ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM appears once a year. 1971

ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM concerns itself primarily with Ottoman history and Ottoman philology. However, the editors also welcome articles on subjects related to Ottoman studies in the history and culture of Europe, including in particular Danubian Europe, the Black Sea area and the Caucasus, and in the history and culture of the Arab and Iranian lands, and Byzantium.

Authors of articles will receive ten free offprints of their contribution and a free copy of the volume in which their article appears. Authors of articles may buy additional copies of any volume at a discount from the retail price. Similarly they may buy additional offprints of each of their articles without discount.

Contributors are invited to send articles by registered mail to

Tibor Halasi-Kun
29 Claremont Avenue
New York, New York 10027

or to

Halil İnalcık
Turan Emeksiz Sokağı 8/10
Çankaya, Ankara

Books for review, as well as requests for review copies, are to be sent to either of the above addresses.

The subscription price is ƒ 80, — per volume; the price of single copies is ƒ 96, — .

Edirne'nin Fethi 1361, TTK, 1964 Ankara
"Edirne Armağanı"

Subscriptions as well as single copies are obtainable from all booksellers and subscription agencies, or directly from Co-Libri, Distributors for Mouton Publishers, P.O. Box 482, The Hague 2076, The Netherlands

# THE CONQUEST OF EDİRNE (1361)

H. İNALCIK

The question of when and how Edirne (Adrianople) was conquered was most recently discussed by the Bulgarian historian A. Burmov and the Turkish historian İ.H. Uzunçarşılı.[1]

In Burmov's opinion, Edirne must have been taken immediately after the battle of Černomen (Çirmen) (26 September 1371), that is, at the end of September or the beginning of October of that same year.[2] He attempts to establish this date by using information contained in three completely unrelated sources: the Serbian Chronicles, Chalcocondyles and Luccari. He begins by quoting the brief notation in the Serbian Chronicles: "Sultan Otman killed King Vukašin and the Despot Uglješa in Macedonia along the Maritza River ... and took Edirne".

Similarly, Chalcocondyles informs us that the Ottomans took Edirne subsequent to the Černomen battle. Finally Luccari, probably using a Bulgarian chronicle now lost, ties the conquest of Edirne to the Černomen battle. The last two sources mention Süleyman Pasha as the Ottoman commander who took Edirne; according to Burmov, these sources err only on this point.

In reviewing the general situation of that time, Burmov also arrived at the conclusion that the date should be set at 1371. In his opinion, the fact that the Serbian princes suddenly came to Černomen and particularly the fact that Vukašin, who was just then busy in Albania,

[1] A. Burmov, "Türkler Edirne'yi ne vakit aldılar?", Turkish translation by H. Eren, *Belleten* 49 (1949), pp. 97-106; İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi* I (Ankara, 1961²), p. 163. Most recently, N. Ormancı, "Edirne'nin fethi tarihine dair", *Türk San'atı Tarihi Araştırma ve İncelemeleri, İstanbul Güzel San'atlar Akademisi, Türk San'atı Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları* 1 (1963), pp. 435-438. He ends his writing with the following words: "As of now, we are not able to establish the date of the capture of Edirne".

[2] The most recent article dealing with this battle is G. Skrivanić, "Bitka na Maritsi", *Voynoistorijskog Glasnika* 3 (1963), pp. 71-94. I would like here to express my special thanks to Dr. D. Lukač-Bojanić for her assistance with and translation of the Serbian sources.

rushed to join his brother Uglješa, is to be explained by events of great importance which were taking place in the area. In other words, the battle of Černomen, which took place in 1371, was a campaign undertaken in order to save Edirne from the Turks. When the Serbs were defeated, the city fell to the Turks.

The evidence presented by Burmov is not conclusive to us.[3] First, the Serbian Chronicles often err greatly in information concerning Ottoman advances in the Balkans. There is no reason to prefer the chronology of this source over others.[4] The confusion in the chronology of Chalcocondyles' work, written in the 1480's, is well known.[5] On the other hand, his and Luccari's mention of Süleyman Pasha in connection with this battle is noteworthy since we know that Süleyman Pasha came to Edirne in the autumn of 1352 in order to aid Cantacuzenus, and that he fought with the Serbs.[6] Chalcocondyles seems to have confused the several battles engaged in by the Serbs and Ottomans between 1352-1371.

Finally Burmov holds it significant that the two Byzantine writers contemporary with the events—Cantacuzenus[7] and Demetrius Cydones—never mention the fall of Edirne; had Edirne fallen previous to 1371, that important event would most assuredly be echoed in their writings. But one must not forget that Cantacuzenus was defending himself in his memoirs; perhaps he preferred not to discuss this event which put him and his son Matthew in a difficult position, since he was held responsible for the Ottoman occupation of Thrace. Cydones, in his letters and other writings, striving to show off his literary style, presented a

[3] G. Ostrogorsky rejects Burmov's theory by saying "This suggestion ... is certainly incorrect". *See*, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey (New Brunswick, N.J., 1969), p. 536, n. 3; M. Tixomirov, *Voprosy istorii* 3 (1948), pp. 691 ff. and F. Babinger, *Revue des études Byzantines* 1 (1950), p. 205 also made objections to Burmov's theory.

[4] The Bulgarian Chronicle, published by I. Bogdan, states that Gallipoli fell after the battle on the Maritsa in 1371 (*see* C. Jireček, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 18, p. 264).

[5] *See* Ostrogorsky, p. 416.

[6] Ostrogorsky, p. 472. It is in the Ahmedî-Şükrullâh-Ruhî group of the Ottoman sources that we find information about this battle of Süleyman Pasha with the Serbs. The fact that the Düstûrnâme (ed. Yınanç, p. 84) attributes Edirne's conquest to Süleyman Pasha may have something to do with this event. Süleyman Pasha (as the ally of Cantacuzenus) was probably the first Ottoman to enter Edirne. Concerning the Ahmedî-Ruhî narrative *see* my "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", *The Historians of the Middle East*, B. Lewis – P. M. Holt, Eds. (London, 1962), pp. 159-162.

[7] The memoirs of Cantacuzenus go as far as the year 1364.



general rather than detailed account of the individual events. Let me also add that even the Byzantine *Short Chronicle*,[8] which gives a faithful chronology of important events, contains no mention of the fall of Edirne. In short, we can say that Burmov's thesis about Edirne's fall subsequent to the battle of Černomen is not based on irrefutable evidence.

Previous to Burmov, C. Jireček, rejecting the generally accepted date of 1361 for the conquest of Edirne,[9] took as his basis the death of Orhan in 1362, as given in the Byzantine *Short Chronicle*, and submitted that Edirne must have been conquered only after that date — probably in 1363 — by Murad I who was then *sultan in his father's place*. Later Jireček, basing himself on a notice found in a work of M. Panaretus, written in the fifteenth century,[10] stated that in March of 1362 Edirne was still in the hands of the Byzantines; and he points out that this only strengthens his theory that the city passed to the Turks in 1363.

The Turkish historian Uzunçarşılı, like Jireček, has also attempted to establish the date of the conquest of Edirne through the date of Orhan's death. Today we definitely know that Orhan died in 1362.[11] According to Uzunçarşılı, after Orhan died in 1362 and Murad I ascended the throne, he was faced with the insurrection of his brothers and, in order to subjugate them and bring Ankara under his control, he was forced to undertake a campaign in the east.[12] Taking into consideration that

[8] *See* P. Charanis, "An Important Short Chronicle of the Fourteenth Century", *Byzantion* 13 (1938), pp. 335-362.

[9] *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague 1878), p. 321; also his "Zur Würdigung der neuentdeckten bulgarische Chronik", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 13 (1891-1892), pp. 255-256.

[10] According to this remark, when the plague broke out John III Comnenus, ruler of Trebizond, who was in Edirne in March 1362, fled from there to Sinop (C. Jireček, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18 (1909), p. 582).

[11] The *Short Chronicle* (*see* Charanis, p. 350) notes that in the year 6870 an epidemic of the plague broke out and in March of the same year (March 1362) Orhan died. Charanis confirms this date with other sources: by comparing with M. Villani's Italian Chronicle from the same period, and with the renovation inscription of the Alâeddin mosque in Ankara. In another unrelated source, the *Calendar* dated 773 A.H. of Zeyn'ül-Müneccim (*Tarihî Takvimler*, ed. Turan (Ankara, 1954), p. 72) the date of Orhan's death is given as 763 A.H. For the inscription on the Alâeddin mosque *see* Mustafa Akdağ, "Ankara Sultan Alâeddin Câmii kapısında bulunan H. 763 t. bir kitabenin tarihi önemi", *Tarih Vesikaları* 18, pp. 366-373, and n. 69 below.

[12] Uzunçarşılı gives in one place 1363 and in another 1362 as the date of this campaign (*Osmanlı Tarihi* I (Ankara, 1961²), p. 164, and p. 165 n. 2). The *Calendar* of Zeyn'ül-Müneccim of Sıvas (ed. Turan, p. 72) gives the date of Eretna-oğlu's march on Ankara as Şevvâl 767 A.H. (the end of July 1364). For Eretna-oğlu's campaign *see* pp. 175-176 below.

these events immediately followed Murad's accession, the author concludes that Murad I could only have undertaken the campaign that culminated in the conquest of Edirne in 1363, or even later in 1364 or 1365.[13]

Both Jireček and Uzunçarşılı accept as a fact that Edirne was conquered only *after the death of Orhan and the ascendance of Murad*, and both arrive at the conclusion that, since Orhan's death has been established at 1362, the conquest naturally took place subsequent to that date. However, the first premise of this syllogism—the supposition that Edirne was conquered after Orhan's death—has not been proved. Both are attempting to prove one unknown by a second unknown. It is these same sources that we have found to be erroneous with regard to dating which states that Edirne was taken by Murad I *after he ascended the Ottoman throne*. No one has yet mentioned the possibility that the sources may have erred on this point too, and that Edirne may have been taken after the death of Süleyman Pasha, but in Orhan's lifetime, by Prince Murad.

In Burmov's opinion, the Ottoman Chronicles, because they give variant dates and contain basically confused and fanciful information, are not to be relied on and should be overlooked on this particular question.[14] Other authors enumerate all the dates offered for the conquest of Edirne by every Ottoman writer from Âşık Paşazâde to Hayrullâh Efendi — *i.e.* 759, 760, 761, 762 or 763 A.H. — and they either select one of them or leave the question completely open. But no one has yet attempted a systematic analysis of these Ottoman narratives.

Without further discussion concerning the dates of the conquest of Edirne, let us, by comparing information contained in Ottoman sources with those of the Byzantine sources, study here the real course of events, and see which of the dates of these events can be clearly established.

[13] Uzunçarşılı, p. 163 n. 2, and pp. 164-165.

[14] The letters given in Ferîdûn Beğ (*Münşeâtü's-Selâtin* I (İstanbul, 1274), pp. 90-96), which, it is claimed, were sent to Karaman-oğlu and Üveys Han (the first one dated 1 Rebiülâhir 767, and Üveys Han's answer of evâil-i Zilkâde 763) concerning the conquest of Edirne are, as the other documents of this collection dating before the time of Beyazid I, not authentic (*cf.* M. H. Yınanç, "Ferîdûn Beğ Münşeâtı", *TOEM*, 11-13, p. 161; 14, pp. 37, 95, and 216). The letter sent to Üveys Han (undoubtedly Şeyh Üveys Bahâdır Han of the Celâyirids, who was sultan between 757 and 776 A.H.) is nothing but the account given in the Ottoman chronicles put into the form of a letter in Persian by an amateur.



Our point of departure will be the death of Süleyman Pasha and the imprisonment of Prince Halil.

Of the old Ottoman narratives, Âşık Paşazâde gives the date 758 A.H. (beginning on 25 December 1356) as the year of Süleyman's death, whereas the *Anonymous Chronicles* and Oruç give 759 A.H. (beginning on 19 December 1357). Pseudo-Ruhî indicates that Süleyman died after waging war in Rumelia for six years; thus, if we keep in mind that he took Cinbi (Tzympe) in 753 A.H. (1352 A.D.), we must accept both for this source and for Pseudo-Ruhî the year 758 A.H. as the year of Süleyman's death. One of the *Calendars*[15] notes that Orhan died five years after Süleyman. Since we know that Orhan died in 763 A.H. (1362 A.D.) this date too confirms Süleyman's death in 758 A.H. The testimony of the contemporary Byzantine historian N. Gregoras corroborates this date (iii, p. 560 = *CSHB* vol. 8). He tells us that Süleyman's death occurred soon after Halil's captivity. We know that Halil was captured in the summer of 1357.[16] Therefore *we can state that Süleyman died either in the summer or the autumn of 1357.*

The detailed information given by Gregoras concerning Halil's release from captivity is important for a better understanding of the situation in which the Ottomans found themselves.

Orhan's eleven year old son Halil was taken captive at sea by pirates and taken to Phocaea (Foça). To save him, Orhan had no other choice but to appeal to the Byzantine Emperor. Emperor John V Palaeologus, who wanted to squeeze the greatest possible advantage from the situation, succeeded in completing an advantageous agreement with Orhan. The conditions of this agreement were that the Ottoman sovereign undertake the establishment of peaceful relations by the cessation of all aggression against Byzantine territory; further, that he assume expenses for the ships which were to be sent against the Phocaeans, cancel the outstanding debts of the Emperor, and promise to support the Emperor by ceasing to aid Matthew Cantacuzenus, who was holding out against the Emperor in Thrace.[17] This last condition was extremely important. The Ottomans

[15] I refer to the Paris *Calendar* which gives the most detailed information concerning the Ottomans (ed. Turan, pp. 16, and 18).

[16] İskender Hoci, who translated this section of Gregoras (iii, p. 560) into Turkish, establishes the summer of 1356 as the date of this event. However, E. de Muralt (*Essai de chronographie byzantine* II (St. Petersburg, 1871), p. 661) gives 1357 as the date of the same event. Gregoras ends his writing with the event of Halil's rescue which took place in 1359 (Ostrogorsky, p. 415). Halil remained prisoner in the hands of the Phocaeans for two years.

[17] John Cantacuzenus (iii, p. 321 = *CSHB* vol. 4) corroborates Gregoras (iii, pp. 504,

had since 1345 been the faithful allies of John Cantacuzenus, who had been struggling against his rivals in Byzantium from his Thracian headquarters in Adrianople and Didymoteichum (Orhan had become his son-in-law when, in 1346, he married Cantacuzenus' daughter Theodora).[18] The Ottomans who through this alliance had first found the opportunity to settle in Rumelia (conquest of Cinbi in 1352) now were able, through their continued support, upon abdication of John Cantacuzenus to his son Matthew, to strengthen their position in Thrace and open up further areas for their activities. In the face of this situation John V Palaeologus in Constantinople had to rely mainly on the co-operation of the Serbs and Bulgars. Now with the agreement with Orhan, John V Palaeologus hoped to stop the advance of the Ottomans, whose activities were the source of great concern in Constantinople, and whose support rendered Matthew a dangerous rival, and to effect, if possible, the evacuation of Thracian cities under Ottoman occupation. According to Byzantine sources, unlike his aged and ailing father, who sought a more conciliatory policy toward Byzantium, Süleyman Pasha was utterly determined in his policy of conquest.[19] Thus he seems to have fully understood the extreme sacrifice involved in the giving up of this bridgehead which was of the greatest importance for the continuation of the *gazâ* and the establishment of the Ottoman state in Europe. An interesting narrative has it that the dying Süleyman's last request was that he be buried in Bolayır, his first conquest on the Gallipoli peninsula, and that his corpse never be left to the enemy.[20] One can understand quite well from the Ottoman and Byzantine accounts the deep and hopeless grief that beset Orhan, the ailing old Ottoman sovereign, at the captivity of Halil by the Phocaean pirates and Süleyman's sudden death.[21]

and 561) on this point (*see*, *Histoire de Constantinople* viii, tr. M. Cousin (Paris, 1674), p. 266).

[18] Ostrogorsky, p. 472; P. Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydın* (Paris, 1957), pp. 220-221.

[19] In 1354 Orhan was in negotiation with his father-in-law, John Cantacuzenus, concerning the evacuation of the Turks from the places occupied by Süleyman Pasha in Thrace, and it is claimed in Cantacuzenus' memoirs (iii, pp. 276-277; tr. viii, pp. 230-231) that he even agreed to this evacuation in return for financial compensation. From Cantacuzenus' statement it also becomes evident that Süleyman Pasha at that time resisted such a move. Chalcocondyles (i, p. 22, ed. Darkó; tr. pp. 9, and 12) depicts Süleyman as the third Ottoman ruler.

[20] "You will bury me in this province, and should the infidel come you will resist and not flee ... and also you will do your best lest my corpse be left in their hands". (Anonymous, *Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osmân*, ed. Giese (Breslau, 1922), p. ١٧).

[21] Gregoras, iii, pp. 560-561, tr. pp. 241-242; Anonymous, *Tevârîh*, p. 17; especially



Gregoras relates (iii, p. 561) that Orhan's peace agreement with the Byzantine emperor was subsequent to Süleyman's death. This agreement, signed under duress, was a great sacrifice for the Ottomans. It meant the cessation of conquest, the desertion of their ally Matthew, and the abandonment to a bitter fate of Ottomans resident in Rumelia. The indecision and hopelessness that beset these *gazis* at the loss of their energetic leader Süleyman Pasha is clearly reflected in the *Anonymous Chronicle*. This chronicle relates that, after Süleyman's death, the enemy undertook an all-out attack by land and sea from the direction of Kavak-Tuzlası *i.e.* Saros Bay,[22] but they withdrew when they saw that the Ottomans were determined to fight on regardless of cost.[23] As to Matthew, who had been left to his own resources, he was taken prisoner by the Serbians and turned over to the Byzantine emperor.[24]

Under these new conditions, John V Palaeologus' position on the Byzantine throne was strengthened. In contrast, Orhan's only thought now was to effect the release of his son Halil. He insisted that John V Palaeologus proceed in person with a fleet against the Phocaeans (at that time, Byzantium had three galleys), and the emperor set out in the following spring, *i.e.* the spring of 1358. Orhan had also made an agreement with İlyas Bey, the ruling prince of Saruhan, to attack the Phocaeans by land; together they encircled the city, but without success. The emperor returned to his capital without consulting Orhan. The

*Düstûrnâme*, p. 84. Afterwards Orhan established pious foundations for the convent of dervishes built at his grave in Bolayır. According to Ruhî: "When the heart-breaking news of his death reached Prince Orhan in Bursa, with much crying and sighing he wept and wailed, yet since there was no other way but to accept this grave misfortune, he ordered that an edifice for public welfare (*'imâret*) should be built in Bolayır at the place where the late Süleyman Pasha lay buried". We are preparing for publication an annotated edition of a copy of this important *wakf* document which was redrawn following an official review during the reign of Mehmed II, and which is at present kept in Istanbul in the Museum of Turkish and Islamic Works.

[22] There is a natural saltpan before the village of Kavak at the Bay of Saros. In Ottoman times it was farmed out.

[23] Anonymous, p. ١٨: In the winter of 1357-1358 the emperor remained with his small fleet in Bozca-ada (Tenedos). We may assume that the Byzantines, in order to profit from the agreement made with Orhan, wanted to put up a show in the hope of taking possession of the places occupied by the Ottomans on the Gallipoli peninsula. However, as can be seen from the Ottoman account, they must have given up their plans when they realized that the *gazis* there, faithful to Süleyman Pasha's decision, were preparing for a fight.

[24] Ostrogorsky (p. 474) gives 1357 as the date of this event. According to Gregoras (iii, p. 564), this event took place at the time the emperor set out by ship for Phocaea, in the spring of 1358.

Ottoman sovereign then made known to the emperor that, should the latter not return to Phocaea for continued efforts to rescue Orhan's son, he (Orhan) would void the agreement and undertake new assaults against Byzantine territories. The emperor immediately embarked for Priconisum with two ships. He met with Orhan, placated him and within the same year set out for Phocaea. Nevertheless he again returned without a solution. Orhan came to Chalcedon (Kadıköy) in the spring of 1359, and through representatives he conferred with the emperor, who remained offshore on his ship. Orhan accepted the new conditions of the emperor. These conditions stipulated that, as soon as he was rescued, Prince Halil would be engaged to his daughter and there would be a permanent peace between the two states. The Ottoman sovereign also handed over a sum of nearly one hundred thousand gold pieces for Halil's ransom. In the summer of that year the emperor again set out for Phocaea, and the governor of that city surrendered Halil to him. Halil was brought to Istanbul and remained there for a time. He was ceremoniously engaged to the ten-year-old Irene. Subsequently the prince was brought to Nicomedia (İzmit) and returned to his father. The emperor also wanted Halil to be declared heir to the throne, according to Gregoras. Orhan was also so inclined. Since Halil's very person *represented peace between the Ottomans and Byzantium*, the *gazi*s, who wanted the conquest of Rumelia, probably would have preferred Murad to Halil. Halil's return to Ottoman lands can be placed around the end of September 1359. Orhan once again assigned to him his former governorship of İznik.

According to Gregoras (iii, p. 558), the Ottoman threat which had been felt all the way to the gates of Byzantium in the time of Süleyman had receded in the two-year period of Halil's captivity, and a period of true peace and quiet had held sway in Thrace.

The period between 1357 and 1359 was for the Ottomans a period of pause in the conquest of Rumelia. One notices, however, that during this two-year period, the bridgehead established in Rumelia was strengthened by emigrants from Anatolia, and new forces were assembled for an even greater onslaught there.[25] With Süleyman Pasha's conquest

[25] The colonization policy initiated in Süleyman Pasha's time must have been continued also after his death (*cf.* Âşık Paşazâde, ed. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri* I (İstanbul, 1949), p. 124). We know that of the villages which had been assigned by Orhan as *wakf*s to the convent of dervishes in Bolayır many carried Turkish names.



of Rumelia was born a new overseas Ottoman governorship, Ottoman Rumelia.[26] Its geographic and military conditions won for this region a status entirely different from that of Anatolia. Of primary importance was the fact that a sea controlled by Christians separated this new realm from the Turkish homeland in Anatolia. Already in 1362, the Crusaders in the West thought that the Turks could be annihilated if the Crusader fleet cut off the Straits and left them helpless in Rumelia.[27] During the administration of Süleyman Pasha, the leader of the *gazi*s who formed the backbone of the state at that time, *Ottoman Rumelia assumed the status of a quasi-independent state vis-à-vis Anatolia.*[28] In Gregoras' words (iii, pp. 560-561),[29] Süleyman was "Orhan's designate for the sultanate and entrusted with the general administration of the state". A Serbian source says that "even during his father's lifetime he assumed power and turned toward the west".[30] When Orhan's eldest son Süleyman died, in accordance with Turkic–Mongolian tradition, the oldest brother Murad was sent with his tutor (Lala) Şahin to this most important distant frontier sector of the state in Rumelia.[31] It is more than improbable that in the five year period between Süleyman's

Among the villages in Malkara we should mention Bulgurlu, Esendük, Şeyh Halil, Yegen, Pazarlu-Beg, Kara-Ahi, Ulamış and Sasanlar.

[26] According to *wakf* documents, at the time of Süleyman Pasha's death the border line went through the Yayla-Dağ between Keşan and İpsala and the mountainous region that separates Malkara and Hayrabolu. On the shores of the Marmara Sea, Hora and Bakacık-Tepesi to the south of the town Tekfur-Dağı (Rodosto) formed the boundary. The claim that Süleyman captured Tekfur-Dağı, İpsala and Vize (Ruhî) does not seem to be correct. We only know that during his various campaigns he came to these regions and even as far as Edirne.

[27] O. Halecki, "Un empereur de Byzance à Rome", *Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie* 8 (1930), pp. 76, and 117. This plan seems to have been the basis of all Crusade projects in the fourteen-fifteenth centuries. *See* my *Fatih Devri* I (Ankara, 1954), pp. 47-53.

[28] As the nucleus of the Rumeli Beylerbeyliği, Paşa Sancağı can be considered as having been established in Süleyman Pasha's time. Most likely the name Paşa Sancağı also originated from that time. In Murad's time and especially after the big campaign under Lala Şahin Pasha's command, Rumelia was to be given to a Beylerbeyi with the title of Pasha.

[29] İskender Hacı translation, *TOEM* 1, p. 242.

[30] *Lebensbeschreibung des Despoten Stefan Lazarević von Konstantin dem Philosophen*, transl. M. Braun (Wiesbaden, 1956), p. 5. For Süleyman's important position within the state *see* Ahmedî, *İskendernâme*, ed. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri* I, pp. 12-13.

[31] The signature Şahin b. Abdullah that can be seen on the *wakf* document issued by Orhan in Şaban 761 (June 1360) is most likely that of Lala Şahin himself, and if so he must have been in Anatolia at that time.

death in 1357 and Orhan's death in March of 1362 the Rumelian sector would have been ignored. The *Düstûrnâme* tells us quite clearly that after Süleyman's death, Orhan sent his eldest son Murad to the "holy war" area, and that he made conquests in Rumelia while his father was still alive.[32] At the head of *gazi*s temporarily halted in their drive for conquest, the young prince was to prove himself deserving of the sultanate. The tutor Şahin, a capable commander, and the seasoned march commanders Hacı İlbegi and Evrenuz (Evrenos), after the rescue of Prince Halil in 1359, undertook the conquest with renewed vigor. The peace and amity agreement forced on the aging Orhan by John V Palaeologus for the sake of Halil was signed under abnormal circumstances; a cessation of the advance in Rumelia would have meant for the *gazi*s there certain annihilation. The only way to hold on and survive in this new country was to spread and strengthen themselves, to open up new territories continually for the nomads, *akhi*s and dervishes pouring in every day from Anatolia.[33] On the other hand, as we have seen, John V Palaeologus had driven Matthew, the ally of the *gazi*s, from the Edirne sector and had brought that area under his direct control and rule.[34] Therefore it was only natural that the aim of the new push in Rumelia should be this area long considered by the Ottomans as being under their protection. The Ottomans, even before the conquest, seem to have considered the Edirne region their sphere of influence. The unusual intensity of the renewed assaults by Rumelian *gazi*s in 1359 stirred an echo even in the Western sources. It was then that the systematic occupation of Thrace really began.[35] The Florentine M. Villani[36] writes that Didymoteichum temporarily fell for the first time to the Turks in 1359 in the course of this assault,[37] and Turkish raiders appeared at the walls of Byzantium in that same year.[38]

[32] *Mir Orhan'ın ulu oğlu Murâd — Ol zaman olubdu kerrâr-i cihâd* (*Düstûrnâme-i Enverî*, ed. Yınanç, text (İstanbul, 1928), p. 84. Further, Chalcocondyles (i, pp. 29-30, tr., p. 17) writes that, as soon as his brother died, Murad hurried to Rumelia. He too, similar to the *Düstûrnâme*, notes that Edirne had been taken by Süleyman Pasha. It is likely that both used the same source of information. P. Luccari (*Copioso Ristretto degli Annali di Rausa*, Libri quattro, Venetia, 1605, p. 64) notes the following regarding Süleyman Pasha: "fu portato sepelire ne' Giardini di Galipoli, lasciando il Regno a Murat suo fratello".

[33] Concerning the first Turkish colonization in Thrace *see* Ö. L. Barkan, "İstilâ devirlerinin kolonizatör Türk dervişleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), pp. 279-386; and my "Ottoman Methods of Conquest", *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954).

[34] Concerning the continued support lent to Matthew by the Ottomans *see* Cantacuzenus, iii, pp. 324 ff., tr., p. 437, and Gregoras, iii, p. 564, tr., p. 246.

[35] J. Dräseke, "Der Übergang der Osmanen nach Europa im 14. Jh.", *Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 31 (1913), pp. 476-504.



Indeed, some Ottoman sources also date to 761 (1359 A.D.) a great attack under Murad's command which resulted in the conquest of Edirne. These sources, however, err in showing this campaign of one and a half years as having taken place in one and the same year. The Ottomans whom Villani mentions as having appeared in front of Istanbul in 1359 must have been the *gazi*s of the Ottoman sources who in 761 (1359) under Murad's command had come to surround a fortress "near Istanbul"[39] as well as the Çorlu stronghold. It is very likely that the panic which developed in Byzantium when Murad marched on Çorlu in the direction of Istanbul aroused such a reaction in Italy. Murad had carried out this attack with the aim of protecting his rear guard from an assault from the direction of Byzantium during his expedition against Edirne. After he took Çorlu, he returned to the West and strove to take the other fortresses on the Byzantium–Adrianople road.

Let us analyze more closely the narratives in the Ottoman chronicles concerning this expedition. These narratives rest basically on two principle narratives, one from Âşık Paşazâde, and another one used by Ahmedî and many after him, the most detailed version of which is found in Pseudo-Ruhî and Neşrî.[40]

Both groups of the Ottoman narratives give 761 A.H. (beginning 23 November 1359) as the date when Murad began his great conquest in Rumelia.[41] Yet those sources generally assume that Murad ascended the throne in the same year. They may have been led into error by the fact that in 1359 Murad, as his brother Süleyman and his father Orhan in Osman Ghazi's time, assumed responsibility for the major affairs

[36] F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14-15. Jahrhundert)* (Brünn–München–Wien, 1944), p. 46 (M. Villani died in 1363).

[37] According to Oruç (p. 20), Dimetoka was conquered in 760 A.H. (December 3, 1358 - October 24, 1359).

[38] Ostrogorsky, p. 478 (he mentions Villani).

[39] *Cf.* Anonymous, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osmân*, ed. Giese, p. 20.

[40] Concerning these two groups of narratives *see* my "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", pp. 152-167.

[41] Âşık Paşazâde, ed. Atsız, pp. 126-127; Anonymous *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osmân*, ed. Giese, p. 21; Oruç, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osmân*, ed. Babinger (Hannover, 1925), p. 20; Neşrî, *Ğihânnümâ* I, ed. Taeschner (Leipzig, 1951), pp. 52-53.

of state still in his father's lifetime. In the case of the Pseudo-Ruhî account, one may assume that this expedition was confused with the Rumelian campaign undertaken against the Serbs by Murad I after his enthronement.[42] These points will be discussed further below. First we shall look more closely at the two basic accounts.

Âşık Paşazâde's tradition (Chapter 43) reads in short: When Orhan died, Murad "came [straight] to Bursa". He gathered troops from Karesi and from his own governorship. Accompanied by his tutor Şahin, he crossed Gallipoli. He marched straight on the "Banatoz"[43] stronghold and took it without a fight. From there he went on to Çorlu, and seized it after heavy fighting. He levelled the stronghold walls.[44] Then he came before the stronghold of "Misini". The commander (*tekvur*) of this fortress surrendered it.[45] Then the *gazis* took "Burgus" (Lüle-Burgaz). Its occupants fled. The fortress was burned down.[46]

[42] For the text of Ruhî *see* p. 169.

[43] Âşık Paşazâde has بنطوز (ed. Atsız, pp. 126-28; ed. Giese, pp. 48-51); and Neşrî has بُطنوز (ed. Taeschner I, p. 52; ed. Unat-Köymen, I, p. 192); Oruç has بَطنوز (ed. Babinger, Oxford MS. p. 20, and Manisa MS). We may assume that this fortress was Banatoz (today Barbaros, a district in the Tekirdağ sub-county) on the seashore south of the town of Tekirdağ (Rodosto).

[44] Concerning Çorlu (classical: *Σύραλλον*; Byzantine: *Τζουρουλλός, Τυρολόη*), the Ottoman source is supported by the following observation of B. de La Broquière in 1433: "je vins a une ville que l'on nomme Chourleu qui a esté assés bonne par semblant, car les Turcz l'ont abatue et est repeuplée de Grecz et de Turcz" (*Le Voyage d'Outremer*, ed. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1892), p. 169). For the pertinent note in Evliyâ Çelebi *see* H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1956), p. 12.

[45] In Âşık Paşazâde and Neşrî مسنى (Misini); in Oruç and *Anonymi* مسين, مسين (Misin); in the Byzantine period it was Messene (*Μεσσήνη*) (*see* Babinger, pp. 43-44; Kissling, p. 15, n. 62). Concerning the fortress Misini we find the following note in a Gallipoli statistical register written around 938 A.H. (Prime Ministry Archives, Tapu No. 167): ... چفتلك در زمين قلعهٔ مسينى ، ذكر اولان مسينى حصار Today it is Misinli in Çorlu sub-county. The information given by de La Broquière about this fortress which he called Misterio corroborates that of the Ottoman account; and he says: "de là je alay à une ville que l'on nomme Misterio qui est une petite place fermée et n'y demeurent que Grecz excepté ung Turc à qui Grant Turc l'a donnée" (p. 169). Misinli, which until the exchange of population after World War I was inhabited by Greeks, is today a village of 300 dwellings populated by immigrants from Rumelia. The walls of the fortress are still standing. *See* A. M. Mansel, *Trakya'nın kültür ve tarihi* (İstanbul, 1938), plate XXIII.

[46] Burgaz, later Çatal-Burgaz and Lüle-Burgaz (for the name and historical background of the city *see* Kissling, p. 16). de La Broquière (p. 170) corroborates the



On the other side, Hacı İlbegi had settled in "Burgus"[47] on the banks of the Maritsa River, and was putting pressure on Didymoteichum (Dimetoka). At last he ambushed the fortress's commander (*tekvur*) and took him prisoner; he released him when the fortress was surrendered. Still in the Maritsa valley, Ghazi Evrenuz had seized the Keşan stronghold and was putting pressure on İpsala (Chapter 44).

Murad came to Eski (Baba-Eskisi)[48] from Burgus (Lüle-Burgaz). He found the stronghold empty. The population had fled to seek refuge in Edirne. The fortress was burned (in Neşrî's version). They seized several other strongholds in the environs. Murad sent Lala Şahin with the troops against Edirne. The enemy met them outside Edirne with a large force, and a great battle ensued.[49] The defeated enemy retreated to the stronghold. At this point Hacı İlbegi and Ghazi Evrenuz rejoined Sultan Murad. Then Murad sent them to Edirne as the advance guard of his army. At that time the Maritsa was overflowing. The commander of Edirne[50] boarded a boat and fled by night to Ainos (Enez).[51] When

---

Ottoman narrative and says: "Et de là, je vins à une ville que l'on nomme Pirgasi qui est aussi tous les murs abbatus et n'y demeure que Turcz". de La Broquière mentions the settlements he has seen up to this point, *i.e.* Çorlu, Misterio (Misini) and Pirgasi (Burgaz) in the same sequence as does the Ottoman narrative. Thus it seems clear that the route between İstanbul and Edirne followed the same route in the 1430's also.

[47] Kulelü-Burgaz, to the immediate east of Dimetoka on the Edirne route, is called Phytion today, and may be identical with Eğri Kaleli Burgaz or İlbeği Kalesi mentioned by Evliya Çelebi (V, p. 328; *cf.* also Oruç, pp. 20, and 93). The great tower on the hill dominating the road is still standing today.

[48] Identical with Boulgarophygum of the Byzantines (*see* Babinger, pp. 51-52 and Kissling, pp. 40-41). Also Zambry, the settlement mentioned by de La Broquière after Burgaz, is very likely Baba-Eskisi (Babaeski). He too found the walls of this town destroyed.

[49] İdrîs (*Heşt Behişt*, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, Hazine No. 1655, f. 141ᵇ) gives Sazlu-Dere as the place of this battle (*cf.*, *Tâcü't-Tevârih* I, p. 72). In this part, İdrîs follows Neşrî and gives both narratives. Like Neşrî, he too mentions the *Akhis* of Ankara.

[50] In Oruç (Manisa MS) ادرنوس تكورى (Adranos? Tekvuru); in Hoca Sa'deddin (I, p. 72): "*Edirne Tekvuru* ki اندرنه [Adrine?] demekle meşhur idi".

[51] Enez, today a district of Keşan. It was also written Enoz, Aynoz or Inoz (اينوز). In Byzantine times it was *Αἶνος* and in ancient times *Ἀφυνθος* or *Πολτυοβρία* (*see* Babinger, p. 49). The rent-income of this important harbor, an outlet of the Edirne and Maritsa Valley on the Aegean Sea, and that of the salt-pans there was assigned to the despot Demetrius Palaeologus when Morea was annexed in Mehmed II's time (*see*, *TV* new series 1 i (1955), p. 134). Concerning the conquest of Enez *see* my

news of this was heard the following morning, the inhabitants opened the city gate (Oruç, Manisa version: Kumkale Kapısı) and surrendered. This conquest took place in 761 (45th Chapter).

The *Anonymous Chronicles* and Oruç give a shorter version of this story. Some of the *Anonymi* combined this account with the section in Ahmedî dealing with Murad I, thus giving both versions. The Manisa copy of Oruç, however, gives the date of the conquest of Edirne following the above-mentioned narrative as 761 A.H., and based on the *Calendar*s as 762 A.H.

Âşık Paşazâde's narrative relates the strategic moves for conquest undertaken by Murad after he took command of the frontier forces in Rumelia in place of his brother Süleyman in 761 A.H. (1359); and here the events are set forth in a completely logical order. Thus, while Murad was seizing the vital fortresses along the historic Constantinople–Adrianople road which were, starting from Constantinople: Çorlu, Misini and Burgus (Lüle-Burgaz), commanders of the marches were holding down the fortresses, and especially Didymoteichum which protected Edirne from the south, *i.e.* from the Maritsa valley. In the second and final phase of the expedition, Murad set up his headquarters in Baba-Eskisi, at a distance of fifty-five kilometers from Edirne; from there he sent Lala Şahin against Edirne. The Byzantine forces which gathered in Edirne attempted to scatter the Ottomans by engaging in a battle outside the walls, at Sazlu-dere, but when they were defeated they retreated to the fortress. (The reason why Murad systematically destroyed fortresses abandoned by their population—such as Çorlu and Baba-Eskisi—is easily understood. It was because of the systematic application of this method in the Ottoman conquests that fortresses were prevented from becoming renewed centers of resistance after the Ottomans withdrew.) After his successful attempt at Sazlu-dere, Murad decided to gather all his forces for a last, concentrated attack on Edirne. He summoned the march forces commanded by Hacı İlbegi and Evrenuz (Evrenos) which had been active in the Keşan mountain region and the Maritsa valley. They united with Murad's army and formed the advance guard. Then the entire army moved on Edirne. The tradition that Edirne was taken without a siege seems to conform to the truth. After the defeat at Sazlu-dere, the populace of Edirne had little hope of success against the full complement of Murad's army. It was known of the

"Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time", *Speculum* 30 iii (1960), p. 42. Until recent times, communications between Enez and Edirne were accomplished by ship on the Maritsa.



Thracian fortresses (like Banatoz, Misini) which surrendered of their own will, that Murad had protected them from pillage and had allowed the local population to remain; but those fortresses which were subdued after attack were pillaged, destroyed and the local people enslaved.[52] Once Murad had complete control of the Constantinople–Adrianople road there was no hope of aid from Byzantium. According to the narrative, the Byzantine commander fled down the Maritsa to the port of Ainos. Actually, at that time this was the only route of escape from Adrianople to Byzantium. All in all, as we have shown above, the toponymic and topographic data which it contains, and their conformity with the observations of de La Broquière on the situation of the fortresses after the conquest, clearly indicate this account to be a reliable source.

Pseudo-Ruhî, who gives the most complete and detailed version of the second group of accounts,[53] explains events after the ascendance of Murad in this way:

THIRD CHAPTER

ON THE ACTIVITIES OF MURAD, SON OF ORHAN, SON OF OSMAN

When Orhan Bey died the leading men of the state and viziers enthroned his son Murad Han. In the night of the same day Bayezid, the son of Murad was born. People and *beys* from all over the world congratulated him on his accession to the throne and the birth of his son. Murad I acted in complete justice toward his subjects so that even those rebellious people came to submit to his rule and all subjects enjoyed prosperity and peace. He convened the *'ulemā* in Bursa and at a felicitous moment

[52] It can be said that, in Ottoman times, towns in Thrace which had a large percentage of Greek inhabitants had most likely been taken by peaceful means. For example, according to a statistical register dated 925 A.H. (Prime Ministry Archives, Tapu No. 75, p. 388) in Mürefte there were 107 Christian households compared to four Muslim households. Also from the point of view of taxation, Mürefte and a number of Christian towns like it received special treatment. On the other hand, in places taken *'anvaten*, by force, "the infidels" were taken into captivity and their lands and goods given to Muslims, according to the Islamic holy law. Such places thus rapidly became Muslim towns (*see* above, n. 46, for de La Broquière's interesting observation concerning Burgaz in 1433). Naturally there are also towns which obtained a Muslim or Greek majority later on, prompted by different conditions. But this situation evolved over a long period of time.

[53] Here we use the copy of the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Marsh MS No. 313). For studies on early Ottoman history, it is necessary to establish the original text by comparing this copy, which J. H. Mordtmann attributes to Ruhî (*MOG* 2, pp. 129-136), to other related manuscripts.

laid the foundation of a complex of charitable institutions at Ḳaplūca [in Bursa]. The architects and masons did their best for its completion and so, in a short time, a *medrese* and an *'imāret* were built of an indescribable beauty. To meet the expenses the sultan granted *waḳf*s which were to be given to the *'ulemā*, reciters of the Qur'an, descendants of the Prophet and Muslim poor. Afterwards he intended to pass over to Rumelia in order to make an expedition into Hungary. But before his departure news came to the effect that the *bey*s in various parts of upper Rūm had intentions against Bursa. That is to say, as soon as the sultan crossed the Straits and went to make war against the infidels they would come with their armies over against Bursa to plunder it and make injuries on the Muslims there. Thereupon Sultan Murad asked the leading *'ulemā* of the time whether he should make war against the infidels or repulse the aggressors. Their answer was that the latter was to be done first. So delaying the Holy War and sending orders around, the sultan assembled an army from all over his realm and marched against Rūm. When he reached the border he defeated the enemy who appeared there, and made conquests including Ankara. From there he came to Sultan-Öyüğü and conquered it also. He came to Bursa safely, and, assembling his army again, he crossed over to Rumelia, defeated the Serbian army and conquered Edirne. It occurred in the year 761.

This is how Sultan Murad set out to make Holy War against Serbia. When Sultan Murad had the intention to make Holy War against Serbia he placed his son Bayezid on the throne under the tutorship of Timurtaş Bey, and then he himself assembled a large army and crossed the Strait over to Rumelia in order to march against Serbia...

« المطلب الثالث : فی بیان احوال السلطان مراد بن اورخان بن عثمان.

چون مرحوم اورخان بك بو خراب آباد دنیادن اول بقای سروره رحلت اتدی اکابر و اعیان و وزراء نامدارلر اوغلی سلطان الاسلام و المسلمین سلطان غازی مراد خان تخته کچوردیلر و هم اول کیجه سلطان السلاطین سلطان بایزید بن غازی مراد بن اورخان بن عثمان ظهوره کلدی خلق عالم و اطراف جوانبده اولان بکلر ایلچیلر کوندروب تخت ایچون مبارك باد ایدوب و اوغلیچون تهنیت اتدیلر سلطان مراد خان غازی داخی رعایایه بر وجهله عدل [و] داد اتدی که عدلنوك آوازمسی عالمه طولو



اولب صورت عصیان و طغیان ایدن کمسنلر مطیع و منقاد اولوب رعایا داخی مرفه الحال و منتظم الاحوال اولدی کندو داخی دولت و سعادتله بروساده علما و فضلا جمع ایدوب بر مبارك وقتده قبلوجه‌ده بر عمارت بنا اتدردی مهندسلر و بنّالر انوك مصلحتنه و اتمامنه مباشر اولب از زمان ایچنده بر مدرسه وبر عمارت یاپلدی که قابل وصف اولیا انك مصالحیچون وقفلر قویوب محصولاتن اهل علمه و حافظلره و ساداته و سایر فقرای مسلمینه صرف اولنه دیو امر ایتدی پس اندن صگره قصد اتدیکه روم ایلنه کچوب انکروسه غزا ایده ناگاه بو اثناده خبر کلدیکه یوقرو رومده اولان متفرق بکلرك بروسایه قصدلری وار شویلکه خداوندکار دولتله دکزی اوته کچوب غزایه متوجه اولدغی کیب عسکرله کلوب بروسایِ غارت ایدوب مسلمانلره نکبت یتشدورەلر. پس اندن سلطان مراد خان اول زمانوك علماسندن و فضلاسندن بو خبر اصلنی استفسار اتدیکه غزا اتمك اوْلی مدر یاخود دشمن دفع اتمك انفع‌در پس علمای کرام و فضلای فخام جواب ویردیلر که غزادن ایسه دفع دشمن یِکْرَکْدُرْ دیدوکاری اجلدن غزایِ تأخیر ایدوب اطراف جوانبه نامەلر پراکنده ایدوب حوضهٔ تصرفنده اولان مملکتوك عسکرن جمع ایدوب روم طرفنه محاربه و مقاتله اتمکه متوجه اولدی تا روم حدنه یتشوب ظاهر اولان اعدایِ کسر ایدوب ایل ولایت ضبط ایدوب انقرهٔ فتح اتدی اندن سلطان ایوکنه کلوب انی دخی فتح اتدی کیرو صحت وسلامت و عافیت برله محروسهٔ بروسایه کلوب عسکر جمع ایدوب روم ایلنه کچوب سرف لشکرن صیوب ادرنه‌یی فتح ایتدی یدی یوز آلتمش برنجیییلده. سلطان مراد خان غازی سِرف اقلیمنه غزایه واردغی در :

چون سلطان مراد خان سِرف اقلیمنه غزا نیتن ایدوب اوغل یلدرم بایزید بروساده تخته قویب و تمورطاش بکی یانندە لالا ایدوب کندو عسکر بی نهایه جمع ایدوب دکیزدن روم ایلنه کچوب سرف اقلیمنه متوجه اولدی...»

Neşrî expertly combined the two traditions by transmitting the Ahmedî – Pseudo-Ruhî tradition about events immediately following Murad's accession, then grafting on events from the Âşık Paşazâde narrative of the conquest of Edirne, as if, from a chronological point of view, they had taken place afterwards.[54] However, Neşrî wanted to correct the date of Süleyman Pasha's death to 760, and repeated Âşık Paşazâde's remark saying *Esahh oldur ki oğlu Süleyman Paşa iki ay önden vefat etmiştir*[55] "The truth is that his son Süleyman died two months before him" and transmitted again in the Âşık Paşazâde version the conquest of Edirne. Here, however, he corrected the date to 762. No doubt if Neşrî had given 758 as the date of Süleyman Pasha's death as it is in Âşık Paşazâde, he would have had to accept that Orhan, who he says died two months afterwards, also died in that same year, and that Murad's accession took place in 758. He shows, however, again based on a copy of Âşık Paşazâde, 758 as the year of the conquest of Bolayır. He allowed one year for the following conquests with the remark "all of the aforementioned conquests took place within one year", and set Süleyman's death subsequently for the year 760 A.H. He allowed another year for Murad's enthronement and the Ankara campaign — which he had taken from Pseudo-Ruhî — and set the date of his subsequent return to Rumelia and the conquest of Edirne at 762. We know that Neşrî attempted to resolve such inconsistencies in the sources in other places as well. Thus, although the two ancient traditions— Âşık Paşazâde and Ahmedî–Pseudo-Ruhî — set the conquest of Edirne at 761,[56] Neşrî differed from these traditions by setting the date at 762.[57]

[54] Common with Ruhî (p. 51): *İttifak bir gün ... kavuştu*; and p. 52: *Leşker cem'edip diledi ki ... Sultan-öyüğü'ne gelip etrafını fethedip*. It seems that in the latter Neşrî used a more detailed variant of the same source as Ruhî. The remaining parts are all from Âşık Paşazâde (Neşrî, *Ğihânnümâ* I, ed. Taeschner, pp. 51-53). This important copy from the year 898 was discovered by Th. Menzel; it was not used by F. R. Unat and M. A. Köymen in their critical edition of Neşrî (*Kitâb-ı Cihânnümâ*, Ankara, 1949). Here we shall refer always to the Menzel copy.

[55] Âşık Paşazâde, ed. Giese (Leipzig, 1929), p. 46.

[56] The Anonymous *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osmân* (ed. Giese, p. 31), and Oruç (ed. Babinger, p. 21, and 93) give the date as 761. Kemal Paşazâde, however, who represents a somewhat more recent compilation period, follows Neşrî (*see* MS No. 3078 in the Nuriosmaniye Library) for his report that Süleyman died while on a goose hunt and giving, like Neşrî, the date of his death as 760 A.H. This historian also used the *Anonymi* (the last will of Süleyman Pasha and the narration of the landing of the infidels at Kavak-Tuzlası). For the conquest of Edirne, İdrîs adhered to Neşrî and gave the date as 762, whereas Âlî (*Künhü'l-ahbâr* V, pp. 45-49) and Cennâbî (a good copy of this is in the Selimiye Library of Edirne, No. 1569, f. 700) follow Ruhî.

[57] As we have seen previously, Oruç also gave the date as 762 in the Manisa copy. Rather than assuming a direct connection between Neşrî and Oruç, we should consider the *Calendar* as the common source used by both.



After taking notice of this point, let us now attempt to analyze the Ahmedî–Pseudo-Ruhî tradition group. In the Pseudo-Ruhî tradition, the important events are given in the following order:

1. When Orhan died, the influential men of state put his son Murad on the throne.
2. The rebellious elements who caused trouble in the early days of his reign were brought under control and the situation stabilized.
3. Murad had an *'imâret* and *medrese* built at Kapluca.
4. He then wanted to cross to Rumelia and "make Holy War against Hungary" (*"Laz ve Ungurus"* in Şükrullâh's *Behcetü't-Tevârîh*). But it was then that he learned that "the various Begs of Upper Rūm" (in *Behcetü't-Tevârîh*, Mehmed b. Hacı Halil, and Neşrî "the kings of the area") were to attack Bursa during his advance into Rumelia.
5. At this point he went with his army "as far as the border in Rūm, and subduing the enemies who appeared" he made conquests and he took Ankara. From there he passed to Sultan-Öyüğü (Sultan-Önü, Eskişehir), conquered it also and returned to Bursa.
6. Again mobilizing an army he crossed to Rumelia. "Defeating the Serbian army he captured Edirne in the year 761."
7. Subsequently, stationing his son Yıldırım Bayezid in Bursa with his tutor Timurtaş Bey, he again undertook a campaign to Rumelia and "he turned to the Serbian region".

Neşrî transmits this tradition in shorter form but adds to it another account of how the Ankara *Akhi*s received them (Menzel's text, p. 52: *"derler ki . . . kırılışursız"*). Ahmedî, Şükrullâh and Mehmet b. Hacı Halil note that at his ascession, Murad brought in as his vizier Halil-i Çenderî, but Pseudo-Ruhî has no mention of this.[58] On the other hand, the events in Pseudo-Ruhî, cited above in numbers 6 and 7, do not appear in Ahmedî, Şükrullâh and Mehmet b. Hacı Halil. In other words, after the conquest of Ankara and Sultan-Öyüğü, they pass immediately to the Karaman campaign, and do not mention the campaign against the Serbs and the conquest of Edirne. The points in common in all of these sources, including Pseudo-Ruhî, are:

[58] Neşrî, adhering to Âşık Paşazâde on this point, states that Hayreddin, the kadi of Bursa, was made kadıasker, whereas Ahmedî and Mehmed b. Hacı Halil maintain that he was elevated to the vizierate. On this contradiction *see* p. 208 below. Mehmed b. Hacı Halil states that in this appointment Mevlâna Şeyh Fahreddin, a disciple of Abdülkâdir Gîlânî, played a role.

1. that Murad at his accession punished those whose loyalty to him had wavered, and
2. that later, moving east to the *serhadd-i Rûm* "border in Rūm", he conquered Ankara and Sultan-Öyüğü. It can be assumed that the common source contained mainly these principal events.

As for those who rose against Murad when he took the throne, Ahmedî expressed it thus:

*Oldular yağı ana kardaşları*
*Kamunun bitti elinde işleri*[59]

"His brothers had become enemies
Their fate was sealed by his hand"

According to Uzunçarşılı, the meaning of "*kardaşları*" here is Murad's brothers.[60] He suggests that, at the time of Murad's accession, Prince Halil and İbrahim were alive and had mounted opposition to him in Anatolia. The sources give no date for Halil's death.[61] If he were alive then, at the age of sixteen, he would have to have been in İznik.[62] The Ottomans shared the ancient Turkic belief that God appoints the sovereign.[63] Thus it would only be natural that at Orhan's death (March, 1362) the faction which held Halil felt free to proclaim him sultan in his father's place. Indeed, as we mentioned above, the Byzantine emperor naturally was among those who wanted to see Halil on the Ottoman throne. On the other hand, the then thirty-six year old Murad[64] was in Rumelia in full charge of the main forces of the state. He had won great fame with his conquest of Thrace and, as representative of the war and conquest policy against Byzantium, was doubtlessly supported by the *gazi* groups. On the whole, the conditions in those times may

[59] ed. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri* I, p. 15.

[60] *Osmanlı Tarihi* I (Ankara, 1960²) p. 160. According to P. Wittek ("Zur Geschichte Angoras im Mittelalter", *Festschrift G. Jacob* (Leipzig, 1932), pp. 352-353) instead of "brothers", the word *kardaş* here is used rather in the sense of "Muslim neighbors".

[61] N. Jorga (*GOR* I, p. 202) writes that Halil died before his father Orhan, but it is not clear how he arrived at this conclusion.

[62] *See* Gregoras (*ibid.*). A *Calendar* written in 773 A.H. (ed. Turan, p. 72) notes that Orhan and someone with the name Halil died in the same year, *i.e.* 763. However, Turan reads خليل آغاء آتا بك as "Atabeg Halil Ağa". We could not check this in the original.

[63] *See* my "Osmanlılarda Saltanat Verâset Usûlü ve Türk Hakimiyet Telâkkisiyle İlgisi", *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 14 i (1959).

[64] The recently discovered *Calendars* (*see*, *Tarihî Takvimler*, ed. Turan (Ankara, 1954), pp. 16, and 52) corroborate the year 1326 as the year of his birth.



substantiate the thought that there could have been a struggle among the brothers for the Ottoman throne. However, a struggle between Murad and Halil for the throne can only be guessed at. The only information clearly emanating from the sources is that quarrels broke out in Anatolia in the course of Murad's accession. That the rebels, in a short rhymed version (by Ahmedî) of the tradition, are referred to as brothers is open to interpretation and can not be considered as conclusive evidence.

Orhan's death, on the other hand, must have been considered an opportunity by Eretna-oğlu who counted Ankara within the sphere of his control. We have more definite information concerning the actions of Eretna-oğlu in Sıvas. Ankara was considered under the authority of the Eretna state until the Ottoman occupation; and a certain Melik Nâsireddin Bahtiyâr Beğ was in power there.[65] After Eretna's death (in 1352)[66] a struggle broke out among his sons,[67] and the Ottomans, taking advantage of the situation, undertook a campaign under the command of Süleyman Pasha to Ankara for the first time in 1354[68] and gained control of the city. An inscription[69] placed on the Sultan

[65] H. Edhem, *Düvel-i İslâmiye* (İstanbul, 1927), p. 384; H. Hüsameddin, *Amasya Tarihi* III (İstanbul, 1927), pp. 40, 63, and 65.

[66] A. Tevhîd, "Beni Ertena", *TOEM* 4, p. 16; Hüsameddin, p. 42.

[67] Hüsameddin, p. 44; Tevhîd, p. 18.

[68] *See* Wittek, "Zur Geschichte Angoras ...", p. 347. Although it was Nâsireddin Mehmed Bey, the younger son of Eretna, who became sultan in place of his father either toward the end of 754 A.H. or at the beginning of 755 A.H. (1354), his brother Câfer declared himself ruler in Kayseri. Karaman-oğlu Süleyman supported Mehmed Bey (Hüsameddin, pp. 48–49). Concerning the capture of Ankara in Orhan's time we quote here the following official record (Ankara statistical register written in 867 A.H., Prime Ministry Archives, Tapu No. 9): "Ayaş'ta Ahî Bâyezîd çiftliği, kadîmü'l-eyyâmdan vakf olıgelmiş, elinde merhûm Orhan Bey ve Gâzî Hüdâvendigâr ve Sultan Mehemmed bitileri vardır. Elhâletü hâzihi Ahî Bâyezîd oğlu Ahî Elvan vakfiyyet üzere mutasarrıftır".

[69] *See* M. Akdağ, "Ankara Sultan Alâeddin Camii kapısında bulunan Hicrî 763 tarihli bir kitabenin tarihî önemi", *TV* NS 1 iii (1961), p. 372, plate II. *Cf.* M. Gâlib, *Ankara* I (İstanbul, 1341), p. 47. The text of this three line inscription is as follows:

عمر هذا لجامع المبارك لولو باشا
دام دولته من جملة المولى المعظم السلطان الاعظم
اورخان خلد الله ملكه فى سنة ثلاث وستين و سبعمائة

There is a record in one of the statistical registers from Mehmed II's time (Prime Ministry Archives, Tapu No. 12, f. 196) that in the village of Eşreflü in Gallipoli Lu'lu' [Lulu] Pasha donated a meadow as a *waḳf* for his caravanseray. T. Gökbilgin

'Alâeddin Mosque in Ankara by Lu'lu' (or Lulu) Pasha in the time of Orhan, and dated 763, clearly shows that previous to March 1362, the date of Orhan's death, Ankara was still subject to the Ottomans, whereas, according to the Ottoman tradition, Murad had to conquer Ankara anew with another campaign. In that case, Ankara was no longer under Ottoman domination after March of 1362. Evidently this too must have been connected with the crisis of indecision which developed in the Ottoman realm after Orhan's death.

The information given by Hüseyin Hüsameddin as pertinent to Central Anatolia and Ankara at this date is rather illuminating.

In 759 A.H.[70] the Karaman-oğlu 'Alâeddin brought Eretna-oğlu Mehmed back to his throne. In this way the Karaman-oğlu and Eretna-oğlu Mehmed once more assumed a superior position in Central Anatolia. It was at this time that the former ruling prince of Ankara, Bahtiyâr Bey, once more got hold of Ankara and began raiding Ottoman territory.[71] Bahtiyâr Bey received encouragement from the Karamanids. Hüseyin Hüsameddin accepts these events as coinciding with the date of Orhan's death and Murad's accession.[72]

The eastern campaign of the new Ottoman sultan, Murad, was conducted, according to Pseudo-Ruhî's version, against *yukaru Rûm'da olan müteferrik beğler* "the various begs of upper Rūm".[73] As is known, the Ottomans had named the area belonging to the Eretna state *Rûm*, and in the fifteenth century the name *Rûm Beylerbeyliği* or *Rûm Vilâyeti* was given to the Beylerbeylik of this region.[74] According to Hüseyin

(*Edirne ve Paşa Livası* (İstanbul, 1952), p. 291) shows Lulu Pasha in Murad II's time, which cannot be correct.

[70] Although Hüsameddin gives the date as 762, a contemporary *Calendar* from *Sivas* (ed. Turan, p. 72) shows the date as 759.

[71] Hüsameddin, pp. 64-65. On this point he uses Müneccimbaşı's *Câmi'ü'd-düvel* and other sources which we could not identify.

[72] But he gives the date of Orhan's death as Receb 761, whereas Orhan's death occurred in March 1362 (*see* above, n. 11).

[73] We know not only of Bahtiyâr Bey in the Ankara region, but many other local beys' names are given in the *awḳāf* entries of the fifteenth century Ottoman statistical registers. According to a statistical register from Ankara from the year 867 A.H. (Prime Ministry Archives, Tapu No. 9) even before the Ottomans took over, in the Ankara region there were a number of well known families such as the Yeğen Bey oğulları, Dündar Bey oğulları, Emir Yakub oğulları, Kozan Bey oğulları, Ulu Bey oğulları, Bikâri Bey, Abdullah Bey, Süleyman Bey and Mahmud Bey oğulları.

[74] *See* Neşrî, ed. Taeschner I, pp. 87, and 144. According to Hüsameddin (pp. 142, and 145) Prince Yıldırım Bâyezid was the first vâli in 788 A.H., and Devatdâr Ahmed



Hüsameddin, Sunkur Pasha, one of Murad's commanders, surrounded Ankara; the people of the city, displeased with Bahtiyâr Bey, surrendered the fortress to Sunkur and recognized the sovereignty of the Ottoman sultan. Bahtiyâr Bey fled to Amasya. Neşrî relates how Murad I was greeted by the *akhi*s when he ceremoniously entered the city after the conquest.

On the other hand, a reliable contemporary source has it that Eretna-oğlu Mehmed marched on Ankara the year following Murad's accession, *i.e.* in 765 A.H. (beginning 10 October 1363).[75] (It is noteworthy that this source, written in Sıvas, the capital of Eretna-oğlu, makes special mention of Orhan Ghazi's death.)

Evidently, this Eretna-oğlu campaign must have been made to counter Murad's "border in Rūm" campaign. Its goal was to take Ankara back from the Ottomans.[76]

Essentially, the Ahmedî–Şükrullâh–Mehmet b. Hacı Halil versions explain events subsequent to Murad's actual enthronement, *i.e.* after March 1362. Since Edirne had been conquered previous to that, these sources which transmit the original tradition naturally make no mention of *the conquest of Edirne among the events after Murad's accession.* However, in the Bodleian manuscript attributed to Ruhî (Pseudo-Ruhî), we find the conquest of Edirne simply combined with a campaign against the Serbs. On the other hand, as we have seen above, in the Âşık Paşazâde tradition there are substantial details given concerning the Thracian conquests which culminated in the capture of Edirne. In the Âşık Paşazâde tradition (chapter 47), Murad's giving the Rumelia governorship to Lala Şahin and the Beylik of Marches to Evrenuz must be

Pasha became the first beylerbeyi in 789. Fort he naming of the region *Rûm vilâyeti, see* P. Wittek, "Le Sultan de Rûm", *Annuaire de l'Institut Oriental* 6 (Brussels, 1938).

[75] The Turan edition of the *Calendar* prepared in Sıvas in Muharrem of 773 by Zeynü'l-Müneccim b. Süleyman, p. 72: عزم مير محمد بانكورية و انهزام بعض لشكر در حوالى آب كرم از مغل در اواخر شوال و جنك بمغل در بوك صاحب وانحطاط دولت مير محمد بيست و پنجم ذى القعده در هفتصد و شصت وپنج اتفاق مغل بامارت بابوق ودخول بقيصريه آخر محرم

For the inscription on the tomb of Eretna-oğlu Mehmed (dated 767 A.H.) *see* H. Edhem, *Kayseriyye Şehri* (İstanbul, 1334), p. 113.

[76] We know from a note in *Bazm u Razm* (p. 186) that relations between the Eretna-oğulları and the Ottomans were still hostile around 782/1380. When Kadi Burhaneddin got control of the territory of the Eretna house he continued this policy of enmity. From the same source (pp. 390, and 408) we know that, for a while at least, Kadi Burhaneddin pushed his attacks as far as Ankara.

events connected with his accession. The same source states that, with these appointments, Murad secured his hold over Rumelia and, passing through Gallipoli, returned to Bursa where he spent the winter. Also mentioned in the course of these events is the appointment to the "*vezirlik*" of Kara Halil, then the Kadıasker in Bursa. Indeed, the Ahmedî-Şükrullâh account (which is unrelated to Âşık Paşazâde) also tells us that Murad's first act after his accession was the appointment of Kara Halil to the "vizierate". The new sultan had to win over Kara Halil who as kadi was the most important individual administrator in the Bursa capital. There is a strong possibility that the subsequent political influence of Kara Halil and the Çandarlıs may have been a result of the support he rendered Murad in the securing of his throne. It is noteworthy that İznik, which belonged to Prince Halil, later became the center of the Çandarlıs.

After his arrival at Bursa, Murad did not return to Rumelia until 766 A.H. (28 September 1364 to 19 August 1365), this again according to the Âşık Paşazâde tradition. Lala Şahin was compelled to handle all alone the defense actions against the Serbs who were attacking Edirne. It is from the Ahmedî–Pseudo-Ruhî tradition that we learn what sort of difficulties Murad had had to deal with following his accession (the 1362 Ankara campaign; the Eretna-oğlu attack on Ankara in 1363 or 1364).[77]

Thus, after this analysis of the Ottoman accounts as they relate to our subject, we can say that once put into chronological order, the sound historical information contained in these accounts gains its real value. Let us now take up once more the question of the date of the conquest of Edirne.

In the above discussion we attempted to show that the conquest of Edirne does not have to be tied to the 1362 accession of Murad I. The Ottoman tradition gives 761 A.H. (23 November 1359 to 13 October 1360) as the date of the conquest of Edirne. This date, as we pointed out above, marked the beginning of the new mobilization for conquest in Rumelia which was undertaken under *Prince* Murad's direction after the release of Halil in 1359. The goal of this mobilization was, indeed, Edirne,

[77] A third, unrelated narrative occurs in *Düstûrnâme-i Enverî* (p. 84). As we have already mentioned above, this source speaks about the activities undertaken by Prince Murad in Rumelia after Süleyman's death but still in Orhan's lifetime. For the information given in this source concerning the capture of Edirne by Süleyman Pasha *see* n. 6. The *Düstûrnâme* also mentions a defeat of the Serbs at Sazlu-Dere which was brought about after Orhan's death, in 765 A.H.



but the Ottoman source errs when assuming that the fall of Edirne took place within the same year. Indeed, according to another Ottoman tradition, the Manisa copy of Oruç (Muradiye Library, MS 1373, f 41[r]), Edirne fell in 762 A.H.; on this we find the following notation: *Kum-kalesi kapısını açıp kaleyi* [Edirne] *verdiler; ol yıl içinde güneş tutulup yıldızlar tamam göründü, Hicretün sene 762 Edirne fetholundu. Hicretün sene 761 vâki' oldu.* ("Opening the gate of Kum-kalesi they surrendered the fortress; in that year the sun eclipsed and the stars were completely visible, in the year 762 A.H. Edirne was taken. It took place in the year 761 A.H.")[78] The essential point here is the notation that Edirne was conquered in the year of the eclipse. Babinger was the first to call attention to this point and calculations have shown that this eclipse had taken place on 5 May 1361.[79] Oruç took this note from the *Calendar*s and added it to the Âşık Paşazâde account, and thus mentions the years 761 and 762 side by side as the date of the conquest of Edirne.[80] The information contained in the Ottoman *Calendar*s[81] about the eclipse is in conformity with the *Calendar* written in 773 A.H. by Zeynü'l-Müneccim:[82]

[78] In the Oxford copy of Oruç (ed. Babinger, p. 23): "in this year the sun had a full eclipse, all the stars were fully seen, Edirne was captured, in the year 761 A.H.". In the Cambridge copy (ed. Babinger, p. 93): "opening the gates of the fortress its populace surrendered the fort, Edirne was captured in 761 A.H. ... Also Evrenos beg captured İpsala in the year of 763 of the Hegira. In that year the sun had a full eclipse and the world became dark".

[79] Babinger first studied this question in *MOG* 2 (1926), pp. 311 etc.; in 1944 he once again reviewed the question in his *Beiträge*, pp. 46-47; lastly he made it clear in the *Revue des Études Byzantines* 1 (1950) p. 205 that the spring of 1361 can be accepted almost certainly as the date of the capture of Edirne.

[80] It seems that his mistake in giving the year of the full eclipse of the sun once as 762 and then as 763 must be attributed to the dating system followed by the *Calendar*s. The *Calendar*s give the date of an event retroactive from the date of their writing (*see* my *Fatih Devri* I, p. 23, and Plate I). Oruç, who seemingly had repeatedly re-written his work (this can be seen especially in studying the Manisa copy) must have made his mistake when trying to coordinate the dating of the *Calendar* with the Hijrî date.

[81] كنش كلى دوتللدن و قراكو اولب يلدوزلر ظاهر اوللدن و سلطان اولو ملك ناصر واقعه‌سندن و سلطان ملك اشرف جلوسندن ... برو طقسان بر يلدر *See* ed. Turan, p. 44. Actually the Egyptian Mamluk sultan An-Nâsır Nâsırü'd-Dîn Hasan was taken prisoner by Yal-Bogha in March of 1361. The Melik Nâsır incident in the *Calendar* must refer to this event.

[82] ed. Turan, p. 72.

کسوف تام در شهور هفتصد شصت دو و ظهور ستارهٔ گیسودار در شرق و وفات اورخان و خلیل آغاء آتابك در سنه هفتصد شصت و سه

The year 762 A.H. given here for the total eclipse falls within 11 November 1360 to 2 October 1361 A.D. Thus the date of 5 May 1361 which Babinger arrived at for this eclipse falls within the year 762 A.H.

On the other hand, Zeynü'l-Müneccim notes that Orhan died in 763, one year after the eclipse; we have already noted above the accuracy of this date.

Our analysis of the Ottoman traditions also confirms the date 762 A.H., *i.e.* 1361 A.D., which Oruç gives for the conquest of Edirne.[83] Further, Halecki[84] notes that, according to Venetian sources, news of the conquest reached Venice on 14 March 1361. Unless this was a false report,[85] shortly before this date, in the year 1361 "at the time the Maritsa was overflowing", Edirne surrendered to Murad.

[83] We attempted to show above that Neşrî must have arrived at the same date of 762 by different means. *Heşt Behişt* also adheres to the view that the capture of Burgus on the Maritsa by Hacı İlbegi, the battle at Sazlu-Dere and the capture of Edirne all took place in 762 A.H.

[84] *Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie* 8 (1930), p. 75. Halecki (pp. 76-77) points out that in March 1362, upon the fall of Edirne, Venice sent a galley with an ambassador to propose to the emperor an alliance against the Turks. For the joint fleet, Byzantium was to contribute four galleys, and Venice and Genoa two each.

[85] In those times in favorable weather a courier could travel from Istanbul to Venice in thirteen days. We know that from time to time erroneous news concerning the fall of Istanbul reached Italy. According to Matteo Villani (Halecki, p. 75; Babinger, *Beiträge*, p. 46) Dimetoka definitely fell to the Turks in November of 1361. The same source, however, erroneously gives 1361 as the date of Orhan's death.

Some contributions to appear in forthcoming volumes:

R. Dankoff (Brandeis University), Kāšγarī on the Tribal and Kinship Organization of the Turks

P. B. Golden (Rutgers University), The Migrations of the *Oğuz*

T. Halasi-Kun (Columbia University), A Rasulid Hexagloss from Arabia Felix

T. Halasi-Kun (Columbia University), The Ottoman Elements in the Syrian Dialects, II-III

T. Halasi-Kun (Columbia University), Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary, Addenda to "Ottoman: *nam-i diğer*"

A. Z. Hertz (Columbia University), Armament and Supply Inventory of Ottoman Ada Kale, 1753

A. C. Hess (Temple University), Firearms and the Decline of Ibn Khaldun's Military Elite

C. H. Imber (University of Manchester), The Costs of Naval Warfare, The Account of Hayruddin Barbarossa's Herceg Novi Campaign in 1539

H. İnalcık (University of Ankara), The Concept of State and Law in the *Ḳutaḍġu Bilig* and its Origins

P. Oberling (Hunter College, The City University of New York), The Istanbul *Tünel*

A. Tietze (University of California, Los Angeles), Muṣṭafā 'Ālī of Galipoli's Prose Style