Idris Bidlisi (d. 1520), who completed his chronicle a bit later, in 1506. Both works summarized the previous achievements of early Ottoman historiography. When describing Mehmed II Fatih's campaign against Trebizond in 1461, Ibn-i Kemāl gave a short explanation to his readers for why the Sultan should have undertaken the long and laborious campaign outside the easternmost borders of the Ottoman Empire:

* **Correspondence details:** (Dmitry Korobeinikov), University at Albany SUNY, Department of History, Social Science 145, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany NY, USA, 12222; e-mail address: dkorobeinikov@albany.edu

This article is part of the themed section *Urban Agencies: Reframing Anatolian and Caucasian Cities (13th-14th Centuries)*, guest editors: Bruno De Nicola and Matthew Kinloch. To read all related articles, please access: dx.doi.org/10.1553/medievalworlds_no14_2021.

The famous nation (*taife*), called Romans (*Erum dimekle*), from the malicious faith of the Christians, of old took (*eline girübdurdi*) the lands of the climate of Rüm (*iklim-i Rüm*), famous for its pleasant weather and charm of landscape. They lived in the littoral of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, in the fortified places, and every region (*nahiye*) had its own independent ruler (*bir müstakil vali*), whom they customarily called Tekvur, and whom they showed submission and paid land tax (*haraj*) and military taxes (*rüsum-ı sipahi*). Some time ago some of those beys were defeated (*makhur idüb*), and the [Sultan] wanted to expel the rest, as he wished to raise high the banners of the sultanate inside the aforementioned community (*millet*) of the false Scripture. According to that plan he first destroyed by the hand of war the Tekvur¹ of Istanbul, who was the seminal ruler in the house (*re'isi belgi re'si menzilesindeydi*) of that community. Then he forced to bow one by one the Tekvur of İnöz, the Tekvur of Mora and the Tekvur of Amasra...².

The statement was noteworthy for its total dismissal of Byzantium as a single political and cultural entity, though the idea behind it was the title of the Ottoman sultan as *Sultan-ı İklim-i Rüm* (›Sultan of the climate of Rum‹),³ albeit the latter was based on geographical considerations: the ›climate of Rum‹, strictly speaking, meant the territory of the former Roman empire but hardly the empire itself, as the ›climate‹ suggested no political connotations. However, the ›climate of Rum‹ in Ibn-i Kemāl came as a distorted political entity. This came as no surprise. For the Ottoman historical tradition, be it the *Tevārīkh-i āl-i Osmān* of Āşīkpāşāzāde (composed in 1485 and continued until 1502) or the *Kitāb-i Cihān-nümā* of Meḥmed Neşri (composed in the 1490s), does not recognize Byzantium as a single unity. On the contrary, the Ottomans created the unified political space out of the possessions of the various *tekvurs*, each a master of a city: of Harman-Kaya, of Bilecik, of Bursa, to name but a few.

Ibn-i Kemāl's statement was by no means limited to a declaration of the military superiority of the Ottoman Empire, which, by way of conquest, made harmonious and unified the distorted political landscape of Christian possessions. That the Ottomans might have had a different view was demonstrated by Sultan Sulaymān the Magnificent, who called himself the shah of Baghdad in 'Iraq (*Shah-i Bagdād-i 'Irāq*), the Caesar of Rome (*qayşar-i Rüm*), and the sultan in Egypt (*Mişra* (i.e. *Mısra*) *Sultān*) in the inscription in the fortress of Bender (Bendery, Tighina) in Moldova, AH 945 (29 May 1538-18 May 1539).⁴ The title *qayşar-i Rüm* (Caesar of Rome) was a traditional designation of the Byzantine emperor in Persian and Ottoman sources (from the Arabic *al-qayşar al-Rüm*).

1 *Takwūr* (*t'agawor*, *tākvar*, *tekfur*, *tekvur*) was a traditional Turkish designation for a Christian ruler, usually before 1453, from the Armenian, *t'agawor*, ›king‹.

2 İbn Kemal, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Osman*, ed. Turan, 180.

3 Nuri Yurdusev, *Ottoman Attitude*, 33.

4 Marks, *K istorii Benderskoi kreposti*, 7-8; Sapozhnikov and Levchuk, *Iz istorii Benderskoi kreposti*, 306-337, accessed on 22 April 2020: docplayer.ru/57202915-Iz-istorii-benderskoy-kreposti-k-100-letiyu-knigi-n-a-marksa.html; Guboglu, *L'inscription turque de Bender*, 175-187; Çulpan, *Moldavya'da Bender Kalesi Kitabesi*, 49-51 (881-883); Eyice, *Bender Kalesi*, accessed on 24 April 2020: islamsansiklopedisi.org.tr/bender-kalesi. The inscription in Bender is popular enough to have been cited in Turkish newspapers – sometimes with the translation and the picture of the inscription. Cf. Karakaş, *Kanuni'nin kitabesi 101 yıl sonra yerinde*, accessed on 30 May 2020: www.milliyet.com.tr/gundem/kanuni-nin-kitabesi-101-yil-sonra-yerinde-2833045. The translation of the inscription: »Ben Allah'ın kuluyum, bu dünyanın sultanıyım. Tanrı'nın inayetiyle Ümmet-i Muhammed'in başındayım. Allah'ın faziletleri ve Muhammed'in mucizeleri benimle beraber gelirler. Adına Mekke ve Medine'de hutbe okunan Süleyman'ım ben. Ben, Bağdat'ta şah, Bizans diyarlarında kayser, Mısır'da sultanım. Donanmalarını Akdeniz, Mağrip ve Hind'e yollayan sultanım. Macar taht ve tacını alan ve onları bir kuluna bağışlayan sultan benim. Voyvoda Petru başkaldırdı, ancak atımın ayakları onu toz eyledi; Boğdan'ı da fethettim. Sene 945 Kaleyı yapan tarihini yazan Osman'ın soyundan gelen Süleyman (Hicri 945/ Miladi 1538).«

Sulaymān saw himself as a successor of the Byzantine emperors of old,⁵ though how exactly he expressed this depended greatly on the language employed by the respective department of the Ottoman chancery. For example, the Greek chancery of the sultan employed the Byzantine (or rather Byzantinized) translations of the Ottoman titles, e.g. Mehmed II Fatih (1444-1446; 1451-1481) conferred on himself the title »the great *authentēs* (»ruler«) and the great emir« (ὁ μέγας αὐθέντης κ(αι) μέγας ἀμοιράς) in his Greek charters,⁶ though, following the ḥadīth »If *qayṣar* perishes, there will be no *qayṣar* after him« (which was emphatically rendered as »the *qayṣar* will perish, and there will be no *qayṣar* after him«, سيهلك قيصر ولا قيصر بعده, after the conquest of Constantinople),⁷ he usually did not use the title in his Ottoman charters.⁸ His son Bayezid II (1481-1512) called himself, besides his father's title μέγας αὐθέντης,⁹ »Sultan Bayezid khan, by the grace of God the greatest *autokrator* in both Asia and Europe«, Σουλτάν Μπαγιαζετ χάν θ(εο)ῦ χάρητι μέγιστος αὐτοκράτωρ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἡπείρων Ἀσίας τε καὶ Εὐρώπης.¹⁰ Its variant »*autokrator* of the East and the West«, αὐτοκράτωρ Ἀνατολῆς καὶ

5 Abrahamowicz, *Osmanskii sultan kak vostochnorimskii imperator*, 103-105.

6 See, for example, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* 3, ed. Miklosich and Müller, 293; *Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Miscellanea documenti turchi, 1454-1813*, b.1 (accessed on 14 July 2020), document 1: *Mehmed II's letter to the Greek Archons of Morea*, p. 1 (26 December 1454), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=39572 (on the letter, see Wright »Eskisinden Daha Gönençli Olansınız«, 34-37); document 2: *Ahdname. The Treaty of Constantinople between Venice and Mehmed II*, p. 1 (25 January 1479), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=39573 (see Wright and MacKay, *When the Serenissima*, 269); document 3: *After receiving Giovanni Dario the sultan announces the conclusion of peace and sends Lütfi bey to Venice as his representative*, p. 1 (29 January 1479), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37555; document 6: *Mehmed II's letter to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo after the mission of Ambassador Benedetto Trevisan; permission for the citizens of Venice to travel in Ottoman domains*, p. 1 (7 October 1479), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37558; document 10: *Mehmed II's letter to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo on the border disputes between Venice and the Ottoman Empire*, p. 1 (7 January 1480), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37562

7 Gelibolulu Muṣṭafa 'Ālī, *Künhü'l-Aḥbār*, ed. Hüdayi Şentürk, 53.

8 Köhbach, *Çasar oder imperaṭor?*, 231-232. The ḥadīth can be found in al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī. The translation, trans. Muhsin Khan, vol. 4, 3027 (book 56:157), 3120-3121 (book 57:8), 3618 (book 61:25), pp. 165, 217, 492-493; vol. 8, 6629-6630 (83:3), p. 332; al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, ed. Şuhayb al-Karamī, 3027, 3120-3121, 3618, 6629-6630, pp. 579, 596, 692, 1267. Cf. Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, 3027 (sunnah.com/bukhari/56/235), 3120 (sunnah.com/bukhari/57/29), 3121 (sunnah.com/bukhari/57/30), 3618 (sunnah.com/bukhari/61/125), 6629 (sunnah.com/bukhari/83/9), 6630 (sunnah.com/bukhari/83/10); Saḥīḥ Muslim, 2918 a-b (sunnah.com/muslim/54/93) and sunnah.com/muslim/54/95); Jami' at-Tirmidhi, 2216 (sunnah.com/tirmidhi/33/59) (all accessed on 27 May 2020).

9 *Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Miscellanea documenti turchi, 1454-1813*, b.1 (accessed 15 July 2020), document 27: *Sultan Bayezid II asks Doge Giovanni Mocenigo via Ambassador Antonio Vitturi to renew the peace treaty between Venice and the Ottoman Empire*, p. 1 (12 January 1482), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37579.

10 Lefort, *Documents grecs dans les archives de Topkapı Sarayı*, 15-16, 67, 79, 100, 131, charter 19, line 2, charter 22, line 2; *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* 3, ed. Miklosich and Müller, 309-310; *Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Miscellanea documenti turchi, 1454-1813*, b.1 (all accessed on 16 July 2020), document 44: *Sultan Bayezid II receives Ambassador Andrea Zantani and confirms the peace treaty with Venice*, p. 1 (15 March 1499), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37596, document 77: *Preliminary peace treaty ('ahidnāme)*, p. 1 (24 December 1502), <http://www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37629>, document 103 (has elements of the Byzantine chrysobullos logos): *Letter of Bayezid II to Doge Leonardo Loredan concerning the exchange of the ambassadors and the oaths to observe the peace treaty*, p. 1 (8 August 1503), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37655, the Greek text of document 103 was the translation of the Ottoman letter of Bayezid II (document 101, 5-14 August 1503, www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37653). See also Selim I's 'ahidnāme (document 161, date: 17 October 1513), www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/document.htm?idUa=37714&idDoc=39753&first=0&last=1. Selim I's Greek title: Σουλτάν Σελιμ χάν θ(εο)ῦ χάρητι μέγιστος αὐτοκράτωρ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἡπείρων Ἀσίας τε καὶ Εὐρώπης can be found in document 163 (renewal of the previous treaty with the Republic of Venice, granted to Ambassador Antonio Giustinian, 25 October 1513), url: www.archivodistatovenezia.it/divenire/document.htm?idUa=37716&idDoc=39755&first=0&last=1.

Δύσεως,¹¹ was a combination of title *autokrator* (inherited from Byzantium) and the Grand Seljuqs' honorific ›king of the East and the West‹, the *malik al-mashriq wa al-maghrib*, which had been granted to Toghrıl-bey (I) (1040-1063) by Caliph al-Qā'im bi-Amr Allāh (1031-1075) on 25 Dhū al-Qa'da AH 449 (24 January 1058).¹²

Yet within the chancery of the Sublime Porte, save its Greek department, the title *qayşar-i Rūm* was a rarity, despite the fact that it was considered to have been part of Ottoman identity. For example, in their relations with the Hapsburgs, the Ottomans were reluctant to call their rivals in Vienna *Kaiser* (*rūmā'i çasar*),¹³ because this was a »corrupted« form of the title *qayşar*, which was considered to have been an equivalent of the sultan's title *şehinşāh* (*sahāhanshāh*) and was associated with the possession of Constantinople and the »seat of the *qayşars*«; instead, they preferred a more ›ideologically distant‹ title *imperaṭor*.¹⁴ The traditional title of the Ottoman sultans, which Sulaymān used on various occasions and, in particular, in his letter to King Francis I (1515-1547) on 11 Muḥarram AH 942 (12 July 1535), usually comprised other honorifics:

Sultan of Sultans, the Proof of the Khaqans, the one who distributes the great (lit. – Khusrau's) crowns over the earth, the shadow of Allah in the universe (lit. – ›both worlds‹), the Padishah and Sultan of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, of the provinces of Rumeli, Anadolu, Rum and Karaman...¹⁵

The power of the Ottoman sultan was seen as possession of a great number of provinces that the ancestors of Sulaymān the Magnificent had conquered with their sword. The later title of Sulaymān I in 1565 contained another notion:

I, who am Sultan of the Sultans of East and West, fortunate lord of the domains of the Romans, Persians and Arabs, Hero of creation, Champion of the earth and time, Padishah and Sultan of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, of the extolled Kaaba and Medina the illustrious and Jerusalem the noble, of the throne of Egypt and the province of Yemen, Aden and Sana'a, of Baghdad and Basra and Lahsa and Ctesiphon, of the lands of Algiers and Azerbaijan, of the regions of the Kipchaks and the lands of the Tartars, of Kurdistan and Luristan and all Rumelia, Anatolia and Karaman, of Wallachia and Moldavia and Hungary and many kingdoms and lands besides; Sultan Suleyman Khan, son of Sultan Selim Khan.¹⁶

11 Lefort, *Documents grecs dans les archives de Topkapı Sarayı*, charter 22, line 2.

12 Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān fī tāriḫ al-a'yān*, ed. Sevim, 24-26; (reprinted in: Sevim, *Mir'ātü'z-Zaman Fi Tarihi'l-Āyan*, 47-49); al-Ḥusaynī, *Akhbār al-dawlat al-saljūqiyya*, MS British Museum, Stowe Or. 7, fol. 11a (reprinted as a *facsimile* in al-Ḥusaynī, *Soobscheniia o Sel'djukskom gosudarstve*, ed. Buniatov, 36); al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'riḫ al-mulūk wa al-umam* 8, 182; al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'riḫ al-mulūk wa al-umam* 16, ed. Ābd al-Qādir Ātā and Ābd al-Qādir Ātā, 19-20; al-Bundārī, *Zubdat al-nuṣra wa nukhbat al-uṣra*, ed. Houtsma, 13-15; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī al-tāriḫ* 9, ed. Tornberg, 633-634; trans. Richards, 114-115; Bar Hebraeus, *Ktābā d-maktbānut zabnē*, ed. Bedjan, 237-238; *idem*, ed. and trans. Budge, 211-212; *idem*, MS Bodleian Library, Hunt 52, fols. 74, col. 2-74v, col. 1; Mirkhwānd, *Tāriḫ rawḍat al-ṣafā'* 4, ed. Sabūkhī, 261-263; Bosworth, *Political and Dynastic History*, 46-47.

13 Cf. Fekete, *Türkische Schriften*, 4 and 208 (accessed on 22 May 2020: library.hungaricana.hu/hu/view/MolDigiLib_VSK_turkische_schriften/?pg=300&layout=s).

14 Köhbach, *Çasar oder imperaṭor?*, 229-234.

15 Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili*, 148-149.

16 Fekete, *Einführung in die Osmanisch-Türkische Diplomatie*, xxxii (accessed on 22 May 2020: library.hungaricana.hu/en/view/MolDigiLib_VSK_Einfuehrung/?pg=33&layout=s); Nuri Yurdusev, *Ottoman Attitude*, 19; Lewis, *Modern Turkey*, 31. I use the translation by Lewis here.

Here, the expression »fortunate lord of the domains of the Romans, Persians and Arabs«, the *ṣāhib qirān-i mamālik-i Rūm va 'Ajam va 'Arab* (صاحب قران ممالک روم و عجم و عرب) combined the honorific *ṣāhibqirān* (lit. – »the one who is under the lucky combination of stars«), so popular in the Timurid times, possession of the lands of Byzantium, and the ancient Arab title *mawālī al-'Arab wa al-'Ajam* (»Lord of the Arabs and non-Arabs (i.e. the Persians)«, employed *inter alia* by the Great Seljuqs (in particular, by Sultan Malik-shāh (1073-1092) in his famous inscription at Nishapur (AH 465-485/1065-1085)).¹⁷

The notions of Rum in the inscription in Bender, in the letter of Sulaymān I the Magnificent to Francis I, and in the title of 1565 were starkly different. While in the first case Rum meant the Byzantine Empire as a single unit, the Rum in the letter addressed to Francis I was just a territory alongside other provinces, like Karaman or Anadolu. In that sense, Rum was the province (*eyalet*) of Sivas (also called »*eyalet* of Rum«), which of old was the northeastern part of the Seljuq sultanate of Rum and the territory of the emirate of Aratna/Eretna and his successors (1336-1380), including the state of Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Aḥmad (1381-1398);¹⁸ these, however, did not include Erzurum (Arzan al-Rūm, the Erz-i Rūm of Sulaymān I's charters) and Diyarbakır (Diyār Bakr).¹⁹ Sulaymān I's title in 1565 was far more »universal« than the one in the letter to King Francis I, but again, the Rum there was a combination of »kingdoms«, not a single united empire.

Yet the inscription in Bender was by no means addressed, nor a concession, to a Christian audience. The Latin translation of the title of Sulaymān I (made in Hungary) might have comprised the traditional titles of the Byzantine emperors employed in Western chanceries for centuries, like, for example, *imperator Constantinopolitanus*; or the Latin title *rex regum* (»king of kings«) of the Byzantine coins.²⁰ However, the Ottoman inscriptions in Hungary, a country with a predominantly Christian population, listed no Byzantine titles.²¹ On the contrary, in his inscriptions on the candlesticks brought from the cathedral of St Stephan in Buda (Budin), now at either side of the *mihrāb* (mihrab) of the Hagia Sophia, dated to AH 933 (8 October 1526-26 September 1527), Sulaymān the Magnificent called himself »Cihān Sahib-kıran-ı Hān« (»The Khan of the world, the one who is under the lucky combination of stars«) and »Sultan of al-Aqṣā, Egypt, Kaaba, and Syria«. ²² All the components correlated to the titles which were used by Sulaymān in his letter to the king of France: the mosque al-Aqṣā symbolized Sulaymān's power over Jerusalem, the *Kuds-i Şerīf* in his letter to Francis I; Kaaba was a symbol of Mecca; while Mısır (Egypt) and Şam (Syria) were mentioned in the list of countries which Sulaymān ruled.

17 Blair, *Monumental Inscriptions*, 170, n. 64.

18 Kennedy (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Islam*, maps 50 and 51: »Anadolu and Rumeli in the later 13th/19th century«.

19 Schaendlinger (with Römer), *Die Schreiben Süleymāns des Prächtigen*, . 12, 16, N 7.

20 Papp, *Die Verleihungs-, Bekräftigungs- und Vertragsurkunden der Osmanen für Ungarn und Siebenbürgen*, 150, 153: *ego szultan Szoleymanus Schyak caesar caesarum Dei gratia gloriosus magnus et invictissimus imperator Constantinopolitanus, rex regum, dator coronam* (correx: *coronas*, see below the title of the Ottoman Sultan »the one who distributes the crowns«), *umbraculum Dei super terram dominator Magni Maris et Inferioris, dominus Maioris et Minoris Asiae, Africe et Europe*

21 Tollius, *Epistolae Itinerariae*, ed. Hennin, 150, 198-200, 205-206, 235; Tütüncü, *Osmanlı'nın Kuzey-Batı Sınırı Macaristan ve Slovakya'da Osmanlı Anıtları*, 645-655.

22 Tütüncü, *Osmanlı'nın Kuzey-Batı Sınırı Macaristan ve Slovakya'da Osmanlı Anıtları*, 647-649.

Even so, the inscription in Bender was by no means an isolated phenomenon. Besides the representation of the sultan's power as an agglomeration of the provinces under his sway (which resulted in the prolix titles of Sulaymān I in his letter to the king of France), there was another approach, focusing on the Ottoman Empire as the heir of empires of old.

Qayşar-i Rūm and the Universal Aspirations of the Ottomans

The tradition listed five sovereigns of all the lands, »who because of their greatness were not called by their names«, but were known by their special titles: the padishah of India (*Hindūstān*), whose title was *rāy*;²³ the pādishāh of Rum, *qayşar*; the pādishāh of China (*Chīn wa Māchīn*), *faghfūr*;²⁴ the pādishāh of Turkestan, *khāqān*; and the pādishāh of Iran (*Irān wa Tūrān*), *shāhanshāh*.²⁵ Although the cited version of the theory of five rulers was from the *Tuzik-i Timūri*, or the *Autobiography of Tamerlane*, which is considered by some scholars a Mughal fake, the theory of five kings was formed at the beginning of the Islamic era, in the ninth century, if not earlier. The four most powerful potentates in the universe were mentioned for the first time by Suleymān al-Tājir (fl. 851) (though the theory itself was thought to have originated in India): the most prominent was the king of the Arabs (*malik al-'arab*), the second was the emperor of China (*malik al-Şīn*), the third was the Byzantine emperor (*malik al-Rūm*) and the fourth Ballaharā, the king of the people »whose ears are perforated«, which might have suggested a Rāshtrakūta king of the Deccan.²⁶ A later list, dated to 872, whose alleged author was the Chinese emperor himself (he might have been Emperor I-Tsung (859-873) of the T'ang dynasty), stated that the richest and most powerful was the king of 'Irāq, called *king of kings* (*malik al-mulūk*, an Arabic translation of the title *shāhanshāh*); then he, the emperor of China, also called *king of the mankind* (*malik al-nās*); then the king of the Turks (*malik al-Turk*), or *king of the wild beasts* (or *the lions'*, *malik al-sibā'*); and after him, the king of India (*malik al-Hind*), who was appropriately called *king of the elephants* (*malik al-fiyala*) and also *king of wisdom* (*malik al-ḥikma*), because India was the motherland of philosophy. The Byzantine emperor (*malik al-Rūm*), or *king of the great men* (*malik al-rijāl*) was the last in the list of the five rulers.²⁷ The theory of five kings obviously had traces of the Sasanian period, hence the title *shāhanshāh* and the mention of the Turks of the Great Turkic Khaganate, who were noted as »the neighbours of China« in the list of 872 and who were indeed destroyed by the Chinese and other fellow Turks in 744. The list supposedly originated in a Buddhist milieu, but was seemingly adapted to Islamic practices, hence the first place of the »king of 'Irāq«, whose title, *malik al-mulūk* or *shāhanshāh*, suggested an 'Abbasid caliph as successor of the Sasanian shahs. It survived for centuries. In the first quarter of the thirteenth century, the geographer Yāqūt al-Hamawī (d. 1229) mentioned the legend of Kirmanshah where Khusrau II Parvêz (590-628) had gathered four kings in his castle, and these were the *faghfūr*, king of China; the *khāqān*, king of the Turks; the *dāhir*, king of India;

23 In other variants Dārā (Darius), as the name was understood as a title.

24 Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* 2, entry 227: *Faghfur*, ed. Hambis, 652-661. I am grateful to Professor Qui Yihao (Shanghai) for his consultations on Pelliot.

25 *Institutes political and military*, ed. White, 58-59; *Ulozheniie Temura*, trans. Karomatov, 58.

26 Sulaymān al-Tājir, *Ajā' ib al-dunyā wa-qiyās al-buldān*, ed. Shāhīn al-Mirrikhī, 45; Sulaymān al-Tājir, *Akhbār al-Şīn wa'l-Hind. An Account of China and India*, trans. and comm. Maqbul Ahmad, 42, 65-66.

27 Al-Sirafī, *Silsilat al-tawārikh* 2, ed. Reinaud, 79; see also *idem*, *Silsilat al-tawārikh* 1, ed. Reinaud, 81-82.

and the *qayşar*, king of Rum or Byzantium.²⁸ The Timurid chronicles repeatedly called Sultan Bayezid I Yıldırım (1389-1402) *qayşar-i Rûm*, because he ruled one of those great kingdoms which was defeated by *amîr* Timur Gurgan (Gürgân, Güregen) (1370-1404).²⁹ However, in the famous correspondence between Bayezid I and Timur, the title *qayşar-i Rûm* was not employed. In his first letter to the Ottoman sultan,³⁰ Timur addressed Bayezid I as »the King in Rum«, *al-malik fî al-Rûm*.³¹ In his replies to Timûr's letters, Bayezid I used the title »Tekvur« as an offensive word: »Know this, you rapacious dog, who is called Timûr and who is more infidel than the Byzantine Emperor (lit. »the king Takfûr«, *al-malik al-Takfûr*)«. ³² The notion of the five kingdoms was presented in one of the honorific titles (*laqabs: elqâb, alqâb*) of the Ottoman sultans, preserved in the »Münşeat üs-Selâtîn« by Feridun Bey Ahmed (d. 1583).³³ Though the work of Feridun Bey was full of forgeries, nevertheless the titles which he listed were genuine.³⁴ In any case, they might have represented the history of ideas at the time of the younger contemporary of Sulaymân the Magnificent. One of the *laqabs* preserved by Feridun Bey in a special chapter, reads:

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 Khusrau, the palace of supremacy and power of Nushirwan, the throne of justice, the rule of the Caesar (*âyîn-i qayşar*), Jamshid of the realm (lit. – place), Khurshid of the world, the khâqân, the one who distributes the crowns, the possessor of the countries, the sultan, the one who sits on the throne, the *şâhibqirân*, the padishah of the kingdom, the successful one.³⁵

It is easy to see that the Ottoman sultan was presented as the master of three out of five kingdoms: the Persian pādishāh (*pādshāh*), the Byzantine emperor (*qayşar*), and the Turkic hakan (*khâqân*).

Thus, Ibn-i Kemâl had a choice. That he knew those theories is confirmed, first, by the place of his description of the *Iklim-i Rûm* within the structure of the *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*: he wanted to describe the world the Ottomans were about to finish just before the campaign of Mehmed II Fatih against the Empire of Trebizond in 1461, conquest of which made the sultan an undisputed sovereign of what once was the Byzantine empire. And secondly, on the verbal level, he used the expression »heir to the kingdom of qayşer« (*vârih-i mülk-i qayşar*), which he applied to Bayezid II in his encomium to Mehmed II. He also praised

28 Yâqût ibn 'Abd Allâh al-Ĥamawî, *Mu'jam al-buldân*, 4, 9555, ed. Farîd 'Abd al-'Azîz Jundî, 375-376; *idem*, *Mu'jam al-buldân*, 4, ed. (Beirut, 1977) 330-331; Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* 2, ed. Hambis, 653, 655.

29 Cf. Sharaf al-Dîn 'Alî Yazdî, *Ẓafar-nameh*, MS Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 3268, fols. 233a-234a; *idem*, *Zafar-name. Kniga pobed amira Timura*, trans. Akhmedov, 265-266; Navâ'î, *Asnâd*, 95-96.

30 Timur sent four letters to Bayezid I between 1399 and 1402.

31 Navâ'î, *Asnâd*, 92.

32 Navâ'î, *Asnâd*, 94. The expression »the infidel Takfûr«, *Takfûr-i kafûr*, was used in the letter of Bâyezîd I sent to Sultan Aĥmad Jalâyirîd (1382-1410) of Baghdad circa 10 May 1396 (*idem*, *Asnâd*, 83-84). The *Takfûr-i kafûr* was either Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos (1391-1425) or his co-emperor John VII Palaiologos, who acted as a regent in 1399-1403. A similar mention of the »accursed Takfûrs« (*Takfûrân-i malâ'in*) occurred in Bâyezîd I's reply to the second letter of Timûr (*idem*, *Asnâd*, 102). Anoošahr, *Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam*, 120-128; Kaçar, *A Mirror for the Sultan*, 273-276.

33 On him, see Özcan, Feridun Ahmed Bey, accessed on 30 May 2020: islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/feridun-ahmed-bey.

34 Cf. İnalçık, Power relationships between Russia, the Crimea and the Ottoman Empire, 192-199.

35 Feridun-bey Ahmed, *Münşaat-i Selatin*, vol. 1, 4.

Mehmed for destruction of the community of the *tekvurs* of Istanbul, Tarabuzan (Trebizond), Mora (Morea), Amasra (Amastris), and Midillü (Mytilene, Lesbos).³⁶ The arbitrariness of his construction is evident from the fact that one of the rulers of the list, the ›tekvur‹ of Amasra, was actually a member of the Genoese administration in the city outside Byzantine control.

A Kingdom or Just a Genoese Castle? Ibn-i Kemal's Narrative of Amasra

I do not suggest that Ibn-i Kemal *invented* the *tekvur* of Amasra: the same story of how Amasra and its *tekvur* surrendered to Mehmed II was narrated in Ibn-i Kemal's primary sources, the chronicles of ʿĀşıkpaşazâde (d. between 1491 and 1502) and Mehmed Neşri (d. circa 1520).³⁷ However, he masterfully transformed the story for his own purposes. To understand the context of the Ottoman sources, one needs to recall the real circumstances of Amasra in the fifteenth century.

Amasra (Amastris in the Byzantine, and Samastro in the Genoese documents), was a Genoese colony with its own consul. Its foundation should be dated to the period of the dogate of Simone Boccanegra (1339-1344, 1356-1363), or even later, between 1374 and 1378.³⁸ In March 1454, Mehmed II demanded that Samastro should recognize his authority (*samastrensem locum in suam jurisdictionem postulavit obtinere*)³⁹ instead of being under the sway of a ›Tatar empire‹ (*Samastram non subesse Imperio tartarorum, set esse potius in Turchia*). The Ottoman demands were met by the signoria, who recommended its ambassadors Luciano Spinola and Baldassarre Maruffo agree with the Ottoman terms (on 11 March 1454), but the embassy never reached the sultan.⁴⁰ During the summer of 1454 the Ottoman and Tatar (under Hâjji Giray I (1441–1466)) forces attacked Caffa, the capital city of Genoese Gazaria. As a result, Caffa agreed to pay a tribute to both the Ottomans and the Crimean Tatars, without the consent of Genoa. Caffa began to pay its tribute to the Tatars on 23 July 1454.⁴¹ The tribute to the Ottomans was settled much later, by 11 September 1454.⁴² It is unlikely that the signoria, when giving instructions to Luciano Spinola and Baldassarre Maruffo in March 1454, already knew that Caffa would be jointly attacked by the Ottomans and the Crimean Tatars, and that the tribute of Caffa, whose administration ruled Samastro, would be an issue of the future talks with both Mehmed II and Hâjji Giray I. Though the ›Tatar empire‹ mentioned in the instructions was most likely the Crimean Khanate (there was evidence from 1458 that the *imperator tartarorum* had possessions near Tana, which suggested Hâjji Giray I),⁴³ it is not completely excluded that in the case of Samastro in March 1454, an

36 İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. Turan, 540, 544.

37 ʿĀşıkpaşazâde, ed. Öztürk, 212-214; Derviş Aḥmed ʿĀşiqî, *Menâqib ve-tevâriḥ-i Âl-i ʿUtmân*. MS Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. or. oct. 2448, fols. 247b-249b. Accessed on 20 May 2020: digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN683354299&PHYSID=PHYS_0008; Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 300; *Gihânnümâ. Die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlânâ Mehmed Neschrî*, 1: MS Cod. Menzel, ed. Taeschner, 189-190.

38 Karpov, *Ital'ianskiie morskiiie respubliki*, 71.

39 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 106: document xxxiii. Accessed on 20 May 2020: www.storiapatriagenova.it/BD_vs_contenitore.aspx?Id_Scheda_Bibliografica_Padre=99&Id_Progetto=0.

40 Prima serie, ed. Belgrano, 269. Accessed on 20 May 2020: www.storiapatriagenova.it/BD_vs_contenitore.aspx?Id_Scheda_Bibliografica_Padre=150&Id_Progetto=0.

41 Dzhanov, Kaffa, Krymskoie khanstvo i osmany, 95-105.

42 Dzhanov, Kaffa, Krymskoie khanstvo i osmany, 105-107.

43 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 832: document cccc (24 March 1458).

earlier tribute (and jurisdiction) was meant, *before* any Crimean attack against Caffa. If so, the expression *Imperio tartarorum* actually suggested an Anatolian power, as in March 1454 Samastro was far from the Tatar realms across the Black Sea, be these the Crimean Khanate or the Golden Horde under Küçük Muḥammad (1435-1459) (or his successors till 1502). The *Imperio tartarorum* in Asia Minor could only have been the state of the *amīr* Timur Gurgan (1370-1404), the powerful master of Samarqand, who destroyed the army of Sultan Bayezid I in 1402 and acted as a supreme ruler in Asia Minor when imposing tributes and restoring the states which had been conquered by the Ottomans. The Timurid state under Abū Saʿīd b. Muḥammad b. Mirān Shāh (1451-1469) still existed as a shadow of the once first-ranking power in Transoxiana, and in the eastern, central and western parts of Persia as far as 'Irāq-i 'Ajam. Its prestige slowly faded. The old tribute, which might have been established by Timur, was imposed on the Genoese city officially located on Turkish land. The dubious status of Samastro was promptly mentioned by Ruy González de Clavijo, the Castilian ambassador, who visited the city on 25 March 1404 en route to Samarqand: *La cual dicha villa de Samastro es de Genoveses, y está en la tierra de la Turquía junta con el mar en un otero muy alto*[...].⁴⁴ The text of the Genoese document evidently suggested that Samastro enjoyed the so-called double suzerainty, being a part of both the Genoese colonial empire and the local Muslim power, and thus within the lands of *dār al-'ahd*, the lands of the covenant, which, strictly speaking, were part of the lands of Islam, the *dār al-Islām*, from 1402-1403 or 1454, although the Genoese authorities insisted that it was a remote outpost of the Genoese empire.⁴⁵

An additional aspect of Amasra's judicial status was the circumstances of how the city's tribute was actually paid. Samastro's tribute to the Ottomans had to be paid separately from Caffa's.⁴⁶ Moreover, the city of Samastro was excluded from the terms of the Genoese-Ottoman treaty of 18 July 1455.⁴⁷ It seems that Samastro had to deal with the sultan on its own, as the books of the massaria of Caffa for 11 April 1458 reported a visit of the embassy of Samastro to the ›Lord of the Teucric‹ (*ad dominum teucrum*), which meant the Ottoman sultan.⁴⁸

44 Clavijo, *Embajada a Tamorlán*. Accessed on 30 July 2020: www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra-visor/vida-y-hazanas-del-gran-tamorlan-con-la-descripcion-de-las-tierras-de-su-imperio-y-senorio--o/html/feed4b6c-82b1-11df-acc7-002185ce6064_1.htm#1; *idem*, *Itinéraire de l'Ambassade Espagnole*, 109; *idem*, *Embassy to Tamerlane*, 57.

45 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 594, document cclvii (23 March 1456).

46 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 866 (1459), 917: document ccccxvi (4 April 1459).

47 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 299: document cxvii.

48 Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1241: Massaria Caffae 1457-58, fol. 143r. I thank Dr Alexander Dzhhanov (Kiev, Ukraine) for checking the books of the massaria of Caffa for the years 1457-1460. The data concerning Samastro in the unpublished text of the massaria's books was collated and transcribed by him.

The city had been besieged by the Ottomans by 9 September 1459,⁴⁹ and was surrendered to them sometime in September or October 1459.⁵⁰ The destruction (*perditionum*) of Samastro was mentioned in the massaria's books on 10 March 1460.⁵¹ The enigmatic *tekvur* of Amasra was either its last consul, Francesco Spinola, elected in February-March 1459 (though he never took the office)⁵² or, more likely, its penultimate consul, Bartolomeo di Lavello, who was elected on 1 December 1456⁵³ and whose mandate officially ended on 16 May 1459.⁵⁴ The unfortunate Bartolomeo survived *in situ* the *perditionum* in 1459 of Samastro, which he tried in vain to defend; his debts to the commune of Caffa, caused by the Ottoman siege and the subsequent fall of Amasra, were mentioned in the massaria's book on 10 March 1460.⁵⁵

Like 'Aşıkpâşâzâde and Meḥmed Neşrî before him, Ibn-i Kemâl decided to omit all these details. But he went further: in the narratives of 'Aşıkpâşâzâde and Neşrî the story of Amasra was that of the excellent fortress, inhabited by the infidels, whose ›padishah‹ was a Frank (Fireng) and who gave shelter to fugitive slaves from all over Anatolia, who committed piracy and »without questions« (*sorıcak gayrı*) expropriated even the Ottoman state ships. Ibn-i Kemâl deleted the »Fireng Pâdishâh« from the narrative and replaced him with the »independent ruler« (*müstakil valisi*),⁵⁶ but his most important innovation was a structural one: instead of just mentioning the conquests of Meḥmed II in a strict chronological order, he tried to differentiate these by groups. Contrary to all the historical circumstances, still traceable in 'Aşıkpâşâzâde and Neşrî, the consul of Amasra lost his ›Frankish‹ characteristics and became one of those *tekvurs* whose chief master was the emperor of Byzantium. The ruler of Amasra was not the only Genoese who was treated in this way. As far as Asia Minor was concerned, other Genoese possessions on the peninsula and the islands, namely the

49 Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1240: Massaria Caffae 1457-58, fol. 72r. Cf. Mioni, *Una inedita cronaca bizantina*, 77 (#57), 86: September AM 6968 = September AD 1459. The same year of AM 6968 is given in almost all other short Greek chronicles which mentioned the fall of Samastro: *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken* 1, ed. Schreiner, 476 (#16), 536 (#46), 581 (#12); *idem* 2, ed. Schreiner, 498 (with a suggestion of the date of AM 6969 = 1 September 1460-31 August 1461). The year of AM 6968 of the Byzantine era began on 1 September 1459 and ended on 31 August 1460; see Grumel, *La chronologie*, 128, 263; Kuzenkov, *Khristianskiie khronologicheskiie sistemy*, 330, 519.

50 The date is based on the discrepancy in the Ottoman sources. They mention the fall of Amasra either in AH 863 (8 November 1458-27 October 1459) or AH 864 (28 October 1459-16 October 1460). The surrender of Amasra and the repopulation of the city on the orders of the sultan did not take place momentarily but required the presence of Meḥmed II for some time, probably from the end of AH 863 to the beginning of AH 864 (October 1459). İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. Turan, 179; Neşrî, ed. Öztürk, 300; *idem*, 2, ed. Unat and Köymen, 740-741; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 190; Tursun Beg, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, ed. Inalcik and Murphey, 44-45; Karpov, *Ital'ianskiie morskiie*, 76.

51 Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1228: Massaria Caffae 1459-1460, fol. 27v.

52 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 858, 891: document ccccxvi (14 February 1459), 908: document ccccxvii (9 March 1459), 929: document ccccxli (16 May 1459), 866 (1459): document ccccxvi, 917 (4 April 1459).

53 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 664 (1453-1457): document cccxvi (1 December 1456).

54 Codice diplomatico, ed. Amédeo Vigna, 929: document ccccxli (16 May 1459).

55 Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1228: Massaria Caffae 1459-1460, fol. 27v: +MCCCCLX die X marcii. *Bartholomeus lauelus debet nobis pro Introitu massarie Samastri per ipsum exactis in diversis partitis ab anno de 1458 citra usque ad perditionum (=perditionem) Samastri ut per eius rationem destinte apparet asperos de ottomano sex milia sex centum sex decim valent ad rationem asperorum CX de ottomano pro asperis ducentorum caffè et dicta pro comune Ianue (in Caffa) de LVI asperos XII XXVII* (transcription by A. Dzhanov). I am grateful to Dr A. Dzhanov (Kiev) for his help with, and transcriptions of, the books of Massaria Caffae.

56 İbn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. Turan, 176-179.

Gattilusio state in Lesbos, also belonged to the »community of the *tekvurs*«, a late Byzantine commonwealth of sorts in Anatolia. The Gattilusio rulers, and in particular the last master of Lesbos, Niccolò (1458-1462), were traditionally called *tekvurs* on the pages of ʿĀşıkpāşāzāde and Meḥmed Neşri, but both failed to mention any community to which the *tekvur* might have belonged (though the Gattilusio maintained close matrimonial connections with the Byzantine imperial dynasty). Likewise, the early Ottoman chroniclers were perfectly aware that the consul of Amasra was a ›Franc‹.⁵⁷ For them, a bare fact of the conquest had spoken for itself.

And yet the attempt at universality in Ibn-i Kemāl's chronicle was not without fault. Had he wanted to elevate Mehmed II, he would have used a more appropriate notion of one of five kingdoms, and the Ottoman sultan as a master of Rum. Instead, in his encomium to Mehmed II, he created a more nuanced picture. Mehmed II had conquered three groups of states: the city-states of the *tekvurs* (Constantinople/Istanbul, Morea/Mora, Trebizond/Trabuzan, Mytilene/Midillü on Lesbos, and Samastro/Amasra); the countries ruled by dynasties or kings, like the king of Bosnia (Bosna Kırālı, which means Stephen II Tomašević (1461-1463)), or the duke of St Sava (Hersek, Herzegovina, under Stjepan Vukčić Kosača (1435-1466) and his successor Vlatko Hercegović (1466-1482)); and the whole assembly of the Bosnian, Montenegrin and Serbian noble families, such as Pavlı-oğlu, which means Duke (Vojvoda) Petar II Pavlović-Radosavljević (1450-1463) of Bosnia and his brother Lord (Knez) Nikola Pavlović (1450-1463), or Çirni-oğlu, who was Lord Stefan Crnojević (Stefanica (1451-1465), or his successor Ivan the Black Crnojević (1465-1490) of Zeta. The list ends with the despotate of Serbia (Laz) and the possessions of the Republic of Venice, which included, as Ibn-i Kemāl mistakenly insists, even Caffa.⁵⁸

It is easy to see how artistically the list was composed: it included two hierarchical orders – one descending, and another ascending. The descending order was that of titles and nobility: it began with »emperors« (*tekvurs*), continued with kings and lords, and ended with the state whose ruler was no king in the Ottoman eyes, the master (Doge) of Venice, called just Venedik beği (the title of beğ was one of the lowest in the Ottoman hierarchy). The ascending list was that of territories: the smallest ones (the *tekvurs*') were mentioned at the beginning, and the largest (Serbia) and most powerful (Venice) ones were listed at the end.

The discrepancy between the universal aspirations of the Ottomans and the »nucleotide« description of the *İklim-i Rûm* in Ibn-i Kemāl, in which each ›*tekvur*‹ had a region (*nahiye*), rooted not only in the perception of the Byzantine cities on the part of the Ottomans, but also in the Ottoman historical tradition, which emerged sometime at the end of the fourteenth century and described the Ottoman advance of the thirteenth and the first half of the fourteenth century as ›frog leaps‹ within the chain of towns and castles of the boundary zone, often with overlapping viewsheds. Almost every town had its own *tekvur*.

57 *Āşıkpaşazāde*, ed. Öztürk, 212-214, 229-231; Derviş Aḥmed ʿĀşiqi, *Menāqib*, MS Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. or. oct. 2448, fols. 247b-249b, 264a-266a; Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 300, 307; *idem* 1, ed. Taeschner, 189-190, 196.

58 Ibn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. Turan, 540-541.

Fortresses Where a New State Began: The Cases of the Ottomans and the Karamanids

According to the Ottoman tradition, the springboard of the Ottoman expansion was the Seljuq territory within the triangle of small towns of Sultan Öyüğü-Eskişehir, Söğüt, and İnönü.⁵⁹ Further west there was the castle of İnegöl (Angelokomis), whose *tekvur* had the name of Hagios Nikolaos (Aya Nikola), which was obviously the name of a local church taken as a person's name. According to Āşıkpāşazāde and Neşri, Bilecik (Belokomis) with its own *tekvur* and his brother Kalonoz, Yar-hisar (also with its own *tekvur*, whose daughter, Lülüfer Hatun, once a bride of the *tekvur* of Bilecik, became wife of Orhan I (1324-1362)), Köprühisar (also with a *tekvur*) and Yenişehir (Melangeia) had been conquered by Osman by AH 699 (28 September 1299-15 September 1300),⁶⁰ whilst the *Tavārikh-i al-i Osmān* (MS Bodleian Library) gives another date: AH 687 (6 February 1288-24 January 1289).⁶¹ The community of the *tekvurs* (which also included the *tekvurs* of Bursa, Adranoz, Batanoz/Bidnos, Kestel (Kastellon), and Kite), seemingly connected with Nicaea (Iznik) and Qustantiniyye (Constantinople, Istanbul), became a part of the first scene of the Ottoman advance.⁶² It finished with the last *tekvurs*, conquered by Meḥmed II.

The nucleus of these possessions was precisely described: it was a *hisar*, a fortress, which controlled the adjacent territory, in the same way as Köprühisar controlled access to the environs of Yenişehir; and the fall of the former meant a conquest of the latter.⁶³ Most interestingly, the »fortress story«, or the memory of a location where a future polity came into being, became an essential part of historical tales throughout Anatolia. In this, the Ottomans, with their eponymous fortress of Söğüt (in Neşri's wording: Söğüd Dervendi kal'ası)⁶⁴ as the first possession of Ertoğrul-gazi, the founder of the Ottoman state, were not unique. A similar tale can be found in other primary sources in Anatolia.

For example, the foundation of the Karamanoğulları (Karamanids, Qarāmān oğhlānları)⁶⁵ beylik was described by Ibn Bibī (d. after 1284/85), whose account gave interesting details of how a new state could have been established. According to Ibn Bibī,

59 Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 33-35; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 23-24.

60 Derviş Aḥmed 'Āşiqi, *Menāqib*, MS Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. or. oct. 2448, fols. 18a-31a; Āşıkpaşazāde, ed. Öztürk, 18-29; Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 30-46; *idem*, 1, ed. Unat and Köymen, 60-105; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 20-32.

61 *Tavārikh-i al-i Osmān*, MS Bodleian Library, Rawl. Or 5, fol. 17; cf. *İstanbul'un fethinden önce yazılmış tarihi takvimler*, ed. Turan, 16-17 (AH 650), 52-53 (AH 655); İdris Bidlisi, *Tā'rih-i Hasht-Bihisht*, MS Bodleian Library, Ouseley 358, fols. 61b-63b (AH 698).

62 Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 36-51; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 25-35.

63 Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 42, 46; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 28-29, 32.

64 Neşri, ed. Öztürk, 26; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 18.

65 On this variant of the name of the Karamanoğulları, see Yazıcızāde 'Alī, *Selçuk-nāme*, ed. Bakır, fol. 400a.

The father of the sons of Qarāmān at the beginning of his career was from Turkmen coalminers on the borders of Armenia, known as the province (*vilāyet*) of Qamar al-Dīn. He continually carried charcoal from the mountains to Lāranda, and by this he sustained his family and children. During the time of disturbance in the kingdom of Rūm, [when] Bāyjū-nūyan appeared for the second time, he seized the opportunity as is customary among the rebellious and corrupted people, and with the group of his companions (*bā qaumī az abnā'i jins-i khwēsh*) he began to collect the mob (lit. 'assembly', *jam'iyat*) and became engaged in highway-robbery (*rāh-zanī*) and violence (*ḥarāmī-garī*). When the late Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs Gharīb (the Stranger, i.e. 'Izz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II) – let Allah illuminate [him] with His proof – was forced to leave his protected kingdoms, and the Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıç Arslān⁶⁶ – let Allah cover him with the cloth of His atonement – now possessed both parts of the realm, he gave promises to, and [instigated] hopes of, Qarāmān and lured him to a trap of obedience and a net of submission. And he granted him the office of an amīr (*amārāt*), a high dignity (*manṣab*), and a great estate (*iqṭā'-i buzurğ*).⁶⁷

The grant of the estate (*iqṭā'*) and the title took place after Rukn al-Dīn Qilij Arslān IV entered Konya on 14 Ramaḍān AH 659 (12 August 1261)⁶⁸ – the date is confirmed by one of the short chronicles.⁶⁹ It is understandable why he was forced to bribe Qarāmān-bey with grants and titles, because at the same time the Seljuq and Mongol troops tried to put down the rebellion of Meḥmed-bey of Denizli,⁷⁰ and the Sultan, whose resources were limited, could not have afforded another military campaign at that time. However, Qarāmān-bey, who was a supporter of the exiled sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II (1246-1256; 1257-1261),⁷¹ did not want to remain loyal to Qilij Arslān IV. Soon Qarāmān-bey and his kinsmen rebelled again in the province of Armenia. A hard-fought battle, in which the army of *parwāna* Mu'īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, the uncrowned head of the sultanate, managed to defeat the joint army of Qarāmān-bey and the Turks of Ermenak, took place at the fortress of Kāvala (Kabal(l)a, modern Gevale Kalesi, 11 km northwest of Konya)⁷² in the autumn or winter of 1261.⁷³ When Qarāmān-bey died (seemingly some time after the battle), his brother Būñsūz, the *amīr-i jāndār* (the head of the sultan's bodyguards) of the sultanate, submitted himself to the sultan. It is not clear what forced Būñsūz to surrender. He was imprisoned and, it seems, soon died. The elder, grown-up sons of Qarāmān-bey were sent to the fortress of Kāvala. However, after the death of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Qilij Arslān IV in 1265 the sons of Qarāmān-bey were dispatched (obviously as prisoners) to various fortresses across the sultanate. Only afterwards did the *parwāna* Mu'īn al-Dīn

66 'Izz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II's middle brother and rival, Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıç Arslān IV (1248-1254, 1256-1265).

67 Ibn Bibī, ed. Erzi, 687-688; *idem*, ed. Zhālāh Mutaḥaddīn, 590-591; *idem*, trans. Duda, 308-309; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 321-322.

68 *Tārīkh-i āl-i Saljūq*, ed. Jalālī, 99; *Anadolu Selçukluları Devleti Tarihi*, ed. Uzluğ, 54-55.

69 *İstanbul'un fethinden önce yazılmış tarihî takvimler*, ed. Turan, 32-33: the »enthronement« of Qarāmān-bey took place fifteen years before the capture of Konya by his son in AH 675. This means AH 660 (26 November 1261-14 November 1262).

70 Baybars al-Manṣūrī al-Dawādār, *Zubdat al-Fikra fī ta'rikh al-Hijra*, ed. Richards, 73.

71 Aksaraylı Mehmed oğlu Kerīmüddin Mahmud, *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr*, ed. Turan, 71 (hereafter Aksarayı).

72 Pictures of the magnificent ruins of the fortress of Gevale were published on the site »Gevale«, accessed on 24 March 2021: gevale.com/fotograf/. See also Belke and Restle, *Galatien und Lykaonien*, 182-183.

73 See the tentative date in Aksarayı, ed. Turan, 71: *dar ān sāl wa zamān*, »in that year and time«, i.e. this and next year, which was a typical expression in Aksarayı. The year in question was AH 659, which ended on 25 November 1261. The battle took place sometime around that date.

Sulaymān, the uncrowned head of the sultanate decide to release them. This was a mistake. The Karamanoğulları at once resumed their rebellion in the province of Armenia sometime in 1276. The expedition of the troops of the *parwāna* was totally fruitless, as they were unable to lure the Karamanoğulları from their mountains.⁷⁴ By the time the campaign of the Mamluk sultan Beybars I al-Bunduqdārī (1260-1277) against Ilkhan Abaqa (1265-1282) started, the uprising of the sons of Qarāmān had reached Antalya.⁷⁵ Once the Mamluk sultan appeared in Anatolia, Meḥmed-bey Karamanoğlu formed a coalition of three Turkmen confederations (Karamanoğulları, Eşrefoğulları⁷⁶ and Menteşeoğulları) under the banner of Beybars. They marched towards Konya, taking and plundering it on Thursday, 8 Dhū al-Ḥijja AH 675 (13 May 1277). There they proclaimed a certain Cimri to be ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Siyāwush, the son of the exiled sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II. Meḥmed-bey Karamanoğlu became his vizier. It is interesting to note that in his search for a true Seljuqid prince, Meḥmed-bey was going to send an embassy to the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259-1282), who kept a son of Kaykā’ūs II at his court, thus resuming the precedent of appointing a Seljuq hostage from Constantinople to the throne in Konya.⁷⁷ Under Cimri as sultan of Rum, Turkish for a while became an official language at the court, though Persian still remained an undisputed language of office and literature.⁷⁸ Yet this remarkable achievement did not turn into a moment of a »political beginning« of the Karamanoğulları emirate. In the *History of the Karamanoğulları* composed by Şikārī (fl. c. 1450) the conquest of Asia Minor was described as an outcome of an epic struggle by the Turks, sent by Pādishāh Hürmüz of Iran, against three rulers of Byzantium: the *qayşar-i Rūm* Yūnānūs, who resided in Kayseri; his brother Khiraql, who lived in Lārende (Laranda); and Khiraql’s man Fişandūn, who was in Constantinople.⁷⁹ What was interesting in this story was a typical *quid pro quo* of substituting a person’s name with a placename. This was a commonplace in early Turkish historiography: we already saw this in the case of the *tekvur* of İnegöl, whose name was Hagios Nikolaos (Aya Nikola), if we are to believe ‘Āşīkpāşāzāde and Neşri, seemingly after a local church’s name. Likewise, Fişandūn was not the name of a real person. Almost all the names in the first chapter of Şikārī were fictitious: Yūnānūs was derived from ›Yunan‹, ›Greece‹; while Khiraql was the name of Emperor Heracleus (610-641) transcribed in a vernacular Arabic form which can sometimes be found in the Christian-Muslim polemics. Fişandūn was a rare place name, a village or a small town Dere köyü, 9 km southeast of Lārende (Laranda), named after the beautiful Byzantine ninth- or tenth-century church, now a mosque, which is still called

74 Ibn Bībī, ed. Erzi, 688-689; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutaḥaddīn, 591; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 322-323; *idem*, trans. Duda, 309.

75 Aksarayi, ed. Turan, 110-113; Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye*, 558-559.

76 The next mention of the Turkmens of the Eşrefoğulları occurs in AH 679 (3 May 1280-21 April 1281), when they, together with the Karamanoğulları, plundered Konya and Akşehir. By 1287, the Eşrefoğulları had conquered Ghurghurūm and made it their capital; see *Tārīkh-i āl-i Saljūq*, ed. Jalālī, 107-108, 113; *Anadolu Selçukluları Devleti Tarihi*, ed. Uzluk, 64, 70. Little is known about them; cf. Sevim and Yücel, *Türkiye tarihi*, 308-309.

77 On the Byzantine-Seljuk relations, see Korobeinikov, *Byzantium and the Turk*, 111-159.

78 Ibn Bībī, ed. Erzi, 688-697; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutaḥaddīn, 592-598; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 323-326; *idem*, trans. Duda, 310-314; Aksarayi, ed. Turan, 122-124; *Tārīkh-i āl-i Saljūq*, ed. Jalālī, 103-103; *Anadolu Selçukluları Devleti Tarihi*, ed. Uzluk, 59-60; Cahen, *The Formation of Turkey*, 205-206; Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye*, 560-564; Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society*, 45-46, 59-60, 147-148; Yıldız, Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey.

79 Şikārī, *Karamanoğulları tarihi*, ed. Koman, 2; *idem*, *Karamannāme*, ed. Sözen and Sakaoğlu, 99, 608; *idem*, *Karamannāme*, MS Yusufağa (Milli) Kütüphanesi 562, fol. 2a.

Fisandon Kilisesi Camii.⁸⁰ The name »Fişandün« was actually a Persian or Turkish rendering of the word Byzantion, understood as an adjective »Byzantine« of sorts; it seems, judging from the usual way of making new placenames, that the name Fişandün first appeared as the name of the church, and only then of the town. The location of Fişandün church was suspiciously close to the early routs from the Taurus mountains to Lārende. Despite the very picturesque description of the struggle all over »Rūm, Yunān, Shām, Ermeni, and Mağrib«, the first conquest, which, according to Şikārî, became the springboard of the emirate of the Karamanoğulları, was a fortress called Khiraql (خرقل) on the Armenian border. The attack was launched by Nüreddin (or Nüre Sufi), father of Qarāmān-bey. Khiraql's governor Qīşūn took the side of the Seljuqs, turned Muslim, and married the daughter of one of the nomad leaders, Turgut bey.⁸¹ If we exclude a possible play on the part of Şikārî who might have toyed with the name of Khiraql, which appeared earlier in his chronicle as a name of the brother of the Byzantine emperor Yūnānūs, then the most plausible explanation is that Khiraql meant Herakleia Kybistra, the famous Byzantine city. Herakleia had been under Seljuq rule at the beginning of the twelfth century and was large enough to have been mentioned among those cities which the aging 'Izz al-Dīn Qilij Arslān II (1156-1192) distributed between his sons and a nephew.⁸² It was taken by the Armenians in 1211, but was soon returned back to the Seljuqs; and it was mentioned as a Seljuq city after 1246.⁸³ Thereafter Herakleia was in decline, and sometime in the second half of the thirteenth century its inhabitants moved to a new location, thirteenth kilometres to the northwest, where nowadays we find the city of Ereğli. The old Herakleia survived as a fortress Tund/Tont Kalesi. The city of Irākliye in Ibn Bibî and Aqsarāyî meant the old Herakleia before 1246.⁸⁴ The text of Şikārî, which most likely referred to the events in the 1250s, is explicit: Khiraql was a fortress. Its strange name Khiraql, which contrasts with the Medieval Greek pronunciation of Herakleia as [Iraklia] (the correct Irākliye of the Seljuq sources and Ereğli of the Turkish ones), might have indicated that in the second half or at the end of the thirteenth century, when the oral tale was composed, there were two Herakleias: the new city with the old name of Irākliye at the location of modern Ereğli, and the old city, now a castle, whose name was rendered as Khiraql for reasons unknown, at the location of ancient Herakleia, which later became Tund Kalesi.

80 Belke and Restle, *Galatien und Lykaonien*, 165.

81 Şikārî, *Karamanoğulları tarihi*, ed. Koman, 10-11; *idem*, *Karamannāme*, ed. Sözen and Sakaoğlu, 103-104. The name was written in two ways: as Qīşūn (قيصون) and then as Q-şūn (قصون); see Şikārî, *Karamannāme*, MS Yusufağa (Milli) Kütüphanesi 562, fols. 6a-7a. Obviously this was the name of one and the same person, named Qīşūn in both cases. The name of Q-şūn was erroneously rendered as Kosun in the first publication of the *Karamannāme* in 1946, and repeated as such in the edition of 2005, despite the published facsimile of the manuscript. One should note that the manuscript offers no vocalization of the Q-şūn.

82 Ibn Bibî, ed. Erzi, 22; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutahaddīn, 23; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 5; *idem*, trans. Duda, 19; Aksarayı, ed. Turan, 30.

83 Ibn Bibî, ed. Erzi, 545-548; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutahaddīn, 478-480; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 249-250; *idem*, trans. Duda, 238-239; Smbat Sparapet, Taregirk', ed. Agēlean, 234-235; trans. Bedrosian, 111: in 1259 the Cilician Armenian army under Smbat Sparapet (1208-1276) pursued the Seljuks »as far as Afakli«.

84 See the previous note.

The oral tale about the capture of Herakleia (the *terminus a quo* was 1256) left almost no traces in self-representation of the Karamanoğulları: at least, they were never called »masters of Khiraql«. It simply shows that Nüreddin (or Nüre Şüfi), father of Qarāmān-bey, was portrayed as a loyal commander of the eponymous Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn; the latter, given the chronological context, must have been the famous Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād I (1219-1237).⁸⁵ Only after the conquest of two important fortresses, Ermenāk and Mut, sometime before 1259 did the Karamanoğulları manage to establish their own emirate. Henceforth they were remembered as the Turks of Ermenāk (with whom the »sons of Qarāmān« had formed an alliance by 1265) not only in the scornful references of Ibn Bibī (*avlād-i Qarāmān va atrāk-i qal'a-i Armanāk*, »sons of Qarāmān and the Turks of the fortress Ermenāk«, or, more elegantly, *rahzanān-i Armanāk*, »the bandits of Ermenāk«)⁸⁶ but also in the Ottoman chronicles⁸⁷ and, most importantly, in diplomatic correspondence: the Mamluks of Egypt addressed the beys of Karaman as »Şāhib 'Armanak« (and not of Konya, or Lārende, or any other more prominent city of the Karamanoğulları beylik).⁸⁸

Ermenak and Mut, which formed the nucleus of the state of the Karamanoğulları and served them as a shelter from the Seljuq and Mongol troops, were last in the chain of fortresses, which Nüreddin (or Nüre Şüfi) and his son Qarāmān-bey took or tried to take when they became »tired of nomadic life« (cf. the statement of a certain Türkmān beg Hayreddin, addressed to Nüreddin before the conquest of Khiraql: »Ey Nüreddin Beg! Konub göçmekden usandık«).⁸⁹ The springboard of their state was, according to Ibn Bibī, the province (*vilāyet*) of Qamar al-Dīn. This was a precise reference to the earlier Seljuq expedition against Cilician Armenia in 1225-1226, which resulted in the conquest of the important fortress of Janjīn/Chanchi, north of the important Cilician stronghold of Gaban (modern Geben), in the same country of Gaban, now in the subdistrict of Andırın of the province of Maraş,⁹⁰ by the army of the *chāshnīgīr* Mubārīz al-Dīn Çavlı and *amīr* Manuel Maurozomes (*amīr* Kumninūs Mafruzūm). When narrating the outcome of the expedition, Ibn Bibī mentioned that the land of Janjīn was given to a certain *amīr* Qamar al-Dīn. Ibn Bibī only twice mentioned the rare name of the *amīr*: the first time in relation to the expedition of Mubārīz al-Dīn Çavlı and the second time in the story about Qarāmān-bey.⁹¹ The importance of the fortresses of Kapan/Gaban was perfectly described by Sara Nur Yıldız, and the same description could be applied to Janjīn/Chanchi in the country of Gaban:

85 Yıldız, Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier, 116-117.

86 Ibn Bibī, ed. Erzi, 689, 692, 696, 703; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutaḥaddīn, 592, 594, 597, 603; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 323, 329; *idem*, trans. Duda, 310, 317, 345 (note 438).

87 Neşrī, ed. Öztürk, 22-27; *idem*, 1, ed. Taeschner, 15-18.

88 al-'Umarī, *al-Ta'rif bi'l-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Sharīf*, ed. al-Drūbi, 55.

89 Şikārī, *Karamanoğulları tarihi*, ed. Koman, 10; *idem*, *Karamannāme*, ed. Sözen and Sakaoglu, 103; *idem*, *Karamannāme*, MS Yusufāğa (Milli) Kütüphanesi 562, fol. 6a.

90 On the location, see Hewsens, *Armenia: a Historical Atlas*, 140, map 124.

91 Ibn Bibī, ed. Erzi, 305, 334-342, 687; *idem*, ed. Zhālah Mutaḥaddīn, 282, 307-314, 590; *idem*, ed. Houtsma, 129, 138-141, 321; *idem*, trans. Duda, 131, 140-142, 308.

Hidden among the high peaks of the Taurus, this Armenian mountain fortress was an important baronial seat and strategic stronghold for the Rubenid dynastic family. It was here that the kings of Cilician Armenia traditionally kept their treasures and retired in case of danger. Gaban guarded one of the major routes going into Cilicia through the mountains, and control of it was essential in the defence of the Armeno-Cilician kingdom. The importance of Gaban also for the control over the passage of trade can be seen in the agreement made in 1201 between Lewon I and the Genoese which specified that the Genoese were required to pay an extra toll when passing through the region controlled by the lord of Gaban.⁹²

The geographical location of Gaban in Cilicia suggested a long road to Ereğli and Lārende. The information between the lines of the text of Ibn Bibī suggested that despite his animosity towards the Karamanoğulları, nonetheless he did not hide the fact that Qarāmān-bey was not just a coal miner who by chance managed to unite nomadic Turks around him, but rather a member of a larger nomadic group following long-distance pasture routes that moved along the Seljuq-Armenian border zone. They tried to control the coal trade between the mountains and the major Seljuq cities. From this point of view, the statement by Yazıcıoğlu Ali (Yāzījioğhlū 'Alī), the Ottoman translator of Ibn Bibī for the Sultan Murad II (1421-1451), was noteworthy. He wrote that Qarāmān-bey and his descendants were from the tribe of Afşar (Awshār),⁹³ one of the largest Oghuz tribal groups in Anatolia, sometimes believed to have influenced some dialects of Turkish in Asia Minor.⁹⁴ Be that as it may, this perfectly suited the context.

The Armenian sources confirm how desperately Qarāmān-bey and his sons fought for the fortresses in the grey zone between Rum and Cilician Armenia. In particular, Smbat Sparapet (1208-1276), the commander-in-chief of the Armenian army in Cilicia and the brother of King Het'um I (1226-1269, d. 1270), wrote in his *Chronicle* under the year 712 of the Armenian era (AD 1263):

Now prior to the death of the king's father, Kostandin (on 24 February 1263), a certain [individual] named Qaraman (Kharaman) arose from the tribe of tent-dwelling Ishmaelites and came [on an expedition], and as he was traveling many others from the same tribe joined with him. He had them call him sultan and [Qaraman] had grown so strong that the sultan of Rūm, Rukn al-Dīn (Ērugnatīn), out of fear of him, did not dare to reproach him. And so, many areas with their fortresses were forcibly taken by him. He also caused great harassment in the area of Isauria (Sawrioj) and Selewkia, enslaving them. Twice he had destroyed troops of King Het'um, [including] the praiseworthy Halkam who had been designated as governor [of that area] who was slain there. As we mentioned earlier [Halkam] was of Byzantine nationality. Then Qaraman became hostile toward the king's brother, Smbat, because in the district Qaraman was inhabiting

92 Yıldız, *Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier*, 108. I slightly correct Sara Nur Yıldız's identification of fortress Janjīn in Ibn Bibī: the fortress's name better corresponds to Chanchi, and not Gaban, as the names Janjīn and Chanchi almost completely coincide (given the interactions of [j]-[ch] sounds and letters in Persian and/or Turkish). The fortress Chanchi was a gate to the land of Gaban, where the fortress of Gaban occupied a dominant position.

93 Yazıcızāde Ali, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Selçuk*, ed. Bakır, 824; Yazıcızāde 'Alī, *Selçuk-nāme*, MS Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan Bölümü nu. 1391, fol. 400a.

94 Korkmaz, *Die Frage des Verhältnisses* 2, 191; *eadem*, *Anadolu Ağzlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu*, 182.

was a keep called Maniōn which had been wrested from the infidels through much labor and numerous gifts. Previously it had belonged to the Christians. Smbat, the king's brother and sparapet [commander-in-chief] of the Armenians, held [Maniōn] for three years in the midst of such a multitude of infidels. The boastful Qaraman harassed him fiercely and subjected Smbat to all kinds of dangers, causing him to spend a great deal of gold and silver for the needs of his soldiers and for the fortress. Qaraman came against this fortresses and surrounded it for nine months, severely harassing it. Then he began to speak insultingly and to give orders to the Armenian king, Het'um, saying: »If you want to come to me, you need not come to my feet, rather wait a bit until the autumn wind cleanses the bitterness from your country. That way, when I come I will not be weakened and unable to accomplish anything.« As soon as King Het'um heard this, he arose and went to his father, Kostandin, and informed him... So the king arose and went to Tarsus, assembled his troops and went to Selewkia. There were gathered cavalry, infantry and bearers, since they were going to take 1000 k'or of grain to the [besieged] fortress. When the Christian troops and the king reached the borders of the fortress, the infidels who were besieging the fortress fled from its rear. When the king arrived at the fortress with his troops, they did not find the impious Qaraman there. The king ordered that the grain be unloaded at the fortress and they removed guards who had gone into exile and designated new ones in their place. Then they took to the road and returned to their land without a care. Now that impious Qaraman came to a swampy and harsh place, with a mound of stones and a tight pass like a tunnel, and there he waited in ambush. When the Christian forces reached that place, the infidels raised a shriek and struck the believers with arrows. The clamor reached the king and the bravest left their brigades and coursed on to the place of battle. Striking the infidels, they turned them to flight and pierced Qaraman with spears and arrows. [Qaraman] retreated in shame and this impious man died several days later of his wounds. And the impious man's brother, named Bunsuz (Pōnsuz), died in the place of battle, as well as his son-in-law...[words missing] and those slain from the king's troops included Kostandin of Soma, and prince Grigor who was the lord of Mazot Khach', whose right hand was cut off by the point of a sword and fell, and few were those lost by the Christians on that day. Now Smbat, Bakuran's and Kostandin's brother, who was of Byzantine nationality and still a boy, and who was related to King Het'um on his father's side, attacked along with the other braves and covered the ground with the infidels' corpses. When the king and many others saw this, they praised him and sent the glad tidings to Kostandin, the king's father. And when he heard it, he was overjoyed and sent [the lad] back home to his brothers and to his mother, lady (tikin) Shahandukht, with generous awards and gifts. Then the king came joyfully to his own land, in great delight that he had put to shame such an irritant with so little labor.⁹⁵

The chronology of the lengthy piece in Smbat's *Chronicle* accords with Ibn Bībī. The latter wrote that *parwāna* Mu'īn al-Dīn Sulaymān defeated Qarāmān-bey and the Turks of Ermenak in the hard-fought battle at the fortress of Kāvāla near Konya; and the chronology in Aqṣarāyī suggested that the battle took place in the autumn or winter of 1261. The *Chronicle* of Smbat says that Qarāmān-bey's death took place one year later, in 1262, before the death of Constantine of Paperawn (Çandır Kalesi), father of King Het'um I (1226-1269) of Cilician Armenia⁹⁶ on 24 February 1263. The news of the death of Būñsūz in the same battle,

95 Smbat Sparapet, *Taregirk'*, ed. Agēlean, 237-240; trans. Bedrosian, 113. I use here the translation of Bedrosian with some light modifications.

96 Toumanoff, *Les dynasties de la Caucasic chrétienne*, 283-284, 288.

which ended the life of his brother Qarāmān-bey, was probably wrong, as he died later in the Seljuq prison. But what forced him to surrender in 1263? The answer can be found in an anonymous Armenian chronicle, which stated that in the year 711 of the Armenian era (AD 1263), King Het'um I met Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Qilij Arslān IV in Herakleia (Ereğli), seemingly on Seljuq territory, and made an agreement which divided the border fortresses between them.⁹⁷ This was a joint attempt to finish off the rising emirate of the Karamanoğulları.

Thus the combination of the chief sources gives the following picture: the Karamanoğulları began moving near the country of Gaban (Kapan, Geben), in the rich coalfields (important even nowadays), and they moved along the trade route, along which the coal was brought from Upper Cilicia to Lārende. They may or may not have taken the fortress of the old Herakleia en route, though the story seems plausible, but when they passed it, they began to search for a territory of their own. And they found it in the grey zone of in the land between Cilicia and Pamphylia, neither under strong Seljuq, nor Armenian control. The fortress of Maniōn, whose location is still uncertain, but thought to have been south of Papeřawn (Baberon, Çandır Kalesi),⁹⁸ on the mountainous road from Mut to Silifke, was besieged by Qarāmān-bey for three years before he managed to take it in 1262. This means that the fall of the fortresses of Ermenak and Mut to the Karamanoğulları had taken place by 1259, when the siege of Maniōn began. And after 1263, when all seemed to have been lost for the Karamanoğulları, they still continued to control Ermenak and Mut, whence the revival of their state took place in 1276. Hence the importance of Ermenak in the titles of the Karamanoğulları in their correspondence with the mightiest Muslim state, the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt.

Boundary Zone and the »Fortress Narrative«:

From Byzantine Aristocratic Possessions to a Turkic Beylik

In the grey zone, the Karamanoğulları did not meet the armies of Cilician Armenia, nor were they within the reach of the Seljuqs. Outside the big cities of the sultanate, they encountered a chain of fortresses and small towns controlled by the remnants of the Byzantine aristocracy. It was no coincidence that Smbat the Constable mentioned that the master of Maniōn, Halkam, was »of the Byzantine nationality«, or, more precisely, of the »Greek nation« (*Yoyn azgaw*). The same is said in relation to the young Smbat, »Bakuran's and Kostandin's brother, who was related to King Het'um on his father's side«, the hero of the battle at Maniōn in 1262. It was the same Hetoumid dynasty, but a special branch, different from the royal one. Halkam, killed by Qarāmān-bey in 1259-1262, was »mentioned earlier« by Smbat Sparapet as a person of »Greek nationality«, but the only previous mention of the same name was that of Halkam, lord of Maniōn, Lamōs, Zhermanik and Anamuř in 1198. He headed an embassy of King Levon (Leo) I (1187-1219) of Cilician Armenia to Constantinople in 1197.⁹⁹

The ancestry of Halkam, lord of Maniōn, Lamōs, Zhermanik and Anamuř, went back to the Hetoumid lords of Baberon. According to Cyril Toumanoff, Constantine of Papeřawn/Barbaron was the father of King Het'um I; and Constantine's father and Het'um I's grandfather was Prince Vasak of Papeřawn/Barbaron principality, whose elder brother was Bakuran of Barbaron. Their younger brother was Halkam, mentioned as lord of Maniōn, Lamōs,

97 Galstian, *Armiānskiie istochniki o mongolakh*, 73.

98 Hewsens, *Armenia: a Historical Atlas*, 140, map 124.

99 Smbat Sparapet, *Taregirk'*, 207; trans. Bedrosian, 95.

Zhermanik and Anamur in 1198. It is not clear why Halkam, who defended the Armenian faith in front of the Byzantine theologians in 1197 and who was a great uncle of King Het'um I, was labeled as a man »of the Greek nation« by his grandnephew Smbat the Constable, brother of the king and the author of the *Chronicle* (who by no means considered himself a »Greek«). The discrepancy allowed Arutiunova-Fidanian to suggest that the name Bakuran, which was initially applied in the *Chronicle* to *sebastos* Gregory Pakourianos (d. 1086), the famous commander of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118), was used as a sobriquet of the Pakouriani dynasty, which had branches in Armenia, Georgia, and Byzantium (including the Balkans).¹⁰⁰ Smbat the Constable wrote the name of Gregory Pakourianos as »*paron* Grigor, Bakuran's son«, though the name of Gregory's father was most likely Aluz, and Bakuran could only have been the name of his grandfather.¹⁰¹ It was not impossible that the Hetoumids of Barbaron were related to, or were descendants (via marriage) of, the Pakouriani family. If this was so, then old Halkam and young Smbat, »Bakuran's and Kostandin's brother«, all »of the Greek nation«, who on their father's side were relatives of King Het'um I himself, were the Pakourianoï (and Halkam the Hetoumid of 1197-1198 could have been a different person from the Halkam killed in Maniön in 1259-1262). Thus, when establishing their emirate, the Karamanoğulları encountered another world, which resembled the Ottomans' in Bithynia (although the geographical patterns in Bithynia and Cilicia were very different) – the world of the twelfth century, with the great fortresses in the border zone still kept by the members of the Byzantine aristocratic families, the survivors of the Seljuq conquest after 1071. The image of Rum before the Ottomans, as a conglomeration of fortresses with their own *tekvurs*, as was described by Ibn-i Kemāl, receives additional justification.

100 Gregory Pakourianos had a prominent career. He was duke of Theodosiopolis (Erzurum) and grand domestic of the East, also called »*zorvari* of the East« in the Georgian sources, until 1074-1075. He became grand domestic (*meġas domestikos*) of the West sometime from 1081. *Zorvari* was a Georgian *calque* of the Armenian title *zawrawor*, the latter being the translation of the Byzantine title *stratēgos-autokratōr*, i.e. the commander-in-chief of the Byzantine eastern army. *K'art'lis Ts'khovreba* 2, ed. Qaukhch'ishvili, 317; Thomson, *Rewriting Caucasian History*, 308. On Gregory Pakourianos, see Garsoïan, Pakourianos; Jeffreys *et al.*, *Prosopography of the Byzantine World*, 2016. Accessed on 24 March 2021: pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk, Gregorios 61: pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Gregorios/61/; Annae Comnenae, *Alexias* 1, ed. Reinsch and Kambylis, 63-64, 126, 132, 151, 153, 200; *Typicon Gregorii Pacuriani*, ed. Tarchnischvili; ed. Kauchtschischvili; trans. Arutiunova-Fidanian; ed and trans. Gautier; Shanidze, *Gruzinskii monasty' v Bolgarii i ego tipik*. On the family of the Pakourianoï, see Kazhdan, *Armiane v sostave gospodstvuiushego klassa*, 58-65.

101 Arutiunova-Fidanian, *Armiane-khalkidonity*, 15-17. Cf. similar wording (»Grigor, son of Bakurian«) in the Georgian sources, mentioning the *sebastos* Gregory Pakourianos; see Shanidze, *Velikii domestik Zapada Grigorii Bakurianis-dze i gruzinskii monasty'*, 40-43.

The »fortress narrative« survived not only in the writings of the Ottomans or the Karmanoğulları. Its traces can be seen in the pages concerning the foundation of the Candaroğulları emirate, whose first possessions, the fortresses of Safranbolu and Eflani, were remembered long after they had become masters of the far more important cities of Kastamonu and Sinop.¹⁰² The narrative influenced even the perceptions of the early Aqqoyunlu (Aq-qoyunlu). The latter were remembered in the Empire of Trebizond as »Amitiotai«, or masters of the fortress Omidia in the Pontus (the wording was almost on a par with Ibn Bibi's »Turks of Ermenāk«, as in both cases a Turkic nomadic entity was designated by a fortress which these Turks controlled).¹⁰³ The analysis of the Aqqoyunlu historical tradition in the *Kitāb-i Diyārbakriyya* by Abū Bakr-i Ṭīhrānī (fl. 1447-1478 or 1482), which was focused in the city of Āmid (Diyarbakır, Diyār Bakr) as a center of the Aqqoyunlu empire, and which tried to represent their past as grandiosely as possible, allowed R. Shukurov to suggest that the city of Āmid (Omid), which, as Abū Bakr-i Ṭīhrānī insisted, was supposedly the first possession of the Aqqoyunlu, was in reality an intentional substitution for the fortress of Omidia, a real springboard of the Aqqoyunlu, located in the territory of the Empire of Trebizond.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, while the Amitiotai were active in the Empire of Trebizond from 1341 to 1358,¹⁰⁵ the Aqqoyunlu had not conquered Āmid by 1401. Their post-1401 tradition was unable to come to terms with the »fortress narrative« and preferred the greater and more ancient city of Āmid (Omid) to the obscure Pontic fortress Omidia in infidel territory. And yet, even Abū Bakr-i Ṭīhrānī's disdain did not allow him to rewrite his sources completely. According to him, before the Aqqoyunlu had become masters of Āmid (in reality Omidia), they controlled the fortress of Alancık (*qal'a-yi Alanjiq*, another possible reading Alıncak: قلعه النجق),¹⁰⁶ which, given the Pontic context, could have been identical to the modern town of Alancık on the road between Şebinkarahisar (Koloneia, Kūghūniya) and Kelkit in the country of Gümüşhane in the Pontus. For Abū Bakr-i Ṭīhrānī, however, the »fortress of Alancık/Alıncak« more likely sounded like the famous fortress Alıncak, the Armenian Ernchak, east of Nakhchivan, under the sway of the sworn enemy of the Aqqoyunlu, Iskender-beg b. Qara Yūsuf Qara-qoyunlu (1420-1438).¹⁰⁷ It would have been appropriate to lay claim to the Qara-qoyunlu territory by way of referring to the »possessions of old« of the Aqqoyunlu.

102 In his translation of the work of Ibn Bibī, Yazıcıoğlu Ali described the end the Çobanoğulları emirate and the beginning of the Candaroğulları. According to him, Suleyman Pasha Candaroğlu, who was one of the sipahi of the environs of Kastamonu, in the year when the power of the Mongols had weakened (c. 1309), gathered the Turks from Iflughān (Eflani) (where his »timar« was) and marched against Kastamonu. »He besieged Mehmed-bey (son of Yavlak Arslan Çobanoğlu, the descendant of the old Seljuk aristocratic family of the Çobanoğulları), and took him captive, and destroyed him, and became master of Kastamonu and Bürghülü, which was the fortress known at that time as Zalifre (Dhālifre)«; see Yazıcızâde Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, ed. Bakır, 909-910; Yazıcızâde 'Ali, *Selçuk-nâme*, MS Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan Bölümü nu. 1391, fol. 445a. »Bürghülü, known as Zalifre« is the modern-day city of Safranbolu. At that time Iflughān (Eflani) was a strategically important fortress in Paphlagonia.

103 Panaret, *O Velikikh Komnina*, ed. Kriukov, trans. Karpov and Shukurov, 82, 84, 86, 90, 94; Bryer, *Greeks and Türkmens*, 133-134.

104 Shukurov, *Between Peace and Hostility*, 47-51.

105 The dates of the first and the last mention of the Aq-qoyunlu in the chronicle of Panaretos.

106 Abū Bakr-i Ṭīhrānī, *Kitāb-i Diyārbakriyya* 1, ed. Lugal and Sümer, 15, 17. Alancık was the reading advanced by Shukurov, *Between Peace and Hostility*, 49.

107 Zachariadou, [no title], 368.

It was not unusual to start making a principality from the conquest of a fortress. The most unusual thing, however, was the longevity of the memory about it. Instead of forgetting at a later stage those small locations in favor of more prominent and important cities, the Ottomans, the Karamanoğulları, and a great host of other Turkish beys not only carefully recorded their initial conquests but also used the fortresses' names in diplomatic correspondence by way of asserting their political legitimacy. To understand the context, it would have been equivalent to the kings of England continuing to refer to themselves as kings of Winchester throughout the centuries, long after the unification of Anglo-Saxon England into one kingdom and the Norman conquest – just because Winchester was a capital city of Alfred the Great (871-886).

The memory of the »fortresses' past«, so acute even in the sixteenth century, could have pointed to the period of the second half of the thirteenth century as a time of transition, when the cities in the frontier zone in Anatolia were sometimes reduced to the size of a fortress, and their inhabitants were forced to find a new location (and that also suggested a change of trade routes in the zone).¹⁰⁸ Under these circumstances, the importance of the strongholds in the new key locations increased. There, the new formations began. The vision of the »fortresses' past« was still remembered at the time of Sulaymān the Magnificent. It influenced not only the Ottoman perception of Byzantium but also affected Ottoman self-representation as the new masters of the conquered lands.

108 Herakleia Kybistra with its previous location abandoned, and the old city transformed into a fortress, was by no means a solitary example – one can mention, for example, similar changes in the fate of the city of Laodikeia (Denizli): Korobeinikov, *Byzantine-Seljuk Border*.

References

Manuscripts

Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1240-1241: Massaria Caffae 1457-1458

Archivio di Stato di Genova, San Giorgio, Sala 34, 590, 1228: Massaria Caffae 1459-1460

Archivio di Stato di Venezia, Miscellanea documenti turchi, 1454-1813, b.1

All accessed on 14 July 2020:

document 1: *Mehmed II's letter to the Greek Archons of Morea*, p. 1 (26 December 1454), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=39572;

document 2: *Ahdname. The Treaty of Constantinople between Venice and Mehmed II*, p. 1 (25 January 1479), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=39573;

document 3: *After receiving Giovanni Dario the sultan announces the conclusion of peace and sends Lütfi bey to Venice as his representative*, p. 1 (29 January 1479), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37555;

document 6: *Mehmed II's letter to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo after the mission of Ambassador Benedetto Trevisan; permission for the citizens of Venice to travel in Ottoman domains*, p. 1 (7 October 1479), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37558;

document 10: *Mehmed II's letter to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo on the border disputes between Venice and the Ottoman Empire*, p. 1 (7 January 1480), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37562;

document 27: *Sultan Bayezid II asks Doge Giovanni Mocenigo via Ambassador Antonio Vitturi to renew the peace treaty between Venice and the Ottoman Empire*, p. 1 (12 January 1482), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37579;

document 44: *Sultan Bayezid II receives Ambassador Andrea Zantani and confirms the peace treaty with Venice*, p. 1 (15 March 1499), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37596;

document 77: *Preliminary peace treaty ('ahidnāme)*, p. 1 (24 December 1502), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37629;

document 101: Greek translation of document 103, 5 August 1503-1514. August 1503, www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37653;

document 103: *Letter of Bayezid II to Doge Leonardo Loredan concerning the exchange of the ambassadors and the oaths to observe the peace treaty*, p. 1 (8 August 1503), www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/ua.htm?idUa=37655;

document 161: *Selim I's 'ahidnāme with Venice*, 17 October 1513, www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/document.htm?idUa=37714&idDoc=39753&first=0&last=1;

document 163: *Renewal of the previous treaty with the Republic of Venice, granted to Ambassador Antonio Giustinian*, 25 October 1513, www.archiviodistatovenezia.it/divenire/document.htm?idUa=37716&idDoc=39755&first=0&last=1.

Bar Hebraeus, *Ktābā d-makṭbānut zabnē*, MS Bodleian Library, Hunt 52.

al-Ḥusaynī, Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī, *Akhbār al-dawlat al-saljūqiyya (Zubdat al-tawārīkh fī akhbār al-umarā' wa al-mulūk al-saljūqiyya)*, MS British Museum, Stowe Or. 7.

Dervīš Aḥmed 'Āṣiqī, *Menāqib ve-tevārīḥ-i Āl-i 'Uṭmān*. MS Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. or. oct. 2448.

İdrīs Bidlīsī, *Tā'riḫ-i Hasht-Bihisht*, MS Bodleian Library, Ouseley 358.

- Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī Yazdī, *Zafar-nameh*, MS Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 3268.
 Şikârî, *Karamannâme*, MS Yusufağa (Milli) Kütüphanesi 562.
Tavârikh-i âl-i Osmân, MS Bodleian Library, Rawl. Or 5.
 Yazıcızâde ‘Alī, *Selçuk-nâme*, MS Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan Bölümü nu. 1391.
- Abū Bakr-i Tîhrânî, *Kitâb-i Diyârbakriyya*, ed. Necati Lugal and Faruk Sümer, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1993).
- Abrahamowicz, Z., Osmanskii sultan kak vostochnorimskii imperator (kayser-i Rum), in: Il’ja V. Zaitsev and S. F. Oreshkova (eds.): *Turcica et Ottomanica. Sbornik statei v chest’ 70-letiiia M.S. Meyera* (Moscow, 2006) 103-105.
- Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, ed. Franz Miklosich and Joseph Müller, 6 vols. (Vienna, 1860-1890).
- Aksaraylı Mehmed oğlu Kerîmüddin Mahmud, *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr. Moğollar zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*, ed. Osman Turan (Ankara, 1944).
- Anadolu Selçukluları Devleti Tarihi III. Histoire des Seldjoukides d’Asie Mineure par un anonyme, depuis l’origine de la dynastie jusqu’à la fin du regne de Sultan Alâ-el-Din Keikoubad IV (?) fils de Soleimanshah 765/1364 Texte persan publié d’après le MS. de Paris*, ed. Feridun Nâfiz Uzluk (Ankara, 1952).
- Annae Comnenae, *Alexias*, ed. Diether Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis, 2 vols. (Berlin, 2001).
- Anooshahr, Ali, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam. A Comparative study of the late medieval and early modern periods* (New York, 2009).
- Arutiunova-Fidanian, V. A., Armiane-khalkidonity na sluzhbe Vizantiiskoi imperii: Pakuriany, in: Mikhail V. Bibikov (ed.), *Vizantiiskie ocherki: trudy rossïiskikh uchenykh k XXII Mezhdunarodnomu kongressu vizantinistov* (Moscow, 2011) 5-22.
- Âşıkpaşazâde Tarihi* [Osmanlı Tarihi (1285-1502)], ed. Necdet Öztürk (Istanbul, 2013).
- Bar Hebraeus, *Ktâbâ d-maktbânüt zabnê: Gregorii Barhebraei chronicon syriacum: e codd. mss. emendatum ac punctis vocalibus adnotationibusque locupletatum*, ed. Paul Bedjan (Paris, 1890); *The chronography of Gregory Abû’l Faraj, the son of Aaron, the Hebrew physician, commonly known as Bar Hebraeus*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Budge, 2 vols. (London, 1932; reprinted Piscataway, NJ, 2003).
- Baybars al-Manşûrî al-Dawâdâr, *Zubdat al-Fikra fî ta’rikh al-Hijra. History of the early Mamluk Period*, ed. Donald S. Richards, Bibliotheca Islamica 42 (Beirut, 1998).
- Belke, Klaus, with assistance of Marcell Restle, *Galatien und Lykaonien*, Tabula Imperii Byzantini 4 (Vienna, 1984).
- Blair, Sheila, *The Monumental Inscriptions from Early Islamic Iran and Transoxiana* (Leiden, 1992).
- Bosworth, C. E., The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (A.D. 1000-1217), in: John A. Boyle (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran* 5 (Cambridge, 1968) 1-202.
- Bryer, Anthony, Greeks and Türkmens: the Pontic Exception, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975) 113-148.
- al-Bukhârî, *Şahîh al-Bukhârî: The translation of the meanings of Şahîh al-Bukhârî*, trans. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, 9 vols. (Riyadh, 1997).
- al-Bukhârî, Abū ‘Abd Allâh Muḥammad ibn Ismâ‘îl, *Şahîh al-Bukhârî*, ed. Abū Şuhayb al-Karamî (al-Riyâd, 1998).

- al-Bundārī, al-Faṭḥ ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Iṣfahānī, *Zubdat al-nuṣra wa nukhbat al-‘uṣra*, ed. Martin T. Houtsma, in: *Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seldjucides*, 2: *Histoire des Seldjucides de l’Irâq par al-Bondârî, d’après Imâd ad-dîn al-Kâtib al-Iṣfahânî* (Leiden, 1889).
- Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, ed. Peter Schreiner, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1975-1979).
- Cahen, Claude, *The Formation of Turkey. The Seljukid Sultanate of Rûm: eleventh to fourteenth century* (Harlow, 2001).
- Clavijo, Ruy González de, *Embajada a Tamorlán*, in: *Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes*. Accessed on 30 July 2020: www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra-visor/vida-y-hazanas-del-gran-tamorlan-con-la-descripcion-de-las-tierras-de-su-imperio-y-senorio--0/html/feed4b6c-82b1-11df-acc7-002185ce6064_1.htm#1.
- Clavijo, Ruy González de, *Embassy to Tamerlane, 1403-1406*, trans. Guy Le Strange (London, 1928).
- Clavijo, Ruy González de, *Itinéraire de l’Ambassade Espagnole à Samarkande en 1403-1406*, ed. Izmail I. Sreznevski, *Sbornik Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* 28 (St Petersburg, 1881).
- Codice diplomatico delle colonie tauro-liguri durante la signoria dell’Ufficio di S. Giorgio (1453-1475), ed. Amédeo Vigna P., *Atti della società ligure di storia patria* 6 (1868) 1-981. Accessed on 20 May 2020: www.storiapatriagenova.it/BD_vs_contenitore.aspx?Id_Scheda_Bibliografica_Padre=99&Id_Progetto=0.
- Çulpan, Cevdet, *Moldavya’da Bender Kalesi Kitabesi*, *Türk Kültürü* 4/46 (1966) 49-51 (881-883).
- Dzhanov, Aleksandr V., *Kaffa, Krymskoie khanstvo i osmany v 1454-1456 gg.*, *Sugdeiskii zbirnik* 8 (2019) 79-373.
- Eyice, Semavi, *Bender Kalesi. Osmanlı Devleti’nin Boğdan sınırında serhad kalesi*, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 5 (Ankara, 1992) 431-432. Accessed on 24 April 2020: islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/bender-kalesi.
- Fekete, Ludwig, *Türkische Schriften aus dem Archive des Palatins Nikolaus Esterházy* (Budapest, 1932). Available at the *Hungaricana. Hungarian Cultural Heritage Portal* – Accessed on 22 May 2020: library.hungaricana.hu/hu/view/MolDigiLib_VSK_turkische_schriften/?pg=300&layout=s.
- Fekete, Ludwig, *Einführung in die Osmanisch-Türkische Diplomatie der Türkischen Botmässigkeit in Ungarn* (Budapest, 1926). Available at the *Hungaricana. Hungarian Cultural Heritage Portal*. Accessed on 20 May 2020: library.hungaricana.hu/en/view/MolDigiLib_VSK_Einfuehrung/?pg=33&layout=s.
- Feridun-bey Ahmed, *Münşaat-i Selatin*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, AH 1274, AD 1857).
- Galstian, Ashot G., *Armianskiie istochniki o mongolakh* (Moscow, 1962).
- Garsoian, Nina G., Pakourianos, in: Alexander P. Kazhdan et al. (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 3 (Oxford, 1991) 1553.
- Gelibolulu Muṣṭafa ‘Alī, *Künhü’l-Aḥbâr, cilt.ii: Fâtih Sultân Meḥmed devri (1451-1481)*, ed. M. Hüdai Şentürk (Ankara, 2003).
- Grumel, Venance, *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958).
- Guboglu, Mihail, *L’inscription turque de Bender relative à l’expédition de Soliman le Magnifique en Moldavie (1538/945)*, *Studia et acta orientalia* 1 (1958) 175-187.
- Hewsen, Robert H., *Armenia: a Historical Atlas* (Chicago, 2001).

- al-Ḥusaynī, Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī, *Soobscheniia o Sel'djujskom gosudarstve. Slivki letopisei, soobschaischikh o Sel'djujskikh emirakh i gosudariakh*, ed. Ziia M. Buniatov (Moscow, 1980).
- Ibn al-Athīr, 'Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Abū al-Karam Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad 'Abd al-Karīm ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Shaybānī, *al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh*, ed. Carl Johan Tornberg, 12 vols. (reprint) (Beirut, 1965-1967). English translation: Donald S. Richards, *The Annals of the Saljuq Turks. Selections from al-Kāmil fī'l-Tārīkh of 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr* (London, 2002).
- Ibn Bībī, *Al-Awāmīr al-'Alā'iya fī'l-Umūr al-'Alā'iya*, ed. Zhālah Mutaḥaddīn (Tehran, 1390); *Histoire des Seldjoudes d'Asie Mineure, d'après l'abrégé du Seldjouknāme d'Ibn-Bībī: texte persan*, ed. Martin Th. Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoudes 4 (Leiden, 1902); *El-Evāmīrū'l-'Alā'iyye fī'l-umūri'l-'Alā'iyye*, ed. Adnan S. Erzi (Ankara, 1956); German translation: Herbert W. Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī* (Copenhagen, 1959).
- Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Alī, *al-Muntaẓam fī ta'rīkh al-mulūk wa al-umam*, ed. unknown, 10 vols. (Hyderabad, 1940-1942); ed. Muhammad 'Abd al-Qādir 'Atā and Mustafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Atā, 18 vols. (Beirut, 1992).
- Ibn Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman. VII. Defeter (Tenkidli transkropsyon)*, ed. Şerafettin Turan (Ankara, 1957).
- İnalçık, Halil, Power relationships between Russia, the Crimea and the Ottoman Empire as reflected in titulature, in: Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejey, Gilles Veinstein and S. Enders Wimbush (eds.), *Passé turco-tatar, présent soviétique. Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen (Turco-Tatar Past, Soviet Present. Studies Presented to Alexandre Bennigsen)* (Paris, 1986) 175-211.
- Istanbul'un fethinden önce yazılmış tarihî takvimler*, ed. Osman Turan (Ankara, 1954).
- Institutes political and military, written originally in the Mogul language, by the Great Timour, improperly called Tamerlane; first translated into Persian by Abu Taulib Alhusseini; and thence into English, with marginal notes, by Major Davy. The original Persian transcribed from a MS. in the possession of Dr. Wm. Hunter*, ed. Joseph White (Oxford, 1783).
- Jami' at-Tirmidhi*. Accessed on 27 May 2020: sunnah.com/tirmidhi.
- Jeffreys, Michael et al. (eds.), *Prosopography of the Byzantine World, 2016* (King's College London, 2017). Accessed on 24 March 2021: pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk.
- Kaçar, Hilmi, *A Mirror for the Sultan. State Ideology in the Early Ottoman Chronicles, 1300-1453*. Proefschrift voorgelegd tot het behalen van de graad van Doctor in de Geschiedenis (Gent, 2015).
- Karakaş, Gökhan, Kanuni'nin kitabesi 101 yıl sonra yerinde, *Millet*, 25 February 2019. Accessed on 30 May 2020: www.milliyet.com.tr/gundem/kanuni-nin-kitabesi-101-yil-sonra-yerinde-2833045.
- Karpov, Sergey P., *Ital'ianskii morskii respubliki i Iuzhnoie Prichernomor'ie v xiii-xv vv.: problemy torgovli* (Moscow, 1990).
- K'art'lis Ts'khovreba*, ed. S. Qaukhch'ishvili, 2 vols. (Tbilisi, 1955-1959).
- Kazhdan, Alexander P., *Armiane v sostave gospodstvuiushego klassa Vizantiiskoi imperii v XI-XII vv.* (Erevan, 1975).
- Kennedy, Hugh (ed.), *An Historical Atlas of Islam. Atlas historique de l'Islam* (Leiden, 2002).
- Köhbach, Markus, *Çasar oder imperaṭor? – Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiser durch die Osmanen nach dem Vertrag von Zsitvatorok (1606), Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 82 [in memoriam Anton C. Schaendlinger] (1992) 223-234.*

- Korkmaz, Zeynep, Anadolu Ağızlarının Etnik Yapı ile İlişkisi Sorunu, in: Zeynep Korkmaz, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar 2* (Ankara, 1995) 179-187.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep, Die Frage des Verhältnisses der anatolischen Mundarten zu ihrer ethnischen Struktur, in: Zeynep Korkmaz, *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar 2* (Ankara, 1995) 188-198.
- Korobeinikov, Dimitri, The Byzantine-Seljuk Border in Times of Trouble: Laodikeia in 1174-1204, in: Alicia Simpson (ed.), *Byzantium, 1180-1204: »The Sad Quarter of a Century«?* (Athens, 2015) 49-81.
- Korobeinikov, Dimitri, *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 2014).
- Kütükoğlu, Mübahat S., *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili* (Istanbul, 1994).
- Kuzenkov, P., *Khristianskiie khronologicheskiie sistemy* (Moscow, 2014).
- Lefort, Jacques, *Documents grecs dans les archives de Topkapı Sarayı: contribution à l'histoire de Cem Sultan. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivlerinin Yunanca Belgeleri. Cem Sultan'ın Tarihine Katkı*, Publications de la Société d'histoire turque: Série 7; Türk Tarih Kurumu yayınları, 7/76 (Ankara, 1981).
- Lewis, Geoffrey, *Modern Turkey* (New York, 1974).
- Marks, N. A., *K istorii Benderskoi kreposti* (Odessa, 1917).
- Mioni, Elpidio, Una inedita cronaca bizantina (dal. Marc.Gr. 595), *Rivista di studi bizantini e slavi* 1 (1981) 71-88.
- Mīrkhwānd, *Tārīkh rawḍat al-ṣafā'*, ed. N. Sabūkhī (Tehran, 1338-1339).
- Navā'ī, 'Abd al-Ḥusayn, *Asnād va mukātabāt-i tārikhī-yi Īrān* (Tehran, 1963).
- Neschri, *Gihānnümā. Die altosmanische Chronik des Mevlānā Meḥammed Neschri*, ed. Franz Taeschner, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1951-1955).
- Neşri, Mehmed, *Kitāb-ı Cihān-nümā (Neşri Tarihi)*, eds. Faik R. Unat and Mehmet A. Köymen, 2 vols. (Ankara, 1987).
- Neşri, Mevlānā Mehmed, *Cihānnümā [6. Kısım: Osmanlı Tarihi (687-890/1288-1485)]. Giriş, Metin, Kronoloji, Dizin, Tıpkıbasım*, ed. Necdet Öztürk (Istanbul, 2013).
- Nuri Yurdusev, Ahmet, The Ottoman Attitude toward Diplomacy, in: Ahmet Nuri Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (New York, 2004) 5-35.
- Özcan, Abdülkadir, Feridun Ahmed Bey, *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 12 (Ankara, 1995) 396-397. Accessed on 30 May 2020: islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/feridun-ahmed-bey.
- Panaret, Mikhail, *O Velikikh Komninakh (Trapezindskaia khronika)*, ed. A. M. Kriukov, trans. Sergei P. Karpov and Rustam M. Shukurov (Saint Petersburg, 2019).
- Papp, Sándor, *Die Verleihungs-, Bekräftigungs- und Vertragsurkunden der Osmanen für Ungarn und Siebenbürgen. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*, Schriften der Balkan-Kommission 42 (Vienna, 2003).
- Peacock, A. C. S., *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia* (Cambridge, 2019).
- Pelliot, Paul, *Notes on Marco Polo*, ed. Louis Hambis, 2 vols. (Paris, 1959-1963).
- Prima serie di documenti riguardanti la colonia di Pera, ed. Luigi T. Belgrano, *Atti della società ligure di storia patria* 13 (1877) 97-336. Accessed on 20 May 2020: www.storiapatriagenova.it/BD_vs_contenitore.aspx?Id_Scheda_Bibliografica_Padre=150&Id_Progetto=0.
- Sahih al-Bukhari*, trans. Muhammad Muhsin Khan. Accessed on 27 May 2020: sunnah.com/bukhari.
- Sahih Muslim*, trans. Abdul Hamid Siddiqui. Accessed on 27 May 2020: sunnah.com/muslim.

- Sapozhnikov, Igor and Volodymir Levchuk, Iz istorii Benderskoi kreposti: k stoletiiu knigi N.A. Marksa, *Scriptorium nostrum* 2/5 (2016) 306-337. Accessed on 22 April 2020: docplayer.ru/57202915-Iz-istorii-benderskoy-kreposti-k-100-letiyu-knigi-n-a-marksa.html.
- Schaendlinger, Anton C. (with Claudia Römer), *Die Schreiben Süleymāns des Prächtigen an Karl V., Ferdinand I. und Maximilian II* (Vienna, 1983).
- Sevim, Ali, Mir'ätü'z-Zaman Fî Tarihi'l-Âyan (Kayıp Uyûnü't-Tevârih'ten Naklen Selçuklular-la İlgili Bölümler) Sıbt İbnü'l Cevzî, *Belgeler* 14 (sayı 18) (1989-1992) 1-260.
- Sevim, Ali and Yaşar Yücel, *Türkiye tarihi. Fetih, Seçluklu ve beylikler dönemi* (Ankara, 1989).
- Shanidze, Akaki G., *Velikii domestik Zapada Grigorii Bakurianis-dze i gruzinskii monastyr', osnovannyi im v Bolgarii* (Tbilisi, 1970).
- Shanidze, Akaki G., *Gruzinskii monastyr' v Bolgarii i ego tipik. Gruzinskaia redaktsiia tipika. Kartvelta monasteri Bulgaretsi da misi tipikoni. Tipikonis kartuli redakcia* (Tbilisi, 1971).
- Sharaf al-Dîn 'Alî Yazdî, *Zafar-name. Kniga pobed amira Timura*, trans. Ashraf Akhmedov (Tashkent, 2008).
- Shukurov, Rustam, Between Peace and Hostility: Trebizond and the Turkish Pontic Periphery in the Fourteenth Century, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9/1 (1994) 20-72.
- Sıbt İbn al-Jawzî, Shams al-Dîn Abû al-Muza'ffar Yûsuf İbn Qızoghlû, *Mir'ât al-zamân fî târikh al-a'yân*, ed. Akaki Sevim (Ankara 1968).
- al-Sırafî, Abû Zayd al-Ḥasan İbn Yazîd, *Silsilat al-tawârikh*, in: *Relation des voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persans dans l'Inde et à la Chine dans le IXe siècle de l'ère chrétienne: texte arabe imprimé en 1811 par les soins de Feu Langlès*, ed. and trans. Joseph T. Reinaud, 2 vols. (Paris, 1845).
- Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları tarihi*, ed. Mesud Koman (Konya, 1946); *Karamannâme*, eds. Metin Sözen and Necdet Sakaoğlu (Istanbul, 2005).
- Smbat Sparapet, *Taregirk'*, ed. Serobe Agélean (Venice, 1956). English translation: Robert Bedrosian, *Chronicle* (New Jersey, 2005).
- Sulaymān al-Tājir, Akhbār al-Şin wa'l-Hind. An Account of China and India, translated from original Arabic with commentaries by S. Maqbul Ahmad, *Arabic classical accounts of India and China* (Calcutta, 1989).
- Sulaymān al-Tājir, *Ajā' ib al-dunyā wa-qiyās al-buldān*, ed. Sayf Shāhin al-Mirrikhî (al-'Ayn, 2005).
- Tārikh-i āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlî*, ed. Nādira Jalālî (Tehran, 1999).
- Thomson, Robert W., *Rewriting Caucasian History. The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles* (Oxford, 1996).
- Tollius, Jacobus, *Epistolae Itinerariae*, ed. Heinrich C. Hennin (Amsterdam, 1700).
- Toumanoff, Cyril, *Les dynasties de la Caucasic chrétienne de l'Antiquité jusqu'au XIXe siècle. Tables généalogiques et chronologiques* (Rome, 1990).
- Turan, Osman, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye. Siyasî Tarih Alp Arslan'dan Osman Gâzi'ye (1071-1318)* (Istanbul, 1971).
- Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, ed. Halil Inalcik and Rhoads Murphey (Minneapolis, 1978).
- Tütüncü, Mehmet , Osmanlının Kuzey-Batı Sınırı Macaristan ve Slovakya'da Osmanlı Anıtları ve Kitabelerine Yeni bir Kaynak: Hollandalı Jacob Tollius, in: Halit Eren and Sadik Ünay (eds.), *Balkanlar'da İslam Medeniyeti Uluslararası Üçüncü Sempozyum Tebliğleri, Bükreş, Romanya, 1-5 Kasım 2006* (Istanbul, 2011) 643-656.

- Typicon Gregorii Pacuriani*, ed. Michael Tarchnischvili, in: *Corpus scriptorium christianorum orientarium* 144: *Scriptores iberici*, 4 (Louvain, 1954); ed. S. Kauchtschischvili, in: *Georgica. Scriptorum byzantinorum excerpta ad Georgiam pertinentia* 5 (Tbilisi, 1963) 83-301; *Tipik Grigoriia Pakuriana*, trans. Viada A. Arutiunova-Fidanian (Erevan, 1978); ed. and trans. Paul Gautier, *Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos*, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 42 (1984) 5-145.
- Ulozheniie Temura*, trans. Kh. Karomatov (Tashkent, 1999).
- al-ʿUmārī, Ibn Faḍl Allāh Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā, *al-Taʿrīf biʾl-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Sharīf*, ed. S. al-Drūbī (al-Karak, 1988).
- Wright, Diana G., »Eskisinden Daha Gönençli Olansınız«. Fatih Sultan Mehmed'in Yunanlı Beylere Mektubu, 1454, *Derin Tarih* 8 (Kasım, 2012) 34-37.
- Wright, Diana G. and Pierre MacKay, When the Serenissima and the Gran Turco made Love: the Peace Treaty of 1478, *Studi Veneziani*, 53 (2007) 261-277.
- Yāqūt ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-buldān*, ed. Farīd ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Jundī, 7 vols. (Beirut, 1990).
- Yāqūt ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-buldān*, 5 vols. (Beirut, 1977).
- Yazıcızâde ʿAlī, *Selçuk-nâme*, fascilime edition of MS Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Revan Bölümü nu. 1391, ed. Abdullah Bakır (Ankara, 2014).
- Yazıcızâde Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk (Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Tarihi)*, ed. Abdullah Bakır (Istanbul, 2009).
- Yıldız, Sara Nur, Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey: Medieval Anatolian Warlord or Kemalist Language Reformer? Nationalist Historiography, Language Politics and the Celebration of the Language Festival in Karaman, Turkey, 1961–2008, in: Jorgen Nielsen (ed.), *Religion, Ethnicity and Contested Nationhood in the Former Ottoman Space* (Leiden, 2012) 147-170.
- Yıldız, Sara Nur, Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier: Armenians, Latins, and Turks in Conflict and Alliance during the Early Thirteenth Century, in: Florin Curta (ed.), *Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis: Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2005) 91-120.
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., [no title], *Leben und Taten der Türkischen Kaiser. Die anonyme vulgärgriechische Chronik Codex Barberinianus Qraecus 111 (Anonymus Zoras)* by Richard F. Kreutel. Reviewed in: *Der Islam* 50/2 (1973) 367-369.

Website

Gevale, accessed 24 March 2021: gevale.com/fotograf/ (Selçuklu Belediyesi, 2015).