Tursun Beg, Historian of Mehmed the Conqueror's Time

TURSUN BEG,[1] author of *Tārīkh-i Abu' l-Fatḥ*,[2] left us the most detailed and important account of Mehmed the Conqueror's time. But, surprisingly enough, his work was not known to the most famous historians of the Ottoman Empire except for Kemāl Pasha-zāde;[3] and very little is known about his family.

In the course of my research on the cadi records of Bursa, I came across some interesting information on Tursun's life and family. These records occur between the dates *Djumādā* II, 889 (begins on June 26, 1484) and *Djumādā* I, 896 (begins on March 12, 1491). They show him as a partner in various legal transactions or as a witness at some important cases.[4]

Tursun Beg's name is given in these records as, "Tursun Beg ibn Ḥamza Beg,"[5] and also as "Mawlānā Tursun Beg ibn Ḥamza Beg."[6] In his *Tārīkh,* Tursun mentioned *Djübbe* ʿAlī Beg, governor of Bursa, as his uncle[7] but never cited his father's name. However, we know that Fīrūz Beg was the father of Ḥamza Beg and ʿAlī Beg, Governor of Iznik in 1422.[8] Thus it becomes clear why Tursun, as a member of a family which played a critically important role in Ottoman history between the years 1380-1480, was entrusted, under Mehmed the Conqueror, with the most important and delicate missions—as related in his history.

Fīrūz Beg was one of the outstanding commanders under Murād I. As the sandjak-beg of Ankara he took part in the battle of Konya against ʿAlā al-Dīn the Karamanid in 1387, and in the battle of Kosovo-Polje in 1389.[9] Under Bāyezīd I he was moved to the governorship of Antalya.[10] Ankara was then given to his son Yaʿkūb Beg who distinguished himself by his defense against Timur in 1402[11] and who later played a dubious part in the struggle between Mehmed I and his brother Süleymān. An official record in the Ankara survey book[12] of 867H/(begins 26. IX. 1462) proves that he had recognized

Süleymān as Sultan in 1410. When Süleymān had to leave for Rumeli to go against Mūsā Chelebī he entrusted Yaᶜkūb with protecting his Anatolian possessions.[13] Yaᶜkūb Beg for some time maintained an independent position against Mehmed Chelebī (the future Mehmed I), and did not take part in his campaign against Djüneyd Beg, of the dynasty of Aydın-oghulları.[14] On his way back Mehmed took Ankara, captured Yaᶜkūb Beg and sent him to prison in Tokat (814 H/begins 25. IV. 1411). Thus, under Meḥmed I (1413-21) Fīrūz Beg's family, after a long period of control in Central Anatolia from Ankara, lost some of its influence in the state. Ḥamza, second son of Fīrūz Beg, however, seems to have continued in governorship at Antalya as a loyal man of Mehmed I.

In the struggle for the Ottoman throne against Muṣṭafā, his uncle, and Djüneyd, Murād II followed a lenient policy toward the important families and granted amnesty for those begs who had been involved in actions against his father.[15] Ḥamza and ᶜAlī, sons of Fīrūz Beg, vigorously supported the young Sultan and played an important part in consolidating his sultanate, thus becoming very influential figures during his reign.

In the summer of 1422 ᶜAlī, son of Fīrūz, then at Iznik (Nicaea), successfully defended the town against the attacks of the allied forces of Muṣṭafā, brother of Murād II, the Karamanids, the Germiyanids and Isfendiyār Beg. This ᶜAlī was apparently Djübbe ᶜAlī, governor of Bursa for a long time (at least during the period 1444-56) under Murād II and Mehmed II. He and his son Maḥmūd Beg played a central role during the Varna crisis (1443-44).[16] Evidently ᶜAlī enjoyed the same confidence under Mehmed II as before, and remained governor of this key city in Anatolia. As Tursun Beg tells us[17] Djübbe ᶜAlī Beg was entrusted with the survey of Istanbul, a delicate job, in 1456. It is most probable that Djübbe ᶜAlī was appointed governor of Istanbul after he carried out the survey.

The most celebrated member of the family was undoubtedly Ḥamza Beg, father of our historian.[18] He was governor *(subashı)* of Karahisar when he heard that his father, governor of Antalya, had died (1421) and that Antalya was threatened by a joint attack from the begs of Teke and Karaman.[19] Ḥamza emerged as one of the ablest military leaders of his time when he defeated the joint attacks of the Karamanid Meḥmed Beg and the Ḥamīd-oghlu ᶜOs̱mān Chelebī in their siege of Antalya (September 1422-February 1423). Upon this success he was officially appointed governor of the sandjaḳ of Teke (1423). Ḥamza

was soon promoted to the governorship *(beglerbegilik)* of Anatolia upon the death of Urudj (winter 1424 or spring 1425), and proved himself to be a match for Djüneyd, the most dangerous enemy of Ottoman rule in Anatolia. Ḥamza eliminated him and brought Smyrna and the old territory of Aydın back under Ottoman sovereignty (1425).[20] He also played a crucial part in bringing to a successful end the long siege of Salonica in 1430. Residing in Bursa and responsible for Anatolian affairs, he was described as "le plus grand gouverneur du Turcq," by Bertrandon de la Broquière in 1432.[21] Ḥamza beg built in Bursa one of the most extensive complexes of charitable institutions in the city.[22] In the mosque's court there are three magnificent mausoleums: Ḥamza Beg's, his wife's,[23] and that of his grandson Ḳara Muṣṭafā Pasha. Tursun Beg's tomb must be one of the thirteen tombs in the mausoleum of Ḥamza Beg.

Muṣṭafā Pasha or Ḳara Muṣṭafā Pasha, third vizir at the imperial Divan in 1473 (after Maḥmūd and Gedik Aḥmed)[24] enjoyed the complete confidence of Mehmed the Conqueror. He was assigned to make inquiries about Bāyezīd (later Bāyezīd II) in Amasya in 1477[25] and to be his tutor *(lala)* in 1478. As tutor and then son-in-law of Bāyezīd, he became the closest and most trusted man of Bāyezīd II. As the second vizir upon Bāyezīd's accession he led the struggle against the dictatorial power of Gedik Aḥmed; but his rivals eventually had him executed.[26] The family continued, however, to hold important positions, always in Anatolia. Muṣṭafā Pasha's son Mehmed Beg was governor of the sandjaḳ of Khudāvendigār by 1503 and was married to another daughter of Bāyezīd II.[27] Thus, along with the Timurtash family, the Fīrūz Beg family held a key position in Anatolia for over a century.

Ḥamza Beg's son Tursun was born to this illustrious family apparently sometime after 1426.[28] Tursun mentions in his own work, composed after his retirement in Bursa about 1488, that he had been in government service for forty years. He must have had madrasa training, since he also was referred to as *mawlānā* in the Bursa cadi records. As a son of a beglerbegi, he must automatically have been granted a *tīmār* or *ziᶜāmet* with the title of *beg* in accordance with the Ottoman regulations. However, it seems that he did not like a *sipāhī*'s life in the countryside and "chose (instead) to join his uncle Djübbe ᶜAlī Beg, governor of Bursa, to enjoy the good living in that city" (text p. 60). In his history (p.9) he also stated that he was privileged to have had the opportunity of working in and advancing through the ranks of

state service with "wisdom and righteousness" for forty years side by side with the great men of his age. Like the famous sixteenth century historians Selānīkī and ᶜĀlī, Tursun Beg too was a specialist in the financial branch of the secretarial profession and served as *il-yazıdjı* (provincial surveyor), *Dīvān Kātibi* (Secretary in the Imperial Council), *Anadolu Defterdārı* (Financial Secretary in the province of Anatolia), *Anadolu Defter-Ketkhudāsı* (Keeper of the Tīmār Registers in the province of Anatolia), and finally *Defterdār* in the Imperial Divan in Istanbul.

Tursun Beg, as a result of his *medrese* education, was equipped with all the necessary skills and knowledge to perform the duties of *münshī*. Reaching the rank of *münshī* was the ultimate achievement in the secretarial profession.[29] In his history, Tursun Beg shows his knowledge of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian as well as of the subtleties of the literary arts, and his complete mastery of all the skills of a *münshī*. Furthermore, his complete familiarity with the theories and principles of Islamic statecraft and administration is apparent from the introduction of his history (text pp. 11-31). After serving on the survey commission for the Byzantine houses in Istanbul in 1456,[30] Tursun Beg participated in several other jobs in the provinces. Again under Mehmed II, Tursun Beg was involved in the survey inspection of the *yaya* and *müsellem* troops in Anatolia in conjunction with Isḥāḳ Chelebī, Chalab-verdi, son of Sasa Beg, and Ilyās Beg, *subashı* of Kula.[31] Tursun Beg was known during his time as a *yazıdjı* (secretary or surveyor). Since the job of provincial surveyor was a delicate one, surveyors were appointed from among the most well-known and trustworthy people.[32]

Tursun Beg's first important position in the secretarial profession was as *dīvān kātibi* under the Grand Vizir Maḥmūd Pasha. Tursun states that he served under Maḥmūd Pasha for twelve years and that these years made up the happiest period of his life (text p. 23). Since Maḥmūd Pasha's first vizirate lasted twelve years, it can be inferred that Tursun was continuously in his service during this period. Tursun was bound to his benefactor and patron Maḥmūd Pasha by ties of great respect. Even in his history, which was written long after Maḥmūd Pasha's death, Tursun always tries to vindicate his master's decisions and show their wisdom. For this reason Tursun can justly be accused of partisanship in some of his historical depictions. One example is his description of the conquest of Agriboz (or Igriboz, Euboea), in which he gives no recognition to Rūm Mehmed for his accomplishments,

ascribing all credit for the Ottoman success in that campaign to Maḥmūd Pasha (text pp. 139-43).

Tursun Beg was lucky in writing his history in that he had the opportunity of being present in the *Dīvān* as secretary when important historic decisions were made, and of witnessing important events first hand. By virtue of his position, he was also present in the war councils during Maḥmūd Pasha's campaigns and was able to record for us the discussions and viewpoints which were debated in these councils. (For example, see text pp. 88, 118.) In all probability Tursun Beg entered Maḥmūd Pasha's service after having completed the survey of houses in Istanbul with his uncle in the years 1456-57. Prior to that he had been in Mehmed II's army in 1452 while it was engaged in building the fortifications at Rumeli-Hisar and was present at the siege of Istanbul in 1453. He was in the company of Mehmed II during his first visit to the Aya-Sofya (Santa Sophia) after the capture of the city and recorded verbatim in his history the Conqueror's citation of Khaḳānī's famous verse on that occasion (text p. 57). In view of the detailed information which Tursun Beg provides about the Belgrade campaign (text pp. 70-75), he probably also accompanied the sultan on this campaign. After having entered Maḥmūd Pasha's service, he was always at the side of his master in all of the campaigns in which he participated. We know with certainty that he was with Maḥmūd during his Serbian campaign of 1458 from the important details on that campaign contained in his history. During the Kastamoni campaign it was he, acting as Maḥmūd Pasha's *Dīvān Kātibi,* who composed the letter summoning Ismā'īl Beg to surrender (text pp. 98-99). He was with the army in the Wallachian campaign of the summer of 1462, and upon the capture of the island of Midilli (Lesbos) he was allotted three slaves (text p. 112) as his personal share of the booty. Likewise in the Bosnian campaign he was with Maḥmūd Pasha in the Sultan's army (text pp. 113-22). When Maḥmūd Pasha was sent by the Sultan against Sokol and Kluc, Tursun Beg accompanied him (text p. 119).

Tursun participated in the Morean campaign against the Venetians, again in the company of Maḥmūd Pasha, in 1463. Following the enemy's flight, Maḥmūd sent Tursun as a messenger to inform the Sultan of the victory. Tursun met up with the Sultan, who was at that time on his way toward the Morea with the remainder of the army, at Izdin (Zituni). He was immediately taken into the Sultan's presence by Isḥāḳ Pasha, the second vizir, and made his report. Everyone in the

army rejoiced at the news. The Sultan and government officials all gave rich presents to Tursun Beg, bearer of the good news. He received so many presents in money and in valuable goods that even as he was writing his history he commented:

> At that time I had vowed never again to complain of poverty, but now in my old age I am forced to break my vow. (text p. 125)

In summer 1464 Tursun Beg was in the company of Maḥmūd Pasha when he went on the offensive against the Hungarians in Bosnia. After the Hungarians had retreated, Tursun and Mihal-oghlu Iskender Beg were charged with the provisioning of the garrison at Izvornik (Zvornik). In 1466 and 1467 Tursun participated, along with the Sultan and Grand Vizir, in the first and second Albanian campaigns. According to our historian the Sultan acted particularly mercilessly in these campaigns in order to daunt the Albanians into submission (text pp. 134-38). In July 1468 Tursun Beg's patron Maḥmūd Pasha was dismissed from office. Tursun gives information about the violent struggle for the Sultan's favor between Maḥmūd Pasha and his rivals. While Maḥmūd was on campaign against Serbia in 1458, the influence at court of the *defterdār* Ditrik Sinān had grown as a result of his being in company with the Sultan on his Morean campaign (text pp. 91-92). The rivalry between Maḥmūd Pasha and Ditrik Sinān ended with Sinān's dismissal and finally with his death. Later on, as developments in Karaman grew in political significance, a new group with expertise and experience in Anatolian affairs gained influence as the Sultan's advisors. As a result of this change in the focus of policy, Isḥāḳ, Rum Mehmed, and Gedik Ahmed Pashas were now in the spotlight, and subsequently were promoted to the Grand Vizirate. Tursun Beg's treatment of these figures in his history is less than favorable. On the other hand, he praises Ḳaramānī *Nishandji* Mehmed Pasha, who was Gedik Ahmed Pasha's rival (text p. 172). It is likely that Tursun Beg was on good terms with Mehmed Pasha since, like himself, Mehmed Pasha was also a *münshī* of Turkish origin. During this period, Tursun Beg advanced rapidly through the ranks of the finance department, and when Maḥmūd Pasha was appointed Grand Vizir for the second time in 1473 Tursun Beg was again in his service.

He still attempts to vindicate his benefactor in his treatment of the campaign against Uzun Ḥasan which resulted in the death of Khāṣṣ

Murād Pasha (text p. 53). Tursun Beg does not even so much as mention Maḥmūd Pasha's execution. Saying that sultans act with the guidance and inspiration of God, Tursun Beg refrains from speaking critically of the Sultan. Nevertheless, he does not hesitate to voice general comments about the Conqueror's excessive temper (text pp. 24-25) and impulsiveness (text pp. 74, 153). Furthermore, Tursun tries in his history to demonstrate how Maḥmūd was always in the right in his decisions, whether as military commander or as statesman. Tursun was active in Maḥmūd's service, aiding him in all his state and personal business in the role of a close assistant. As a poet and literary man Tursun was included in Maḥmūd Pasha's private meetings in which current politics, literature and other intellectual subjects were discussed (text pp. 23-28). During one of these meetings Ḥayātī, a poet known for his wit and sense of humor, composed a taunting verse addressed to Tursun Beg. According to the story in Sehī's *Hasht Bihisht,*[33] Tursun never forgot this insult and was later held responsible for Ḥayātī's being put to death. After 1474 Tursun Beg, as a high-ranking official in the *Dīvān,* accompanied the Sultan on the campaigns which he personally led. As a result of his being present in the Moldavian campaign (summer 1476), the campaign against the Hungarians (winter 1476), and in the campaign in Albania (summer 1478), Tursun Beg was in a position to give interesting original details concerning these campaigns. But it is evident that he was not present in the campaigns commanded by the pashas in which the Sultan did not take part. As a result, his information on the events in Karaman (1468-74), the Crimean campaign (1475), the siege of Lepanto (1477), and the campaigns against Rhodes and Otranto (1480) is limited, and his treatment of these campaigns in the history is brief and of a general character.

According to what he himself says in his history, it is clear that after forty years of government service, Tursun Beg went into retirement and was allotted the retirement pension set aside for members of the religious institution.[34] During the time in which he was occupied with writing his history, Tursun Beg was living in Bursa, and his name is mentioned many times in the Bursa Court Records for the years 889/1484, 892/1487, and 896/1491 in connection with various undertakings. In an entry dated 25 Djumāda II 889/20 July 1484, the now venerable old man, author of our history, is referred to as "iftikhār al-aʿyān Tursun Beg bn. Ḥamza Beg." From another of the entries in the Bursa court records we learn that Tursun Beg's wife was Selçuḳ

Khātūn, the daughter of Balaban Pasha.[35] That Tursun Beg had two daughters named Māhrū and Fakhr al-Nisā' is learned from the Bursa Court Records. From one of the entries (Sidjill A 8/8, p. 79b), we learn that Tursun Beg was appointed *mutawallī* (administrator) to his uncle Djübbe ʿAlī's *waḳf* property in Bursa. From another entry (Sidjill no. A 8/8, 62b), dated Djumādā I, 896/begins 12. III. 1491, we learn that Tursun Beg sold his house. It is most probable that Tursun Beg started to write his history in Bursa in 1488. At this date he was in all likelihood over the age of sixty. His date of death is unknown.

TURSUN BEG'S WORK

Tursun gave the title *Tārīkh-i Abu' l Fatḥ,* History of the Conqueror, to his work (p. 11). He, like many other Ottoman historians such as Idrīs Bidlīsī, Djelālzāde Muṣṭafā, Selānīkī and 'Ālī, was an historian belonging to the government secretarial *(kuttāb)* class. Most of these historians also belonged to that category of bureaucrats known as the *kātib-i tadbīr,*[36] who, as members of the highest rank in the secretarial profession, were in close relations with all the statesmen responsible for the formulation of policy. They considered it part of their duty as historians to record their experiences as an aid to others in the good management of government affairs. The state secretaries were divided into two principal categories: those specializing in general government correspondence, *inshā'*, and those specializing in the Financial Department, *māliyye*. Tursun Beg, like Selānīkī and 'Ālī, belonged to the second category. Throughout his history, there are indications showing his knowledge and familiarity with the profession of a finance secretary. Especially noteworthy in this context is his attitude towards the material value of conquest and expansion. He looks upon conquest as a process by which state revenues could be expanded (text pp. 22, 25, 68, 89-100, 113, 117, 121, 138, 166). Tursun Beg intends his work, a record of what had happened in the past, as a guide and aid to administrators and statesmen in the proper management of state affairs. He follows the general line of the Advice to Kings literary genre and subscribes to their approach to political theory. He puts great emphasis on the need for the king's justice and protection of the *reʿāyā* masses as the foundation of political stability. Whenever in the course of his history a decision or course of action is taken in the war councils, he indicates his opinion as to which decisions were wise and correct and which were wrong and harmful.

There is one main theme which runs throughout Tursun's history: the concept that the good order of state and society is inextricably bound to the being of the one Sultan. At the time of the history's writing, everyone in Ottoman society was under the influence of the destructive effects of the civil war which had broken out after Mehmed II's death. The fear that Sultan Djem, at that time in refuge in Europe, would return to claim the throne and that civil war would again blaze out was universal (see especially text pp. 7-31, 175-84, 198). Sharing this feeling with all those who were concerned with the well-being of the Ottoman state, Tursun desired that Bāyezīd be firmly established on the throne, and in his history he wanted to emphasize this point. The long introduction (pp. 11-31) was certainly written for that purpose.

At the same time, Tursun did not neglect to express his awareness that it was through the conquests of Mehmed II that the Ottoman state had become the most powerful and respected state in the Islamic world. Bāyezīd II wanted an Ottoman history composed that would show the superiority of the Ottoman House to other rival Islamic dynasties in Iran and Egypt.[37] During just the period in which Tursun was writing his history, a violent conflict broke out between the Ottomans and the Mamluks, who backed and supported Djem Sultan and the Karamanid House in defiance of Bāyezīd II. It is likely that it was within the ambience of Ottoman-Mamluk rivalry that Tursun Beg conceived the idea of writing a history of Mehmed's reign, with which he was so intimately familiar, and of presenting it to the new Sultan Bāyezīd. Tursun gives open expression to his anti-Mamluk feelings in his history.[38]

Tursun also makes reference in his introduction (text pp. 9-10) to the fact that he considered it a debt of gratitude to the late Sultan Mehmed, for his generosity towards him, to compose a history of his reign. However, it is made clear that at the same time he expected some reward from Bāyezīd II for the writing of his history. In the appropriate places throughout the text he refers to his poverty and to Sultan Bāyezīd's generosity (text pp. 8, 22, 125, 159, 179). Tursun also states that his purpose in writing the history of Mehmed's reign was to form the foundations for the history of Mehmed's young successor (text p. 179). In fact, in the *Tārīkh-i Abu' l Fatḥ* itself Tursun Beg covers the events of Bāyezīd's reign up to the year 1488. He also gave expression to his intention to continue his history should his own longevity permit (text p. 198).

As for Tursun Beg's historiographical methodology and manner of historical interpretation, he was firmly tied to the basic Islamic belief; that is to say, according to our author the course of history is predetermined by God's predestination. Thus, whatever project the Sultan might undertake, its outcome was subject to this predestination, and success was granted to the Sultan in all his undertakings as a result of the backing and support *(te'yīd)* of God (text pp. 15, 160, 170, 181, 189-90, 198).

In the Ottoman state and the Islamic states which preceded it, there had existed an official or semi-official school of historiography which was based on official government documents, especially correspondence and memos to and from the Sultan *(talkhīṣāt)*.[39] Histories written by historians of this school are detailed and all-inclusive, usually giving precise and accurate information about the events described and their dates of occurrence. Another category or school of historical writing, on the other hand, was exhibited in the personal histories based on the historian's own reminiscences or experiences rather than on official documentation. Tursun Beg's history belongs in this second category. He states in his introduction (text p. 11) that he wrote his history using information about events which he had either witnessed himself or information that was currently accepted as common public knowledge *("Beyn al-nās tevātür ile ṣābit")*. For this reason, a great many mistakes are present both in the chronology and in the protagonists of events which he describes. There are many important events which were not personally witnessed by the author and are therefore left uncovered in his work. It is for certain that his work is far from being a complete or comprehensive history of the reign of Mehmed II. The importance of this history derives not from its completeness, but rather from the fact that it is based on the personal reminiscences of a man, Tursun Beg, who served for forty years in the highest government circles, and who was in close contact with the influential men and decision makers of his time. The *Tārīkh-i Abu'l-Fatḥ* thus constitutes a first hand source for the study of the attitudes of the Ottoman ruling class, their inner power struggles, the character and contents of their war councils, aspects of Ottoman society and culture whose private nature makes them little susceptible to study through the official and semi-official histories. Tursun's work is also one of the most reliable sources for the personalities of Mehmed II and Maḥmūd Pasha, as well as for an understanding of the most important internal and external issues and problems of the day

as seen by an inside observer. The central importance of artillery for the Conqueror in his founding of the empire is thus one issue which is concretely confirmed by Tursun Beg's history. There can be no doubt whatsoever that it is the most important Ottoman source for the period of Mehmed II's reign.

Like most of the *münshīs*, Tursun Beg was also a poet. The couplets and verses sprinkled throughout his history give ample evidence of his quite considerable skill in the poetic arts. He was given a present of a sable fur, a robe of honor, and 2,000 *akça* in cash for the poem which he presented to Mehmed II on his return to Edirne after the winter campaign of 1476 (text pp. 165-66). He also celebrated the occasion of Bāyezīd II's first campaign and the conquest of Ak-Kerman and Kilia in 1484 by greeting the returning Sultan with a verse (text pp. 189-90).

Tursun Beg's history was written in the official literary prose style which was in the process of development in Ottoman government circles at that time,[40] and can thus be regarded as one of the first and most important examples of the fifteenth century Ottoman historical writing. This high-flown literary *inshā'* language seems to have developed in the time of Murād II on the basis of imitation of Persian models,[41] and thus contains many anomalies which were not well incorporated into the structure of the Turkish language nor firmly established in their usage. It is perhaps for this reason that the *Tārīh-i Abu'l Fatḥ* was somewhat lacking in popularity among later generations of Ottoman historians.

This work was, however, one of the principal sources upon which Kemāl Pasha-zāde relied when he composed the section of his history dealing with the reign of Mehmed II. Idrīs Bidlīsī and Sa'd al-Dīn apparently remained unaware of the existence of Tursun's work.

NOTES

1. Our historian says (M. Ârif, edition, p. 8, see note 2 below) his name is originally *Ṭūr-Sīnā,* a Qur'ānic name distorted into *Tursun* meaning in Turkish, "let him survive." *Tursun,* a popular name extensively used in the period was evidently not liked by our author. Besides, a poet, Ḥayātī (Sehī, *Tedhkire,* Istanbul 1325 H. p. 70) made fun of him by referring to the original meaning of Tursun, which our author resented.

2. Mehmed Ârif published this work (as a supplement to *Târîkh-i ᶜOṣmânî Endjümeni Medjmūᶜası,* Istanbul, 1330 H.) using three manuscripts, two at the Topkapı Palace Library, Istanbul, Revan no. 1097 and Revan no. 1098 and one at the Aya Sofya Library (now at the Süleymaniye Library) no. 3032. In his edition M. Ârif relegated to the footnotes the best version, the Aya Sofya MS, most probably the original copy presented to Bāyezīd II, bearing the seal of this Sultan. Two more copies are known of *Tārīkh-i Abu'l Fatḥ,* one at the Topkapı Palace Library, Hazine no. 1470 (see F. Karatay, *Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu,* vol. 1, Istanbul, 1961, p. 204); and the other at the national library of Vienna (see G. Flügel, Die Arabischen, Persischen und Türkischen Handschriften . . . , II, p. 207, MS no. 1984). Rhoads Murphey and I made a facsimile edition of the Aya Sofya Ms with a summary translation: *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror,* Biblioteca Islamica: Minneapolis and Chicago, 1978.

3. See H. Inalcık, "Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time," in *Speculum,* vol. XXXV, 1960, pp. 408-27. A passage from Tursun Beg was quoted in a *Medjmūᶜa* (Köprülü Library, Istanbul, no. 1596, p. 363).

4. These records are to be found in the *sidjill* no. A 4/4: 6b, 135b, 147b, 304a; no. A 5/5: 341a; no. A 8/8: 62a, 79b. According to these records Tursun was present in Bursa at least between *Djumāda* II 889/June 1484 and Djumāda I 896/March 1491. All these *sidjill* books are at the Bursa Arkeoloji Müzsi, Bursa; for facsimiles, see H. Inalcik, "Tursun Beg, Historian of Mehmed the Conqueror's Time," *Wiener Z eitschrift für die Kundes des Morgenlandes,* 69 (1977).

5. *Sidjill* no. A 4/4: 147b: Iftikhār al-aᶜyān Tursun Beg b. Ḥamza. H. Hüsameddin (*Amasya Tarihi,* Ist. 1923, p. 206) speaks of a certain "Tursun Çelebī bn. Bakhshāyish Beg" who became *defterdār* and *muharrir-i vilâyet* to prince ᶜAlā' al-Dīn in 835/1431-32.

6. *Sidjill* A 8/8: 62a.

7. "ᶜAmmum Djübbe ᶜAlī Beg ki o eṣnāda Bursa Begi idi" (p. 60).

8. Cf. Saᶜd al-Dīn, *Tādj al-Tawārīkh,* Ist. 1279 H., p. 316.

9. See Neshrī, *Ğihānnümā,* I, ed. F. Taeschner, Leipzig, 1951, pp. 61, 67.

10. P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche,* Amsterdam, 1967, (reprint), p. 81, put the date of the Ottoman conquest of Antalya in the fall of 1391 or early summer, 1392. According to a newly discovered source (*Tarihî Takvîmler,* ed. Osman Turan, Ankara, 1954, p. 18) Antalya was first conquered by Murād I in 1388. Now Barbara

Flemming, Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien und Lykien im Spätmittelalter, Wiesbaden, 1964, pp. 101-09, suggests that the Ottoman conquest took place between 1397-99. It may be that the Ottomans lost the city during the confusion after the death of Murād at the battle of Kosovo-Polje in 1389. According to *Takvîmler* (O. Turan, *ibid.*) Bāyezīd I invaded "the entire territory of Teke" in 1390. Our Fīrūz Beg is often confused with another Fīrūz Beg who was at the frontier on the Danube (B. Flemming, 119, 121, 130; İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* I, third edition, Ankara, 1972, p. 265). In Wittek (*ibid.,* pp. 79, 84-85, 119, 147, especially p. 86 note 1), our Fīrūz is apparently mixed up with the Fīrūz of Vidin and Khodja Fīrūz (Pīrūz), governor of Menteshe. The latter must be a eunuch, an *agha,* perhaps a *ḳapı-aghası,* when he was appointed governor of Menteshe (cf. *Düstūrnāme-i Enverī,* ed. M. Halil, Istanbul, 1928, p. 88: Fīrūz Agha).

11. See Sharaf al-Dīn ᶜAlī Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma,* ed. A. Urunbayev, Tashkent, 1972, p. 408a-b.

12. *Başvekâlet Arşivi,* Istanbul, *Mâliyeden Müdevver Defterler,* no. 9, p. 1: *"Ḳarye-i Ughur çayırı khāṣṣa-i sandjaḳ, tīmār-i Süleymān Beg, Khudāvendigār zamānında Fīrūz Beg satın almısh, feterāttan sonra oghlu Yaᶜḳūb Beg 'ushrün ḥāfizlara waḳfetmish."* In another place (p. 229): *"Yaᶜḳūb Beg Destārlu'yu satun alıdjaḳ Ḥadjdjī Sinān elinde duta-durdughu bir çiftlik yeri waḳf-i ewlād etmish, Emīr Süleymān dahi müsellem dutup mektūb vermish . . ."* See also Neshrī, *ibid.,* pp. 123-25.

13. Neshrī, *ibid.*

14. Neshrī, *ibid.,* pp. 135-36.

15. "Murād II" (H. Inalcık) *İslâm Ansiklopedisi,* v. 8, pp. 598-601.

16. H. Inalcık, *Fâtih Devri üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesîkalar,* Ankara, 1954, pp. 37-53.

17. P. 60.

18. This Ḥamza has been mixed up with other Ḥamzas who lived in the same period. Dukas (ed. V. Grecu, Bucharest, 1958, Index: *Chamza*) was mistaken in identifying him with Ḥamza, brother of Grand Vizir Bāyezīd Pasha. The same mistake appears in H. Hüsameddin (vol. III, p. 203). In his work, *Ḥamza Beg Tarihi,* Bursa, 1949, Ali Ziya Topaç mixed our Ḥamza with Bāyezīd Pasha's brother who was active in the 1400's, and Hamza Beg who was killed by Vlad Dracul in 1461.

19. Here is a translation of the passage in the Anonymous Chronicles (ed. F. Giese, p. 60): "At this time Antalya was guarded by Fīrūz Beg, one of the well known servants of Mehmed I's grandfather. Mehmed I had appointed him governor of this place. He died at the time when Mehmed I died (May, 1421). Ḥamza Beg, son of Fīrūz Beg, the *subaşı* (governor) of Karahisar, left there one of his men and came down to Antalya."

20. See "Murād II" in *Islâm Ansiklopedisi,* v. 8, pp. 601-02. For the dates: F. Thiriet, *Registre des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie,* v. II, Paris and the Hague, 1959, nos. 1949, 1980.

21. *Voyage d'outremer,* ed. Ch. Schefer, 1892, p. 127.

22. The complex originally included a mosque, a *madrasa,* and a *zāviye*. Of the *madrasa* only parts of its walls are left. For the actual position see Kâzım Baykal, *Bursa ve Anıtları,* Bursa, 1950, p. 36. The district around the complex is called *Hamza Bey Mahallesi* after his name.

23. Ḥamza Beg married the sister of ᶜOşmān Çelebī of the Teke dynasty in 830/begins 2. XI. 1426 (Saᶜd al-Dīn, *Tādj al-Tawārīkh,* I, Istanbul, 1279 H., p. 231). Her mausoleum, adjacent to the mosque, houses two tombs besides her own. In 1432 Broquière *(ibid.)* found her in the pilgrimage caravan returning from Damascus. It is most probable that this lady was Tursun Beg's mother.

24. Neshrī, *ibid.,* p. 208.

25. H. Hüsameddin, *Amasya Tarihi,* Vol. III, Istanbul, 1927, p. 231; documents at the Topkapı Palace Archives (no. 6366) confirm this information.

26. D. da Lezze, *Historia Turchesca,* ed. I., Ursu, Bucharest, 1910, p. 180; H. Hüsameddin, *ibid.,* p. 235; Solaḳzāde, *Tārīkh,* Istanbul, 1297, p. 873; ᶜĀşıḳ Paşa-zāde, ed. N. Atsız, Istanbul, 1947, p. 243.

27. See document in T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı,* Istanbul, 1952, p. 474. Muṣṭafā Pasha and his wife Ḥadīdje Sultan, daughter of Bāyezīd II, had a large estate at Kükürtlü-Karamustafa thermal baths near Bursa. Ḥadīdje Sultan's mausoleum near the Kükürtlü, recently repaired, is one of the most imposing monuments in Bursa. It houses eleven tombs. Muṣṭafā Pasha constructed a complex here with a mosque, *madrasa,* and a bath (see A. Z. Topaç, *ibid.*). Today only the bath, Karamustafa Kaplıdjası, formerly Akça Hamām, stands. Muṣṭafā Pasha's mausoleum is in the court of Hamza Beg mosque.

28. If his mother was the daughter of ᶜOşmān Chelebī, see note 23. Tursun was a junior secretary in 1444.

29. See my article, "Reîs al-Küttâb," *Islâm Ansiklopedisi.*

30. H. Inalcık, "The Policy of Mehmed II . . . ," Dumbarton Oaks Papers vol. 23-24 (1969-70), pp. 231-49.

31. *"Tursun Beg ve Isḥāḳ Çelebī ve Sasa Beg oghlu Çalab-verdi ve Kula Subashısı Ilyās Beg yazdıḳları yayanın ve müsellemin defteri"* (Bursa, *Sidjill* no. A 4/4, 135b, 884 H.).

32. See H. Inalcık, *Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid,* Ankara, 1954, Introduction, pp. xiii-xiv.

33. Printed edition, Istanbul, 1325 H., p. 70.

34. See Ârif's text (pp. 8, 10), *"waẓīfe ve idrār."*

35. Balaban Beg (Pasha) was appointed governor of Menteshe in 829 H./ begins 13. XI. 1425 (ᶜĀshıḳ Pashazāde, p. 167; Neshrī, 157; Wittek, *ibid.,* p. 100) when Ḥamza Beg was governor of Anatolia. Balaban Beg was at the siege of Salonica in 1425 (Iorga, *GOR,* I, p. 402), was governor of Gallipoli (his *mülkname* dated 1 Muh. 840/16. August 1436, Topkapı Palace Archives, Sinān Pasha documents no. 156; his *waḳfiyye* dated 846/begins 12. V. 1442, on the *madrasa* and bath he built in Gallipoli, T. Gökbilgin, p. 261), became governor of Tokat in 1439 (Neshrī, p. 168; H. Hüsameddin, *ibid.,* 216), died in Edirne 850/ begins 29. III. 1446, and was buried in the court of the mosque he built in Edirne (for his *awḳāf* see T. Gökbilgin, *ibid.,* pp. 63, 223-24).

36. See "Reîs ül-Küttâb," *Islâm Ansiklopedisi,* vol. 9, p. 677.

37. *Historians of the Middle East,* eds. B. Lewis and P. Holt, London, 1962, p. 164.

38. Ârif's text, pp. 183, 192-97: *"ki kulun olsa djā'iz Miṣra Sulṭān,"* (text p. 189). For reference to the fact that Mehmed's last campaign was intended to crush the Mamluks see pp. 171-72.

39. Examples of this school of historical writing are Ibn Taghribirdī among the Mamluks, and among the Ottomans Fındıklılı Silāḥdār Meḥmed Agha.

40. *"Ḥilye-i inshā' ile mütezeyyin bir ṣūret taṣwīr ve taḳrīr edem"* (p. 10).

41. Examples of this open imitation of Persian models can easily be found in *Menāhidj al-Inshā',* ed. Şinasi Tekin, Cambridge, Mass., 1973.

Indiana University Turkish Studies and
Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series
General Editor: İlhan Başgöz

Halil İnalcık

The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire

Essays on Economy and Society



Indiana University Turkish Studies and
Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series
Volume 9



BLOOMINGTON

Bilkent University
Halil İnalcık Center