

Στους γονείς μου,
Δήμητρα και Κωνσταντίνο

To my parents,
Demetra and Constantinos

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF THRACE
ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

BY
GEORGIOS C. LIAKOPOULOS

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
ANKARA, SEPTEMBER 2002

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master in History

Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık
Thesis supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master in History

Dr. Eugenia Kermeli
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master in History

Associate Professor Dr. Mehmet Öz
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan
Director

ABSTRACT

In my thesis I examine Thrace as a geographical unity during the Ottoman conquest in the fourteenth century. In the first chapter I present the sources that I used, Byzantine and Ottoman. The life and works of the chronographers are discussed to the extent that they assist us in comprehending their ideology and mentality. I focus on the contemporary sources of the fourteenth century. The second chapter treats with the diplomatic relations between the Byzantines and the Turks in the fourteenth century before and after the Turkish settlement in Thrace. This provides the reader the base to figure the political situation, which facilitated the Turkish expansion in Thrace. The central part of my thesis is a topographic analysis of Thrace during the Ottoman expansion. I tried to research the etymology of the Thracian toponyms and then attempted to locate them on a map, mentioning their Byzantine and modern Turkish, Greek or Bulgarian equivalents, if possible. This visualizes the routes that the Ottomans followed when conquering Thrace. A map of fourteenth-century Thrace accompanies my thesis.

The fourteenth century was of paramount importance for both the Byzantine Empire and the Ottoman Emirate. In Byzantine history it marks the end of a great medieval empire, especially relating to its administrative and economic decadence. For Ottoman history, it punctuates the transition of a frontier *beglik* into a world-dominant empire. Thrace was the first European territory of the Ottomans and functioned as the vaulting horse of their expeditions in the Balkans. The intellectual intercourse of Greek-Orthodox and Turco-Islamic political ideology gave birth to the heir of the Byzantine State.

ÖZET

Tezimde Trakya'yı 14. yüzyılda Osmanlı fetihleri sırasında coğrafi bir birim olarak inceliyorum. Birinci bölümde, kullandığım Bizans ve Osmanlı kaynaklarını sunuyorum. Kronografların hayatı ve eserleri, ideoloji ve mentalitelerini anlamamıza yardımcı olan boyutlarıyla tartışılıyor. 14. yüzyılın çağdaş kaynaklarına odaklanıyorum. İkinci bölüm, Bizanslılar ve Türkler arasında, Türklerin Trakya'ya yerleşmelerinden önceki ve sonraki diplomatik ilişkilere değinir. Bu, okuyucunun Türklerin Trakya'da yayılmasını tesis eden politik durumu kavramasını sağlar. Tezimin merkezî kısmı Osmanlı yayılması sırasında Trakya'nın topografik bir analizidir. Trakya yer adlarının etimolojisini araştırmaya çalıştım ve daha sonra bir harita üzerine mümkün olduğunca Bizans, modern Türkçe, Yunanca ya da Bulgarca karşılıklarını yerleştirmeye çalıştım. Bu, Osmanlıların Trakya'yı fethederken izledikleri rotayı göz önüne koyar. Bir 14. yüzyıl Trakya haritası ilişiktir.

14. yüzyıl, hem Osmanlı Beyliği hem de Bizans İmparatorluğu açısından büyük önem taşır. Bu yüzyıl, büyük bir ortaçağ imparatorluğunun idarî ve ekonomik çöküşüne bağlı olarak Bizans'ın sonuna işaret eder. Osmanlı tarihi açısından ise bir uçbeyliğinden dünya hakimi bir imparatorluğa geçişi belirler. Trakya, Osmanlıların Avrupa'daki ilk toprağıydı ve Balkanlar'a sefere çıkarken kullandıkları bir hareket noktası işlevini gördü. Yunan-Ortodoks ve Türk-İslâm siyasi ideolojilerinin ilişkisi Bizans Devleti'nin varisini doğurdu.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many have helped in the production of this dissertation. Thanks are due especially to the supervisor of my thesis, Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık, who first suggested that I write it and whose experience and judgment were so readily available. I thank Dr. Eugenia Kermeli and Dr. Mehmet Öz for having participated in the examining committee. I would like to thank Dr. Maria Pigaki (Cartographer, National Technical University of Athens) for her invaluable help in designing the map of Thrace. I am also indebted to all my professors in the Department of History at Bilkent University; as Alexander the Great had said about his teacher, Aristotle, ‘I owe living to my parents, but good living to my teacher’.

I would like to acknowledge here my great indebtedness to my parents, Demetra and Constantinos for their constant and unimpaired encouragement and incitement. In particular, I thank my friends, Spyros, Aggeliki, Anna, Zoe, Dimitris, and Tuba for helping me in defeating the *Chimeras* of this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
1. Chapter 1. Sources.....	5
1.1. Byzantine Sources.....	5
1.1.1. Nicephoros Gregoras.....	6
1.1.2. John Cantacuzenus.....	12
1.1.3. Other Byzantine Sources.....	17
1.2. Ottoman Sources.....	18
1.2.1. Yahşi Fakih.....	18
1.2.2. Aşıkpaşazade.....	22
1.2.3. Neşri.....	23
1.2.4. Anonymous Chronicles.....	24
1.2.5. Oruç.....	26
1.2.6. Other Ottoman Sources.....	26
1.3. Travel Books.....	27
2. Chapter 2. Byzantine-Turkish Diplomatic Relations in the Fourteenth Century and their Effect on Thrace.....	28
2.1. The Geo-strategic Position of Thrace.....	28
2.2. First Byzantine Civil War.....	30
2.3. The Period Between the Two Civil Wars.....	32
2.4. Second Byzantine Civil War.....	34
2.5. Emperorship of John V Cantacuzenus; Turkish Settlement in Thrace..	37
2.6. The Ottoman Conquest of Thrace.....	44
2.7. The Conquest of Adrianople.....	50
3. Chapter 3. Topography of Thrace.....	55
3.1. Thrace's Place in History.....	55
3.2. Topography of the Ottoman Conquest of Thrace.....	57
Conclusion.....	86
Bibliography.....	92

LIST OF TABLES

Thracian Toponyms.....	88
Chronological Framework of the Ottoman Conquest of Thrace.....	90
Map of Thrace.....	91

INTRODUCTION

The theme of this dissertation is the historical geography of Thrace in the fourteenth century. This is an examination of the Thracian toponyms and the changes they underwent during the Ottoman conquest of the area. From the onomastics of the place names one can draw conclusions on the methods of the Ottoman expansion in the South-West Balkans. The Byzantine-Turkish diplomatic relations, mainly presented by John Cantacuzenus, illuminate the position of Byzantium and the Turkish Principalities in the fourteenth century international arena. The research is based mostly on literary sources of both the Ottoman and the Byzantine historiographic tradition. Archival sources of earlier Byzantine times as well as later Ottoman records provided the basis for the research. Moreover, archaeological ruins, and folk traditions and narrations were helpful to an extent.

History is a living scientific field. One cannot talk of one 'History' that is written without alterations throughout the centuries. Different schools of historical methodology have given the historian the opportunity to choose among a series of approaches. Often characterized as a 'social science', history found itself during the twentieth century cooperating with the other social sciences, like anthropology, geography, sociology, demography, economics, etc. According to the 'interdisciplinary approach', history examines everything that man has done

or thought in the past. As a collective history, the 'total history', is bound to proceed hand in hand with its fellow sciences. Seen from this point of view, geography can be very supportive to history.

Toponymy can be quite helpful in historical research, complementing the source based traditional history. Toponymy belongs to the field of onomastics; it deals with the place names, their etymology and their multiple cultural and anthropological connotations. At this level the principles of linguistics, and geography, especially anthropogeography, could be helpful to the researcher. Every name – both in anthroponymy and in toponymy – has a certain meaning. Since toponyms belong to the level of macro-history, the researcher most of the times has to look back to medieval or ancient, and even archaic, languages to trace the exact, if possible, etymology of a toponym. Place names often derive from natural or physical conditions (seasons, directions, colors, numbers, plants, fruits, animals), or people and societies (food, drink, senses, family members, religions, people names, occupations) indicative of the characteristics of a certain place.

In every place name lays an encrypted part of the history of that place. The researcher, by putting the toponyms s/he has examined on a map, can visualize a great gamut of human actions, like population movements, military campaigns, conquests, ideological or religious influences, economic relations, trade routes, communication networks, etc. People are connected to their environment. Especially in the pre-industrial era, societies were obliged to make a living out of their immediate environment. The agricultural nature of this era's economy established a strong attachment between humans and earth. This bond

is most of the times reflected in the way people would name the places they inhabit.

Based on earlier Byzantine archives and local ecclesiastical catalogues for the history of the Thracian place onomastics, the main research was done on Byzantine historical works like Nicephoros Gregoras, *Historia Rhōmaikē*, John VI Cantacuzenus, *Historiai*, and the *Short Chronicles*. The Byzantines by the time of the fourteenth century had a one-thousand-year-old historiographic tradition. The *quadrivium* education that most of the Byzantine scholars acquired in Constantinople highlighted the Thucydidian methodological model of the causality relations in history. The Byzantine historians, raised with the *imperium œcumenicum* mentality, treated the Turks in their works as another temporary enemy of the state that will soon withdraw to his uncivilized origins. The Byzantine *Short Chronicles*, on the other hand, are epigrammatic sources of two-five lines that give brief information of a certain event. Composed by the simple people in a naïve poetic style, they give quite authoritative chronologies.

For a more complete view of fourteenth century Thrace the use of the early Ottoman chronicles is essential. The *Menfòib* of Yahşi Fakih, which was saved embodied in Aşıkpaşazade's, *Tevārī ħi Ā-i 'Osmān* is the only contemporary Ottoman source. Neşri's *Cihānnümā*, was based on the work of Aşıkpaşazade. A common tradition connects the chronicle of Yahşi Fakih to the various Anonymous, *Tevārī ħi Ā-i 'Osmāns*, and Oruç's work under the same title. The Ottoman sources support the ideal of the Holy War and are often embroidered with mythological stories. Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri belong to a more 'official' historiography, whereas the Anonymous chronicles reflect the Anatolian people's view.

According to the above mentioned sources, most of the Byzantine place names of Thrace passed in the Turkish language slightly only changed to fit the phonetic rules of Turkish. This is an indicator that Byzantines and Ottomans had some kind of relationship for a period of time before the final Ottoman conquest of the region. The nomadic Turkish tribes used to cut off the fortified cities from their countryside, which would force them to surrender. In the meantime, the Turks had trade relations with the Greeks that lived in the walled cities and towns. On the other hand, the new toponyms in Thrace show the place of origin of the new inhabitants and are often connected to folk traditions concerning the nature or the conquest of a certain place.

CHAPTER 1

SOURCES

1.1. Byzantine Sources

Historiography was one of the fields of literature in which the Byzantines excelled. Through its millennium tradition, Byzantium produced a commendable number of serious historians. Most of them tried to imitate the style of Thucydides. However, they were not flawless. Amongst their weaknesses is a certain lack of interest in foreign affairs.¹ They were focused on Constantinople, the seat of the imperial government and the Patriarchate on which their intrigues were centered. The Turkish invasions from the eleventh century onwards created a new status in Asia Minor, which could not be neglected by the Byzantine foreign policy. Thus, the Byzantine historians and chronographers were obliged to mention the Turkic tribes in their works and to study something of their history. The emergence of the Ottoman Emirate in North-West Asia Minor brought the Turks in the vicinity of Constantinople and

¹ With the exception of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De administrando imperio*.

into more urgent relationship with Byzantium; and inevitably, the Byzantine writers began to give more and more attention to their neighbors.²

1.1.1. Nicephoros Gregoras

Nicephoros Gregoras was born in Heraclea Pontica of Paphlagonia in ca. 1293.³ His uncle, who is mentioned in 1300 as the metropolitan bishop of Nicomedia, undertook Gregoras' education especially in the fields of ancient Greek philosophy and Christian theology.⁴ At the age of twenty he went to Constantinople, where he attended the Logic classes of John Glykys (Patriarch 1315-1319) and perfected himself in rhetoric. His relation with Theodore Metochites⁵ was determinative of his career in astronomy. Due to his versatile knowledge, he gained the favor of the emperor Andronicos II (1282-1328).⁶ The

² S. Runciman, 'Byzantine Historians and the Ottoman Turks', in *Historians of The Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 271-276 (pp.271-72).

³ According to Hans-Veit Beyer, 'Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 27 (1978), pp. 127-155 (pp. 127-130), Gregoras was probably born in 1293. H. Hunger proposes a possible date of birth a couple of years after 1290, see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 1, (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1978), p. 454, footnote, 56. Finally *PLP* presents the years 1292-1295 as most possible for the birth of Gregoras, 'Τρηγοῦρος Νικηφόρος', in *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. by Erich Trapp, no. 4443, vol. I/2 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), pp. 234-237 (p. 234).

⁴ Gregoras admired him and dedicated him a biography, see V. Laurent, 'La vie de Jean, Métropolitte de'Héraclée du Pont', *Archeion Pontou*, 6 (1934), pp. 3-63.

⁵ At that time Metochites was the most important figure in the Constantinopolitan political mechanism and had the title *mesazon*; *mesazon* (μεσάζων) was the emperor's confidant entrusted with the administration of the empire. Doukas, [Michael] Doukas, *Vyzantiotourkiki Istoría*, trans. by Vrasidas Karalis, (Athens: Kanaki, 1997), p. 232, identified the *mesazon* with the Turkish *vezir*, see *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 'Mesazon', vol. 2, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, New York, 1991), p. 1346.

⁶ For the social status of the intellectuals and their relation to the centers of patronage and the way in which that status affected the intellectuals' view of themselves and their society see I. Ševčenko, 'Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century', in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, 6-12 Septembre 1971*, ed. by M. Berza and E. Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971), pp. 69-92.

emperor proposed him the post of *chartophylax*⁷, but Gregoras refused it offering the excuse of his young age. He accepted, however, the directorship of a private school, which functioned in the Chora Monastery. Gregoras was entrusted with diplomatic missions, including a legation to the Serbian king Stefan Uroš III (1321-1331) in 1326. With the downfall of his patrons, Andronicos II and Metochites, in 1328, Gregoras lost his property. He managed really quickly to get in contact with the new government, and made a new significant friend, the *Grand Domestic*⁸ John Cantacuzenus (emperor as John VI, 1347-1354). He stood high in Andronicos III's (1328-1341) favor as well.⁹

Based on his theological principles, Gregoras strongly rejected the new movement of Palamism. In the following years he found himself fighting in serious theological disputes. Gregoras emerged victorious in a philosophical disputation, accompanied by political tracts, against the monk Barlaam of Calabria, an outspoken Aristotelian scholastic, and was recognized as Constantinople's leading academician.¹⁰ A theological controversy with deep political ramifications followed, in which Gregoras contended the doctrine of Hesychasm.¹¹ His anti-hesychast argumentation is collected in *Antirrhētica I, II*, and in a *Logos* of 1333 in his *Rhōmaikē Historia*. On the base of Aristotle, Plotinus, and Proclus, he asserts that the divine *ousia* (essence) and the divine

⁷ *Chartophylax* (χαρτοφύλαξ), an ecclesiastical official in Constantinople and the provinces, usually a deacon, attested from the 6th century with archival and notarial duties that grew in extent and significance with the growth of synodal transactions, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 'Chartophylax', vol. 1, pp. 415-416.

⁸ *Megas domestikos* (μέγας δομέστικος), supreme military commander (after the emperor), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 'Megas Domestikos', vol. 2, pp. 1329-1330.

⁹ R. Guiland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras, L'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926), p. 22.

¹⁰ For the theological debates of Gregoras see N. Gregoras, *Rhomäische Geschichte, Historia Rhomaike, IV*, trans. by Van Dieten and Jan Louis (Stuttgart: Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, 1994), pp. 18-58.

¹¹ For the ideological movement of Hesychasm see J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm, Theological and Social Problems* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1974).

energiar (operations) are not to be distinguished. Against Barlaam he wrote the treatise *Antilogia* and two Platonic-style dialogues, *Philomathēs ē peri hybristōn* (Philomathes or on the Revilers) and *Florentios ē peri sophias* (Florentios or on Wisdom). As a consequence, he lost favor in the eyes of Cantacuzenus, who was helped by the followers of Palamas in taking the reins of the government in Constantinople in 1347. During the Synod that Cantacuzenus called in 1351, Gregoras opposed the palamists and was condemned by imperial order in confinement and ‘silence’ in the Chora Monastery.¹² Some of his students were imprisoned. His old friend Agathangelos visited him five times in three years and informed him about the latest news from the outside world.¹³ When John V Palaiologos (1341-1391) entered victorious the capital (November 1354), Gregoras was freed. He must not have lived much after the death of Palamas (14th November 1357), whom he mentions in his history. We assume that he died in ca. 1360.¹⁴

This historian and representative of the Palaiologian Renaissance was called *ho philisophos* (the philosopher). His work deals with history, rhetoric, grammar, theology, philosophy and astronomy, and this is an indication of his classical education. His main work is the *Rhōmaikē Historia* (Roman History) that covers the period of 1204-1359 in 37 books, in which he undertakes theological and ideological dialogues. It surpasses every other contemporary work in terms of extent and wealth of contents. In the first part of his work (1st-

¹² N. Gregoras, Nicephorus, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. by Hier. Wolf, Car. Ducange, Io. Boivini, Cl. Capperonnerii (Bonnae: CSHB, Impenis Ed. Weberi, vol. I, 1829, vol. II, 1830, vol. III, 1855), vol. II, 1830, pp. 1013^{4-sq} (hereafter Gregoras), R. Guiland, *Essai*, pp. 37-sq.

¹³ This person must be identical to Angelos Manuel *epi tou kanikleiou*, Ἐπιτοροῦς Νικηφόρος’ *PLP*, p. 235.

¹⁴ ‘Gregoras Nicephorus’, *Britannica*, vol. 5, p. 476. R. Guiland concludes *ex silentio* that Gregoras must have died at the end of 1359 or at the beginning of 1360, since Gregoras does not mention any historical event after that time, see R. Guiland, *Essai*, p. 53.

11th books) he narrates the history of 1204-1341 that the author seems to have considered as a separate chapter. The text after the eleventh book has survived in less than half of the manuscripts.¹⁵ In the second part (12th-29th books) he deals with the history of the period 1341-1355. The 30th-35th books are dedicated to two theological conversations against Palamas in the form of dialogue. Finally, the 36th and 37th book present the history of the years 1355-1358, but with many inconsistencies. It seems that Gregoras died before making the finishing touches.¹⁶ The period that he had lived is presented in a colorful detailed way. Thus, the period between 1341-1349 covers the same extent as the one of the two previous decades (12th-17th books). Gregoras does not clearly state when he started composing his history. In the beginning of his work he says that the dynasty of the Angeloi was ‘till today’ governing Epirus.¹⁷ Consequently, we consider 1337, when Epirus lost its independence, as a *terminus ante quem*. H.-V. Beyer argues that he must have started composing earlier, in 1328-1329.¹⁸ In the summer of 1352, during his confinement, he composed, as he says, ten books (18th-27th books) in forty days.¹⁹

His work has been characterized more as a ‘collection of memoirs’, rather than as historical.²⁰ The notion that history must include everything made for the glory of God,²¹ justifies astronomical, geographical, ethnographical, etc.

¹⁵ R. Guiland, *Essai*, p. 241. For the manuscripts of the work of Gregoras see *idem.*, pp. xvi-xxviii.

¹⁶ H. Hunger, *Literatur*, p. 457.

¹⁷ Gregoras, I, p. 14₁.

¹⁸ H.-V. Beyer, ‘Chronologie’, p. 133.

¹⁹ K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*, vol. 1 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1958), p. 296.

²⁰ H. Hunger, *Literatur*, p. 458; K. Krumbacher, *Litteratur*, p. 295; R. Guiland, *Essai*, p. 236.

²¹ Gregoras, I, p. 4₄.

deviations.²² He believes that the orations are the mirror of persons.²³ In his first seven books he used the history of Georgios Akropolites and Georgios Pachymeres; he actually transferred an abridged form of the latter into his work.²⁴ In spite of the fact that he has certain gaps in his historical narration, he offers more information than Cantacuzenus.²⁵ As a humanist and member of the Palaiologian intelligentsia, he proves that he has broad horizons and critical mind. He foresees the loss of Asia Minor to the Turks and he tries to give the whole image of the Turkish conquests, knowing that this is impossible for him to achieve.²⁶ The abandonment of the Byzantine navy and the decay of the imperial ideology cover his narration with pessimism.²⁷ His humanism is apparent in the idealization of the Greek antiquity.²⁸ Gregoras gives credit to prophecies and dreams. He also believes that the position of the stars may affect human lives.²⁹ The argument he uses is stoic; *cosmos* is a unity, an entity, every part of which suffers along with the Romans, whenever there is turbulence in their dominions. The Divine Providence bears characteristics of the ancient Greek *necessity* and not of the freely acting God of the Bible.³⁰ He is interested in the political, economic and social affairs of the Byzantine state. He composes often with the

²² About the deviations concerning lands and people see: about the Bulgarians Gregoras, I, pp. 26-sq, about the Scythes, pp. 30-41, about the Galatians and the Celts, pp. 102-sq, about Kefissos, p. 251_{9,22}, about the Russians, III, pp. 511-517, about Cyprus, pp. 27-29, about Crete, pp. 38-42, about Milan, p. 193.

²³ Gregoras interpolates orations of Syrgiannes, Gregoras, I, pp. 299₁₄-301₄, Andronicos III, pp. 398₁₅-402₂₀, John Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 587₆-588₂₄, 776₂₁-778₆.

²⁴ G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958), p. 451.

²⁵ R. Guiland, *Essai*, pp. 251-254.

²⁶ For the references to the Turkish conquests see G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 452.

²⁷ Gregoras, I, pp. 566-568.

²⁸ Beside the use of ancient Greek historical and mythological examples, he uses archaic expressions, see H. Hunger, *Literatur*, p. 462. He calls the non-Greek nations 'barbarians', following the ancient tradition, see G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 451.

²⁹ Gregoras, I, pp. 49₂₃-50₅.

³⁰ N. Grigoras, *Romaiki Istoria A' periodos: 1204-1341 (Kefalaia 1-11)*, trans. by Dimitrios Moschos (Athens: Nea Synora-Livani, 1997), p. 23.

pen of a rhetorician and not of a historian. The modern day reader should bear in mind that rhetoric was then the quintessence of education that connected the Byzantine scholar with his ‘natural’ roots, the ancient Greek educational and political coordinates, and his social models, the Constantinopolitan educated bureaucrat, the man of letters. Gregoras seems to hold the uneducated people in low esteem, which is a common characteristic of the intelligentsia.³¹ According to G. Moravcsik and K. Krumbacher, Gregoras was the greatest Byzantine ‘Polyhistor’ of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.³²

Beside a historian, Gregoras proved to be a prominent scientist, mainly in the field of astronomy. Among his works we count: Commentary on *Nicomachos*, Commentary on *Harmonica* of Ptolemy, *Peri tōn hybrizontōn tēn astronomian* (On the Revilers of Astronomy), *Pōs dei kataskeuazein astrolavon* (How an Astrolabe Should be Constructed), *Peri enyphniōn tou Synesiou* (On the Dreams of Synesios)³³ etc. Gregoras was also engaged in the eclipses and the calendar reform. His proposal to reform the Julian calendar was rejected in 1325,³⁴ it was adopted, however, by Pope Gregorius XIII in 1578. For Gregoras astronomy was the summit of human wisdom, which ‘purified the eye of his intelligence’.³⁵ As far as the philosophical side of Gregoras is concerned, he showed a preference to Plato and to cosmologic and metaphysic problematic. Among his philosophical works we can mention the *Logoi* (Orations), *Epitaphioi*

³¹ Gregoras, I, 1829, pp. 256₁₁₋₂₁, 567₉₋₁₂. For this snobbism see H. Hunger, ‘Klassizistische Tendenzen in der byzantinischen Literatur des 14. Jahrhunderts’ in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, 6-12 Septembre 1971*, ed. by M. Berza and E. Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971), pp. 139-151 (p. 149).

³² G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 451, and K. Krumbacher, *Litteratur*, p. 293.

³³ For this work see R. Guiland, *Essai*, pp. 209-216.

³⁴ Andronicos II considered that the strong conservative forces of the Church would never permit such a change, see *ibid.*, pp. 283-285.

³⁵ Quoted in D. Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire* (London: 1979), p. 51.

'eis megan logothetēn Theodōron Metochitēn' and *'eis Andronicon III'* (Funeral Orations for the *grand logothet* Theodore Metochites and Andronicos III), *Epistolai* (Letters), *Logos aformēn eilēphōs ton tou vasilēōs pros ta tou Platonos erota* (Oration by Reason of the King's (oration) about the *Eros* of Plato), *Lyseis aporiōn pros tēn vasilida Helenēn tēn Palaiologinan* (Answers to the Queries of Queen Helen Palaeologina), etc.³⁶

1.1.2. John Cantacuzenus

The other chief historian of the fourteenth century was John Cantacuzenus. He was more than a writer one of the protagonists of the fourteenth-century Byzantine history. The civil war between him and the party of John V Palaiologos led him to the imperial throne in Constantinople in 1347. Cantacuzenus was born probably about 1295.³⁷ His mother, Theodora, was the aunt of Adronicos III.³⁸ He inherited and employed his mother's family name of Palaiologos at least during the period of his career as *Grand Domestic*, though after his proclamation as emperor in 1341 he seems purposely to have avoided

³⁶ *Istoria tou Ellenikou Ethnous*, vol. 9 (Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1980), p. 360; for a list of Gregoras' works see 'Γρηγορῶς Νικηφόρος', *PLP*, pp. 235-236, and R. Guiland, *Essai*, pp. xxxi-xxxv.

³⁷ Whether or not one accepts the identification of Michael Cantacuzenus as his grandfather († 1264), which would give 1294 as the *terminus post quem* for the death of his father and thus 1295 as the latest possible date for the birth of John himself, the evidence is clear that John was of an age with the emperor Andronicos III Palaiologos; and Andronicos is known to have been born in 1297, see D. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus) ca. 1100-1460, A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, Center for Byzantine Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 1968), p. 35.

³⁸ St. I. Kourouses, 'Ἰωάννης ὁ Καντακουζηνός', *Threskeutike kai Ethike Egkyklopaideia*, vol. 7 (1965), pp. 29-35 (p. 29).

using it.³⁹ It seems reasonably certain that John never knew his father and was brought up as an only child by his mother. It is also clear that he was on most intimate terms with the young Andronicos Palaiologos from an early age, and that he was an outstanding member of the younger generation of the aristocracy which, for whatever reasons, rose in support of Andronicos when he was disinherited by his grandfather in October 1320.⁴⁰

After the final victory of Andronicos III, Cantacuzenus became the mightiest man in the empire, being the most intimate and confidant friend of the emperor. On 26 October 1341, he was proclaimed by his followers as emperor in Didymoteichon. He was crowned emperor in Adrianople by Lazaros, Patriarch of Jerusalem, on 21 May 1346, and on 8 February 1347 he was crowned again in Constantinople by the Patriarch Isidore. Among those dates one must mention the bloodshed and unrest that the civil war between Cantacuzenus and John V Palaiologos caused. Both of them used foreign powers from the Balkans and Asia Minor. Many of the Byzantine territories were lost to the Serbs, the Genoese and the Turks. The struggle between the two prominent Byzantine families continued in 1352. John V Palaiologos supported by Francesco Gattilusio entered victorious Constantinople in November 1354. Cantacuzenus tried for a few weeks to remain in his imperial position next to his antagonist. On 10 December 1354, in a ceremony in the palace, John divested himself of all imperial insignia and put on the habit of a monk, under the monastic name

³⁹ Besides *mezas domesticos* (1325?-1341) he became *mezas papias* (1320), governor of Adrianople (1320-1321?), and co-emperor (1341-1347), 'Καντακουζηνός Ἰωάννης', *PLP*, p. 94.

⁴⁰ For the relations of Cantacuzenus and Andronicos see T. Miller, *The History of John Cantacuzenus (Book IV): Text, Translation and Commentary* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1975), pp. 2-6.

Joasaph. He moved to the monastery of Mangana.⁴¹ In 1379, Andronicos IV restricted Cantacuzenus and his family in Genoese Pera. In 1381 he was let free and went to the Peloponnese, where he acted behind-the-scenes, after the death of his son, Manuel. It was at Mystras, the capital of the Despotate of Morea, that John Cantacuzenus died and was buried on 15 June 1383.

It was during his monastic life, between the years 1354-1383, that he applied himself to writing his memoirs or *Historiai* (Histories) and also to the composition of a number of theological and polemical works.⁴² His *Historiai* are divided into four books and they correspond to the period of 1320-1356; some events go as far as 1362.⁴³ At the beginning of the first book he interpolates an imaginary correspondence, in which Neilos – the archbishop of Thessalonica Neilos Kabasilas⁴⁴ – exhorts Christodoulos (the pseudonym of the author) to compose his memoirs. Neilos praises Cantacuzenus. Christodoulos in his response clearly mentions that he intends to write *sine ira et studio* based on inspection on the spot.⁴⁵ The first book mainly deals with the war between Andronicos II and Andronicos III and the second one with the reign of

⁴¹ He retired there in the winter 1354-1355 and not to Mount Athos, which is a mistaken opinion, according to D. Nicol. He must have spent though, a large part of his monastic life in the monastery of Charsianeites in Constantinople, where he had probably completed his *Historiai* and also his theological works, D. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos*, p. 94. The biographer of the emperor, John Comnen, mentions just Mangana, see D. Nicol, 'The Doctor-Philosopher John Comnen of Bucharest and his Biography of the Emperor John Kantakouzenos', in his *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), pp. 511-526 (p. 523). In a later period though, he must have gone to Mount Athos, G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 321, H. Hunger, *Litteratur*, p. 466, and K. Krumbacher, *Litteratur*, p. 298.

⁴² The time of the composition of his memoirs was probably the first decade following his abdication. 1369, the year that the codex Laurentianus IX, 9 was composed, should be considered as the *terminus ante quem*, St. I. Kourouses, 'Ἰωάννης ὁ Καντακουζηνός', p. 33, D. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos*, p. 100. Moravcsik proposes the year 1368, G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 322. For the schema of the manuscripts of *Historiai* see T. Miller, *The History of John Cantacuzenus*, pp. 7-18.

⁴³ K. Krumbacher, *Litteratur*, p. 298.

⁴⁴ J. Dräseke, 'Zu Johannes Kantakuzenos', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 9 (1900), pp. 72-84 (p. 81).

⁴⁵ I. Cantacuzenus, *Historiarum Libri IV*, ed. by B. G. Niebuhr, Imm. Bekker, and L. Schopen (Bonnae: CSHB, Impenis Ed. Weberi, vol. I, 1827, vol. II, 1831, vol. III, 1832), vol. I, 1827, p. 10⁷⁻¹⁸, (hereafter, Cantacuzenus).

Andronicos III (1328-1341). The third one begins with the death of Andronicos III and ends with the entrance of Cantacuzenus in Constantinople in 1347; finally the fourth book deals with the reign of Cantacuzenus, his abdication and the following years. Whereas the first, second and fourth book have more or less the same length, the third one is almost twice as large.⁴⁶

Cantacuzenus tries to present his *Historiai* in a favorable for him way by passing over in silence or by covering displeasing events; for example he does not mention the conquest of Nicaea and Nicomedia by the Ottomans. For that reason one must be very careful when one reads Cantacuzenus' memoirs. Generally, however, the events mentioned are authoritative and only their explanation and commentary lies on the subjective level. His work has a historic and philological value; above all it is the composition of an experienced politician based on diary notes and often on official records and archives.⁴⁷ The most important document that he quotes verbatim is a letter of the Egyptian sultan Nasraddin Hasan addressed to the author.⁴⁸ It is written in colloquial Greek and can be compared to letters of Turkish sultans to Western leaders of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁴⁹ Cantacuzenus, like Julius Caesar, invokes the *truthfulness* of his narration. He appears to be always prudent. He interpolates speeches in his work. The portraits of the main characters though, are missing. One can trace Ancient Greek models in his style. He avoids platitudinous and pompous patterns that could remind of a rhetoric school. John followed

⁴⁶ H. Hunger, *Literatur*, p. 467.

⁴⁷ G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952), p. 373. He had access to official documents even from the period of the civil war, but mostly from the time of the emperorship of the young Palaiologos, i.e. the decrees of Andronicos II, see Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 232₂₃-233₁₄, 233₁₇-234₃, 234₁₃-235₁₀.

⁴⁸ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 94-99.

⁴⁹ This is one of the oldest examples of vulgar Greek prose, K. Krumbacher, *Litteratur*, p. 300.

Thucydides brilliantly.⁵⁰ Mythological and historical examples appear only occasionally. Dreams and prophecies seem to be of no value for Cantacuzenus. As a faithful Byzantine he believes in the guidance of people and nations by the Providence. He seems to have thought the Turks less dangerous to the empire than the Serbs, and to have had no strong feelings against them and their religion, at least whenever this seemed diplomatically correct.⁵¹ His *Historiai* provide an invaluable account of the fourteenth-century Byzantine internal and foreign affairs.

Of his polemical works only two have so far been published. One is the *Prooimion* (Prologue) to the writings of the monk Christodoulos, John's pseudonym against the heretical doctrine of Barlaam and Gregorios Akindynos. The other is his collection of Treatises against the Muslims, which take the form of an *Apologia* for the Christian faith in four chapters and four *Logoi* (Orations) against Muhammad. The theological and polemical writings of John which remain to be edited are as follows: *Sermones Antirrhētics* (Refutations) by the monk Christodoulos of the anti-Palamite treatise in four books composed by John Kyparissiotēs *Antirrhētica* (Refutations) of the treatise by Prochoros Cydonēs entitled *Peri ousias kai energeias* (De essentia et de operatione), in two parts written in Constantinople in the years 1368-1369, *Antirrhētica* (Refutations) of the writings of Isaac Argyros, *Treatise on the Light of Tabor*, addressed to Raoul Palaiologos, *Treatise against the Jews* in nine chapters, *Scholia peri tōn hesychastōn* (Comments on the Hesychasts), *Correspondence* with the papal legate Paul, consisting of four letters of John and two of Paul. The

⁵⁰ See H. Hunger, 'Thukydides bei Johannes Kantakuzenos. Beobachtungen zur Mimesis', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 25 (1976), pp. 181-193.

⁵¹ For the references he makes of the Turks see G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, p. 322.

widespread belief that John, as the monk Joasaph, copied many manuscripts with his own hand, among them the sumptuous collection of his theological and polemical works contained in *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1242*, once the property of the monastery of St Anastasia Pharmakolytria in Chalkidice, seems now to have been dispelled.⁵² The monk Joasaph in question was a renowned copyist of the monastery Tōn Hodēgōn in Constantinople, active from the years 1360 to 1406 or 1418, long after the death of Cantacuzenus. There is no evidence that John ever copied manuscripts himself. Finally John has been credited with the *Anonymou Paraphrasis tōn Aristotelous Ēthicōn Nicomacheiōn* (*Paraphrasis Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum Incerti Auctoris*, Anonymous' Paraphrase of the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle) or at least of the first five or six books of that work. The *Paraphrasis*, which remains anonymous, was simply transcribed on John's commission and not composed by him.⁵³

1.1.3. Other Byzantine Sources

Besides these two main sources, the following ones are rather helpful for an overview of the fourteenth century: Demetrios Cydones' *Correspondence*, Laonicos Chalcocondyles' *Apodeixeis Historiōn* (Proofs of Histories), the *Short Chronicles*, Gregorios Palamas' *Correspondence*, Michael Doukas' *History* (the exact title of his work has not survived).

⁵² L. Politis, 'Jean-Joasaph Cantacuzène fut-il copiste?', *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 14 (1956), pp. 195-199.

⁵³ D. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos*, pp. 98-101.

1.2. Ottoman Sources

There is a scarcity of indigenous Ottoman source materials before the last two decades of the fifteenth century. From the fourteenth century almost nothing survives. As it will appear below, the Ottomans firstly engaged themselves with historiography only in the time of Bayezid II (1481-1512).⁵⁴ The historical works of the fifteenth century have a direct and robust style. They are the raw material on which later Ottoman writers relied.⁵⁵

1.2.1. Yahşi Fakih

Yahşi Fakih is one of the first known Ottoman chronographers, second only to, the more poet than historian, Ahmedi. We do not know much of his life. Most of the information about him derives from his work. Yahşi Fakih came from the township of Geyve in eastern Bithynia.⁵⁶ His father, İshak Fakih, was the *imam* of the second Ottoman sultan, Orhan (1326-1362).⁵⁷ We can assume

⁵⁴ C. Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1990), p. 1.

⁵⁵ V. L. Ménage, 'The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 168-179 (p. 168).

⁵⁶ V. L. Ménage, 'The Menāqib of Yakhshi Faqīh', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 26 (1963), pp. 50-54 (p. 50).

⁵⁷ Hacı Kalfa mentions that the name of his father was İlyas, whereas İdris Bitlisi argues it was Osman; Hüseyin Namık gives his genealogical tree concluding that his father name was İshak, see F. Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und Ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1927), pp. 10-11. Bursalı Mehmed Tahir agrees with Hacı Kalfa, see Brusalı Mehmed Tahir, *'Osmanlı Mü'ellifleri*, vol. III, (İstanbul: Maḡ ba'a-ı 'Āmire, 1333), p. 163. A. Savvides, 'Το έργο του Τούρκου χρονικογράφου Ασίκ-πασά-ζαδέ (c.1400-c.1486) ως πηγή της υστεροβυζαντινής και πρώιμης οθωμανικής περιόδου', *Deltio Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon*, 3 (1982), pp. 57-70 (p. 60).

that Yahşi Fakih was born in the middle of the fourteenth century. The epithet *faḳīh* (*faḳı*) that accompanies his name drives us to the conclusion that he attained the religious education. The persons that were given this title in the Islamic world belonged to the close environment of the emir, who often asked for their advice and guidance. They attained high education especially in the field of *tafsīr*, the elucidation of the Quran.⁵⁸ The year of death of Yahşi Fakih cannot be calculated with certainty. Its *terminus post quem* is the year 1413, when he accommodated Aşıkpaşazade in his house. We assume that he wrote his chronicle during the last ten years of his life.

We cannot access the original version of Yahşi Fakih's chronicle, except through the *Tevārīh-i Āl-i 'Osmān* (Stories of the House of Osman) of Aşıkpaşazade. As Aşıkpaşazade mentions, because of his illness he could not accompany Mehmed I (1413-1421), when the latter left Bursa in 1413 for the final confrontation with his brother Musa. Aşıkpaşazade, on his way from the Elvan Çelebi convent, at Mecidözü near Çorum, to Bursa had to stay at Geyve in the house of Yahşi Fakih. There, Yahşi Fakih gave Aşıkpaşazade his *Menf'kīb-i Āl-i 'Osmān* (Deeds of the House of Osman), an Ottoman history down to Bayezid I (1389-1402) i.e., until his accession in 1389 or, the latest, to his death in 1403. Aşıkpaşazade states that 'he transmitted (*naḳl*)' the Ottoman history down to the reign of Bayezid I from this source.⁵⁹ However, he states that he

⁵⁸ For the science of *fiḳh* see F. M. Köprülü, 'Fıkh', *İslām Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV (Eskişehir: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı), pp. 601-622 and I. Goldziher [J. Schacht], 'Fiḳh', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill), p. 886.

⁵⁹ H. İnalcık, 'How to Read 'Āshīq Pasha-zāde's History', in his *Essays in Ottoman History* (İstanbul: Eren, 1998), pp. 31-50 (p. 32). Aşıkpaşazade, the Anonymous *Tevārīh*, and Oruç's relationship on the basis of a common source can be established from the emergence of Osman Gazi up to the suppression of Mustafa, the rebellious brother of Murad II (1421-1451) in 1422. It seems that this common source was the chronicle of Yahşi Fakih, H. İnalcık, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 152-167 (pp. 152-153).

added things, which came to his knowledge through personal experience in seeing and hearing: ‘bilüp işitdügümden ba‘zı aḥvālinden ve menākıblarından ihtişār edüb kalem diline virdüm’.⁶⁰ The author says in it that only, when he was questioned about the *tevārīh* and the *menfıkıb* of the Ottoman house, he composed a short account ‘from what he had learned and heard’. Instead of the words ‘bilüp işitdügümden’, all the other manuscripts have here a longer passage, which gives the impression that it has been interpolated into the smoothly-running text of ‘Ālī Beg, because it seems syntactically awkward, and also conveys to the whole prologue a meaning which the author can hardly have intended.⁶¹ Replacing those two words the text reads:

‘faķır dahī cevāb virdüm kim Orḥān Ġāzī’niñ imāmı ũshfķ Faķı oālı
Yahşı Faķı’dan kim ol sultān Bāyezīd Hān’a gelince bu menāķıbı ol
Yahşı Faķı’da(n) yazılmış buldum kim ol Yahşı Faķı Orḥān Ġāzī’niñ
imfırmı oālıdur faķır dahī’⁶²

This passage adds two important details, the name of the father, İshāķ, and the fact that the *menāķı b* were written down (*yazılmış buldum*). These must have been inserted by Aşıkpaşazade himself, when in editing the recension presented in F. Giese’s edition, he expanded the prologue by bringing to its logical place the name of his primary source.⁶³

⁶⁰ ‘Aşıkpaşazāde, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān veya ‘Aşıkpaşazāde Tārīhi*, ed. by ‘Ālī Beg (İstanbul: Maṭ ba‘a-ı ‘Āmire, 1337), (hereafter, Aşıkpaşazade-Ali), p. 1.

⁶¹ V. L. Ménage, ‘The Menāqib of Yakḥshī Faqīh’, p. 50.

⁶² F. Giese, ed., *Die altosmanische Chronik des ‘Aşıkpaşazāde* (Osnabrück: 1972), (hereafter, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese), p. 1.

⁶³ V. L., Ménage, ‘The Menakib of Yakḥshī Faqih’, p. 51.

Yahşi Fakih's *menfķıbnfme* as transmitted by Aşıkpaşazade has the characteristics of the popular epic style, which combined genuine historical with folk stories from various origins, Turcoman or Greek.⁶⁴ The author gives a lengthier account of Osman's reign than of the one of Orhan. In his work there is a chronological gap of more or less fifteen years (1335-1357, according to the chronology of Yahşi Fakih, which corresponds to actual 1337-1354).⁶⁵ According to H. İnalcık, the chronicle was composed after the battle of Ankara (28 July 1402). Ideological tinges in the chronicle indicate the effort of the chronographer to underline the piousness of the first sultans in contrast with Bayezid and his 'indifference' towards the Islamic prudence. In that way the Ottoman defeat at Ankara was presented normally as the God's punishment on Bayezid.⁶⁶

The *menfķıbnfme* of Yahşi Fakih is to a large extent historically authoritative. Being one of the closest persons of the sultan was an advantage for the chronographer. Thus, he had the ability to narrate recent events with vividness. This chronicle includes the achievements of Osman and his comrades-in-arms like Samsa Çavuş, Akçe Koca and Köse Mihal. Among others, it treats with the first military operations that concluded in the conquest of Bilecik and Aynegöl, the undertakings on the east bank of Sakarya and in Mesothynia. Furthermore it includes the annexation of the emirate of Karasi, the activities of Süleyman Paşa in Rumili and some events of the reign of Murad I (1362-1389) in Anatolia. Finally, Yahşi Fakih included legends and folktales that he might have heard from dervishes, such as the story of the poplar-tree that was planted

⁶⁴ H. İnalcık, 'How to Read 'Āshık Pasha-zāde's History', p. 32.

⁶⁵ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi ton Palaion Soultanon (1300-1400)* (Athens: MIET, 1991), p. 52.

⁶⁶ H. İnalcık, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', p. 155.

outside the palace in Bursa, or the one of the presence of the prophet Muhammad at the conquest of Aetos (Aydos).⁶⁷

The Anonymous *Tevārīhs* are more detailed in some parts than other sources, especially the ones criticizing the administration. Aşıkpaşazade, Oruç and the Anonymous *Tevārīh* use, each in his own way, a common source from the emergence of Osman up to 1422. It seems that this source was Yahşi Fakih's work with a continuation to 1422. In general, Aşıkpaşazade's version is the most detailed one, although Oruç appears to give in a few places a fuller treatment of the 'original' text. All three of them add to the common source new information from different sources such as oral traditions and *menākı bnāmes*. However, it appears that the Anonymous *Tevārīh* have also used a rhymed work from 1402 down to 1424, the one of Hamzavi.⁶⁸

1.2.2. Aşıkpaşazade

In order to understand the way that each of the above-mentioned historians used the chronicle of Yahşi Fakih, I should try to give an account of their lives and works. Aşıkpaşazade (Derviş Aḥmed 'Āşıkī bin Şeyḥ Yahyā bin Şeyḥ Süleymān bin 'Āşık Paşa) was born in 795/1392-1393 at Elvan Çelebi village and lived there among the dervishes⁶⁹ until 1422, when Mihaloğlu took him to join Murad II (1421-1451). He states that he participated in all of Murad

⁶⁷ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 49; see also V. L., Ménage 'The Menakib of Yakḥshī Faqih', pp. 50-54.

⁶⁸ H. Inalcik, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', p. 154.

⁶⁹ This region of Çorum was densely populated by Turcomans since the Danishmendids; *bābār* dervishes must have had strong influence there, H. Inalcik, 'How to Read 'Āşık Pasha-zāde's History', p. 33.

II's campaigns and whatever he wrote about this sultan comes from his personal observations. According to certain *vakfiyyes* his fortune included several real estates in Istanbul.⁷⁰ Since the last event he mentions occurred in the year 908/1502⁷¹, and his new endowments were made in November of the same year, it may be supposed that he died in 1502. The audience the author had in mind in writing his chronicle was in the first place the dervishes, primarily those belonging to the *Vefā'iyye* order. Besides telling about the Ottoman family's origins, his main purpose was to demonstrate how the *Vefā'ī halīfe* Ede-Bali and his own family played a decisive role in the establishment and rise of the Ottoman dynasty.⁷²

1.2.3. Neşri

Neşri in his *Cihānnümā* (Cosmorama) used the work of Aşıkpaşazade as his main source. We do not know much of his life. His real name must have been Meḥmed, or, according to the evidence of the Bursa register, Hüseyn bin Eyne Beg, Neşrī being his pseudonym (*mahlaş*). He was a *müderriş* in Bursa, where he is said to have deceased. Most probably he came from Karaman.⁷³ We may add that he was a minor poet. He worked in the early years of the reign of Bayezid

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 34. F. Babinger argues that the last event he mentions occurred in 1478, F. Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 37.

⁷² H. İncelik, 'How to Read 'Āshīk Pasha-zāde's History', pp. 36, 39-48.

⁷³ V. L. Ménage, *Neşrī's History of the Ottomans, The Sources and the Development of the Text* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 2. F. Babinger and Bursalı Mehmed Tahir though, claim that he came from Germiyan, see F. Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 38, Brusalı Meḥmed Ṭāhir, '*Osmānlı Mü'ellifleri*', vol. III, p. 150.

II.⁷⁴ He died during the time of Selim I (1512-1520). In the Ottoman Empire his work was used extensively by almost all the historians of the classical age of literature, which began during that reign.⁷⁵ His *Cihānnümā* is a universal history from the Creation to his own days. Only its sixth and last section (*kısm*) has survived. It is devoted to the history of the descendants of Oghuz Han and was presented to Bayezid II. It is divided in three strata or layers (*tabaka*), the third of which deals with the history of the Ottomans from the legendary beginnings of the dynasty down to the first years of the reign of Bayezid II, the latest date being 25 Şa‘bān 890/6 September 1485. His main sources, apart from Aşıkpaşazade, were the Oxford Anonymous History (Bodleian Library, MS. Marsh 313), and a Chronological List.⁷⁶ Neşri tried to use a historical method by questioning his sources and trying to establish the truth of the events. The forthright judgments on public men – like the family of Çandarlı – of Aşıkpaşazade are frequently softened.⁷⁷

1.2.4. Anonymous Chronicles

The Anonymous Chronicles were composed in the fifteenth century in simple Turkish with a rather naïve and lyrical style lacking the elaborate forms of classical literature. They were popular readings in their time. They have a

⁷⁴ The completion of his work falls between 892 (beginning December 1486) and Rebi‘ul-āhir 898/February 1493, the date appearing in the colophon of the Codex Menzel, the earliest dated manuscript, V. L. Ménage, *Neshri’s History of the Ottomans*, p. 9.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-5.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8; see also M. Kalicin, ‘L’homme dans l’œuvre de Neşri “Tarih-i Al-i Osman”’, *Études Balkaniques*, 2 (1983), pp. 64-82 (pp. 65-66).

⁷⁷ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 45; V. L. Ménage, ‘The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography’, pp. 175-176.

paramount importance as sources for the first two centuries of the Ottoman history. They seem to be stories narrating the political and military deeds of sultans in a chronological hierarchy. Their common content consists of three main parts: a. the emergence of the Ottomans until the fall of Constantinople, b. the mythical history of Constantinople and the basilica of St Sophia, and c. some incidental events until 963/1555.⁷⁸ Their language is the vulgar-colloquial Turkish of the fifteenth century. They are written in a script, which includes the vowel points (*hareke*) that makes them a true thesaurus of early Ottoman anthroponymy and toponymy, for they are easily readable.⁷⁹ The artless syntactical forms and the lack of a common orthography is a *topos* in the Anonymous Chronicles. Their sources appear to be Ahmedi, Yahşi Fakih, and the Chronological Lists. They give a detailed account of the conquest of Thrace and the rest of Rumeli implying that the age of the Holy War was more illustrious than the time of Bayezid I. Mythological patterns appear hand in hand with historical facts. Their composers were people of low class, not having attained high education, and imbued with the spirit of the Holy War. F. Giese in his *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken* had collected thirteen manuscripts of those *Tevârih-i Âl-i 'Osmâns* found in European libraries and presented a single text.⁸⁰ There are nearly fifty manuscripts of Anonymous Chronicles in Turkey and around the world.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Anonim, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman F. Giese Neşri*, ed. by Nihat Azamat (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1992), p. xxix.

⁷⁹ Anonim, *Osmanlı Kroniği (1299-1512)*, ed. by Necdet Öztürk (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2000), (hereafter, Anonymous-Öztürk), p. xi.

⁸⁰ F. Giese, ed., *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken* تواریخ آل عثمان , *Teil 1 Text und Variantenverzeichnis* (Breslau: 1922), pp. i-v, (hereafter, Anonymous-Giese).

⁸¹ Anonymous-Öztürk, p. xxxii; F. Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 40-42.

1.2.5. Oruç

Oruç (Oruc bin ‘Ādil el-Ḳazzāz el-Edrenevī) is the last member of the authors’ chain that used the *menfkıbnfme* of Yahşi Fakih in their work. As his name indicates, he came from Edirne. His history is entitled *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān* and covers the events from the appearance of the Ottomans until the military expedition of the Conqueror in Karaman in 872/1467. It was composed during the reign of Bayezid II. Being contemporary with Mehmed II (1451-1481) and living in the same city with him (Edirne), makes his account of this sultan detailed.⁸² It seems that Oruç made two principal recensions in his work, the first one ca. 900/1494-95, and the second one 908/1502-3.⁸³

1.2.6. Other Ottoman Sources

Auxiliary to the above-mentioned sources will be Ahmedi’s *Dāsītān-i Tevārīh-i Müluk-ı Āl-i ‘Osmān* in his *İskendernāme*, Şükrullah’s *Behcetü’-tevērīh*, Enveri’s *Düstürnāme*, the Chronological Lists (*Tārīhī Takvīmler*), Müneccimbaşı Ahmed bin Lütfullah’s *Cāmi‘u’-d-düvel*, İbn-i Kemal’s *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, Lütfi Paşa’s *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, Hadidi’s *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, and Evliya Çelebi’s *Seyāhatnāme*.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁸³ C. Woodhead, ‘Urudj’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 10, (Leiden: E. J. Brill), p. 908, and V. L. Ménage, ‘On the Recensions of Uruj’s History of the Ottomans’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 30 (1967), pp. 314-322 (p. 322).

1.3. Travel Books

Last but not least, I should mention two travel books that give information about the Thracian country: Bertrandon de la Broquière's *Le voyage de l'Outremer*, and Jovan Maria Angiollelo's *Viaggio di Negroponte*.

CHAPTER 2

BYZANTINE-TURKISH DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY AND THEIR EFFECT ON THRACE

2.1. The Geo-strategic Position of Thrace

The region of Thrace, and especially its eastern part, with the Gallipoli peninsula, had a profound strategic value for the Byzantine State. Laying on the north shore of the Hellespont, it controlled the Dardanelles straights, a vital sea ford in the Constantinople-Mediterranean route. The Maritsa (Hebros) river with its tributaries formed a commercial communication network connecting Thrace with the Bulgarian inland. The Thracian plain was a celebrated wheat producing area.¹ The Byzantines, bearing in mind the importance of Thrace, were in pains to take care of its administration and defense. Thrace was the western vanguard of Constantinople and its importance was well realized by the Byzantines who built many fortresses all across it.² The town of Gallipoli and its surroundings were placed in the focus of the Byzantine care. During the last years of the thirteenth century and the first years of the fourteenth, refugees from Asia Minor

¹ R. Janin, *La Thrace Étude Historique et Géographique* (Constantinople: 1920), pp. 5-11. For a geological study of Thrace see A. Ardel and E. Tümertekin, 'Geographical Observations in Thrace I', *Review of the Geographical Institute of the University of Istanbul*, 2 (1955), pp. 149-157.

² Justinian I (527-565) built 199 fortresses in Thrace.

sought a better luck in Thrace, leaving behind their residences and properties in Anatolia.³ The mercenary Ramón Muntaner of the Catalan force passed from Asia Minor over to the Gallipoli peninsula in 1305. Later, in his memoirs, he wrote that it was the most beautiful peninsula in the world, rich in wheat and grain, wine and all kinds of fruits. Again according to Muntaner, it was prosperous and densely populated. Its towns, Hexamilion, Gallipoli, Potamos, Sēstos, Madytos, had large and nice dwellings.⁴

This image of a thriving prefecture changed just a few decades later, due to the Byzantine civil wars and the Turkish raids. It was during the adventure of the Catalan Company that the Turks eventually crossed to Europe.⁵ Gregoras says that the Catalans at Gallipoli first invited 500 of the Turks as allies from the opposite side (of the Dardanelles), i.e. from Asia Minor, and that many more volunteered their services.⁶ In fact, the second group also arrived in 1305. They did not ask for any money; all they wanted was to keep the booty that they would gain, giving only one fifth to the Catalans. They continued their devastations until 1313. After being ousted for a while, they started again the usual plundering. During the Byzantine civil war between John V Palaiologos and John

³ Gregoras, I, p. 214.

⁴ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thyloi*, pp. 92-93, P. Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin Byzance et l'occident, Recherches sur « La geste d'Umur Pacha »* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957), pp. 68-60, and N. Iorga, *Contributions catalanes à l'histoire byzantine* (Paris: 1927), pp. 9-39; see also B. Spiridonakis, *Greks, Occidentaux et Turcs de 1054 à 1453 Quatre Siècles d'Histoire de Relations Internationales* (Thessalonica: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1990), pp. 173-180.

⁵ N. Oikonomides, 'The Turks in Europe (1305-1313) and the Serbs in Asia Minor (1313)', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 159-168 (p. 159). For the activities of the Catalans in the Byzantine territories see A. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins, The foreign Policy of Andronicus II 1282-1328* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972), pp. 158-199.

⁶ Gregoras, I, pp. 228-9. F. Dirimtekin, based on the chronicle of Muntaner records that under the command of Halil 800 cavalrymen and 2000 infantrymen joined the Catalan force, F. Dirimtekin, 'Muasır Bizans Kaynaklarına Göre Osmanlıların Rumeliye Geçiş ve Yerleşmeleri', in *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 25-29 Eylül 1970, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler, II. Cilt* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), pp. 577-580 (p. 577).

VI Cantacuzenus, the Turks firmed their positions in Thrace, since they were invited by the one side or the other as allies or mercenaries.

The history of the Byzantine civil wars of the fourteenth century is more or less parallel to the political career of John Cantacuzenus. He was unique in being the only Byzantine emperor to record the events of his career. He had a hope, however naïve, of working out a *modus vivendi* with the Muslim world of Asia Minor. He fancied that he might win the trust and cooperation of western Christendom without compromising the Orthodoxy of his Christian faith and the special qualities of the culture into which he was born.⁷

2.2. First Byzantine Civil War

The first civil war was between Andronicos II and his grandson Andronicos III. The conspiracy to promote the cause of the young Andronicos began to form in the early months of 1321 in Adrianople. Apart from his friend, John Cantacuzenus, its leaders were Syrgiannes Palaiologos and Theodore Synadenos. The fourth member was Alexios Apokaukos. In April they all met in Adrianople. The old emperor was furious. He declared his grandson to be an outlaw, and he bullied the hierarchy of Constantinople into excommunicating all present and future supporters of the rebel. But Andronicos III had many supporters already.⁸ This struggle started from personal contentions and jealousy between grandfather and grandson. Soon, however, it turned out to be a clash between the *ancien régime* and the new ambitious aristocratic class.

⁷ D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor, A Biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk, c. 1295-1383* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 4.

⁸ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 25-40, 87-93, Gregoras, I, pp. 296-319.

The representative of the later was the triumvirate of Andronicos III, John Cantacuzenus and Syrgiannes. Due to the bad economic situation of the empire, Andronicos II subjected its people to further ruinous taxation. By playing on their grievances the young Andronicos gained followers everywhere in Thrace. He promised immediate remission of taxes for all. On 2 February 1325 Andronicos III was crowned as emperor in his own right at a ceremony in St Sophia in Constantinople. It was probably now that Cantacuzenus was promoted to the high rank and office of *Grand Domestic*, which he was to hold for the next fifteen years. Andronicos II had employed Turkish mercenaries to fight his battles in Thrace, hoping that they could be relied upon to return in Asia Minor when they had earned their pay. But some stayed as brigands. In 1326 Cantacuzenus was set upon by some of them, unhorsed and wounded in the foot while on his way to Didymoteichon.⁹ The war continued for seven years and one month, from 19 April 1321 to 24 May 1328, when the eight hundred soldiers of the triumvirate hailed Andronicos III as their only emperor in Constantinople. So ends the first book of Cantacuzenus' memoirs.¹⁰ The old emperor was treated with kindness and humanity. He became a monk under the name Antonios in January 1330 and he died in February 1332. It seemed that the old regime belonged well to the past and left the stage for the younger.¹¹ Cantacuzenus had earned his position as the new emperor's right-hand man.

⁹ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 206-207, Gregoras, I, p. 384, P. Schreiner, ed., *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol. 2 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), pp. 231-232, (hereafter Short Chronicles). Also see D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, pp. 23-24.

¹⁰ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 306, Gregoras, I, p. 427, Short Chronicles, II, p. 234.

¹¹ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 431, 473, Gregoras, I, pp. 460-463, 474-481, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 239-242.

2.3. The Period Between the Two Civil Wars

On 10 June 1329 a battle was joined between the Byzantines and the Ottomans at Pelekanon (modern day Eskihisar near Gebze) in Bithynia. It was a historical turning point, since it marked the first direct encounter on the field between a Byzantine emperor and an Ottoman emir. Andronicos III was wounded and he had to be carried to the nearby fortress of Philokrēnē.¹² The Ottomans gave the Byzantine troops no chance to retreat in an orderly fashion. The dispirited army was led safely back to Chrysopolis (Skoutari, Üsküdar) and then ferried to Constantinople.¹³

In August 1333 Andronicos arranged a meeting with Orhan at which a settlement was reached. It is not known for sure whether Cantacuzenus accompanied him, although he records the event. Perhaps he was ashamed to report the exact terms of the first Byzantine-Ottoman treaty.¹⁴ The emperor agreed in paying Orhan an annual tribute of 12,000 gold coins for possession of what little was left of Byzantine Bithynia.¹⁵ Needless to say that this was cheaper than trying to recruit, equip and maintain an army to launch a war against the Turks of Asia Minor. Cantacuzenus' mind behind this treaty is apparent, though not stated.

Cantacuzenus had a profound friendly relationship with Umur, emir of Aydın. Umur answered a call for help from the emperor and Cantacuzenus, when

¹² R.-J. Loenertz, 'La chronique brève de 1352 texte, traduction et commentaire', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 30 (1964), pp. 39-64 (pp. 39, 45-47). Also see U. V. Bosch, *Kaiser Andronikos III. Palaiologos, Versuch einer Darstellung der byzantinischen Geschichte in den Jahren 1321-1341* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Verlag, 1965), pp. 153-157.

¹³ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 341-363, Gregoras, I, p. 458, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 235-236. Also see V. Mirmiroğlu, 'Orhan Bey İle Bizans İmparatoru III Andronikos Arasındaki Pelekanon Muharebesi', *Belleten*, 13 (1949), pp. 309-321.

¹⁴ D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, p. 33.

¹⁵ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 446-448, Gregoras, I, p. 458, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 238, 243-244.

they were engaged in recovering the island of Lesbos from the Genoese in 1335. He came in person to Andronicus' camp at Kara Burun between Chios and Smyrna. It was there that Cantacuzenus first met him. Their meeting is recorded by Cantacuzenus and Umur's panegyrist, Enveri.¹⁶ Even the generally prosaic Gregoras compared Umur's friendship with Cantacuzenus to that between Orestes and Pylades.¹⁷ Cantacuzenus offered one of his three daughters in marriage to Umur. All of them were as lovely as houris. Her name was Despoina. Umur turned down the offer, though, since he thought of himself as John's brother.¹⁸ Umur in 1338 sent 2,000 Turkish foot-soldiers as mercenaries for the war of the re-incorporation of the Epirus province, which was successful.¹⁹

On 15 June 1341 Andronicos III died. Both Cantacuzenus and Gregoras recognized that it was a turning point in the history of their age.²⁰ It was unfortunate that the late emperor had not made his wishes clear regarding the succession. In 1330 in Didymoteichon he had nominated Cantacuzenus as guardian and regent of the empire. He had more than once offered him the title of the co-emperor. In 1341 his son John Palaiologos was nine years old. There would have to be a regent until he came of age. A prominent candidate was Cantacuzenus. On the other hand there was much opposition to him as a member of the aristocracy. The Patriarch John Kalekas and the dowager empress Anna of Savoy became the regents of young John. Apokaukos, once Cantacuzenus' ally and friend, favored the palace. In the mid-time Cantacuzenus repulsed some

¹⁶ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 482-495, H. Mükrim, ed., *Düstürnâme-i Enveri* (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyyâti, 'aded 15, Devlet Matba'ası, 1928), pp. 39-40, (hereafter, Enveri).

¹⁷ Gregoras, I, pp. 649-650.

¹⁸ Enveri, p. 54-55. We know only three daughters of Cantacuzenus, namely Maria, Theodora and Helena. Despina (دسپينه) probably derives from Greek Despoina (δέσποινα), which means lady, P. Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin*, pp. 175-176.

¹⁹ G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte*, pp. 403-405.

²⁰ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 557-560, Gregoras, I, pp. 559-560, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 250-251.

Turks who were trying to land troops near Gallipoli and persuaded Umur to help him by sailing his ships up the mouth of the Danube to terrorize the Bulgarians.²¹

2.4. Second Byzantine Civil War

On 26 October 1341 the army of Cantacuzenus and his supporters proclaimed him as their emperor. There was no coronation, merely a proclamation and an investiture.²² John was a secondary emperor committed to acknowledging and protecting the rights of the legitimate heir to the throne, John Palaiologos, and his mother.²³ In Constantinople his action was interpreted as a declaration of war. This was the beginning of the second civil war in Byzantium with, once more, catastrophic consequences in Thrace. The Serbians, the Bulgarians and the Turks all took advantage of the Byzantine internal political situation and participated actively, no matter on which side. The *dynatoi* (local magnates) and propertied classes declared for Cantacuzenus, whereas the rest opted to legitimize their actions by claiming to support the regency in Constantinople. Cantacuzenus used to call on the help of Umur. When his wife, Eirene, was blockaded by the Bulgarians in Didymoteichon, Umur sailed over from Asia Minor with a force of 380 ships and 29,000 men.²⁴ He succeeded in frightening the Bulgarians away. In mid-1343, when John was blockaded in

²¹ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 65-70, Gregoras, II, pp. 496-598. For the naval presence of the Turks in the Aegean see, E. Zachariadou, 'Holy War in the Aegean during the Fourteenth Century', in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. by Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton and David Jacoby (London: Frank Cass, 1989), pp. 212-225.

²² Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 155-160, 166-173, Gregoras, II, pp. 610-612, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 252-253.

²³ D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, p. 55.

²⁴ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 344. Gregoras gives no figures. Enveri reads 300 ships and 15,000 men, Enveri, pp. 46-47. The much later historian Doukas records that Umur was accompanied by up to 500 Turkish horsemen and as many foot soldiers, Doukas, p. 102.

Macedonia, Umur rescued him by sailing to Thessalonica with 60 ships and 6,000 men.²⁵ Those expeditions were quite beneficial to the *gazis* of Umur, for the booty was plenty. Actually Umur acted as a mercenary and he always demanded an area where his soldiers would freely plunder.²⁶

The fighting in Thrace went on and some times came close to the suburbs of the capital. Towns and villages changed hands more than once. The fields and livelihoods of the Thracians were ruined by the passage of Byzantine, Serbian, Bulgarian and Turkish armies. Cantacuzenus reports:

‘the whole [Thracian] region, ravaged as though by enemies, took refuge in the cities and nothing escaped damage, and very soon inhabited Thrace looked like a Scythian desert as the strength of the Romans was being squandered and destroyed by itself.’²⁷

In 1345 another contingent of Turkish mercenaries arrived in Thrace to assist Cantacuzenus. This time it was sent by Orhan of the Ottoman emirate. The empress Anna had also appealed to Orhan, but he preferred his older friends. Cantacuzenus let them free to plunder the countryside. In the spring of the same year Umur from Aydın and Süleyman from Saruhan came to join him with an army of 20,000 cavalymen. Their task was to kill the Bulgarian adventurer Momčilo who was active at the Didymoteichon region. Momčilo was killed in a battle on 7 June 1345. After that John led his Turkish troops to Serres. On their

²⁵ D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, pp. 67-68.

²⁶ H. İnalcık, ‘The Rise of the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium and the Crusades’, in his *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series, Vol. 9, 1993), pp. 309-341 (p. 327).

²⁷ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 186; the English translation is from J. Gill, ‘John VI Cavtacuzenus and the Turks’, *Byzantina* 13₁, (1985), pp. 57-76 (p. 59).

way, however, Süleyman fell ill and died. His men accused Umur of murdering him. Umur at once retreated to Smyrna taking his force with him.

On 16 May 1346 Cantacuzenus was crowned emperor fulfilling the promise of his proclamation and investiture at Didymoteichon five years before. The ceremony was performed by Lazaros, Patriarch of Jerusalem and took place at Adrianople.²⁸ Ambassadors had reached him from Orhan asking the hand of his daughter Theodora in marriage to the emir. Such a bond of kinship would strengthen the existing ties of friendship and alliance between the two men. Cantacuzenus consulted his friend Umur. Since there was no relationship of 'brotherhood' between John and Orhan, this marriage would be canonical according to Islamic law. Cantacuzenus agreed.²⁹ This is what Cantacuzenus records. However, it may well have been John himself who proposed Orhan, for he knew that empress Anna was trying to bribe and persuade Orhan to assist her. Doukas, who characterizes this marriage as squalid and sacrilegious, records that it was Cantacuzenus who turned to Orhan.³⁰ The wedding took place in Selymbria (Silivri) on the Thracian coast. The bridegroom was absent.³¹ No one considered it a Christian marriage; and no one pretended that it was. According to A. Bryer, this wedding was a turning point in Byzantine-Turkish relations and illuminates all other imperial alliances.³² It was one of the customary means of Byzantine diplomacy to send princesses to foreign courts as brides.³³ In this way

²⁸ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 564-565, Gregoras, II, pp. 762-763.

²⁹ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 585-589, Gregoras, II, pp. 762-763.

³⁰ Doukas, pp. 112-114.

³¹ For the ceremony see, A. Bryer, 'Greek Historians on the Turks: the case of the first Byzantine-Ottoman marriage', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to R. W. Southern*, ed. by R. H. C. Davis, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: 1981), pp. 471-493 (pp. 482-484).

³² *Ibid.*, p. 473.

³³ R. Macrides, 'Dynastic Marriages and Political Kinship', in *Byzantine Diplomacy, Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. by Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), pp. 261-280.

a foreign dynasty would become part of the imperial house of Constantinople.³⁴ Michael VIII (1259-1282) had married off daughters to the khans of the Mongols; Andronicos II had done much the same.³⁵ Cantacuzenus does not refer to the dowry. He prefers to praise the virtues of his daughter. He mentions that for seven years after this marriage there were no more Turkish incursions into Byzantine lands.³⁶

This civil war ended on 8 February 1347 when the two parts reached an agreement. John Cantacuzenus and the young, fifteen-year-old, John Palaiologos should reign jointly as co-emperors for a period of ten years, at the end of which their rule should be equally shared.³⁷ A new era of forgiveness, general amnesty and stability began. On 21 May 1347 the second coronation of Cantacuzenus took place by the Patriarch of Constantinople Isidore.³⁸

2.5. Emperorship of John V Cantacuzenus; Turkish Settlement in Thrace

Orhan, the son-in-law of Cantacuzenus came to Chrysopolis to offer him his congratulations. He brought with him Theodora. Cantacuzenus sailed over to meet him and for some days they hunted, wined and dined together. Such tokens

³⁴ For the Late Byzantine diplomacy see, N. Oikonomides, 'Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 1204-1453: Means and Ends', in *Byzantine Diplomacy, Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. by Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), pp. 73-88.

³⁵ S. Runciman, 'The Ladies of the Mongols', in *Eis Mnemen K. I. Amantou* (Athens: 1960), pp. 46-53.

³⁶ D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, p. 78.

³⁷ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 604-615, Gregoras, II, pp. 773-779, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 268-270.

³⁸ Tradition held that the emperor of the Romans should be crowned in his city of Constantinople by the Patriarch of that city. Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 29-30, Gregoras, II, pp. 787-791.

of goodwill between Christian and Muslims were very much to the taste of Cantacuzenus.³⁹

Shortly after the wedding of Helena Cantacuzene to John V Palaiologos (28 May 1347), Orhan sent a secret agent to Constantinople to murder her husband. In that way, as he thought, he would offer assistance to his father-in-law. According to Cantacuzenus, it was a custom among the Turks to murder any possible candidate to the throne.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, this shows the intimacy between the two leaders. By 1348 there were Turks in large numbers raiding the Thracian coast. They were individual adventurers. Some of them were beginning to settle in Thrace for good. Cantacuzenus confronted some of them in a battle in Mosynopolis.⁴¹ He is often apologetic in his memoirs for the atrocities of the Turkish troops that he used during the civil war in Thrace.

The Byzantine state was living a period of decline. The imperial treasury was empty. Cantacuzenus turned to Pope Clement VI, for he knew that he was hoping to reconstitute a league of western Christian powers against the Turks. The Pope's aim was to protect the commerce of the westerners on the coast of Asia Minor. Umur and Smyrna were of his main targets.⁴² Cantacuzenus was more than eager to help. It seems that it was high time he had forgotten his amicable brotherhood.⁴³ In May 1348 Umur was killed defending Smyrna against the Pope's league.⁴⁴ Cantacuzenus does not mention it. Only from

³⁹ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 33, 43-48, 53-53, Gregoras, II, pp. 798-812.

⁴⁰ Cantacuzenus, III, p. 111.

⁴¹ As he records, he was able to converse with them in Turkish, Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 62-66.

⁴² E. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300-1415)* (Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies – No. 11, 1983), pp. 41-62.

⁴³ Cantacuzenus, III, p. 54.

⁴⁴ A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938), pp. 290-300.

Gregoras do we learn how much he suffered on the death of his friend.⁴⁵ In those years the inhabitants of Thrace suffered great famine and poverty, they fell victims of usurers, they were used by the Byzantine parties and they were afraid of new Turkish raids.⁴⁶

Following his usual tactic, Cantacuzenus asked for the help of Orhan to rescue Thessalonica that was under Serbian attack in 1347. Orhan sent him 20,000 cavalymen under the command of his son Süleyman. They were suddenly ordered by Orhan though, to hurry back to Bithynia.⁴⁷

Byzantium was a victim of the clashing interests of the Italian maritime republics in eastern Mediterranean. The sea-battle in the Bosphorus between the Byzantines and the Genoese (13 February 1352) brought an end to John's ambitious ideas concerning the reconstruction of the Byzantine navy.⁴⁸ Quite annoying for John was the fact that the Genoese had sought and obtained the help of Orhan. This was a very intelligent movement of the Ottomans who made their début in the international diplomatic arena.⁴⁹ It was the answer to the triple treaty of Byzantium-Venice-Aragon.

Internal intrigues and disputes seemed to be endless in Byzantium. This time the apple of discord had fallen between John V Palaiologos and the son of Cantacuzenus, Matthew. In 1352 John V attacked Adrianople, in the province allotted to the governorship of Matthew. Matthew and his men were driven to the citadel. He sent immediately urgent messages to his father who led an army to

⁴⁵ Gregoras, II, p. 835.

⁴⁶ Well-known for his lamentations, the Byzantine scholar Demetrios Cydones, narrates in the fifth letter of his second book the calamities of the Thracian people that he saw and heard one day of 1346, D. Cydonès, *Correspondance*, vol. 1, ed. by Raymond-J. Loenertz O. P. (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1956), p. 29, (hereafter, Cydones-Correspondance).

⁴⁷ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 104-105, 108-118.

⁴⁸ M. Balard, 'A propos de la bataille du Bosphore', in *La Mer Noire at la Romanie génoise (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*, ed. by Michel Balard (Aldershot: Variorum, 1989), pp. 431-469.

⁴⁹ Ş. Turan, *Türkiye-İtalya İlişkileri I Selçuklular'dan Bizans'ın Sona Erişine* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000), pp. 284-285.

the relief of his son. Among his troops were some Turks provided by Orhan and some Aragonese or Catalan mercenaries who had survived the Venetian-Genoese war. The place of the battlefield was again Thrace. Some sort of order was restored in Matthew's principality by allowing the Turks to terrorize the nearby towns. The Serbians, the Bulgarians and the Venetians though, all saw John V Palaiologos as the future emperor. Cantacuzenus once again called the help of Orhan. A huge cavalry force under the command of Süleyman arrived in Thrace. Near Adrianople they defeated the Serbian and Bulgarian allies of Palaiologos. After several rounds of negotiations, John V was forced to leave Didymoteichon and stay in the island of Tenedos (Gökçeada).⁵⁰ In the course of his campaign Süleyman captured the fortress of Tzypmē near Gallipoli. When the fighting was over, he denied evacuating it. He claimed that it was his by right of conquest. Thus, in 1352, the Ottomans possessed their first 'bridge-head' in Europe.⁵¹ The Ottomans had already annexed the principality of Karasi lying on the eastern side of the Dardanelles taking advantage of an internal struggle for the throne in 1345-1346.⁵² The troops from Karasi entered the Ottoman force and participated actively in the Thracian operations. Among their chieftains there were Ece Beg, Gazi Evrenos,⁵³ Hacı İlbegi, and Gazi Fazıl. The name of Evrenos does not resemble a Turkish one. It might be a version of the Greek family name Bryonēs

⁵⁰ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 252-254, Gregoras, III, pp. 182-183, Short Chronicles, II, pp. 281-282. Gregoras records that John V was sent to Lemnos rather than Tenedos.

⁵¹ H. Inalcik, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300-1600* (Phoenix, London: 1997), p. 9.

⁵² Z. G. Öden, *Karasi Beyliği* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), pp. 54-60. Also see E. Zachariadou, 'The Emirate of Karasi and that of the Ottomans: Two Rival States', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 225-236.

⁵³ Evrenos Beg was the ancestor of the famous Evrenosoğulları one of the four ancient families of the Ottoman warrior nobility, the other three being the Mihaloğulları, the Malkoçoğulları and the Turahanoğulları, see I. Mélikoff, 'Evrenos', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill), p. 720, F. Başar, 'Evrenosoğulları', *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı), pp. 539-541 (p. 539), Y. Kurulu, 'Evrenos Gazi', *Yaşamları ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi*, vol.1, pp. 428-9.

that turned into Evrenos in Turkish. In the Byzantine sources he is mentioned as ‘Branetzēs’ (Manuel II Palaiologos, Anonymous of the Chronicle of Ioannina, Anonymous of the Chronicle of Tocco and Laonicos Chalcocondyles), ‘Abranetzēs’ (Phrantzes), and ‘Ebrenez’ (Doukas).⁵⁴ Those *begs* played an important role in the Conquest of the Balkan Peninsula.⁵⁵

Cantacuzenus sent Orhan a protest offering to compensate Süleyman, if he would surrender Tzympe. At the same time Süleyman began to reinforce the stronghold with troops from Asia Minor. Cantacuzenus realized his errors.

At this time Süleyman with a force of 3,000 men sailed off Kemer, passed over to Kozludere and conquered Plagiarion (Bolayır), which dominates the hill on the narrowest point of the northern Gallipoli Peninsula.⁵⁶ Its location has a paramount strategic importance as it controls both the peninsula and the isthmus. A tremendous earthquake shattered the Thracian shore of the Marmara on 1-2 March 1354.⁵⁷ The walls of many towns in the area collapsed. The locals fled to safer areas in the countryside. To the Ottoman leaders this seemed like divine intervention. Both the Short Chronicles and Cantacuzenus record a devastating shock.⁵⁸ The epicenter was between Madytos and Rhaidestos, the region that the Turks were plundering for the past two years. Demetrios Cydones

⁵⁴ G. G. Arnakis, *Oi Protoi Othomanoi, Symvoli eis to Provlima tis Ptoseos tou Hellenismou tis Mikras Asias (1281-1337)* (Athens: Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie, Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, Nr. 41, Nikos Bees, 1947), p. 89 and E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 99.

⁵⁵ For their building activities see, H. Ç. Arslan, *Türk Akıncı Beyleri ve Balkanların İmarına Katkıları (1300-1451)* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001).

⁵⁶ H. İnalçık, ‘Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış’, in *Osmanlı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999), pp. 37-117 (p. 62).

⁵⁷ G. Arnakis argues that after several earthquakes Gallipoli fell twice to the Turks, in March 1354 and in 1355, G. G. Arnakis, ‘Gregory Palamas among the Turks and Documents of his Captivity as Historical Sources’, *Speculum*, 26 (1951), pp. 104-118 (pp. 111-112), and G. G. Arnakis, ‘Gregory Palamas, The Xioveç, and the Fall of Gallipoli’, *Byzantion*, 22 (1952), pp. 305-312 (pp. 310-312). Actually there was only one earthquake and it happened in March 1354, G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte*, p. 422, footnote, 4.

⁵⁸ Short Chronicles, I, 7/13 (p. 66), 37/5 (p. 299), 53/3 (p. 379), 54/2 (p. 388), 55/3 (p. 397), 58/2 (p. 418), 59/17 (p. 439), 60/6 (p. 451), 69/2 (p. 529), 72/2 (p. 555), 72a/1 (p. 560), 87/3 (p. 613), Cantacuzenus, III, p. 277.

and the archbishop of Thessalonica Gregorios Palamas were astonished by this coincidence.⁵⁹ The Ottoman sources do not mention such a natural disaster. A passage in Enveri gives vaguely a hint of a natural disaster that facilitated the conquest of a castle.⁶⁰ In the hagiography of Seyyid Ali it is mentioned that the walls of Gallipoli collapsed after an earthquake caused by the supernatural powers of the dervish.⁶¹ The Ottoman chronographers record that Gallipoli fell after a siege, when her governor surrendered himself.⁶² I assume that Gallipoli was strong enough to endure the Ottoman siege at the beginning. The Ottomans used to cut off the fortified cities from their countryside, which would force them to surrender.⁶³ When the earthquake occurred, the Turkish forces were near Gallipoli so as to capture it immediately, despite the fact that Süleyman was in Asia Minor at that moment.⁶⁴ This surprised the Constantinopolitans and impressed the westerners.⁶⁵

Cantacuzenus continued his diplomatic struggle. Orhan was not so sure that his son was in the right. He proposed that all three parties should meet somewhere in Nicomedia (İzmit) to discuss the issue promising to pay Süleyman 40,000 *hyperpyra* by way of compensation if he would relinquish the cities he

⁵⁹ D. Cydonii, *Symbouleutikos heteros peri Kallipoleos aitesantos tou Mouratou*, in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, ed. by J.-P. Migne (Brepols-Turnhout: Bibliothecae Cleri Universae), vol. 154, pp. 1009-1036 (pp. 1012D, 1013A), (hereafter, Cydones-Symbouleutikos). Lambros-Dyouniotes, 'Γρηγορίου Παλαμά επιστολή προς Θεσσαλονικείς', *Neos Ellenomnemon*, 16 (1922), pp. 3-21 (p. 8).

⁶⁰ Enveri, p. 83.

⁶¹ I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'Seyyid 'Ali Sultan d'après les registres ottomans: l'installation de l'Islam hétérodoxe en Thrace', in *The Via Egnatia Under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 45-63 (p. 49).

⁶² Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, pp. 50-51.

⁶³ The communication of the local authorities with Constantinople was often hazardous. Some of Byzantine cities of this era tried to work on ways of self-administration, see E. Zachariadou, 'Ερήμερες απόπειρες για αυτοδιοίκηση στις ελληνικές πόλεις κατά τον ΙΔ' και ΙΕ' αιώνα', *Ariadne*, 5 (1989), pp. 345-451.

⁶⁴ Cantacuzenus, III, p. 278.

⁶⁵ In August 1354 the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople wrote that Constantinople, faced with this danger, was prepared to place itself under the protection of a powerful Christian state, H. Inalcik, *The Ottoman Empire*, p. 10.

had occupied. The meeting never took place. Cantacuzenus had lost his self-confidence and once more he thought of abdication.⁶⁶ According to the Byzantine perception of international law, the territories that had once been under the rule of the Byzantine Empire *de jure* belonged to it eternally. The Ottoman point of view was that, if a territory, conquered in the name of Allah, was recaptured by the infidels, it would be automatically classified in the Abode of War (*dār al-ḥarb*). Consequently, the Muslims had the right to raid and attack it. The knowledge of the Byzantines about the various Turkish emirates was vague. The Turkish hegemonies all around Anatolia resembled a labyrinth. Thus, the Byzantines could not apply the method of playing one dynasty against the other.⁶⁷ It was late for the Byzantines, when Cantacuzenus realized he could not trust Orhan the way he had trusted his ‘brother’, Umur. On 5 December 1354 the government in Constantinople was held to examine the situation in Thrace. The only record of it is in the memoirs of Cantacuzenus. He strongly opposed to go to war against the Turks. As he reads:

‘No one hates them [the Turks] more than I, not only because of their religion, but also because of all the wrongs they have done us over so many years... I propose that we should send ambassadors to them to make peace and persuade them to hand back the places, which they have stolen in Thrace.’⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 279-281, Gregoras, III, p. 242.

⁶⁷ Cydones-Symbouleutikos, p. 1028c, Cantacuzenus, III, p. 32, D. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium (1261-1453)* (London: 1972), p. 135.

⁶⁸ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 295-300; the English translation is from D. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor*, pp. 130-131.

He could not convince the members of the council. His fellows were impetuous to launch a war against the Turks. On 10 December 1354 in a simple ceremony at the palace he discarded all his imperial insignia and resided in Mangana Monastery as monk Joasaph.⁶⁹ Gallipoli became Süleyman's base for his military operations in Thrace and then the first center of the Paşa Sancağı in Rumeli.⁷⁰ Soon it gained great importance as the nautical base of the Ottomans. Many of the workers in the shipyard of Gallipoli were of Byzantine origin even in later times.⁷¹

2.6. The Ottoman Conquest of Thrace

The three main routes of conquest that the *begs* from Karasi followed were towards a. Tekfur Dağı, Tzouroullou (Çorlu), Constantinople, b. over the Kuru Mountain towards Malkara, Charioupolis (Hayrabolu) and Bizye (Vize), and c. through the Maritsa valley towards Kypsela (İpsala), Didymoteichon (Dimetoka) and Adrianople.⁷² The Ottomans applied the method of population deportation (*sürgün*) to 'turkify' their new territories on European soil.⁷³ It was an effective means to secure their new conquests. Aşıkpaşazade records:

⁶⁹ See D. Nicol, 'The Abdication of John VI Cantacuzene', in his *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), pp. 269-283.

⁷⁰ H. İnalcık, 'Gelibolu', *EF*, vol. II, p. 983a.

⁷¹ H. İnalcık, 'Türk Donanmasının Beşiği: Gelibolu', *Türk Kültürü*, 22 (1964), pp. 57-60. Also see F. Kurtoğlu, 'XVI. yüzyılın İlk Yarımında Gelibolu', *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 5 (1935), pp. 291-306 (pp. 296-301).

⁷² H. İnalcık, 'Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış', p. 62. K. Ercilasun, 'Orhan Bey Devrinde Osmanlı Devleti'nin Trakya Politikası', *Türk Kültürü*, 33, no. 388 (1995), pp. 485-499 (p. 496).

⁷³ See the article of Aktepe on the Turkish settlements in Rumeli, based mostly on *taħrîr defterleri*, M. Aktepe, 'XIV. ve XV. Asırlarda Rumeli'nin Türkler Tarafından İskânına Dair', *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 10 (1953), pp. 299-312. Also see H. Şentürk, 'Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluş Devrinde Rumeli'de Uyguladığı İskân Siyâseti ve Neticeleri', *Belleten*, 57 (1993), pp. 89-112.

‘[Süleyman Paşa, son of Orhan Gazi, informed his father] that a large Moslem population was needed in these conquered lands and fortresses. He also asked him to send valiant gazis. Orhan approved and deported to Rumili the nomads called Kara Arabs who had come into his territory. New families arrived every day from Karasi. The newcomers settled down and started the gaza.’⁷⁴

The toponyms of many villages in Thrace indicate that they were inhabited by deported population.⁷⁵ The Turks from Anatolia established separate villages in their new lands and did not usually mix with the native Christian population. Apparently there was a comparative over-population in Western Anatolia in the fourteenth century. The promising lands of Europe attracted many emigrants from the Asiatic hinterland, where anarchy had prevailed after the decline of the Ilkhanid domination.⁷⁶

The people who suffered the most were the peasants, for the Turks were primarily interested in the Thracian plain.⁷⁷ Orhan recruited both foot and cavalry soldiers that formed the nucleus of the future Ottoman army.⁷⁸ The conquest of Thrace should not be attributed solely to Ottoman forces. The *beglik* of Orhan in

⁷⁴ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49. The English translation of the abstract is from H. Inalcik, ‘Ottoman Methods of Conquest’, *Studia Islamica*, 3 (1954), pp. 103-129 (p. 122). Also see, İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), pp. 157-158.

⁷⁵ For the significance of Thracian toponymy see V. Akin, ‘Trakya Köy ve Şehir Yer Adları Üzerine Bir İnceleme’, *Türk Kültürü*, 28 (1990), pp. 530-538. On Turkish place onomastics see M. Eröz, ‘Sosyolojik Yönden Türk Yer Adları’, *Belgelerde Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 12 (1986), pp. 39-42, and W. Eilers, ‘Toponymische Satznamen der Türken’, *Die Welt des Islams*, 15 (1974), pp. 45-68.

⁷⁶ H. Inalcik, ‘Ottoman Methods of Conquest’, pp. 125-127.

⁷⁷ Gregoras, III, p. 224. Cydones-Correspondance, II, p. 121.

⁷⁸ E. Werner, ‘Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa und Orhan’, *Byzantinoslavica*, 16 (1965), pp. 255-276 (pp. 271-272).

Bithynia attracted many warriors from different principalities of Asia Minor.⁷⁹ On the other hand, there was no Byzantine central standing army. Byzantine defense was weak. In the fourteenth century the institution of *pronoia* had faded away.

The social pathology of the Thracians facilitated the Ottoman advance. The struggle between the aristocracy and the peasants or the middle and low class urban population was well represented in the two civil wars. The personal ambitions of the generals or the emperor himself, the political and ecclesiastical disputes, the social contrasts and the dislike towards the central government were the main factors of the Byzantine decadence.⁸⁰

Taking into consideration the political fragmentation in the Balkans, the Ottomans, shown as the protectors of the Orthodox Church, appealed to the populace, whereas the Balkan aristocracy followed a pro-Western – Catholic – policy.⁸¹ The social status in pre-Ottoman Balkans was characterized by a tendency toward feudalization. The local lords, however, were now made Ottoman *timar*-holders under strict state control. The Ottoman conquest in the Balkans had two stages: a. indirect suzerainty over neighboring nations and b. direct control over these countries by the gradual elimination – in terms of Ottomanization – of their native dynasties.⁸²

⁷⁹ G. Vogiatzis, 'Οθωμανοί και μη Οθωμανοί Μουσουλμάνοι στην κατάκτηση και τον εποικισμό της Ανατολικής και Δυτικής Θράκης', *Ellenika*, 41 (1990), pp. 279-286.

⁸⁰ G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi Othomanokratia sti Thraki, Amesos dimografikes synepies* (Thessalonica: Herodotos, 1998), p. 142. Also see I. Dujčev, 'Die Krise der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft und die türkische Eroberung des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas*, 21 (1973), pp. 481-492, and V. Hrochová, V., 'Aspects sociaux et économiques de la decadence des villes byzantines à l'époque des Paléologues', in *Actes du IIe Congrès International des Études du Sud-Est Européen (Athènes, 7-13 mai 1970), tome II Histoire*, ed. by Marie Nystazopoulou-Pélékidou (Athènes: Association International des Études du Sud-Est Européen, 1972), pp. 435-440.

⁸¹ H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, pp. 12-14.

⁸² H. İnalcık, 'Stefan Dušan'da Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna: XV. Asırda Rumeli'de Hıristiyan Sipahiler ve Menşeleri', in his *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Toplum ve Ekonomi Üzerinde Arşiv*

The Serbian Emperor Stephen Dušan (1331-1355), who by the time controlled the greatest part of Western Balkans, died in December 1355 and his empire at once disintegrated into ten thousand pieces, as Cantacuzenus reports.⁸³ The Turks seized the opportunity of conquest in South-Eastern Europe of a greater scale. On the other hand, the Byzantine internal strife reached to an end, when in December 1357 at a ceremony at Epibatai (Selimpaşa), Matthew swore allegiance to John V Palaiologos and disclaimed all his pretensions to the name of the emperor.⁸⁴

In summer 1357 pirates of Phocaea kidnapped the twelve-year-old son of Orhan, Halil. Orhan addressed to John Palaiologos for help. He agreed to assist him if Orhan ceased the incursions in Thrace. Indeed, for a period of two years 1357-1359 the Ottoman operations in Thrace were limited. The pioneer of the Ottoman proliferation in Thrace, Süleyman, died in 1357. According to the Ottoman sources he was seriously injured in a hunting accident.⁸⁵ Doukas records that Süleyman was killed by Matthew Cantacuzenus in a battle near Hexamilion.⁸⁶ The dying Süleyman's last request was to be buried in Bolayır, and his corpse never to be left to the enemy.⁸⁷ Gregoras argues that Orhan's

Çalışmaları, İncelemeler (İstanbul: Eren, 1996), pp. 67-108. Also see H. Lowry, 'The Role of Byzantine Provincial Officials Following the Ottoman Conquests of their Lands', in *IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, Princeton University 24-26 August 1983*, ed. by Heath Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox (Istanbul, Washington, Paris: The Isis Press, 1990), pp. 261-267.

⁸³ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 314-315. Dušan had himself crowned as emperor in 1346 in Skopje. His coronation was a direct challenge to the Byzantine notion of *imperium œcumenicum*, according to which there should be only one emperor in this world, for there is only one God.

⁸⁴ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 345-360. Also see, D. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos*, p. 118.

⁸⁵ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 51. H. Inalcik, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 3 (1971), pp. 185-210 (pp. 190-191). Also see I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, *Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I* (Monachii: Societas Academica Dacoromana, 1967), p. 132.

⁸⁶ Doukas, p. 122.

⁸⁷ Anonymous-Giese, p. 17.

peace agreement with the emperor was subsequent to his son's death.⁸⁸ The active in the area *gazis* were disappointed and hopeless. The anonymous chronicle of *Tevārīh-i Āl-i 'Osmān* records that the enemy, i.e. the Byzantines, undertook an attack by land and sea from the direction of Kavak Tuzlası, but withdrew when they saw that the Ottomans were determined to fight on regardless of the cost.⁸⁹ The Ottomans resumed their raids on Thrace, perhaps as a result of the activity of the papal legate, who visited Constantinople with his fleet and then proceeded to an attack on Lampsakos (Lapseki) in autumn of 1359.⁹⁰ When Süleyman, the eldest son of Orhan, died, according to the Turkic-Mongolian tradition, Orhan sent immediately his son Murad and his tutor Lala Şahin to the frontier region of Gallipoli.⁹¹ This is what Enveri and Chalcocondyles report.⁹² Murad, however, was inactive till the rescue of Halil in 1359. It was then that the *begs* from Karasi launched a more intense round of incursions in Thrace. In the period of 1357-1359 the Turks undertook the task of colonizing the Gallipoli Peninsula.⁹³ A *vaḳfiyye* of Orhan to his son Süleyman, dated in 1360, gives a list of many villages and *çiftliks* with Turkish names in the area.⁹⁴ This colonization was strengthened by nomads, *ahīs* and dervishes pouring in every day from Asia Minor.⁹⁵

⁸⁸ Gregoras, III, p. 561.

⁸⁹ Anonymous-Giese, p. 18.

⁹⁰ E. Zachariadou, 'Orkhan', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 8 (Leiden: E. J. Brill), pp. 175-177 (p. 176).

⁹¹ H. İnalcık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 193.

⁹² Enveri, 84, L. Chalcocondylas, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. by Immanuel Bekker, (Bonnae: CSHB), Impensis Ed. Weberi, 1843), p. 33, (hereafter, Chalcocondyles).

⁹³ This colonization had begun even from the early 1350s, see E. Werner, *Die Geburt einer Großmacht – die Osmanen (1300-1481)*, *Ein Beitrag zur Genesis des türkischen Feudalismus* (Wien, Köln, Graz: Herman Böhlau, 1972), pp. 134-138.

⁹⁴ H. İnalcık, 'Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış', p. 64.

⁹⁵ Ö. L. Barkan, 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler; I İstilâ Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler, II Vakıfların Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Kullanılmasında Diğer Şekiller', *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942), pp. 279-386. Also see H. J. Kissling, 'Zum islamischen Heiligenwesen auf dem Balkan, vorab im thrakischen Raume', in his *Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae, I. Das*

On the other hand, John V Palaiologos had driven Matthew, the ally of the *gazis*, from the Adrianople sector and had brought that area under his direct control and rule.⁹⁶ Therefore it was only natural that the aim of the new push in Rumeli should be this area, long considered by the Ottomans as being under their protection.⁹⁷ This in fact meant that there was no chance of a diplomatic solution. The family of Cantacuzenus was held away from the decision-making centers; and this family was the one who had showed success in comprehending its Turkish neighbors, although most of the times it was circumstantial.

Murad used the already captured strongholds as military bases for his operations in the north towards the Thracian plain. His army was not based only on the Turkish soldiers already in Thrace – as his brother had done – but essentially on a military force from Asia Minor.⁹⁸ Murad presided a council of *gazis* that was held in Malkara.⁹⁹ He divided his force into five groups. He occupied himself with Eastern Thrace, while his comrades-in-arms continued their attacks in the fertile region of the Maritsa and Adrianople. His target was the axon of Constantinople-Adrianople. Quite normally, the key of the conquest of Thrace was the control over its capital, Adrianople. The conquest of Messēnē (Misinli) Tzouroullōs (Çorlu), Arcadioupolis (Burgus, Lüleburgaz) and Boulgarophygon (Babaeski) should be examined within this context. Panic beset

Derwischtum (München: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1986), pp. 46-59. For the nomads (*yürüks*) who inhabited Thrace see M. T. Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlād-ı Fâtiḥân* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından No. 748, 1957), pp. 1-251. Also see the illuminating monograph on *ahilik*, N. Çağatay, *Bir Türk Kurumu Olan Ahilik*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997).

⁹⁶ Cantacuzenus, III, p. 324, Gregoras, III, p. 564.

⁹⁷ H. Inalcik, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 194.

⁹⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 52, F. Babinger, *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch nach den Handschriften zu Oxford und Cambridge erstmals herausgegeben und eingeleitet* (Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1925), p. 19-20 (hereafter, Oruç).

⁹⁹ H. J. Kissling, 'Das Menāqybnāme Scheich Bedr ed-Dīn's, des Sohnes des Richters von Samāvnā', in his *Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae, I. Das Derwischtum* (München: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1986), pp. 112-176 (p. 138).

the Constantinopolitans. In this way Murad was protected from a Byzantine attack in the rear.

On the other side, Hacı-İl Beg had settled in Hacı İlbegi Bergozi (Empythion) on the banks of the Maritsa River, and was putting pressure on Didymoteichon. At last he ambushed the fortress' commander and took him prisoner; he released him when the fortress was surrendered. Still in the Maritsa valley, Evrenos had seized the Kissos (Keşan) stronghold and was putting pressure on Kypsela (İpsala). Adrianople was blockaded from south and east.

2.7. The Conquest of Adrianople

There are many different opinions on the issue of the date of the conquest of Adrianople. G. Ostrogorsky suggests 1362.¹⁰⁰ E. Zachariadou¹⁰¹ and I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr¹⁰² propose 1369. According to Zachariadou, the *terminus post quem* of the date in question is 1366, when a certain John Katakalon (*oikonomos* and deacon of the Adrianople metropolis) composed a poem-eulogy to emperor John V. This poem was commissioned by Polykarpos, the metropolitan of Adrianople (Orestias). The poem was written around Christmas 1366, when Polykarpos still held the metropolitan throne.¹⁰³ I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr concludes that in the first time Adrianople was conquered by 'independent' begs around 1369, and later by the Ottomans in 1376/1377. The

¹⁰⁰ G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte*, p. 427.

¹⁰¹ E. Zachariadou, 'The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', in her *Romania and the Turks (c. 1300-c. 1500)* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1985), pp. 211-217.

¹⁰² I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: La pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomanes', *Travaux et Mémoires*, 1 (1965), pp. 439-461.

¹⁰³ The poem mentions the journey of John V to Hungary to ask for assistance, E. Zachariadou, 'The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks', p. 214.

Byzantine Short Chronicles date the fall of Adrianople in 6877 indiction 7, which corresponds to September 1368 – August 1369.¹⁰⁴ The Bulgarian historian A. Burmov argues that Adrianople was conquered in 1371.¹⁰⁵ Burmov's sources are certain Serbian chronicles, Chalcocondyles and Luccari. Luccari had used a Bulgarian source that has not survived. According to the author's opinion, the battle between Serbians and Turks in Tzernomianon in 1371 should be considered in the context of the Serbian efforts to rescue Adrianople from the Turkish siege.

H. İnalçık suggests the year 1361.¹⁰⁶ S. Shaw agrees with İnalçık.¹⁰⁷ In H. İnalçık's opinion, the Ottoman traditions confirm the date 762/1361, which Oruç gives for the conquest of Adrianople.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, O. Halecki notes that, according to the Venetian sources, news of the conquest reached Venice on 14 March 1361.¹⁰⁹ Unless this was a false report, shortly before this date, in the year 1361 'at the time the Maritsa was overflowing', Adrianople surrendered to Murad.¹¹⁰ T. Gökbilgin writes that the conquest was accomplished under Murad I (1362-1389) by Lala Şahin Paşa, who defeated the *tekvur* at Sazlı-Dere, to the southeast of the city. The latter then fled secretly by boat from his palace on the banks of the Tunca and in Ramazān 763/July 1362 and the inhabitants of the

¹⁰⁴ Short Chronicles, I, 53/4 (p. 379), 54/3 (p. 388), 55/4 (p. 398), 58/3 (p. 418), 59/18 (p. 440), 60/7 (p. 451), 61/5 (p. 458), 69/3 (p. 529), 72/3 (p. 555), 72a/3 (p. 560), III, 60a/3 (p. 151).

¹⁰⁵ A. Burmov, 'Türkler Edirne'yi Ne Vakit Aldılar?', trans. by Hasan Eren, *Belleten*, 13 (1949), pp. 97-106.

¹⁰⁶ H. İnalçık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 210.

¹⁰⁷ S. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, vol. I Empire of The Gazis, The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire 1280-1808* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 18.

¹⁰⁸ Oruç gives the date as 761 A.H., following the Anonymous Chronicles, Oruç, p. 21, and as 762 A.H., based on the Calendars.

¹⁰⁹ O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1972), p. 75, footnote, 1.

¹¹⁰ H. İnalçık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 210.

town surrendered on condition of being allowed to live there freely.¹¹¹ The Ottoman historiography gives more or less this account. Anonymous-Giese reads:

‘Hācı İlbegi Dimetoğa’yı feth itdi. Ve Evrenos Beg Keşan vilāyetin feth itdi İpşala’yı dahī bile. Ve bu tarafından Murād Ġāzī Eski’den göçüb Edrene’ye gelmege niyyet itdi. Lālāsı Şāhīn beglerbegi idi. Andan Şāhīn Lālā’ya leşker virdi, Edrene’ye göndürdi. Çün Şāhīn Lāla Edrene’ye geldi. Edrene kāfirleri karşıladılar, ‘azīm ceng itdiler. Hāylī adam kırıldı. ‘Ākıbet kāfirler münhezim olub kaçub Edrene’ye gelüb hişāra girdiler. Murād Ġāzī’ye Şāhīn Lāla beşāret haberin göndürdi. Bunca başlar bile göndürdi. Ve Hācı İlbegi ve Evrenos Beg Ġāzī Murād’uñ önine düşüb doğrı Edrene’ye getürdiler. Ol vaķit Tunca ve Meric ġāyet taşğundı. Edrene tekvurı gücile kayıġa binüb kaçdı, Eynüz’e gitdi. Ġāzīler ‘ale’ş-şabāh tırdılar, kal‘ayı hālī buldılar. Şehir halkı kal‘ayı açıvirdiler. İçeri girdiler. Edrene feth olundı. Hicretüñ 761 yılında vāķı’ oldı.’¹¹²

The *Rhōmaikē Historia* of Gregoras goes only as far as 1359 and naturally does not mention the conquest of Adrianople. Cantacuzenus and Demetrios Cydones, historians contemporary with the events, never mention the fall of Adrianople; had Adrianople fallen previous to 1371, this important event would most assuredly be echoed in their writings. But one must not forget that

¹¹¹ T. M., Gökbilgin, ‘Edirne’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill), pp. 683-686 and T. Gökbilgin, ‘Edirne Hakkında Yazılmış Tarihler ve *Enis-ül Müsâmirin*’, in *Edirne’nin 600. Fetih Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), pp. 77-117.

¹¹² Anonymous-Giese, p. 21. Parallel to this is the account of Aşıkpaşazade, see Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, pp. 53-54.

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 general rather than detailed account of the individual events. Even the Byzantine *Short Chronicle*, which gives a faithful chronology of important events, contains no mention of the fall of Adrianople.¹¹³ The narration of Murad's first military expedition in the Balkans in the *Tevārīh-i Āl-i 'Osmān* holds much importance, since it illuminates the history of the second half of the fourteenth century, when the Byzantine sources remain silent. With the battle of Maritsa in 1371, in which the Christian leaders of Macedonia were defeated, the conquest of Thrace was sealed. The Balkans laid open to the Ottoman raids. The Byzantines euphemized their state by calling it an empire. The Byzantine lands were limited to the capital city, some fortresses on the Thracian shores, some islands of the north Aegean sea, and Mystras in the Peloponnese.¹¹⁴ In 1376 Murad recaptured Gallipoli that Amadeo of Savoy had taken on 23 August 1366 and given to the Byzantines on 14 June 1367.

The defeat of the Christian powers in Tzernomianon apparently indicates the lack of cooperation among the Christian rulers of the Balkans against a common threat.¹¹⁵ The Latin West was unwilling to provide assistance to

¹¹³ P. Charanis, 'Les Βραχέα Χρονικά comme source historique, An Important Short Chronicle of the Fourteenth Century', *Byzantion*, 13 (1938), pp. 335-362, and H. İnalcık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 187.

¹¹⁴ A. Bakalopoulos, 'Les limites de l'Empire byzantin depuis la fin du XIVe siècle jusqu'à sa chute (1453)', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 55 (1962), pp. 56-65. Also see M. Kiel, 'A Note on the History of the Frontiers of the Byzantine Empire in the 15th Century', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 66 (1973), pp. 351-353.

¹¹⁵ See D. Angelov, 'Certains aspects de la conquête des peuples balkaniques par les Turcs', *Byzantinoslavica*, 17 (1956), pp. 220-275.

‘schismatic’ Byzantium against the ‘infidel’ Turks.¹¹⁶ The pro-western Cydones expressed the opinion that no human power could rescue Byzantium from the coming catastrophe.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ A. Luttrell, ‘Latin Responses to Ottoman Expansion before 1389’, in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 119-134 (p. 134).

¹¹⁷ Cydones-Correspondance, I, p. 117.

CHAPTER 3

TOPOGRAPHY OF THRACE

3.1. Thrace's Place in History

Thrace (according to a theory, its name derives from the Semitic root *ṭarak* = ford)¹ was one of the four daughters of Ocean and Parthenope – Asia, Libya, Europe, and Thrace.² It is first mentioned by Homer in Iliad (‘Θ ρ ▪ ι κ α’, II, 595). Eustathius argues that Thrace formed a large C and included the northern part of the world. The Ancient Greek authors considered Thrace as the Great Northern Land starting from River Pēneios in Thessaly until an aorist edge. On a more solid base its borders were the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Black Sea in the East, Illyricum in the West, Thessaly in the South, and the Danube in the North.³ In Roman times it formed the Prefecture of Moesia. In the fourth century Thrace was one of the largest *dioceseses* of the *Praefectura*

¹ From the Aramaic root קרט, (= to slam, to bang) derives the Hebrew קרט and the Arabic فرط, E. Klein, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1987), ‘קרט’, p. 252. In Arabic the expression ضررلاً تفرط means ‘the ground was so beaten so as to be rendered even, or easy to be traveled; and trodden with the feet’; طريق means road, way, path, see E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1980), vol. 5, ‘طرق’, pp. 1846-1851.

² K. M. Apostolidou, ‘Περί των ορίων της Θράκης’, *Thrakika*, 2nd series, 4 (1982, 1983, 1984), pp. 185-195 (pp. 185-186).

³ A. Adamantiou, ‘Αι γεωγραφικαί περιπέτειαι του ονόματος Θράκη, Συμβολή εις την ιστορικὴν γεωγραφίαν’, *Thrakika*, 1 (1928), pp. 374-392 (pp. 375-377).

Praetorio per Orientem. The notion in the Byzantine era that Thrace was the eastern entrance of Europe traces its origins in antiquity.⁴ In many authors Thrace was synonymous to Europe.⁵ In 680/681 the *theme* of Thrace has been created. At the beginning of the eighth century the nascent *theme* of Macedonia included many Thracian lands. It was in the second half of the tenth century that those two *themes* merged into one. It functioned till the end of the twelfth century or 1204.⁶ The administrative fragmentation of Thrace in a larger scale occurred under the Crusaders.⁷ Finally, during the late Byzantine era, the term Thrace meant a vague geographical unity.⁸

In this chapter I will try to trace the route that the Ottomans followed during the conquest of Thrace in the second half of the fourteenth century. The toponyms mentioned follow the Ottoman attacks (*aķın*) and not an alphabetical order.

From the time of the second Byzantine civil war (1341-1347), many Turks remained in Thrace, either as mercenary vanguards of John Cantauzenus, or as mere bandit groups. They lived on raids and plundering. The Turks were familiar with the Thracian topography long before they settled in there. The rich Thracian plain seemed more attractive than the already Islamized Asia Minor for

⁴ The Byzantine author Procopius (first half of the 6th century) says: ‘the Ocean and the land of Spain are the left side of Europe, whereas Thrace is the place where the sun dawns upon it (Europe)’, Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, ed. by G. Dindorfius (Bonn: 1838), IV, 9, p. 297. For the Byzantine Thrace see S. Kyriakides, ‘Η Θράκη κατά τους Βυζαντινούς χρόνους’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 12 (1945-46), pp. 49-62.

⁵ Like Theophanes and Leon Diakonos, see T. Louggis, ‘Η ιστορική διαδρομή της Θράκης στα πλαίσια της Βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας’, in *Thraki, Istorikes kai Geografikes Prosegiseis*, (Athens: Epistimis Koinonia, Ethniko Idryma Ereunon-National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2000), pp. 77-106 (p. 78).

⁶ D. Zakythenos, ‘Μελέται περί της διοικητικής διαίρέσεως και της επαρχιακής διοικήσεως εν τω Βυζαντινώ κράτει’, *Epeteris tes Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*, 18 (1948), pp. 42-62 (p. 51), and 22 (1952), pp. 159-182.

⁷ See A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, *Studi Veneziani*, 7 (1965), pp. 125-305.

⁸ For the borders of Byzantine Thrace see M. Apostolidou, ‘Ρωμανία-Ζαγορά και τα της Θράκης όρια επί της Βυζαντιακής Αυτοκρατορίας’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 8 (1941-42), pp. 65-82.

the exercise of the Holy War (*cihād*). This attracted holy warriors from other emirates in Asia Minor, like Saruhan and Karasi.

3.2. Topography of the Ottoman Conquest of Thrace

In 1352, when the Byzantines opened once more their hostilities, the Turks who quartered in the Tzypmē area established their permanent rule over the fortress. According to Gregoras, the Turks established there a kind of colony before the arrival of Süleyman from Asia Minor.⁹ In contrast with Gregoras, the Ottoman sources read that Süleyman expressed the will to pass over to Thrace, when he was in Temāşālīk (تماشالیک)¹⁰ near Ayduncuğ (ایدونجوغ)¹¹ and watched the European shores. We assume that Süleyman crossed the sea to Tzypmē in 1352.

Tzypmē (Τ ξ ύ μ π η) is mentioned by Cantacuzenus,¹² Gregoras,¹³ and by the Ottomans. The Ottoman chronographers have given the name Tzypmē many

⁹ ‘The son of Hyrcanus [the son of Orhan, Süleyman], crossed the Hellespont [to Thrace] as if it were his colony or fatherland, and decided to live with the Barbarians [Turks], who had come there shortly before’, Gregoras, III, p. 203₂₀₋₂₃.

¹⁰ Temāşālīk is mentioned by Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11a, Hadîdî, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman (1299-1523)*, ed. by Necdet Öztürk (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1991), p. 71, (hereafter, Hadîdî), Lûtfî Paşa, *Tevârih-i Âl-i ‘Osmân* (İstanbul: T. C. Ma‘ârif Vekâleti Neşriyatından, Matba‘a-ı ‘Âmire, 1341), p. 29, (hereafter, Lûtfî Paşa), Mehmed Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-nümâ, Neşri Tarihi*, vol. 1, ed. by Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), p. 173, (hereafter, Neşri), here it is used as a noun (= to go out to stroll about and watch things, observation), İbn-i Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman, I. Defter*, ed. by Şerafettin Turan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), p. 112, (hereafter, İbn-i Kemal), Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des manuscrits, MS. Anonymous, *Tevârih-i Âl-i ‘Osmân*, Suppl. Turc 1047, p. 25, (hereafter, Anonymous-Paris) (I am deeply indebted to Prof. Dr. H. İnalçık for letting me see his copy of this manuscript), Ankara, Millî Kütüphane, MS. Konya İzzet Koyunoğlu Kütüphanesi, Anonim, *Tevârih-i Âl-i ‘Osmân (II. Bayezid Devrine Kadar)*, No. A-1465, p. 22, (hereafter, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu) (I am deeply indebted to Prof. Dr. H. İnalçık for letting me see his copy of this manuscript), and Oruç, p. 16. There is a certain Temāşālīk in the Havran sub-district (bucak) of the Edremit county (ilçe) in Balıkesir province (il), *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, (Ankara: T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı, Başbakanlık Devlet Matbaası, 1946), p. 1053. This is however, far southern from the shores of Marmara.

¹¹ Ayduncuğ is the Byzantine Kyzikos and the modern day Edincik, in the Bandırma county, in the Balıkesir province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 348.

¹² Cantacuzenus, III, p. 276₁₉₋₂₀.

variants.¹⁴ The exact location of this fortress is unknown. J. Kissling and F. Babinger argue that it is identical with Çimenlik.¹⁵ The Ottoman chronicles enlighten us on the topography of the region. Aşıkpaşazade gives the following account:

‘Meger bir gün seyridürken Aydıncık’a geldi Temāşālīk’a geldi gördi bir ğarīb binālar. Biraz tūrdı hīç söylemedi Süleymān Paşa’ya, Ece Beg dirlerdi bir ‘azīz vardı ve hem haylī bahādır añılurdı eyidür Hānum tefekküre varduñ. Süleymān Paşa eyidür bu deñizi geçmek fikr ederin şöyle geçem kim kāfirūñ haberī olmasya didi. Ece Beg ve Ġāzī Fāzīl eyitdiler biz ikimüz geçelüm görelüm didiler. Süleymān Paşa eydür nerede geçersiz dir. Eyitdiler kim Hānum bunda bir yir vardur kim öte geçmege yaqındur. Göçdiler ol yirden vardılar kim ol yir Virānca hīşārdur Görece’den aşağı deñiz kenārındadır. Ece Begle Ġāzī Fāzīl bir şal çatdılar bindiler gice ile Çīn hīşārınuñ nevāhīsine çıkdılar.’¹⁶

According to this passage, Tzypmē must be opposite the Viranca fortress.

Viranca (ویرانجه)¹⁷ must be located in the (Edincik) Kapıdağ peninsula below

¹³ Gregoras, III, p. 224.

¹⁴ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48, چین , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 44, جمبی , Anonymous-Giese, p. 16, چمنی , Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11a, چمنك قلعه سی , and p. 11b, جمبین قلعه سی , Hadidi, p. 72, Cinbi Hışārı, Münecimbaşu Ahmed b. Lütfullah, *Camiü’-d-Düvel Osmanlı Tarihi (1299-1481)*, ed. by Ahmet Ağırakça (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995), p. 46, (hereafter, Münecimbaşu), چمنی , Lütfi Paşa, p. 159, چمنك حصاری , Neşri, p. 174, جمبنی حصاری , İbn-i Kemal, p. 114, جمبيك , Anonymous-Paris, p. 26, سی / چوبن قلعه سی / چمنك حصاری , Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, pp. 23-24, چمنك حصاری / چمن قلعه , Oruç, p. 17, چمنك حصاری / قلعه سی .

¹⁵ F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.-15. Jahrhundert)* (Brün, München, Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer, München: Georg D. W. Callway, 1944), p. 39, and J. H. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1956), p. 53.

¹⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, pp. 47-48.

¹⁷ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11a, Neşri, p. 174, ویرانجه , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 44, Anonymous-Giese, p. 15, ویرانجه , Anonymous-Paris, p. 26, ویرانجه , Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 23, ویرانجه , Oruç, p. 17, ویرانجه .

Görece (كوره جه),¹⁸ in the Asian shore, but its exact place is not known. Görece – or Kürekci or Gügercinlik – is located by F. Kreutel in modern day Güreci near Lapseki.¹⁹ This, however, is further southwest of Edincik, over a narrower ford to Europe. Şükrullah and Nişancı Mehmed Paşa instead of those places mention Kemer, a place of lush greenery on the seaside.²⁰ It should be the modern day Kemer in Karabiga.²¹ The other Ottoman sources do not add something new. The name of Tzypmē is mentioned in Byzantine sources from the twelfth century onwards²² and then in Ottoman *taḥrīr defterleri* until the sixteenth century. In the *taḥrīr defterleri* Tzypmē is always mentioned as جنبي (Cinbi). In *Gelibolu sancagı taḥrīr defteri* of 879 A.H. it reads: ‘karye-i Umürbeglü Cinbi daḥī dirler’.²³ This implies that Tzypmē was identical with Umürbeglü, or at least it was in its vicinity. According to other entries in *taḥrīr defterleri* the villages Eksamil, Müstecab, Müsteceblü, and alamic are in the same region. M. Aktepe reaches

¹⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 44, كوره جه, Anonymous-Giese, p. 15, كوره جه, Neşri, p. 174, Oruç, p. 17, كوركچنگك, İbn-i Kemal, p. 114, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 23, كوركجى, Anonymous-Paris, p. 26, كوركجه.

¹⁹ R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte, Frühzeit und Aufstieg des Osmanenreiches nach der Chronik “Denkwürdigkeiten und Zeitläufe des Hauses ‘Osman’ vom Derwisch Ahmed, genannt ‘Aşık-Paşa-Sohn’* (Graz, Wien, Köln: Verlag Styria, 1959), p. 311; Güreci is a village in the county of Lapseki, in the province of Çanakkale, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 442.

²⁰ Şükrullah, *Behcetüttevârih*, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri I, Osmanlı Tarihinin Anakaynakları olan Eserlerin, Mütebassislar tarafından Hazırlanan Metin, Tercüme veya Sadeleştirilmiş Şekilleri Külliyyatı*, ed. by Çiftçioğlu N. Atsız (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1925-1949), p. 5, (hereafter, Şükrullah), Karamanlı Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Osmanlı Sultanları Tarihi*, trans. by Konyalı İbrahim Hakkı, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri I, Osmanlı Tarihinin Anakaynakları olan Eserlerin, Mütebassislar tarafından Hazırlanan Metin, Tercüme veya Sadeleştirilmiş Şekilleri Külliyyatı*, ed. by Çiftçioğlu N. Atsız (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1925-1949), (hereafter, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa), p. 345.

²¹ Kemer is in the Karabiga sub-district, of the Biga county in Çanakkale province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2 (Ankara: T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı, Başbakanlık Devlet Matbaası, 1947), p. 666. According to ‘Alî Cevād, *Memālik-i ‘Osmāniyye’niñ Tārīh ve Coğrāfiya Lûgātı*, (Der-Sa‘ādet: Ma‘ārif Nezāreti, Maḥmūd Beg Maḥba‘ası, 1313), ‘Kemer’ p. 280, Kemer is located near Edremit. Like Temaşalık, it is too far from the region described.

²² The *typikon* of the Kosmosoteira monastery, see G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi Othomanokratia sti Thraki*, p. 88, footnote 22.

²³ M. Aktepe, ‘Osmanlı’ların Rumeli’de İlk Fethettikleri Çimbi Kal’ası’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 2 (1950), pp. 283-306 (p. 289, footnote 32), where he cites İstanbul, İnkılâp kütüphanesi, MS. Hicri 879 tarihli Gelibolu sancagı taḥrīr defteri, M. Cevdet Yazmaları No. 79, pp. 96-98, (Prof. Dr. H. İnalçık kindly showed me this *defter*).

to the conclusion that Tzypmē should be located at the north of Gallipoli on the shore of the Sea of Marmara between Bolayır and Kavak Deresi, most probably at the south shore of Kazan-ağzı.²⁴ Bearing in mind that Tzypmē was ‘over’ Gallipoli,²⁵ in a point of the Thracian seashore near Eksamil opposite of Görece, being easily reached by ships, we assume that Tzypmē was not on the shore of the Hellespont, but further north on the shores of Marmara.²⁶ In the 18th century the Turks proudly showed the traveler Lechevalier in Akbaşı Liman of the Hellespont a rocky place called Gaziler İskeleyi, where, according to a legend, their ancestors had moored before attacking Tzypmē.²⁷

Almost all the Ottoman sources mention two fortresses, Bolayır and Aqca Limon (or Liman) that were conquered right after Tzypmē. Bolayır (بولایر)²⁸ is the Byzantine Plagiaron (Π λ α γ ρ ι ά ρ ι ο ν). It bears the same name today.²⁹

The second fortress, Aqca Liman (آقچه لیمان)³⁰ must have been the port of Bolayır. N. Beldiceanu identified it as the modern day Akliman opposite of

²⁴ M. Aktepe, ‘Osmanlı’ların Rumeli’de İlk Fethettikleri Çimbi Kal’ası’, p. 302. N. Oikonomides argues that Tzypmē was very close to Branchialion (not far from modern day Bolayır and possibly identical with it), N. Oikonomides, ‘From Soldiers of Fortune to Gazi Warriors: The Tzypmē Affair’, in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. by Colin Heywood and Colin Imber (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1994), pp. 239-247 (p. 241).

²⁵ Cantacuzenus, III, pp. 242₁₆, 276₁₉, 277₇, 278₂₂, 279₁₄, and Anonymous-Giese, p. 16.

²⁶ The shores of the Hellespont are much more rugged than the ones of the Sea of Marmara. Moreover, the Byzantines must have protected them with garrisons, see E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 98.

²⁷ See A. Vakalopoulos, *Istoria tou Neou Ellinismou*, vol. 1 (Thessalonica: Herodotos, 2001), p. 131, footnote 6, where he cites B. Lechevalier, *Voyage de la Troade fait dans les années 1785 et 1786*, vol. 1 (Paris: 1802), p. 277.

²⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 45, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11b, Münecimbaşı, p. 47, Lütfi Paşa, p. 30, Neşri, p. 176, İbn-i Kemal, p. 122, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 24, Oruç, p. 18 mention it as بولایر, whereas Anonymous-Giese, p. 16, and Anonymous-Paris, p. 27 mention it as بلایر.

²⁹ Bolayır in the county of Gelibolu, province of Çanakkale, see *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. I, p. 167.

³⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11b, Anonymous-Paris, p. 27, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 24, Oruç, p. 18, and Lütfi Paşa, p. 30 mention it as آقچه لیمن, Anonymous-Giese, p. 16, Münecimbaşı, p. 47, Neşri, p. 176, İbn-i Kemal, p. 120, mention it as آقچه لیمان, Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48 mentions it as آقچه لیمان.

Çanakkale.³¹ This, however, is not accurate, since Aşıkpaşazade mentions that it was pretty near Bolayır. Consequently, it was in the north of the Hellespont and not near Çanakkale. It worths to mention that the seaside region of Plagiaron was called Leukē (Λ ε υ κ ῆ = white, like ak or akça in Turkish) from the antiquity.³²

The Ottomans conquered after that the fortress of Aya Şilonya (ایشلونیه).³³ E. Zachariadou argues that this place-name could be, with some reservations, identified as the Byzantine mountain fortress of Hagios Ēlias (Ἁ γ ι ο ῦ Ἡ λ ί α ῖ) in the Ganos (Γ ῶ ν ο ῦ) region.³⁴ However, Hagios Ēlias was very distant from the place that the first Ottoman attacks in the Gallipoli peninsula took place. Moreover, it was difficult of access due to its altitude. It could have been the, neighboring to Tzypmē, fortress of Hexamilion (Ἑ ξ α μ ί λ ι ο ν). This castle controlled the entrance of the Gallipoli peninsula and was in the center of the Ottoman operation. The Ottomans, having already captured Tzypmē and Aqca Liman, would, as a logical consequence, try to conquer the nearest key-fortress of the inland.³⁵ Aşıkpaşazade does not mention a place-name relevant to Hexamilion. Neşri, on the other hand, mentions two pairs of fortresses, namely, Cimbeni-Ayaşılunye, Odgüklük-Eksamiliye:

³¹ N. Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans le manuscrits turcs de la bibliothèque nationale à Paris, vol. 1, Actes de Mehmed II et de Bayezid II du ms. fonds turc ancien 39* (Paris: Mouton & Co, 1960), pp. 110-111, footnote 6.

³² ‘Λευκή’, *Megale Ellenike Egkyklopaideia*, vol. 17, p. 732, A. Samothrakes, ‘Λεξικόν γεωγραφικόν και ιστορικόν της Θράκης’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 2nd series 28 (1963), pp. 3-596, (hereafter, Samothrakes-Lexicon), ‘Λευκή Ακτή’, (p. 338).

³³ For this toponym, as well, many variants are available, Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 48, ایاس لونجه , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 45, and İbn-i Kemal, p. 123, ایاشلونیه , Anonymous-Giese, p. 16, and Müneccimbaşı, p. 47, ایاسلونیه , Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, ایاش کونیه , Hadidi, p. 74, Ayaşoluna, Lütü Paşa, p. 30, ایاش , Neşri, p. 176, ایاشلنیه , Anonymous-Paris, p. 27, ایاشلونیه , Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 24, ایاشلونیا , Oruç, p. 18, ایاشلونیه .

³⁴ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 98.

³⁵ G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi othomanokratia sti Thraki*, pp. 90-91.

‘El-kıřřa, ‘askerũ ekřerini yanlarına geurdiler. Geen ‘asker iki biñden ziyāde idi. Nāār olub Cimbeni hiřārınuñ kāfirleri bu āzilere müttefik olub bile yürüdiler. Bir gice Ayařilunye dirlerdi bir hiřār dahī var idi. Anı dahī Haķķ Te‘ālā fırsat virüb, fetħ itdiler. Ehl-i İslām elinde öte yakada hiřār iki oldu. Dirler ki fetħ olan iki hiřār Odgüklük’le Eksamiliye’ydi.’³⁶

The name Ayařilunye reached perhaps the Ottoman chronographers of the fifteenth century through the oral traditions. It underwent changes as the new inhabitants adjusted it to the phonetic rules of Turkish, and then it faded away.³⁷

The name Eksamiliye (اكساميليه),³⁸ on the other hand, is unambiguously the Turkified form of the Greek Hexamilion. This place-name was in use at the time of Neřri. Eksamiliye was located in the place of the Hellenistic Lysimacheia (Λ υ σ ι μ α χ ε ρ α). It was dominant over the six-mile walls, from which its name derives. These walls were protecting the Gallipoli peninsula and were built by Miltiade in 560 B.C.³⁹ Its modern name is Ortaköy. The name Eksamil survives only as the name of the neighboring hill.⁴⁰

³⁶ Neřri, p. 176.

³⁷ Most of the Ottoman toponyms derive from their Byzantine predecessor, see H. J. Kissling, ‘Die türkische geographische Nomenklatur auf dem Balkan als Erkenntnismittel für die Südosteuropaforschung’, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 3 (1965), pp. 126-142, and P. Wittek, ‘Von der byzantinischen zur türkischen Toponymie’, *Byzantion*, 10 (1935), pp. 11-64.

³⁸ řükullah, p. 54, İksamilye or İksamiliye, İbn-i Kemal, pp. 138-139, اكسه ميل . The other sources do not mention this fortress.

³⁹ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Εξάμιλιον’, pp. 182-183.

⁴⁰ R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte*, p. 307. A certain Aksamil is mentioned in the *Çanakkal’a ve bahr-ı siyah boğazları ile Marmara denizi rehberi*, (trans. from English) (Bahriye Matbaası, 1311). According to the guide, this village is in the east of Bolayır. řükullah, p. 54, and Niřancı Mehmed Pařa, p. 345 record that it was opposite of Kemer in the Asian shore, see M. Aktepe, ‘Osmanlı’ların Rumeli’de İlk Fethettikleri Çimbi Kal’ası’, pp. 305-306, footnote 75.

Having blocked off Gallipoli, the Ottomans continued exercising their *aķıns* as far as Tekür Tađı (تكور طاغی).⁴¹ Its Byzantine counterpart is the Hieron Oros (Ἱερόν Ὄρος). Today this mountain is called Işıklar Dađı. The name survives today as Tekirdađ,⁴² which was the Byzantine town Rhaidestos (Ραιδέστος). The ancient name of Rhaidestos was Bisanthē (Βισανθη). Rhaidestos was a significant interchange of sea and land-routes.⁴³ The Ottomans firstly baptized it as Rodoscuķ and then as Tekfur Tađı.⁴⁴

One of the fortresses of that area captured by the Ottomans was Ödküklük (اودكوكلك).⁴⁵ The sources give many variants of this toponym and its correct pronunciation resembles an enigma. Seif read it as Ödküñlek and Atsız as Od gönlek. Atsız argues that Od gönlek (= od gömlek) is an expression in Turkish meaning painful work, great grief.⁴⁶ H. İnalçık has chosen the form Ödküklük.⁴⁷ In Ottoman *tahrir defterleri* it is mentioned both as اودكوكلك and as Balabancık.⁴⁸ Balabancık is its modern name.⁴⁹ Its Byzantine predecessor cannot be traced.

⁴¹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49, تكفور طاغی, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 46, Anonymous-Giese, p. 17, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Müneccimbaşı, p. 48, Neşri, p. 180, İbn-i Kemal, p. 151, Anonymous-Paris, p. 28, Anonymous-Koyunođlu, p. 25, Oruç, p. 18, تكور طاغی, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, p. 345, Tekürdađı, Hadidi, p. 74, Tekür tađı.

⁴² It is the capital of the homonymous province in Thrace, *Türkiye'de Meskün Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 1050.

⁴³ I. Ortaylı, 'Rodosto (extension en Marmara de la Via Egnatia) au XVIe siècle', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 193-202.

⁴⁴ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert*, p. 108.

⁴⁵ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49, اول كل كل, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 46, Şükrullah, p. 54, Neşri, p. 176, İbn-i Kemal, pp. 135-136, اودكوكلك, Hadidi, p. 74, Ot-gönlek.

⁴⁶ Çiftçiođlu N. Atsız, *Osmanlı Tarihleri I*, p. 67, footnote 15. Kreutel translates it as 'fireplace' or 'ford' in eastern Turkish, R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte*, p. 317.

⁴⁷ H. İnalçık, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', p. 160.

⁴⁸ M. Aktepe, 'Osmanlı'ların Rumeli'de İlk Fethettikleri Çimbi Kal'ası', pp. 303-304, footnote 70; Ş. Tekindađ, 'Süleyman Paşa', *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 11 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı), pp. 190-194 (p. 192).

⁴⁹ Balabancık in the subdistrict of Müstecep, county of Malkara, province of Tekirdađ, *Türkiye'de Meskün Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 120.

Another fortress occupied by the Ottomans in that region is the Seydi Kavağı (سیدی قواغی).⁵⁰ It corresponds with the Byzantine Sausadia (Σ α υ σ α δ α).⁵¹ This township had a great strategic value in the Byzantine times.⁵² Its modern name is Kavak.⁵³

Within the same operations, the Ottomans conquered the town of Madytos (Μ δ υ τ ο).⁵⁴ In Byzantine times Madytos and Gallipoli were the most significant administrative centers in the Gallipoli peninsula.⁵⁵ It was later called Maydos and then Eceabat. Its modern name is Eceabat.⁵⁶ Elaious (Ε λ α ι ο υ ς) had the same luck.⁵⁷ Its modern name is Eski Hisarlık, near Seddülbahir.⁵⁸

Aşıkpaşazade informs us that the next target of Süleyman Paşa was the vilâyet of Hayrabolu (خیره بولی).⁵⁹ This was the Byzantine Charioupolis (Χ α ρ ι ο π ο λ ι) and ancient Airopolis (Αἰ ρ ο π ο λ ι).⁶⁰ Its modern name is Hayrabolu.⁶¹

⁵⁰ Şükrullah, p. 54, Seydi Kavağı, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, p. 345, Seydikavağı, Müneccimbaşı, p. 49, İbn-i Kemal, pp. 148-149, سیدی قواغی.

⁵¹ For Sausadia see E. Honigmann, 'Pour l'atlas byzantin', *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), pp. 541-562 (pp. 556-558).

⁵² H. J. Kissling, 'Das Menāqybnāme Scheich Bedr ed-Dīn's', p. 163, footnote 5.

⁵³ Kavak the subdistrict of Evreşe, county of Gelibolu, province of Çanakkale, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 643.

⁵⁴ Chalcocondyles, p. 25¹⁴.

⁵⁵ D. Zakythenos, 'Μελέται', *EEBS*, 22 (1952), p. 171.

⁵⁶ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei nach amtlichen Verzeichnissen und Kartenwerken* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1975), p. 60; Eceabat is the capital of the homonymous county of the Çanakkale province, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 347.

⁵⁷ Critobulus Imbriota, *Historiae*, ed. by D. R. Reinsch (Berlin: CFHB 22, 1983), pp. 105¹⁹ and 174²².

⁵⁸ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 64.

⁵⁹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 46, Anonymous-Giese, p. 17 (he also gives the variant خیره بولیه), Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Hadidi, p. 80, Müneccimbaşı, p. 100, Neşri, p. 180, İbn-i Kemal, p. 176-178, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 25, Oruç, p. 18, خیره بولی, Anonymous-Paris, p. 28, خیره بولو.

⁶⁰ F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 83.

⁶¹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 108, and K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, 81. Hayrabolu is the capital of the homonymous county of Tekirdağ, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 496.

The fortress of ̤oñur (فوكور حصارى)⁶² was captured by force and its lord was decapitated. We know nothing about its Byzantine past. According to Aşıkpaşazade, the lord of ̤oñur and his soldiers were in pains to contain the advance of the Ottomans from the south (Gallipoli). After having conquered it, they bestowed it to Hacı-İl Beg, who used it as his base for the attacks against Didymoteichon.⁶³ It seems logical that this fortress was near the Gallipoli peninsula and at the same time in the vicinity of Didymoteichon.⁶⁴ H. İnalçık believes that ̤oñur was on the Kuru mountain south of Malkara.⁶⁵

When Gazi Fazıl died, he was buried in Ece Ovası (اجه اواسى).⁶⁶ Neşri says that it was the *gazis* who captured this area, which was bestowed as *timar* to Yakub Ece. That is why it was named after him.⁶⁷ Ece Ovası must be located in the area of Eceabad.⁶⁸ The plain of Ece is located outside the modern-day Turkish city of Eceabat.⁶⁹

The next step of the Ottomans was the conquest of the most significant city in the area, Gallipoli. In the Ottoman sources it is called Gelibolı (كلیبولی).⁷⁰ It was the Byzantine city of Kallipolis or Kallioupolis (Κ α λ λ π ο λ ι)

⁶² Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 50, فوكور حصارى , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 46, Neşri, p. 182, فوكور حصار , Hadidi, p. 76, فوغرى , Müneccimbaşı, p. 48, فوكور حصار , İbn-i Kemal, p. 158, فوكور حصارى .

⁶³ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, pp. 50-51.

⁶⁴ G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi othomanokratia sti Thraki*, p. 94.

⁶⁵ H. İnalçık, 'Rumeli', *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 9 (Eskişehir: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı), pp. 766-773 (p. 769).

⁶⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 51, اجه اواسى , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 47, Neşri, p. 184, İbn-i Kemal, p. 139, اجه اواسى , Müneccimbaşı, p. 48, اجه اوه سى .

⁶⁷ Neşri, p. 184.

⁶⁸ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 190, footnote 193, H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 111, and Ahmed Rif'at, *Lûgât-ı Târîhiyye ve Coğrâfiyye*, 'Açe Ovası', vol. I, (İstanbul: Maḥmūd Beg Maḥba'sı, 1299), p. 95.

⁶⁹ Eceabat is the capital of the homonymous county of the province of Çanakkale, *Türkiye'de Meskün Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 347.

⁷⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 46, Anonymous-Giese, p. 14, Müneccimbaşı, p. 48, Lütfi Paşa, p. 29, Neşri, p. 176, کلیبولی , Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 11a, Enveri, p. 25, Anonymous-Paris, p. 27, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 22, Oruç, p. 18, کلی بولی , İbn-i Kemal, p. 126, قالی بولی , O. Turan, ed., *İstanbul'un Fethinden Önce Yazılmış Tarihî Takvimler*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1984), p. 16, (hereafter, Tarihi Takvimler), کلی بولی .

Καλλιπολις).⁷¹ In ancient times it was called Krithōē (Κριθωτ). Philip V of Macedonia named it Kallipolis in 209 B.C.⁷² Today it is the city of Gelibolu.⁷³

The following operations of the Ottomans targeted Dimetoka (ديمه توكه).⁷⁴ This was the Byzantine Didymoteichon (Διδυμοτείχων), the city of the twin walls.⁷⁵ Its ancient name was Plōtinoupolis (Πλωτινούπολις). Today it bears the same name, Didymoteicho (Διδυμοτείχο) and it is located 76 km. northeast of Alexandroupoli (Αλεξάνδρουπολις) in northern Evros (Εβρος) district in Greece.⁷⁶

At this point, the Ottoman sources narrate the death of Süleyman Paşa in a hunting accident. Two years after his death, his father, Orhan, died too. The date given is 758/1356-1357.⁷⁷ Under the command of the third Ottoman sultan, Murad I, the military operations in Thrace entered their second period.

⁷¹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 109, and B. Umar, *Türkiye'deki Tarihsel Adlar*, (İstanbul: İnkılâp, 1993), 'Kallipolis', p. 367.

⁷² Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Καλλιπολις', pp. 291-292.

⁷³ Gelibolu is the capital of the homonymous county of the province of Çanakkale, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 400.

⁷⁴ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 42, Münecimbaşı, p. 53, ديمتوكه, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 47, Neşri, p. 184, İbn-i Kemal, p. 162, Enveri, p. 46, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, Oruç, p. 19, ديمه توكه, Anonymous-Giese, p. 19, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 25, (another variant in the same manuscript) ديمه توكا, Hadidi, p. 86, Dimetoka, Lütfi Paşa, p. 32, ديمو توكه. For the folk tales concerning the fall of Didymoteichon, see N. Bapheides, 'Ἡ υπό των Τούρκων ἀλωσις του Διδυμοτειχου, θρύλοι και παραδόσεις', *Thrakika*, 1 (1978), pp. 39-46.

⁷⁵ Gregoras, I, p. 232, Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 134-136, A. Carile, 'Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie', p. 220, Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le voyage d'Outremer*, ed. by Ch. Schefer (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892), p. 172, (hereafter, Bertrandon).

⁷⁶ P. Soustal, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini, Band 6 Thrakien (Thrakē, Rodopē und Haimimontos)* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), pp. 240-244. K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens nach amtlichen Verzeichnissen und Kartenwerke* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1978), p. 19. For Ottoman architectural monuments in Didymoteichon see 'Two Little-known Monuments of Early and Classical Ottoman Architecture in Greek Thrace: Historical and Art-historical Notes on the Hamāms of Timurtaş Pāşazade Oruç Pasha (1398) and Feridun Ahmed Beg (1571) in Didymoteichon', in his *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1990), pp. 127-146.

⁷⁷ For the death of Orhan see H. İnalcık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', pp. 190-191.

The toponym of Kavak Tuzlası (قواق طوزلسی)⁷⁸ is mentioned at this point, when a great armada of Byzantine ships reached the region of Bolayır. The word Kavak (= poplar tree) as a toponym is quite common in this area.⁷⁹ This tuzla (= saltpan) must be near the delta of the Kavak River, the ancient Aigos Potamoi (Αἰγὸς Πόταμοι).⁸⁰ The modern name of this river is Karaova.⁸¹

Murad I crossed the sea to Thrace and on his way from Gallipoli to Çorlu, he attacked Banțoz (بنطوز).⁸² G. Vogiatzis assumes that Bantoz is identical with the Byzantine Panidos, Panion or Panidon (Πανίδοι, Πανίων, Πανιδόν).⁸³ The names Bantoz-Panidos resemble each other.⁸⁴ The only misgiving is that the Vatican manuscript of Aşıkpaşazade-Ali gives the variant منطوز, which reminds of Madytos (Μαδυτός).⁸⁵ H. İnalçık argues that it was the Banatoz stronghold, today Barbaros.⁸⁶ In the same time Chōra (Χώρα) fell to the Ottomans.⁸⁷ It was later called H̄ora or H̄ore. Today its name is Hoşköy.⁸⁸

⁷⁸ Anonymous-Giese, p. 18, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 26, قواق طوزلسی, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12b, قواق دوز لاسی, İbn-i Kemal, p. 189, قواق طوز لاسی.

⁷⁹ Kavak, Kavakderesi, Kavaksuyu, K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, pp. 107, 109.

⁸⁰ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 54-55.

⁸¹ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Αἰγὸς Πόταμοί', pp. 40-42.

⁸² Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 52 (the manuscript of Vatican reads منطوز), Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Neşri, p. 193, Anonymous-Paris, p. 30, Oruç, p. 20, بنطوز, Hadidi, p. 82, Bınatos kal'ası, Müneccimbaşı, p. 52, بنطور.

⁸³ G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi othomanokratia sti Thraki*, pp. 107-108.

⁸⁴ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 109, and K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 21, where he gives the variants: Banados and Panados of the modern-day Barbaros.

⁸⁵ According to E. Zachariadou, it is identical to Madytos, since this Byzantine fortress was on the way of Murad I from Gallipoli to Çorlu, E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai Thryloi*, p. 191, footnote 197.

⁸⁶ H. İnalçık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 196, footnote 43; Barbaros is the capital of the homonymous subdistrict, of the province of Tekirdağ, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 128.

⁸⁷ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 477₅₋₆. A. Germides, 'Τα Γανόχωρα της Ανατολικής Θράκης', *Thrakika*, 46 (1972-1973), pp. 179-288 (pp. 199-203).

⁸⁸ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 83; Hoşköy is a village in the Mürefte sub-district, county of Şarköy, province of Tekirdağ, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 518.

According to the Anonymous Chronicles, Murad I attacked and conquered a fortress near Constantinople, called ̤ođivine (طوغى وينه).⁸⁹ I was not able to locate this fortress. We must examine this information with scepticism, since a fortress near Constantinople would be off Murad I's route from Bantoz to ̤orlı.⁹⁰

̤orlı (چورلى)⁹¹ was the next town that Murad I conquered. His movements punctuated the Constantinople-Adrianople route. The Byzantine counterpart of ̤orlı was Tzouroullas or Tyroloē (Τ ξ ο υ ρ ο υ λ λ ¤ ¤ , Τ υ ρ ο λ ¤ η).⁹² Bertrandon de la Broquière visited this place – Chourleu, as he says – in 1433.⁹³ Its modern name is ̤orlu.⁹⁴ The fall of ̤orlı disconcerted the inhabitants of Constantinople, since it was one of the most significant strongholds in Thrace.⁹⁵

When Murad I came before the fortress of Misini (مسنى), its lord surrendered it. Many variants of this toponym have survived in the Ottoman sources.⁹⁶ This was the Byzantine Messēnē (Μ ε σ σ ¤ ν η).⁹⁷ According to a tradition, it was established by Messenian settlers from Pelopponese in 443 A.D.,

⁸⁹ Anonymous-Giese, p. 20, طوغى وينه, and طوغرى, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 14b, طغوييفه, Anonymous-Koyunođlu, p. 30, طوغى وينه.

⁹⁰ G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi othomanokratia sti Thraki*, p. 107, footnote, 122.

⁹¹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 52, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Anonymous-Giese, p. 17, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Neşri, p. 184, İbn-i Kemal, p. 178, Anonymous-Koyunođlu, p. 25, چورلى, Hadidi, p. 82, ̤orlı, Lütü Paşa, p. 32, چوروم, Anonymous-Paris, p. 28, چورولو, Oruç, p. 18, چورلو.

⁹² H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 12-15, 111.

⁹³ 'item, de là je vins à une ville que l'on nomme Chourleu qui a esté assés bonne par samblant, car les Turcz l'ont abatue et est repeupleé de Grecz et de Turcz.', Bertrandon, p. 169. Also see S. Yerasimos, *Les Voyageurs dans l'empire ottoman (XIVe-XVIe siècles) bibliographie, itinéraires et inventaire des lieux habités* (Ankara: Société Turque d'Histoire, 1991), pp. 106-108.

⁹⁴ ̤orlı is the capital of the homonymous county of Tekirdađ province, *Türkiye'de Meskün Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 273.

⁹⁵ H. İnalçık, 'The Conquest of Edirne (1361)', p. 195.

⁹⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 52, سلورى (Silivri), Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, مسلى, مدلى, سيسى, مسلى, مسلى, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 27, مسنى, Hadidi, p. 88, Misikin, Müneccimbaşı, p. 53, مسلى, Neşri, p. 192, حسنى, Anonymous-Paris, p. 30, مسين, Anonymous-Koyunođlu, p. 30, مسنى, Oruç, p. 20, مسن.

⁹⁷ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 109. See also K. Mamoni, 'Η βυζαντινή Μεσσηνή (Ανατολικής Θράκης)', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 14.1 (1989), pp. 329-342.

when the ancient Drouzipara (Δ ρ ο υ ξ ι π ρ α) was ruined by Attila.⁹⁸ Bertrandon de la Broquière gives an account about this town that he calls Misterio.⁹⁹ Today it is the village of Misinli, it has 300 dwellings populated by immigrants from Rumelia.¹⁰⁰

The Byzantine inhabitants of Thrace were fleeing abandoning their towns. It was the turn of Burgus to follow the example of Misini. Burgus (برغوس)¹⁰¹ was the Byzantine Arcadioupolis, (Α ρ κ α δ ι ο π ο λ ι ς), the ancient Begule, Begouli or Begouli (Β ε ρ γ ο λ η, Β ε ρ γ ο υ λ α ι, Β ε ρ γ ο λ ι ο ν)¹⁰². The etymology of this toponym is the Greek word pyrgos (π ρ γ ο ς, tower). Continuing his journey in Thrace Bertrandon de la Broquière reached Burgus that he names Pürgasi.¹⁰³ This town was later called Çatalburgaz and then Lüleburgaz.¹⁰⁴

The Ottomans then were headed to Meric River (مريچ).¹⁰⁵ The Byzantine name of this river was Hebros, Euros, Maritzēs, Maritsa (Ἑ β ρ ο ς, Ε υ ρ ο ς, Μ α ρ τ ξ η ς, Μ α ρ τ σ α).¹⁰⁶ Its ancient name was Rhombos (Ρ ὀ μ β ο ς). It was

⁹⁸ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Μεσσήνη’, p. 362.

⁹⁹ ‘item, 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 le Grant Turc l’a donnée.’, Bertrandon, p. 169.

¹⁰⁰ A. M. Mansel, *Trakya'nın Kültür ve Tarihi En Eski Zamanlardan Milâddan Sonra Altıncı Asrın Ortasına Kadar* (İstanbul: Edirne ve Yöresi Eski Eserleri Sevenler Kurumu, 1938), plate XXIII. Misinli in the county of Çorlu, the district of Tekirdağ, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 834.

¹⁰¹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 52, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Münecimbaşı, p. 53, برغوس, Anonymous-Giese, p. 20, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 14b, Neşri, p. 192, Anonymous-Paris, p. 30, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, برغوز, Hadidi, p. 83, Burkoz-hisarı.

¹⁰² A. Papatheodorou, ‘Αρκαδιούπολις’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 12 (1945-46), pp. 46-47. Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Βεργούλη’, pp. 90-95.

¹⁰³ ‘et de là, je vins à une ville que l’on nomme Pürgasi qui est aussi tous les murs abbatus et n’y demeure que Turcz.’, Bertrandon, p. 170. H. İnalçık pointed out that the travel memoirs of Bertrandon de la Broquière follow the same sequence with the Ottoman narrative, H. İnalçık, ‘The Conquest of Edirne (1361)’, pp. 196-197, footnote 46.

¹⁰⁴ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 16. Lüleburgaz is the capital of the homonymous county of Kırklareli, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 793.

¹⁰⁵ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 44, refers to it as sea (دکز), Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Anonymous-Giese, p. 17, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Münecimbaşı, p. 53, Lütü Paşa, p. 33, Neşri, p. 192, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 25, Oruç, p. 21, مريچ, Hadidi, p. 78, Meriç, Enveri, p. 47, مارج.

¹⁰⁶ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 190, Gregoras, II, p. 710, Bertrandon, pp. 171-174, 199-201.

named Hebros after the son of Cassandrus, who was drawn in its waters. The name Maritsa may derive from the name of the Slavic clan Moritsi or Moravitsi (from mar-mir, peace, tranquility), or from the ancient Thracian name Marissos or Maris (Μ ῥ ἰ σ σ ο ῦ , Μ ῥ ἰ ῶ) meaning the sparkling surface of river waters.¹⁰⁷ Today it marks off the Greco-Turkish borders in Thrace. Its modern Turkish name is Meriç and its Greek one is Evros (Ε β ρ ο ῦ).

After the successful siege of Didymoteichon, the Ottomans conquered Keşan and İpsala. Keşan (كشان)¹⁰⁸ was the Byzantine Kissos or Kisson (Κ ἰ σ σ ῶ ῶ , Κ ἰ σ σ ῶ ν).¹⁰⁹ Its modern Turkish name is Keşan.¹¹⁰

İpsala (إبصلا)¹¹¹ was the Byzantine Kypsala, Kypselā or Hypsala (Κ ῥ ῖ ψ α λ α , Κ ῡ ψ ε λ α , Ὑ ψ α λ α).¹¹² It is the modern day İpsala, located 34 km. northeast of Enez.¹¹³

Hacı İl Beg has settled in a fortress (burgus), which was named after him, İlbegi Bergozi (ایل بکی برغوزی),¹¹⁴ on the banks of the Maritsa River, and was

¹⁰⁷ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Εβρος’, pp. 172-173.

¹⁰⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 49, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Hadidi, p. 76, Münecimbaşı, p. 53, Lütfi Paşa, p. 32, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, Oruç, p. 20, كشان, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 49, Neşri, p. 194, كشن .

¹⁰⁹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 109.

¹¹⁰ Keşan is the capital of the homonymous county in the province of Edirne, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 675.

¹¹¹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 46, إبصاله, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 49, اپ صله, Şükruallah, p. 54, Ipsala, Ahmedî, *İskender-nâme İnceleme-Tıpkıbasım*, ed. by İsmail Ünver (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1983), (hereafter, Ahmedî), p. 66a, ابسله, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, p. 345, İbsala, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, إبصاله and ابصلا, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Enveri, p. 47, ابصلا, Hadidi, p. 78, İpsala, Münecimbaşı, p. 48, Oruç, p. 20, ابصله, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, ابصاله, Neşri, p. 180, ابسله and p. 194, ابصالا, İbn-i Kemal, p. 176, ابصاله, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, ابصلا, Oruç, p. 20, ابصله, and p. 21, ابسله .

¹¹² Gregoras, I, p. 229, A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, p. 220, Bertrandon, p. 173. F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 83 and D. Zakythenos, ‘Μελέται’, *EEBS*, 22 (1952), p. 166.

¹¹³ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 330-331. İpsala is the capital of the homonymous county of the Edirne district, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 547.

¹¹⁴ Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 48, Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 53, and Neşri, pp. 192-194, say only that Hacı İl Beg conquered a small stronghold at the banks of the Meric River; Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, says that that fortress had the same name as Hacı İl Beg; Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Hadidi, p. 86, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, ایل بکی برغوزی, Neşri, pp. 20, 93, البکی اوغلی برغوزی, Münecimbaşı, p. 53, برغاز, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, ایل بکی بوغازی, Oruç, pp. 19-20, 93, حاجی البکی برغوزی, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, ایلبکی برغوزی .

putting pressure on Didymoteichon. According to H. İnalcık,¹¹⁵ this stronghold is identical with Eğri Kaleli Burgaz.¹¹⁶ It was built by John Cantacuzenus only a few years before its conquest. Cantacuzenus mentions it as Emphythion (Ἐμ π ῑ θ ι ο ν) and emphasizes the strength of its walls.¹¹⁷ Its modern name is Pythio (Π ῑ θ ι ο), located in northern Evros district in Greece, 10 km. east-northeast of Didymoteicho.¹¹⁸

Within the context of blocking off Didymoteichon by taking all the strongholds in the Maritsa River around it, the Ottomans conquered Simavna (سمالونه).¹¹⁹ This was the Byzantine Ammobounon (Ἀ μ μ ῑ β ο υ ν ο ν), which means the sandy mountain.¹²⁰ Its Turkish name derives probably from the phrase ‘eis Ammobounon’ (ε ι ῑ Ἀ μ μ ῑ β ο υ ν ο ν = towards Ammobounon). Today it is the village Kyprinos (Κ υ π ρ ῖ ν ο) northwest of Didymoteicho on the banks of River Ardas in Greece, 26 km. west-northwest of Orestiada (Ο ρ ε σ τ ι ῑ δ α).¹²¹ The governor and *ḳādī* of Simavna was Gazi İsrail. It was the birthplace of Şeyh Bedreddin.¹²²

According to Aşıkpaşazade, Murad I came to Eski from Burgus and found the fortress empty.¹²³ Neşri says that it was burned.¹²⁴ Eski (اسكى)¹²⁵ was the Byzantine Boulgarophygon or Bourtoutizos (Β ο υ λ γ α ρ ῑ φ υ γ ο ν),

¹¹⁵ H. İnalcık, ‘The Conquest of Edirne (1361)’, p. 197, footnote 47.

¹¹⁶ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 111, F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 83.

¹¹⁷ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 184₁₄, 433₁₆₋₁₇.

¹¹⁸ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 419-420.

¹¹⁹ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 83, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 74, سمالونه.

¹²⁰ K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthakiens*, pp. 4 and 52.

¹²¹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 175.

¹²² F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, pp. 80-81.

¹²³ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 53.

¹²⁴ Neşri, p. 194.

¹²⁵ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 53, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 49, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Neşri, p. 194, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, Oruç, p. 22, اسكى, Münecçimbaşı, p. 54, بابا اسكيبسى, Hadidi, p. 83, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, اسكى حصار, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, اسكى, Bertrandon de la Broquière is probably referring to this town when he mentions Zambry, Bertrandon, p. 170.

Β ο υ ρ τ ο ▪ δ ι ξ ο ▪).¹²⁶ The name Boulgarophyton was mentioned in 787 for the first time instead of Bourtoutizos. Later it was called Baba-i ‘atîk, Baba Eski and Baba Eskisi.¹²⁷ Today it is called Babaeski and it is near Lüleburgaz, 35 km. south-southwest of Kırklareli.¹²⁸ This township is renowned for the tekke of Sarı Saltık.¹²⁹

The next step of the Ottomans in Thrace was the conquest of Mağalkara (مغلقره).¹³⁰ This was the Byzantine Megalē Agora or Megalē Karya (Μ ε ρ ▪ λ η Ἄ ρ ο ρ ▪ , or Μ ε ρ ▪ λ η Κ α ρ ▪ α).¹³¹ It is worth-mentioning that many early Ottoman primary sources divide this toponym into two words, showing its apparent Greek etymology.¹³² After the Ottoman conquest, the Greeks called it Malgara (Μ ▪ λ ρ α ρ α). It is the modern day town of Malkara.¹³³

In the same region the Ottomans conquered Garella (Γ α ρ ▪ λ λ α), Pamphylon (Π ▪ μ φ υ λ ο ν), Polyton (Π ο λ ▪ β ο τ ο ν), Akonies (Α κ ο ν ▪ τ η ▪) and Koprion (Κ ο π ρ ▪ ν ο ν). Garella is always mentioned in the sources with its neighboring Aprōs (Ἄ π ρ ω ▪).¹³⁴ It is however a distinct town. Aprōs was called

¹²⁶ A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, p. 218.

¹²⁷ F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, pp. 51-52, and K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 16.

¹²⁸ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 223-224.

¹²⁹ See M. Adamović, ‘Das Tekke von Sarı Saltık in Eskibaba’, *Materialia Turcica*, 5 (1979), pp. 15-24, and H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 40-41.

¹³⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, Münecimbaşı, p. 48, Anonymous-Paris, p. 35, مغلقره, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, مغل قره, Şükrullah, p. 54, میقال قریه, میقال قریه, معال قریه, Ahmedî, p. 66a, میقلقرا, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, p. 345, Miğalkara, Anonymous-Giese, p. 24, مغلقره, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 16b, موغلغارہ, Lütfi Paşa, p. 39, ملقره, Neşri, p. 180, میغل قرا, İbn-i Bibi, p. 171, موغلقره, *ibid.*, p. 176, میقال قاره, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 36, مقلقره, Oruç, p. 23, ملقره.

¹³¹ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 475₁, H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 57-58, R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte*, p. 317.

¹³² G. Vogiatzis, *I proimi othomanokratia sti Thraki*, pp. 109-110. P. Wittek, ‘Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden (VI)’, in *La formation de l’Empire ottoman*, ed. by V. L. Ménage (London: Variorum Reprints, 1982), pp. 165-197 (pp. 180-181, footnote, 40, and p. 182, footnote, 41); see also N. Öztürk, ‘Erken Osmanlı Vekayinâmelerinde Yer İsimlerinin İmlâsı: Malkara Örneği’, in *Uluslararası Osmanlı Tarihi Sempozyumu (8-10 Nisan 1999) Bildirileri*, ed. by Turan Gökçe (İzmir: Türk Ocakları İzmir Şubesi, 2000), pp. 11-23 (p. 22).

¹³³ Malkara is the capital of the homonymous county of the Tekirdağ province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 801.

¹³⁴ D. Zakythenos, ‘Μελέται’, *EEBS*, 22 (1952), p. 167.

later Germiyan and today it is Kermeyan.¹³⁵ Garella was also mistaken for Malkara.¹³⁶ Its later names and location cannot be traced with certainty. Pamphylon was aperted of a walled acropolis and a lower town.¹³⁷ Polyboton,¹³⁸ Akonitēs¹³⁹ and Koprinon¹⁴⁰ cannot be traced as well.

The main target of this operation was the city of Adrianople. The Turks implemented their plan of blocking off Adrianople from east and south. The battle between the Byzantines and the Ottomans was held in Şazlıdere (صازلی دره)¹⁴¹ a tributary of the Maritsa, southeast of Adrianople.¹⁴² Today it is called the same way. There is also a town bearing the same name.¹⁴³

For many centuries Adrianople (Adrianoupolis, Ἀδριανούπολις) was the third largest city in the European territories of Byzantium after Constantinople and Thessalonica.¹⁴⁴ In 127 AD, the Roman Emperor Aelius Poplius Adrian (117-138) visited the city – whose ancient name was Orestias, Oresteia, Ouskodama, Ouskodamos or Odysos (Ὀρεστία, Ὀρεστία, Οὐσκοῦδαμα, Οὐσκοῦδαμο, Ὀδύσος)¹⁴⁵ – and named it after him. The Ottoman sources call it Edrene or Edirne (ادرنه).¹⁴⁶ Today it is called Edirne.¹⁴⁷

¹³⁵ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 112. Kermeyan is located in the Yörük sub-district, county of Malkara, province of Tekirdağ, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 671.

¹³⁶ A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, p. 268.

¹³⁷ Cantacuzenus, II, pp. 187-188.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, II, p. 475₄.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 435₂₄-436₁.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, II, p. 184₁₃₋₁₄.

¹⁴¹ Müneccimbaşı, p. 54, صازلی دره.

¹⁴² K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 166; for the hydrography of the region see P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 56-57.

¹⁴³ Şazlıdere is the capital of the homonymous county in the Edirne district, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol.2, p. 958.

¹⁴⁴ Gregoras, I, p. 95, Cantacuzenus, I, p. 13, Bertrandon, pp. 170-173, A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, p. 218.

¹⁴⁵ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Αδριανούπολις’, pp. 23-33.

¹⁴⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 53, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 49, Anonymous-Giese, p. 17, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 12a, Hadidi, p. 83, Müneccimbaşı, p. 54, Lütfi Paşa, p. 32, Neşri, p. 194, İbn-i Kemal, p. 145, Tarihi Takvimler, p. 28, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 31, Oruç, p. 20, ادرنه, Enveri, p. 53, ادرنه.

During the siege of Adrianople, its governor fled to Enoz (انوز).¹⁴⁸ Its ancient name was Apsynthos or Poltyobria (Ἀψυθηθόσσα, Πολτυοβρία) and its Byzantine Ainos (Αἴνισσος).¹⁴⁹ According to a theory, it was named Ainos after Aeneas, when he had passed over to Thrace after the siege of Troy.¹⁵⁰ Its modern name is Enez, 16 km. south-southeast of Traianoupolis, in Turkey.¹⁵¹

At the time both the Maritsa and the Tunca were overflowing. Adrianople is built near the confluence of Maritsa, Arda and Tunca.¹⁵² Tunca (تنجه) is not mentioned in all the Ottoman sources.¹⁵³ It derives from the Thracian name Tonzos (Τόνζοσσα). Strabo calls this river Arisbos (Ἀρισβόσσα). Other variants of its name are Taxos, Tainaros, Tontos, and Tōnos (Τόνξοσσα, Τάλινάροσσα, Τόντοσσα, Τόνωσσα).¹⁵⁴ Its modern name is Tunca.¹⁵⁵

After the conquest of Adrianople, Murad I sent Lala Şahin to raid in the region of Zağra and Filibe.¹⁵⁶ Zağra (زغره)¹⁵⁷ was the Byzantine Beroē (Βεροή). Its ancient name was Traianē (Τραιανία). It was named Beroē in the fourth century. Some Byzantine authors call it Beroia or Berroia (Βεροία, Βερόια). In

¹⁴⁷ Edirne is the capital of the homonymous district in Thrace, K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 60. On the geographical position of Edirne see B. Darkot, 'Edirne, Coğrafi Giriş', in *Edirne, Edirne'nin 600. Fethi Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), pp. 1-12.

¹⁴⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 54, اون كروس, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 49, انوز, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Hadidi, p. 78, Müneccimbaşı, p. 106, Anonymous-Paris, p. 31, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 32, اينوز, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, انوس, Neşri, p. 196, Oruç, p. 21, انز, Enveri, p. 57, اينز. Concerning the conquest of Enez see H. İnalcık, 'Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and his Time', *Speculum*, 35 (1960), pp. 408-427 (p. 412).

¹⁴⁹ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 483, A. Carile, 'Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie', p. 219, Bertrandon, p. 173, H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 108.

¹⁵⁰ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Αἴνοσ', pp. 45-53.

¹⁵¹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 170-173. Enez is the capital of the homonymous sub-district in the county of Keşan, in the province of Edirne, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 363.

¹⁵² Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Ἀδριανούπολις', p. 23.

¹⁵³ Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, Hadidi, p. 85, تنجه, Enveri, p. 57, تونجه.

¹⁵⁴ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 191-193. Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Τόνζοσ', p. 521.

¹⁵⁵ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 187.

¹⁵⁶ For the Ottoman conquest of this area see H. İnalcık, 'Bulgaria', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill), p. 1302.

¹⁵⁷ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 54, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 50, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Neşri, p. 198, İbn-i Kemal, p. 109, Anonymous-Paris, p. 32, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 32, Oruç, p. 21, زغره, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, زغرا, Hadidi, p. 85, Zağara, Müneccimbaşı, p. 54, زغرة, Enveri, p. 53, زاغرا.

the eighth century, empress Irene (Eirēnē) named it after her as Eirēnoupolis (Εἰρηνοπούλις).¹⁵⁸ In Ottoman times it was called Eski Zagra.¹⁵⁹ Its modern name is Stara Zagora in south Bulgaria.

Filibe (فلبه)¹⁶⁰ was the Byzantine Philippoupolis (Φιλιππούπολις). In ancient times it was called Ponēroupolis (Πονηρούπολις). It was Philip II, king of Macedonia who baptized it Philippoupolis in 341 B.C.¹⁶¹ It is the modern day Plovdiv in Bulgaria.¹⁶²

During the same period, the Ottomans probably conquered the fortress of Boukelon (Βοκελόν).¹⁶³ Later it was called Fikla or Fikel. Today it is Matočina in Bulgaria.¹⁶⁴

On their way westwards the Ottomans conquered Gümülcine (كوملجنه).¹⁶⁵ Its Byzantine name was Koumoutzēna (Κομουντζήνα).¹⁶⁶ Today it is the city of Komotēnē (Κομοτηνή), the capital of Rhodope district in Greece.¹⁶⁷ Gümülcine was famous for the mosque of Gazi Evrenos Bey, the earliest example of Ottoman architecture in the Balkans.¹⁶⁸

¹⁵⁸ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Βερόη', pp. 95-97.

¹⁵⁹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 38.

¹⁶⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 54, Anonymous-Giese, p. 21, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15a, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, Neşri, p. 196, İbn-i Bibi, p. 103, Anonymous-Paris, p. 32, Oruç, p. 21, فلبه, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 50, Müneccimbaşı, p. 55, فلبه, Hadidi, p. 125, Filibe, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 32, فلبه. Also see Bertrandon, p. 200.

¹⁶¹ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Φιλιππούπολις', pp. 538-541.

¹⁶² H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 29-30.

¹⁶³ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 324-328, II, 485.

¹⁶⁴ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 222.

¹⁶⁵ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 55, كوملجنه, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 51, Müneccimbaşı, p. 54, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, Neşri, p. 200, Anonymous-Paris, p. 33, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 34, Oruç, p. 22, كوملجنه, Anonymous-Giese, p. 22, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 15b, كوملجنه, Hadidi, p. 88, Gümülcine.

¹⁶⁶ Gregoras, II, p. 705, Bertrandon, p. 174. The Turkish Gümülcine derives from the Byzantine form of the name, see S. Kyriakides, *Peri tin istorian tis Thrakis, O Ellinismos ton syghronon Thrakon, Ai poleis Xanthi kai Komotini* (Thessalonica: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1993), p. 52-55, and C. Asdracha, *La region de Rhodopes aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles, Étude de géographie historique* (Athens: Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, Nr. 49, 1976), pp. 109-113.

¹⁶⁷ K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens*, p. 48.

¹⁶⁸ M. Kiel, 'The Oldest Monuments of Ottoman-Turkish Architecture in the Balkans: The Imaret and the Mosque of Ghazi Evrenos Bey in Gümülcine (Komotini) and the Evrenos Bey Khan in the Village of Ilca/Loutra in Greek Thrace (1370-1390)', in his *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1990), pp. 117-138; in the same see

The latest within the same year of the conquest of Koumoutzēna, the Ottomans probably conquered Gratianoupolis (Γ ρ α τ ι α ν ο ▪ π ο λ ι ▪),¹⁶⁹ Asōmatos (Α σ ▪ μ α τ ο ▪), Paradēmō (Π α ρ α δ η μ ▪), Kranobounion (Κ ρ α ν ο β ο ▪ ν ι ο ν), and Styliarion (Σ τ υ λ ▪ ρ ι ο ν).¹⁷⁰ Gratianoupolis was called Ígrican or Agrican (اغرجان) in Ottoman times.¹⁷¹ Today it is the town of Gratinē (Γ ρ α τ ι ν ▪), 11 km. east-northeast of Komotēnē in Greece.¹⁷² Asōmatos is the modern day Asōmatoi (Α σ ▪ μ α τ ο ι), northwest of Komotēnē, Paradēmō is called today Paradēmē (Π α ρ α δ η μ ▪), southwest of Komotēnē, Kranobounion is Megalo (or Mikro) Kranobouni (Μ ε γ ▪ λ ο, Μ ι κ ρ ▪ Κ ρ α ν ο β ο ▪ ν ι), 8 and 9 km. respectively southwest of Komotēnē, and Styliarion is Styliari (Σ τ υ λ ▪ ρ ι), 8 km. east-northeast of Komotēnē.¹⁷³ The Ottoman name of Styliarion was Baraklı¹⁷⁴ and the one of Kranobounion Şungurlu.¹⁷⁵

Lala Şahin and Evrenos Beg proceeded westwards and conquered the town of Fire (فرو).¹⁷⁶ This was the Byzantine Bēra (Β ▪ ρ α) on the west bank of the Maritsa.¹⁷⁷ The other Byzantine variants of its name are Berroia and Phēra (Β ▪ ρ ῶ ο ι α, Φ η ρ ▪). The town was named Bēra after the Monastery of Bēra or Bēros (Virgin Mary Cosmosoteira) established by Isaac Comnenos in 1151-

also ‘Observations on the History of Northern Greece during the Turkish Rule: Historical and Architectural Description of the Turkish Monuments of Komotini and Serres, their Place in the Development of Ottoman Turkish Architecture and their Present Condition’, pp. 415-444.

¹⁶⁹ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 260, Gregoras, II, p. 703.

¹⁷⁰ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 415¹⁵⁻¹⁶.

¹⁷¹ Enveri, p. 67.

¹⁷² P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 276-277, K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens*, p. 30.

¹⁷³ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 467. C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, p. 112. S. Kyriakides, *Peri tin istorian tis Thrakis*, p. 58.

¹⁷⁴ K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens*, p. 83.

¹⁷⁵ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 321.

¹⁷⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, Lütfi Paşa, p. 33, Oruç, p. 20, فره, Münecimbaşı, p. 60, Neşri, p. 210, فرجك, Hadidi, p. 78, Firecük. See N. Öztürk, ‘Ferecik’in Süleyman Paşa Tarafından Fethine Dair’, *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4 (1989), pp. 135-145.

¹⁷⁷ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 179, Gregoras, II, p. 625, A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie’, p. 220, Bertrandon, p. 179. H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 85, and K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens*, p. 26.

1152.¹⁷⁸ Later it was called Ferecik by the Turks. Today it is the town of Ferres (Φ ε ρ ρ ¨ ¨) in the Evros province of Greece, 20 km. north-northeast of Enez.¹⁷⁹

On the other hand, Murad I, attacked the fortress of Çatalca (چتالجه), near Constantinople.¹⁸⁰ Müneccimbaşı calls it Catal-Burgaz.¹⁸¹ This, however, must be an error, since Çatalburgaz is another name for Lüleburgaz, further west.¹⁸² This was the Byzantine Metrai (Μ ¨ τ ρ α ι).¹⁸³ Metrai was situated near the lagoon of Athyra (Α θ ¨ ρ α), the modern day Büyük Çekmece.¹⁸⁴ Today the town holds its Ottoman name.¹⁸⁵

Before conquering Vize, the Ottomans seized the area of Kırık Kilise and Bınar Hişarı. They also focused their military operations on the far eastern and the mountainous northern part of Thrace, in today Bulgaria. We do not know much about the Byzantine past of Kırık Kilise (قرق کلسا)¹⁸⁶ or Saranta Ekklesiiai (Σ α ρ ¨ ν τ α ¨ Εκ κ λ η σ ¨ α ι) in Greek. It is possible that it was founded in the Ottoman era. Both its Turkish and Greek names mean ‘forty churches’. Two other variants of this toponym, Kır Kilise and Kırık Kilise mean ‘country church’ and ‘destroyed church’ respectively.¹⁸⁷ This interpretation seems to agree with the existence of the Kırklar Tekke (= the convent of the forty) in Kırık

¹⁷⁸ Samothrakes-Lexicon ‘Φέρραι’, pp. 532-534.

¹⁷⁹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 200-201. For the Ottoman building activity in Ferecik see M. Kiel, ‘Ottoman building activity along the Via Egnatia: The cases of Pazargah, Kavala and Ferecik’, in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 145-158.

¹⁸⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, Neşri, p. 212, İbn-i Bibi, p. 168, چتالجه , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, چتالجه , Lütfi Paşa, p. 39, چتالجه .

¹⁸¹ Müneccimbaşı, p. 60, چتال برغاز .

¹⁸² Lütfi Paşa, p. 39, footnote, 2.

¹⁸³ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 42-43.

¹⁸⁴ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Métrai’, pp. 362-363.

¹⁸⁵ Çatalca is the capital of the homonymous county of the province of İstanbul, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 240.

¹⁸⁶ Müneccimbaşı, p. 59.

¹⁸⁷ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Σαράντα Εκκλησίαι’, pp. 468-469.

Kilise,¹⁸⁸ where the dervishes, according to a theory, honoured the ‘Forty Christian Saints’ from Adrianople.¹⁸⁹ It is doubtful that its ancient predecessors were Karpudaimon (Καρπιδαιμόν),¹⁹⁰ Tapodizos (Ταποδίζος),¹⁹¹ or Heracleia (Ἡρακλεία).¹⁹² It is the modern day Kırklareli, 55 km. east-northeast of Edirne.¹⁹³

Bıñar Hışārı (بيكار حصارى)¹⁹⁴ is the Byzantine Pēgai, or Phrourion tōn Pēgōn Byskion (Πηγὰς Φρουριωντῶν Πηγῶν, Βρουσκάστρον)¹⁹⁵ in Greek inhabitants in the Ottoman period called it Brysis (Βρύσις). Both its Greek and Turkish names mean spring, fountain. The toponym refers to the more than forty springs of the River Tearos (Ταρόρος), that Herodotus mentions.¹⁹⁶ Today it is called Pınarhisar and it is located 27 km. east-southeast of Kırklareli.¹⁹⁷

The conquest of Vize is dated somewhere after 1368. Vize (ویزه)¹⁹⁸ was the Byzantine Bizyē (Βιζήνη).¹⁹⁹ The fact that in 1368 the metropolitan of Bizyē was enthroned as archbishop of Mesēmbria, and the fact that there has not been any reference to Bizyē in the records of the Patriarchate of Constantinople since

¹⁸⁸ F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, vol. I (New York: Octagon Books, 1973), p. 51.

¹⁸⁹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 161-162.

¹⁹⁰ Oberhammer, ‘Karpudaimon’, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 10.2 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung), p. 2009.

¹⁹¹ Oberhammer, ‘Tapodizo’, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 4.A.2 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung), p. 2343.

¹⁹² Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Σαράντα Εκκλησίαι’, pp. 468-469.

¹⁹³ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 420-421. Kırklareli is the capital of the homonymous district, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 688.

¹⁹⁴ Müneccimbaşı, p. 59, بیکار حصارى, İbn-i Kemal, p. 176, بیکار حصارى.

¹⁹⁵ A. Carile, ‘Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae’, p. 220. H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 66, F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 54.

¹⁹⁶ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Βρύσις’, p. 126.

¹⁹⁷ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 220-221. Pınarhisar is the capital of the homonymous sub-district in the Kırklareli province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 910.

¹⁹⁸ Ahmedi, p. 66a, Şükrullah, p. 54, Müneccimbaşı, p. 59, Neşri, p. 180, İbn-i Kemal, p. 176, ویزه.

¹⁹⁹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 67-68, K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 195.

1368 shows that by that time it was conquered by the Ottomans.²⁰⁰ This agrees with the information given by Sadeddin, who dates the conquest of Bizyē in 1368 by Köse Mihal.²⁰¹ Today it is the city of Vize.²⁰²

Lala Şahin attacked Şaruyar (صارویار)²⁰³ on his way to Sofia. We do not know its Byzantine name. Today it is called Sarıyar and it is located near Malkara.²⁰⁴

According to the account given by Oruç, Lala Şahin seized the stronghold of Terkoz (ترقوز).²⁰⁵ This corresponds with the Byzantine town of Derkoi (Δ ρ κ ο ι); other variants of this toponym are Derkos, Delkos and Logos (Δ ρ κ ο , Δ λ κ ο , Λ γ ο).²⁰⁶ Derkoi was located on the banks of the homonymous lake in the northwest of Constantinople. Its modern name is Durusu south of the Durugöl Lake.²⁰⁷

On his way to İncügez (انجوز)²⁰⁸ Murad I besieged and conquered the stronghold of Pulunya. İncügez is the modern day İnceğiz.²⁰⁹ Its Byzantine name cannot be traced. This town was famous for its ancient ruins.

²⁰⁰ Short Chronicles, II, p. 288, footnote, 62. For the ecclesiastical province of Bizyē, see N. Bapheides, 'Η εκκλησιαστική επαρχία Βιζύης', *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesourou*, 19 (1954), pp. 193-212.

²⁰¹ M. T. Gökbilgin, *XV-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı Vakıflar – Mülkler – Mukataalar* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından No: 508, 1952), p. 6, footnote, 5.

²⁰² Vize is the capital of the homonymous county in the Kırklareli province, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 1019.

²⁰³ Müneccimbaşı, p. 59.

²⁰⁴ Sarıyar, in the Şahin sub-district, Malkara county, Tekirdağ province, *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 952.

²⁰⁵ Oruç, p. 23, ترفوز, misspelling for ترقوز.

²⁰⁶ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 69, 108, K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 58. See also A. G. Giannios, 'Από την Ανατολικήν Θράκην η επαρχία Δέρκων', *Thrakika*, 13 (1940), pp. 108-209 (pp. 161-169, 192-193).

²⁰⁷ In *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 1060, it is still mentioned as Terkos in the sub-district of Boyalı, county of Çatalca, province of İstanbul.

²⁰⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, اینجوز, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, Anonymous-Giese, p. 24, Müneccimbaşı, p. 60, Lütfi Paşa, p. 39, Neşri, p. 212, Anonymous-Paris, p. 35, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 36, انجوز, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 16b, Oruç, p. 23, اینجوز.

²⁰⁹ K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 87, H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 43, footnote, 156, and F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der*

According to R. Kreutel, Polunya (پلونیہ)²¹⁰ is identical with Polos or Eski Polos.²¹¹ This was the Byzantine Skopelos (Σ κ ▪ π ε λ ο ▪), which was celebrated in the Late Byzantine period for its fortifications.²¹² The Ottoman sources confess that it was only with the help of the God that a part of the walls collapsed and the Ottomans managed to enter. That is why they gave it the pseudonym ‘God demolished it’, Tañrı Yıkduğı (تکری یقذوغی).²¹³ The name Polunya, though, reminds us of the ancient Apollōnia (Ἄ π ο λ λ ω ν ▪ α),²¹⁴ which was the Byzantine Sōzopolis (Σ ω ξ ▪ π ο λ ι ▪), the Turkish Süzebolu, and the modern Bulgarian Sozopol.²¹⁵ Sozopol, however, is far north from the area that the Ottoman sources examine. E. Zachariadou argues that it could be possibly identical with the Byzantine toponym Plagia (Π λ α γ ι ▪) in the area.²¹⁶ The modern Turkish name of Eski Polos is Yoğuntaş on the Yıldız Mountains, 17 km. northwest of Kırklareli.²¹⁷ Both its Byzantine and modern Turkish name imply a rocky mountainous place.

Murad I was informed about the unexpected demolition of a part of the walls of Polunya, when he was resting under the shadow of a great poplar tree. The Ottomans named that place ‘The Mighty Great Tree’, Devletlü K̇aba Ağac

Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien, pp. 81-82. Today İnceğiz is a township in the county of Çatalca, in the İstanbul province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 543.

²¹⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, بلنیہ , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, پلونیہ , Anonymous-Giese, p. 24, پولونیہ , Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 16b, بولانیہ , Hadidi, p. 98, Pulonya, Münecimbaşı, p. 60, پولونیہ , Neşri, p. 212, Anonymous-Paris, p. 35, Oruç, p. 23, پولنیہ , Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 36, پولنیہ .

²¹¹ R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte*, p. 318.

²¹² F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 52, H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 19. Cantacuzenus, I, p. 194.

²¹³ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, تکری بیقذیغی , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 17a, Neşri, p. 212, تکری یقذوغی , Anonymous-Giese, p. 24, تکری یقذوغی , Anonymous-Paris, p. 35, یقذوغی [تکری], Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 36, تکری یقذوغی , Oruç, p. 23, تکری یقذوغی .

²¹⁴ M. Konstantinidou, ‘Η Απολλωνία (Σωζόπολις νυν)’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 22 (1957), pp. 169-189.

²¹⁵ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Απολλωνία (Σωζόπολις)’, pp. 70-72, P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 454-456.

²¹⁶ E. Zachariadou, *Istoria kai thryloi*, pp. 204-205, footnote, 237. Indeed, Polunya could be a corrupted form of Plagia.

²¹⁷ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 446-447. In *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 916, it was still mentioned as Polos, in the province of Kırklareli.

(دولتو قبا اغاج).²¹⁸ We are unable to trace its Byzantine counterpart. Its modern name is Devletliğaç near the above-mentioned Yoğuntaş, 33 km. northwest of Kırklareli.²¹⁹

After the victory in Şırf Şınduği the Ottomans firmed their control over the Maritsa plain in western Thrace and south Bulgaria. This battle is known as the Maritsa battle where the Ottomans defeated the allied forces of the Serbian lords. It actually opened the way to the further conquest of the Balkans. Şırf Şınduği (صرف صندوقی)²²⁰ is located near Çirmen (چرمن).²²¹ It means ‘Rout of the Serbs’ and was named so by the Turks.²²² The name of Şırf Şınduği still survives today as the name of the village Sırpsındığı near Saraypınar in Turkey.²²³ Çirmen was the Byzantine Tzemomianon (Τ ζ ε ρ ν ο μ ι ▪ ν ο ν) located on the right bank of the Maritsa River.²²⁴ In ancient times it was called Zeirēnia (Ζ ε ι ρ η ν ▪ α).²²⁵ Its modern name is Ormenio (Ο ρ μ ▪ ν ι ο), 101 km. north-northeast of Alexandroupoli, in northern Evros province in Greece.²²⁶ At this time the Ottomans seized Promousoulon (Π ρ ο μ ο ▪ σ ο υ λ ο ν), a fortress in the west of the Maritsa River.²²⁷ Its exact location is unknown.²²⁸

²¹⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 60, دولتو قبا اغاج, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 55, Hadidi, p. 99, Neşri, p. 212, قبا اغاج, Anonymous-Giese, p. 24, دولتو قداملو قواق اغاجی, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 17a, قبا اغاج, دولتو و قداملو, Müneccimbaşı, p. 60, دولتلی قواق, Lütfi Paşa, p. 40, دولتو قوا اغج, Anonymous-Paris, p. 36, دولتو قبا اغج, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 37, Oruç, p. 24, دولتو قداملو قبا اغج.

²¹⁹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 238. Devletliğaç is located in the sub-district of Kofçaz, in the Kırklareli province, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 1, p. 322, K. Kreiser, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei*, p. 54.

²²⁰ Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 51, سرف صندوقی, Anonymous-Giese, p. 23, Neşri, p. 202, سرف صندوقی, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 16a, سرف صندوقی, Müneccimbaşı, p. 55, سرف صندوقی, Lütfi Paşa, p. 34, سرف قو ندغی, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 34, سرف قو ندغی.

²²¹ Anonymous-Giese, p. 23, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 16a, Lütfi Paşa, p. 34, Anonymous-Paris, p. 34, Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 34, چیرمن. See F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien*, p. 29.

²²² H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, pp. 38, 109.

²²³ Sırpsındığı is a sub-district in the province of Edirne, *Türkiye’de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu*, vol. 2, p. 975.

²²⁴ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 191. P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 489-490.

²²⁵ Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Ζειρηνία’, pp. 195-196, and ‘Τζερνομιάνου πόλις’, p. 514.

²²⁶ K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthakiens*, p. 68.

²²⁷ Cantacuzenus, I, pp. 189²⁴, II, 348²¹⁻²².

The administrative and ecclesiastical capital of Western Thrace, Traianoupolis (Τ ρ α ▪ α ν ο ▪ π ο λ ι ▪), was called Urumciğ after the conquest.²²⁹ It was founded by emperor Trajan (98-117 AD) in the place of ancient Doriskos (Δ ο ρ ▪ σ κ ο ▪).²³⁰ This city fell into decline at the beginnings of the thirteenth century. In the middle of the following century it was completely devastated.²³¹ In 1347 the Ottomans demolished every part of the city that had been reconstructed. Consequently, one cannot speak of an inhabited city in 1371-1372, when it was conquered.²³² It was located east of the modern day Loutra Traianoupolēōs (Λ ο υ τ ρ ▪ Τ ρ α ▪ α ν ο υ π ▪ λ ε ω ▪) 15 km. east of Alexandroupoli.²³³

Presumably the Ottomans conquered the stronghold of Peristerion (Π ε ρ ι σ τ ▪ ρ ι ο ν) in order to safeguard the way from the Maritsa River to Koumoutzēna. Enveri mentions it as Gügercinlik (گوجرچنلك).²³⁴ Both the Greek and the Turkish toponym imply a place with nests of pigeons. Indeed the place, being an isolated rock on the banks of a river, justifies its name. It is located near the modern day Pyrgoi (Π ▪ ρ γ ο ι), 3 km. south-southwest of Abas (Α β α ▪), 7 km. north-northeast of Alexandroupoli.²³⁵

In Western Thrace Evrenos Beg conquered Buru, İskete and Marulya. Buru (بورہ)²³⁶ is, most probably, the Byzantine Peritheorion (Π ε ρ ι θ ε ▪ ρ ι ο ν).²³⁷ Its ancient name was Anastasioupolis (Α ν α σ τ α σ ι ο ▪ π ο λ ι ▪) and was named

²²⁸ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 417, C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, p. 136.

²²⁹ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 110.

²³⁰ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Τραϊανούπολις', p. 525.

²³¹ Cantacuzenus witnessed only ruins in 1343, Cantacuzenus, II, p. 415_{9,10}; Bertrandon, p. 179.

²³² C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, pp. 119-120.

²³³ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 482.

²³⁴ Enveri, p. 67; Bertrandon de la Broquière reads Coulony, 'coulon' in archaic French means pigeon, Bertrandon, p. 178.

²³⁵ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 277-278.

²³⁶ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 61, بورہ, Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 56, بورہ, Münecimbaş, p. 61, Neşri, p. 214, Enveri, p. 50, بوری.

²³⁷ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 542, Gregoras, II, p. 692, Bertrandon, p. 175. H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 91.

Peritheorion by Andronicos II Palaiologos.²³⁸ Peritheorion is located in the northernmost point of Bistonis (Β ι σ τ ο ν ς) lagoon. Buru could also be the nearby Byzantine fortress of Poroi (Π ρ ο ι). In some occasions, travelers were referring to Poroi when mentioning Buru. This is valid for the toponym Baru of Jovan Maria Angiolello.²³⁹ Poroi is the modern day Porto Lagos (Π ρ τ ο λ γ ο ς) in the southernmost point of the Bistonis lagoon. The Ottoman name of Poroi is known as Karaağaç.²⁴⁰ Peritheorion was a significant center that would logically attract the Ottomans. The whole area in Ottoman times, including the lagoon, was named Buru. On the other hand, Poroi were on the main artery that connected Nestos River with Gümülcine through the Yeñice-i K̄ara Şu (Genisea) plain.²⁴¹ Today the ruins of Peritheorion are located 3 km. southwest of Koptēro (Κ ο π τ η ρ ο ς) village in Xanthē province in Greece.²⁴²

İskete (اسكته)²⁴³ is the Byzantine Xantheia (Ξ ν θ ε ι α).²⁴⁴ Its ancient name was Xantheia as well, and its location is traced in the east of Bistonis lagoon; Byzantine Xantheia and modern day Xanthē (Ξ ν θ η), however, are further west.²⁴⁵ P. Georgantzis argues that Byzantine Xantheia was located in the place

²³⁸ Samothrakes-Lexicon, 'Περίθεώριον', p. 421.

²³⁹ G. Vogiatzis, 'Οι πληροφορίες του Ενετού Τζοβάν Μαρία Αντζολέλλο για τη Θράκη κατά το έτος 1470 και η σημασία τους για τη γνώση της πρώιμης Οθωμανοκρατίας στο θρακικό χώρο', *Balkanika Symmeikta*, 8 (1996), pp. 19-46 (pp. 25-26). According to S. Yerasimos, the Peritos of Bertrandon de la Broquière is Boru (modern day Lagos), see S. Yerasimos, *Les Voyageurs dans l'empire ottoman*, p. 107.

²⁴⁰ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, p. 412, K. Kreiser, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthakiens*, p. 75.

²⁴¹ C. Heywood, 'The Via Egnatia in the Ottoman period: The *menzilhānes* of the *Sol Kol* in the late 17/early 18th century', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by E. Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 129-141 (p. 132).

²⁴² P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 394-395.

²⁴³ Aşıkpaşazade-Ali, p. 61, اسکته , Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 56, Anonymous-Giese, p. 25, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 17a, Neşri, p. 214, Oruç, p. 24, اسکته , Hadidi, p. 100, İsketye, Münecimbaş, p. 61, Anonymous-Paris, p. 37, اسکته , Enveri, p. 51, اکسیا , Anonymous-Koyunoğlu, p. 37, اسکیت .

²⁴⁴ Cantacuzenus, I, p. 262, Gregoras, II, p. 727. R. F. Kreutel, *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte*, p. 313, P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 501-502.

²⁴⁵ C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, p. 93.

of ancient Topeiros (Τ ▪ π ε ι ρ ο ▪).²⁴⁶ Besides İskete, other variants of its name are İsketye, Ksani, Eskice, İskece, İskite, İskit, Eksya.²⁴⁷

Marulya (ماروليه)²⁴⁸ is the ancient and Byzantine Marōneia (Μ α ρ ▪ ν ε ι α).²⁴⁹ It was a seaside township of medium importance. According to Müneccimbaşı, this fortress was known as ‘Avret Hıṣārı (عورت حصاری).²⁵⁰ Today the ruins of Marōneia lay 3 km. south of the modern day village of Marōneia.²⁵¹

The walled seaside town of Polystylon (Π ο λ ▪ σ τ υ λ ο ν)²⁵² possibly resisted the attacks for quite a while. The date of its conquest is not known. Polystylon was the ancient Abdēra. Its name indicates a place with many columns, probably referring to the ancient ruins. Its Ottoman toponym is unknown. It is located in modern day Paralia Abdērōn (Π α ρ α λ ▪ α Α β δ ▪ ρ ω ν) in Cape Mpaloustra (Α κ ρ . Μ π α λ ο ▪ σ τ ρ α), 6 km. south-southeast of Abdēra.²⁵³

The same applies to the fortresses of Hagia Eirēnē (Α γ ▪ α Ε ι ρ ▪ ν η) and Pobisdos (Π ο β ι σ δ ▪ ▪).²⁵⁴ Their Ottoman names are unknown. The exact location of Hagia Eirēnē cannot be traced. Pobisdos is the modern day Podvis village, 2 km. east of Vlahovo in Bulgaria.²⁵⁵

The Byzantine Mosynopolis (Μ ο σ υ ν ▪ π ο λ ι ▪) was recorded devastated in the first half of the fourteenth century.²⁵⁶ In Roman times it was called Porsulae and was then renamed into Maximianoupolis (Μ α ξ ι μ ι α ν ο ▪ π ο λ ι ▪).²⁵⁷ It kept this

²⁴⁶ P. Georgantzis, *Symvoli eis tin istorian tis Xanthis* (Xanthi: 1976), pp. 35-36.

²⁴⁷ See above footnote, 243, and P. Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin*, p. 167.

²⁴⁸ Aşıkpaşazade-Giese, p. 56, Anonymous-Giese, p. 25, Müneccimbaşı, p. 61, Neşri, p. 214, ماروليه, Anonymous-Öztürk, p. 17a, مارليه, Anonymous-Paris, p. 37, Oruç, p. 24, مارليا.

²⁴⁹ Gregoras, I, p. 244. C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, pp. 115-117.

²⁵⁰ Müneccimbaşı, p. 61.

²⁵¹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 350-351.

²⁵² Cantacuzenus, II, p. 226, Gregoras, II, p. 626, III, p. 564.

²⁵³ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 408-410.

²⁵⁴ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 402.

²⁵⁵ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 406-407.

²⁵⁶ Cantacuzenus, II, p. 429, Gregoras, II, p. 705, Bertrandon, p. 175.

²⁵⁷ C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes*, pp. 104, 106.

name till the ninth century. Its Ottoman name was Misine Hişār.²⁵⁸ It is situated in modern day Messounē (Μ ε σ σ ο ν η), 6 km. west of Komotēnē.²⁵⁹

This concludes the Ottoman operations in Thrace. The Turks crossed the Nestos River, the natural border between Thrace and Macedonia and continued their incursions in the central Balkans.

²⁵⁸ H. J. Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens*, p. 91.

²⁵⁹ P. Soustal, *Thrakien*, pp. 369-370, Samothrakes-Lexicon, ‘Μοσυνόπολις’, p. 369, and ‘Μαξιμανούπολις’, pp. 352-353.

CONCLUSION

The great plains of central Eastern Thrace received the burden of the Turkish proliferation. In two decades (1352-1373/4) the Ottomans conquered Thrace cutting off Byzantium from its limited European territories. During this period Thrace's communication with the capital city of Constantinople was rather thorny. The indigenous population decreased even more. In the Late Byzantine period the Thracians were unable to confront the problems of the civil wars that had taken place in their lands. The deportation and settlement of Turkish nomadic colonists and the inclination of the local population to Islam, which actually concluded in a wave of Islamization, facilitated the Turkification of Thrace.

The descendants of the Christian inhabitants formed a significant percentage of the total population mainly in the sea-side regions and the urban centers. The names of most of the cities and large towns of Thrace clearly derive from their Byzantine counterparts. For nearly half a century before the conquest of Tzyp̄ē, the Turks were active in Thrace. They learned the topography and the toponymy of Thrace. In their narrations they mentioned their accomplishments in the land of the infidels beyond the sea. It was a correct move to choose Tzyp̄ē as their first bridge-head in Europe. Tzyp̄ē was close to the

Asian shore, which made the crossing of military feedbacks easy. Moreover, after passing over the Kuru Mountain, the Turks could easily approach the Thracian inland.

It is possible to argue that the protagonists of the Ottoman conquest of Thrace were the independent warriors who sought booty in an infidel land. After the conquest of Bithynia, Thrace appealed to the Ottomans as a great opportunity for plundering. The Turks of Western Asia Minor were aware of it even from the beginnings of the fourteenth century. The central Ottoman government channeled the vigor of the *gazis*, the unstable nature of the nomadic communities and the heterodoxy of the dervishes into Thrace. Their ardent enthusiasm was absorbed in conquest and colonization.

The Ottomans by conquering Thrace gained strong lodgments for further proliferation in the Balkans. Their victories against the infidels gave them a prestigious post quite important for their expansion in Asia Minor as well. They arrived triumphant in Europe and set up claims on the Christian Balkan states.

On the other hand, the Byzantine Empire lost its only remaining mainland. Beyond Constantinople, the sporadic dominions in Thrace, the Aegean and Morea could not justify the title 'Empire'. For a medieval economy, like the Byzantine, the lack of arable lands and the consequent decrease of agricultural products were equal to a financial collapse. Byzantium survived for one more century; but this was due to the period of unrest for the Ottomans, known as interregnum (1402-1413) and the massive Theodosian walls of Constantinople.

THRACIAN TOPONYMS

	Ottoman	Byzantine	Modern
1	Ağca Liman	Leukē (?)	
2		Akonitēs	
3	Aya Şilonya		
4		Asōmatos	Asōmatoı
5	Ayduncuđ	Kyzikos	Edincik
6	Banđ oz	Panidos	Barbaros
7	Barađlı	Stylarion	Stylari
8	Bolayır	Plagiaron	Bolayır
9	Bıñar Hıř arı	Pēgai	Pınarhisar
10	Burđus	Arcadioupolis, Bergoulē	Lüleburgaz
11	Buru	Peritheorion	
12	Cinbi	Tzypē	
13	Çatalca	Metrai	Çatalca
14	Çirmen	Tzernomianon	Ormenio
15	Çorlu	Tzouroullou, Tyrolōē	Çorlu
16	Devletlü Kaba Ağac		Devletliağaç
17	Dimetoka	Didymoteichon	Didymoteicho
18	Ece Ovası	Madytos (region of)	Eceabat (region of)
19	Edrene	Adrianoupolis	Edirne
20	Eksamiliye	Hexamilion	Ortaköy
21		Elaious	Eski Hisarlık
22	Enoz	Ainos	Enez
23	Eski	Boulgarophygon, Bourtoudizos	Babaeski
24	Fikla	Boukelon	Matočina
25	Filibe	Philippoupolis	Plovdiv
26	Fire	Bēra	Ferres
27		Garella	
28	Gelibolu	Kallipolis	Gelibolu
29	Germiyan	Aprōs	Kermeyan
30	Görece		Güreci
31	Gügercinlik	Peristerion	Pyrgoi
32	Gümölcine	Koumoutzēna	Komotēnē
33		Hagia Eirēnē	
34	Hıyrabolu	Charioupolis	Hayrabolu
35	Hıra	Chōra	Hoşköy

36	İğrican	Gratianoupolis	Gratinē
37	İlbegi Bergozu	Empythion	Pythio
38	İncügez		İnceğiz
39	İpşala	Kypsala	İpsala
40	İskete	Xantheia	Xanthē
41	Kaavak Tuzlası	Aigos Potamoi	Karaova
42	Kemer		Kemer
43	Keşan	Kissos	Keşan
44	Kırk Kilise		Kırklareli
45	Koñur		
46		Koprinon	
47	Mağalkara	Megalē Agora, Megalē Karya	Malkara
48	Marulya	Marōneia	Marōneia
49	Meric	Hebros	Meriç / Evros
50	Maydos	Madytos	Eceabat
51	Misine Hişār	Mosynopolis	Messounē
52	Misini	Messēnē	Misinli
53	Ödküklük		Balabancık
54		Pamphylon	
55		Paradēmō	Paradēmē
56		Pobisdos	Podvis
57	Polunya	Skopelos	Yoğuntaş
58		Polyboton	
59		Polystylon	Paralia Abdērōn
60		Promousoulon	
61	Şaruyar		Sarıyar
62	Şazlıdere		Sazlıdere
63	Seydi Kaavak	Sausadia	Kavak
64	Şırf Şınuđı		Şırpsınuđı
65	Simavna	Ammobounon	Kyprinos
66	Şungurlu	Kranobounion	Megalo/Mikro Kranobouni
67	Terkoz	Derkoi	Durusu
68	Tođıvine		
69	Tekür Tađı	Hieron Oros	Işıklar Dađı
70	Tekür Tađı	Rhaidestos	Tekirdađ
71	Temāşalık		
72	Tunca	Tonzos	Tunca
73	Urumcık	Traianoupolis	Loutra Traianoupoleōs
74	Viranca		
75	Vize	Bizyē	Vize
76	Zađra	Beroē	Stara Zagora

CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF THRACE

- 1352: Tz ympē
- 1352-1354: Aḳca Liman, Plagiaron, Aya Ŗilonya, Hexamilion,
raids to Hieron Oros; Sausadia, Ödküklük, Madytos, Elaious, Ƙoñur
- 1354: Gallipoli, Chōra, (sea-side area till Panidos)
- 1354-1357: Süleyman raids in the Charioupolis area
- 1357-1359: Peaceful period
- 1359: Panidos, Tzouroullous, Messēnē, Arcadioupolis, Boulgarophygon, Megalē Agora,
Aprōs, Garella, Pamphylon, Polyboton, Akonitēs, Koprion, Charioupolis,
Rhaidestos, Kissos, Kypsala, Empythion
- 1360: Ammobounon
- 1361: Didymoteichon, Adrianople
- 1361-1365: Boukelon, Philippoupolis, Beroē
- 1364/5-1371: Koumoutzēna, Gratianoupolis, Asōmatos, Paradēmō, Kranobounion, Stylarion,
Ƙırḳ Kilise
- 1367: Pēgai
- 1368: Bizyē, Ŗaruyar, Derkoi
- 1371: Tzernomianon
- 1371-1372: Promousoulon, Traianoupolis, Peristerion, Peritheorion, Xantheia, Marōneia
- 1373-1374: İncügez, Metrai, Skopelos, Devletlü Ƙaba Ağac

Ottoman Conquest of Thrace

- LEGEND**
- Major City
 - Town
 - Fortress
- Terkoz Ottoman Toponym
(Derby)



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- ‘Aşıkpaşazāde, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān veya ‘Aşıkpaşazāde Tārīhī*, ed. by ‘Ālī Beg (İstanbul: Maṭba‘a-ı ‘Āmire, 1337)
- Aḥmedī, *İskender-nāme İnceleme-Tıpkıbasım*, ed. by İsmail Ünver (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1983)
- Ankara, Millî Kütüphane, MS. Konya İzzet Koyunoğlu Kütüphanesi, Anonim, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān (II. Bayezid Devrine Kadar)*, No. A-1465
- Anonim, *Osmanlı Kroniği (1299-1512)*, ed. by Necdet Öztürk (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2000)
- Anonim, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Osman F. Giese Neşri*, ed. by Nihat Azamat (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1992)
- Babinger, Franz, ed., *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch nach den Handschriften zu Oxford und Cambridge erstmals herausgegeben und eingeleitet* (Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1925)
- Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le voyage d’Outremer*, ed. by Ch. Schefer (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892)

- Cantacuzenus, Ioannes, *Historiarum Libri IV*, ed. by B. G. Niebuhr, Imm. Bekker, and L. Schopen (Bonnae: CSHB, Impensis Ed. Weberi, vol. I, 1827, vol. II, 1831, vol. III, 1832)
- Carile, Antonio, ‘Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae’, *Studi Veneziani*, 7 (1965), 125-305
- Chalcocondylas, Laonicus Atheniensis, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. by Immanuel Bekker, (Bonnae: (CSHB), Impensis Ed. Weberi, 1843)
- Charanis, Peter, ‘Les Βραχέα Χρονικά comme source historique, An Important Short Chronicle of the Fourteenth Century’, *Byzantion*, 13 (1938), 335-362
- Critobulus Imbriota, *Historiae*, ed. by D. R. Reinsch (Berlin: CFHB 22, 1983)
- Cydonès, Démétrius, *Correspondance*, ed. by Raymond-J. Loenertz O. P. (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, vol. 1, 1956, vol. 2, 1960)
- Cydones, Demetrius, *Symbouleutikos heteros peri Kallipoleos aitesantos tou Mouratou*, in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, ed. by J.-P. Migne (Brepols-Turnhout: Bibliothecae Cleri Universae), vol. 154, pp. 1009-1036
- Doukas, [Michael], *Vyzantiotourkiki Istoría*, trans. by Vrasidas Karalis, (Athens: Kanaki, 1997)
- Giese, Friedrich ed., *Die altosmanische Chronik des ‘Āḩkpašazāde* (Osnabrück: 1972)
- Giese, Friedrich, ed., *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken عثمان تواریخ آل*, *Teil I Text und Variantenverzeichnis* (Breslau: 1922)

- Gregoras, Nicephoros, *Rhomäische Geschichte, Historia Rhomaike, IV*, trans. by Van Dieten and Jan Louis (Stuttgart: Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, 1994)
- Gregoras, Nicephorus, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. by Hier. Wolf, Car. Ducange, Io. Boivinus, Cl. Capperonnerius (CSHB, Impenis Ed. Weberi, Bonnae, vol. I, 1829, vol. II, 1830, vol. III, 1855)
- Grigoras, Nikiforos, *Romaiki Istoria A' periodos: 1204-1341 (Kefalaia 1-11)*, trans. by Dimitrios Moschos (Athens: Nea Synora-Livani, 1997)
- Hadîdî, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman (1299-1523)*, ed. by Necdet Öztürk (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1991)
- İbn-i Kemal, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman, I. Defter*, ed. by Şerafettin Turan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991)
- İstanbul, İnkılâp kütüphanesi, MS Hicri 879 tarihli Gelibolu sancagı taħrîr defteri, M. Cevdet Yazmaları No. 79
- Karamanlı Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Osmanlı Sultanları Tarihi*, trans. by Konyalı İbrahim Hakkı, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri I, Osmanlı Tarihinin Anakaynakları olan Eserlerin, Mütebassislar tarafından Hazırlanan Metin, Tercüme veya Sadeleştirilmiş Şekilleri Külliyyatı*, ed. by Çiftçiođlu N. Atsız (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1925-1949)
- Lû t̄fi Paşa, *Tevārīhi Ā-i 'Osmān*, (İstanbul: T. C. Ma'ārif Vekāleti Ne'riyyetindan, Maṭba'a-ı 'Āmire, 1341)
- Loenertz O. P., R.-J., 'La chronique brève de 1352 texte, traduction et commentaire', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 30 (1964), 39-64

- Mükrim, Hâlîl, ed., *Düstürnâme-i Enverî* (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Encümeni Kütüphanesi, 'aded 15, Devlet Matba'ası, 1928)
- Müneccimbaşı Ahmed b. Lütfullah, *Camiü'd-Düvel Osmanlı Tarihi (1299-1481)*, ed. by Ahmet Ağırakça (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995)
- Neşri, Mehmed, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-nümâ, Neşri Tarihi*, vols. 1-2, ed. by Faik Reşit Unat, Mehmed A. Köymen (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995)
- Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des manuscrits, MS. Anonymous, *Tevārîh-i Âl-i 'Osmân*, Suppl. Turc No. 1047
- Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, ed. by G. Dindorfius (Bonn: 1838)
- Schreiner, Peter ed., *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 1, 1975, vol. 2, 1977, vol. 3, 1979)
- Şükrullah, *Behcetüttevârîh*, in *Osmanlı Tarihleri I, Osmanlı Tarihinin Anakaynakları olan Eserlerin, Mütebassıslar tarafından Hazırlanan Metin, Tercüme veya Sadeleştirilmiş Şekilleri Külliyyatı*, ed. by Çiftçioğlu N. Atsız (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1925-1949)
- Turan, Osman, ed., *İstanbul'un Fethinden Önce Yazılmış Tarihî Takvimler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1984)
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., trans., *Istoria kai Thryloi ton Palaion Soutanon (1300-1400)* (Athens: MIET, 1991)

Secondary Sources

1. Monographs

- Arslan, H. Çetin, *Türk Akıncı Beyleri ve Balkanların İmarına Katkıları (1300-1451)* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001)
- Asdracha, Catherine, *La région des Rhodopes aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles, étude de géographie historique* (Athens: Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, Nr. 49, 1976)
- Atiya, Aziz Suryal, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938)
- Babinger, Franz, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.-15. Jahrhundert)* (Brün, München, Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer, München: Georg D. W. Callway, 1944)
- Babinger, Franz, *Die Geschichtschreiber der Osmanen und Ihre Werke* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1927)
- Beldiceanu, Nicoară, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans le manuscrits turcs de la bibliothèque nationale à Paris, vol. 1, Actes de Mehmed II et de Bayezid II du ms. fonds turc ancien 39* (Paris: Mouton & Co, 1960)
- Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène, *Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I* (Monachii: Societas Academica Dacoromana, 1967)
- Bosch, Ursula Victoria, *Kaiser Andronikos III. Palaiologos, Versuch einer Darstellung der byzantinischen Geschichte in den Jahren 1321-1341* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Verlag, 1965)

- Brusalı Mehmed Tahir, *‘Osmānlı Mü’ellifleri*, vols. 1-3 (İstanbul: Maḥba‘a-ı ‘Āmire, 1333)
- Çağatay, Neşet, *Bir Türk Kurumu Olan Ahilik* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997)
- Cevād, ‘Alī, *Memālik-i ‘Osmāniyye’niñ Tārīh ve Cogrāfya Lû gātı* (Der-Sa‘adet: Ma‘ārif Neẓāreti, Maḥmūd Beg Maḥba‘ası, 1313)
- Georgantzis, Petros A., *Symvoli eis tin istorian tis Xanthis* (Xanthi: 1976)
- Georgiades Arnakis, Georgios, *Oi Protoi Othomanoi, Symvoli eis to Provlima tis Ptoseos tou Hellenismou tis Mikras Asias (1281-1337)* (Athens: Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie, Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, Nr. 41, Nikos Bees, 1947)
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, *Rumeli’de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlād-ı Fâtiḥân* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından No. 748, 1957)
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, *XV-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı Vakıflar – Mülkler – Mukataalar* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından No: 508, 1952)
- Guillard, R., *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras, L’homme et l’œuvre* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1926)
- Halecki, Oscar, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1972)
- Hasluck, F. W., *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, vol. 1 (New York: Octagon Books, 1973)

- Hunger, Herbert, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vols. 1-2 (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1978)
- Imber, Colin, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1990)
- Inalcik, Halil, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300-1600* (Phoenix, London: 1997)
- Iorga, N., *Contributions catalanes à l'histoire byzantine* (Paris: 1927)
- *Istoria tou Ellenikou Ethnous*, vol. 9 (Athens: Ekdotike Athenon, 1980)
- Janin, Raymond P., *La Thrace Étude Historique et Géographique* (Constantinople: 1920)
- Kissling, Joachim Hans, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1956)
- Kreiser, Klaus, *Die Ortsnamen der europäischen Türkei nach amtlichen Verzeichnissen und Kartenwerken* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1975)
- Kreiser, Klaus, *Die Siedlungsnamen Westthrakiens nach amtlichen Verzeichnissen und Kartenwerke* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1978)
- Kreutel, Richard F., *Vom Hirtenzelt zur hohen Pforte, Frühzeit und Aufstieg des Osmanenreiches nach der Chronik "Denkwürdigkeiten und Zeitläufe des Hauses 'Osman'" vom Derwisch Ahmed, genannt 'Aşık-Paşa-Sohn'"* (Graz, Wien, Köln: Verlag Styria, 1959)

- Krumbacher, Karl, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*, vols. 1-2 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1958)
- Kyriakides, Stipon, *Peri tin istorian tis Thrakis, O Ellinismos ton syghronon Thrakon, Ai poleis Xanthi kai Komotini* (Thessalonica: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1993)
- Laiou, Angeliki E., *Constantinople and the Latins, The foreign Policy of Andronicus II 1282-1328* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972)
- Lemerle, Paul, *L'Émirat d'Aydin Byzance et l'occident, Recherches sur « La geste d'Umur Pacha »* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957)
- Mansel, Arif Müfid, *Trakyanın Kültür ve Tarihi En Eski Zamanlardan Milâddan Sonra Altıncı Asrın Ortasına Kadar* (İstanbul: Edirne ve Yöresi Eski Eserleri Sevenler Kurumu, 1938)
- Ménage, V. L., *Neshrī's History of the Ottomans, The Sources and the Development of the Text* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- Meyendorff, John, *Byzantine Hesychasm, Theological and Social Problems* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1974)
- Miller, Timothy S., *The History of John Cantacuzenus (Book IV): Text, Translation and Commentary* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1975)
- Moravcsik, Gyula, *Byzantinoturcica*, vols. 1-2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958)

- Nicol, Donald M., *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus) ca. 1100-1460, A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, Center for Byzantine Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 1968)
- Nicol, Donald M., *The End of the Byzantine Empire* (London: 1979)
- Nicol, Donald, M., *The Reluctant Emperor, A Biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk, c. 1295-1383* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Nicol, Donald, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium (1261-1453)* (London: 1972)
- Öden, Zerrin Günal, *Karası Beyliği* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999)
- Ostrogorsky, Georg, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952)
- Rıf'at, Aḥmed, *Lû ğāt-ı Tārīḫiyye ve Coğrāfiyye*, vols. 1-7 (İstanbul: Maḥmūd Beg Maṭba'sı, 1299)
- Shaw, Stanford J., *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, vol. I Empire of The Gazis, The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire 1280-1808* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Soustal, Peter, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini, vol. 6 Thrakien (Thrakē, Rodopē und Haimimontos)* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991)

- Spiridonakis, Basile G., *Greco, Occidentaux et Turcs de 1054 à 1453 Quatre Siècles d' Histoire de Relations Internationales* (Thessalonica: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1990)
- Turan, Şerafettin, *Türkiye-İtalya İlişkileri I Selçuklular'dan Bizans'ın Sona Erişine* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000)
- *Türkiye'de Meskûn Yerler Kılavuzu* (Ankara: T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı, Başbakanlık Devlet Matbaası, vol. 1, 1946, vol. 2, 1947)
- Umar, Bilge, *Türkiye'deki Tarihsel Adlar* (İstanbul: İnkılâp, 1993)
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995)
- Vakalopoulos, Apostolos, *Istoria tou Neou Ellinismou*, vol. 1 (Thessalonica: Herodotos, 2001)
- Vogiatzis, Georgios, *I proimi Othomanokratia sti Thraki, Amesese dimografikes synepeies* (Thessalonica: Herodotos, 1998)
- Werner, Ernst, *Die Geburt einer Großmacht – die Osmanen (1300-1481), Ein Beitrag zur Genesis des türkischen Feudalismus* (Wien, Köln, Graz: Herman Böhlau, 1972)
- Yerasimos, Stephane, *Les Voyageurs dans l'empire ottoman (XIVe-XVIe siècles) bibliographie, itinéraires et inventaire des lieux habités* (Ankara: Société Turque d'Histoire, 1991)
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., *Trade and Crusade Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydın (1300-1415)* (Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies – No. 11, 1983)

2. Articles

- ‘Τρηγορᾶς Νικηφόρος’, in *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. by Erich Trapp, no. 4443, vol. I/2 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), pp. 234-237
- ‘Καντακουζηνός Ἰωάννης’, in *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. by Erich Trapp no. 10973, vol. I/5 (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981), p. 94
- ‘Λευκή’, *Megale Ellenike Egkyklopaideia*, vol. 17, p. 732
- Adamantiou, Ad., ‘Αι γεωγραφικαί περιπέτειαι του ονόματος Θράκη, Συμβολή εις την ιστορικὴν γεωγραφίαν’, *Thrakika*, 1 (1928), 374-392
- Adamović, Milan, ‘Das Tekke von Sarı Saltıq in Eskibaba’, *Materialia Turcica*, 5 (1979), 15-24
- Akın, Veysi, ‘Trakya Köy ve Şehir Yer Adları Üzerine Bir İnceleme’, *Türk Kültürü*, 28 (1990), 530-538
- Aktepe, Münir M., ‘Osmanlı’ların Rumeli’de İlk Fethettikleri Çimbi Kal’ası’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 1 (1950), 283-306
- Aktepe, Münir M., ‘XIV. ve XV. Asırlarda Rumeli’nin Türkler Tarafından İskânına Dair’, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 10 (1953), 299-312
- Angelov, D., ‘Certains aspects de la conquête des peuples balkaniques par les Turcs’, *Byzantinoslavica*, 17 (1956), 220-275
- Apostolidou, K. Myrtilos, ‘Ρωμανία-Ζαγορά και τα της Θράκης όρια επί της Βυζαντιακής Αυτοκρατορίας’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 8 (1941-42), 65-82

- Apostolidou, K. M., ‘Περί των ορίων της Θράκης’, *Thrakika*, 2nd series, 4 (1982, 1983, 1984), 185-195
- Ardel, Ahmet and Tümertekin, Erol, ‘Geographical Observations in Thrace I’, *Review of the Geographical Institute of the University of Istanbul*, 2 (1955), 149-157
- Bakalopoulos, A., ‘Les limites de l’Empire byzantin depuis la fin du XIVe siècle jusqu’à sa chute (1453)’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 55 (1962), 56-65
- Balard, Michel, ‘A propos de la bataille du Bosphore’, in *La Mer Noire at la Roumanie génoise (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*, ed. by Michel Balard (Aldershot: Variorum, 1989) pp. 431-469
- Bapheides, Archimandrite Nikolaos, ‘Η εκκλησιαστική επαρχία Βιζύης’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 19 (1954), 193-212
- Bapheides, Nikolaos Metropolitan, ‘Η υπό των Τούρκων άλωση του Διδυμοτείχου Θρύλοι και παραδόσεις’, *Thrakika*, 2nd series, 1 (1978), 39-46
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, ‘Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler; I İstilâ Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler, II Vakıfların Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Kullanılmasında Diğer Şekiller’, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942), 279-386
- Başar, Fahamettin, ‘Evrenosoğulları’, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı) pp. 539-541

- Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène, ‘La conquête d’Andrinople par les Turcs: La pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomanes’, *Travaux et Mémoires*, 1 (1965), 439-461
- Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène, ‘Seyyid ‘Ali Sultan d’après les registres ottomans: l’installation de l’Islam hétérodoxe en Thrace’, in *The Via Egnatia Under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 45-63
- Beyer, Hans-Veit, ‘Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras’, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 27 (1978), 127-155
- Bryer, Anthony A. M., ‘Greek Historians on the Turks: the case of the first Byzantine-Ottoman marriage’, in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to R. W. Southern*, ed. by R. H. C. Davis, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: 1981), pp. 471-493
- Burmov, Aleksandır, ‘Türkler Edirne’yi Ne Vakit Aldılar?’, trans. by Hasan Eren, *Bellekten*, 13 (1949), 97-106
- Darkot, Besim, ‘Edirne, Coğrafî Giriş’, in *Edirne, Edirne’nin 600. Fethi Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), pp. 1-12
- Dirimtekin, Feridun, ‘Muasır Bizans Kaynaklarına Göre Osmanlıların Rumeliye Geçiş ve Yerleşmeleri’, in *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 25-29 Eylül 1970, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler, II. Cilt* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), pp. 577-580

- Dräseke, Johannes, 'Zu Johannes Kantakuzenos', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 9 (1900), 72-84
- Dujčev, Ivan, 'Die Krise der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft und die türkische Eroberung des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas*, 21 (1973), 481-492
- Eilers, Wilhelm, 'Toponymische Satznamen der Türken', *Die Welt des Islams*, 15 (1974), 45-68
- Ercilasun, Konuralp, 'Orhan Bey Devrinde Osmanlı Devleti'nin Trakya Politikası', *Türk Kültürü*, 33, no. 388 (1995), 485-499
- Eröz, Mehmet, 'Sosyolojik Yönden Türk Yer Adları', *Belgelerde Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 12 (1986), 39-42
- Georgiades Arnakis, G., 'Gregory Palamas among the Turks and Documents of his Captivity as Historical Sources', *Speculum*, 26 (1951), 104-118
- Georgiades Arnakis, G., 'Gregory Palamas, The Χίονες, and the Fall of Gallipoli', *Byzantion*, 22 (1952), 305-312
- Germides, Aggelos, 'Τα Γανόχωρα της Ανατολικής Θράκης', *Thrakika*, 46 (1972-1973), 179-288
- Giannios, Gaitanos Ath., 'Από την Ανατολικήν Θράκην η επαρχία Δέρκων', *Thrakika*, 13 (1940), 108-209
- Gill, Joseph, 'John VI Cavtacuzenus and the Turks', *Byzantina* 13₁, (1985), 57-76
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib, 'Edirne', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) pp. 683-686

- Gökbilgin, Tayyib, 'Edirne Hakkında Yazılmış Tarihler ve *Enîs-ül Müsâmirîn*', in *Edirne'nin 600. Fetih Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), pp. 77-117
- Goldziher [J. Schacht], 'Fiḫ', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) p. 886
- Heywood, Colin, 'The Via Egnatia in the Ottoman period: The *menzilhānes* of the *Sol Kol* in the late 17/early 18th century', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996) pp. 129-141
- Honigmann, E., 'Pour l'atlas byzantin', *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), 541-562
- Hrochová, Vera, 'Aspects sociaux et économiques de la decadence des villes byzantines à l'époque des Paléologues', in *Actes du IIe Congrès International des Études du Sud-Est Européen (Athènes, 7-13 mai 1970), tome II Histoire*, ed. by Marie Nystazopoulou-Pélékidou (Athènes: Association International des Études du Sud-Est Européen, 1972), pp. 435-440
- Hunger, Herbert, 'Klassizistische Tendenzen in der byzantinischen Literatur des 14. Jahrhunderts' in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, 6-12 Septembre 1971*, ed. by M. Berza and E. Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971), pp. 139-151

- Hunger, Herbert, ‘Thukydides bei Johannes Kantakuzenos. Beobachtungen zur Mimesis’, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 25 (1976), 181-193
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘Bulgaria’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) p. 1302
- Inalcik, Halil, ‘Gelibolu’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) pp. 983-987
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘How to Read ‘Āshîk Pasha-zāde’s History’, in his *Essays in Ottoman History* (İstanbul: Eren, 1998), pp. 31-50
- Inalcik, Halil, ‘Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and his Time’, *Speculum*, 35 (1960), 408-427
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış’, in *Osmanlı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999), pp. 37-117
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘Ottoman Methods of Conquest’, *Studia Islamica*, 3 (1954), 103-129
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘Rumeli’, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 9 (Eskişehir: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı) pp. 766-773
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘Stefan Duşan’da Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna: XV. Asırda Rumeli’de Hıristiyan Sipahiler ve Menşeleri’, in his *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Toplum ve Ekonomi Üzerinde Arşiv Çalışmaları, İncelemeler* (İstanbul: Eren, 1996), pp. 67-108
- İnalçık, Halil, ‘The Conquest of Edirne (1361)’, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 3 (1971), 185-210

- Inalcik, Halil, 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography', in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 152-167
- İnalçık, Halil, 'The Rise of the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium and the Crusades', in his *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series, Vol. 9, 1993), pp. 309-341
- İnalçık, Halil, 'Türk Donanmasının Beşiği: Gelibolu', *Türk Kültürü*, 22 (1964), 57-60
- Kalicin, Maria, 'L'homme dans l'œuvre de Neşri "Tarih-i Al-i Osman"', *Études Balkaniques*, 2 (1983), 64-82
- Kiel, Machiel, 'A Note on the History of the Frontiers of the Byzantine Empire in the 15th Century', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 66 (1973), 351-353
- Kiel, Machiel, 'Observations on the History of Northern Greece during the Turkish Rule: Historical and Architectural Description of the Turkish Monuments of Komotini and Serres, their Place in the Development of Ottoman Turkish Architecture and their Present Condition', in his *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1990), pp. 415-444
- Kiel, Machiel, 'Ottoman building activity along the Via Egnatia: The cases of Pazargah, Kavala and Ferecik', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium*

held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 145-158

- Kiel, Machiel, ‘The Oldest Monuments of Ottoman-Turkish Architecture in the Balkans: The Imaret and the Mosque of Ghazi Evrenos Bey in Gümülcine (Komotini) and the Evrenos Bey Khan in the Village of Ilıca/Loutra in Greek Thrace (1370-1390)’, in his *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1990), pp. 117-138
- Kiel, Machiel, ‘Two Little-known Monuments of Early and Classical Ottoman Architecture in Greek Thrace: Historical and Art-historical Notes on the Hamāms of Timurtaş Pāşazade Oruç Pasha (1398) and Feridun Ahmed Beg (1571) in Didymoteichon’, in his *Studies on the Ottoman Architecture of the Balkans* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1990) pp. 127-146
- Kissling, Hans Joachim, ‘Das Menāqybnāme Scheich Bedr ed-Dīn’s, des Sohnes des Richters von Samāvnā’, in his *Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae, I. Das Derwischtum* (München: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1986), pp. 112-176
- Kissling, Hans Joachim, ‘Zum islamischen Heiligenwesen auf dem Balkan, vorab im thrakischen Raume’, in his *Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae, I. Das Derwischtum* (München: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1986), pp. 46-59
- Kissling, Hans-Joachim, ‘Die türkische geographische Nomenklatur auf dem Balkan als Erkenntnismittel für die

Südosteuropaforschung', *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 3 (1965), 126-142

- Klein, Ernest, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1987)
- Konstantinidou, Margaritis, 'Η Απολλωνία (Σωζόπολις νυν)', *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesourou*, 22 (1957), 169-189
- Köprülü, Fuad M., 'Fıkıh', *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 4 (Eskişehir: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı) pp. 601-622
- Kourouses, Stauros I., 'Ἰωάννης ὁ Καντακουζηνός', *Threskeutike kai Ethike Egkyklopaideia*, vol. 7 (1965), pp. 29-35
- Kurtoğlu, Fevzi, 'XVIıncı Asrın İlk Yarımında Gelibolu', *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 5 (1935), 291-306
- Kurulu, Yayın, 'Evrenos Gazi', *Yaşamları ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: 1999), pp. 428-429
- Kyriakides, Stilpon, 'Η Θράκη κατά τους Βυζαντινούς χρόνους', *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesourou*, 12 (1945-46), 49-62
- Lambros-Dyouniotes, 'Γρηγορίου Παλαμά επιστολή προς Θεσσαλονικείς', *Neos Ellenomnemon*, 16 (1922), 3-21
- Lane, Edward William, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1980)
- Laurent, V., 'La vie de Jean, Métropolitte de'Héraclée du Ponte', *Archeion Pontou*, 6 (1934), 3-63

- Lougis, Tilemahos, ‘Η ιστορική διαδρομή της Θράκης στα πλαίσια της Βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας’, in *Thraki, Istorikes kai Geografikes Prosegiseis*, (Athens: Epistimis Koinonia, Ethniko Idryma Ereunon-National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2000), pp. 77-106
- Lowry, Heath, ‘The Role of Byzantine Provincial Officials Following the Ottoman Conquests of their Lands’, in *IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, Princeton University 24-26 August 1983*, ed. by Heath Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox (Istanbul-Washington-Paris: The Isis Press, 1990), pp. 261-267
- Luttrell, Anthony, ‘Latin Responses to Ottoman Expansion before 1389’, in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 119-134
- Macrides, Ruth, ‘Dynastic Marriages and Political Kinship’, in *Byzantine Diplomacy, Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. by Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), pp. 261-280
- Mamoni, Kyriaki, ‘Η βυζαντινή Μεσσήνη (Ανατολικής Θράκης)’, *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 14.1 (1989), 329-342
- Mélikoff, Irène, ‘Ewrenos’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) p. 720

- Ménage, V. L., ‘On the Recensions of Uruj’s History of the Ottomans’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 30 (1967), 314-322
- Ménage, V. L., ‘The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography’, in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 168-179
- Ménage, V. L., ‘The Menāqib of Yakhshi Faqīh’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 26 (1963), 50-54
- Mirmiroğlu, VI., ‘Orhan Bey İle Bizans İmparatoru III. Andronikos Arasındaki Pelekano Muharebesi’, *Bellekten*, 13 (1949), 309-321
- *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago, Auckland, London, Madrid, Manila, Paris, Rome, Seoul, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: 1995)
- Nicol, Donald M., ‘The Abdication of John VI Cantacuzene’, in his *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography*, ed. by Donald M. Nicol (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), pp. 269-283
- Nicol, Donald M., ‘The Doctor-Philosopher John Comnen of Bucharest and his Biography of the Emperor John Kantakouzenos’, in his *Studies in Late Byzantine History and Prosopography* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), pp. 511-526
- Oberhummer, ‘Karpudaimon’, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 10.2, (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung) p. 2009

- Oberhummer, 'Tarpodizo', *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 4.A2 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung) p. 2343
- Oikonomides, N., 'Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 1204-1453: Means and Ends', in *Byzantine Diplomacy, Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. by Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), pp. 73-88
- Oikonomides, N., 'From Soldiers of Fortune to Gazi Warriors: The Tzympe Affair', in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Ménage*, ed. by Colin Heywood and Colin Imber (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1994), pp. 239-247
- Oikonomides, Nicolas, 'The Turks in Europe (1305-1313) and the Serbs in Asia Minor (1313)', in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 159-168
- Ortayli, Ilber, 'Rodosto (extension en Marmara de la Via Egnatia) au XVIe siècle', in *The Via Egnatia under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699), Halcyon Days in Crete II, A Symposium held in Rethymnon 9-11 January 1994*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996), pp. 193-202
- *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vols. 1-3 (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

- Öztürk, Necdet, ‘Erken Osmanlı Vekayinâmelerinde Yer İsimlerinin İmlâsı: *Malkara* Örneği’, in *Uluslararası Osmanlı Tarihi Sempozyumu (8-10 Nisan 1999) Bildirileri*, ed. by Turan Gökçe (İzmir: Türk Ocakları İzmir Şubesi, 2000), pp. 11-23
- Öztürk, Necdet, ‘Ferecik’in Süleyman Paşa Tarafından Fethine Dair’, *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4 (1989), 135-145
- Papatheodorou, Bishop of Elaia Agathaggelos, ‘Αρκαδιούπολις’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 12 (1945-46), 46-47
- Politis, Linos, ‘Jean-Joasaph Cantacuzène fut-il copiste?’, *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 14 (1956), 195-199
- Runciman, Steven, ‘Byzantine Historians and the Ottoman Turks’, in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. by Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 271-276
- Runciman, Steven, ‘The Ladies of the Mongols’, in *Eis Mnemen K. I. Amantou* (Athens: 1960), pp. 46-53
- Samothrakes, Achilleus Th., ‘Λεξικόν γεωγραφικόν και ιστορικόν της Θράκης’, *Archeion tou Thrakikou Laografikou kai Glossikou Thesaurou*, 2nd series 28 (1963), 3-596
- Savvides, Alexis, G. K., ‘Το έργο του Τούρκου χρονικογράφου Ασίκ-πασά-ζαδέ (c.1400-c.1486) ως πηγή της υστεροβυζαντινής και πρώιμης οθωμανικής περιόδου’, *Deltio Kentrou Mikrasiatikon Spoudon*, 3 (1982), 57-70

- Şentürk, M. Hüdai, ‘Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluş Devrinde Rumeli’de Uyguladığı İskân Siyâseti ve Neticeleri’, *Belleten*, 57 (1993), 89-112
- Ševčenko, I., ‘Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century’, in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, 6-12 Septembre 1971*, ed. by M. Berza and E. Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971), pp. 69-92
- Tekindağ, Şehabettin, ‘Süleyman Paşa’, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 11 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı) pp. 190-194
- Vogiatzis, Georgios, ‘Οι πληροφορίες του Ενετού Τζοβάν Μαρία Αντζολέλλο για τη Θράκη κατά το έτος 1470 και η σημασία τους για τη γνώση της πρώιμης Οθωμανοκρατίας στο θρακικό χώρο’, *Balkanika Symmeikta*, 8 (1996), 19-46
- Vogiatzis, Giorgos, ‘Οθωμανοί και μη Οθωμανοί Μουσουλμάνοι στην κατάκτηση και τον εποικισμό της Ανατολικής και Δυτικής Θράκης’, *Ellenika*, 41 (1990), 279-286
- Werner, E., ‘Johannes Kantakuzenos, Umur Paşa und Orhan’, *Byzantinoslavica*, 16 (1965), 255-276
- Wittek, Paul, ‘Von der byzantinischen zur türkischen Toponymie’, *Byzantion*, 10 (1935), 11-64
- Wittek, Paul, ‘Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden (VI)’, in *La formation de l’Empire ottoman*, ed. by V. L. Ménage (London: Variorum Reprints, 1982), pp. 165-197

- Woodhead, ‘Urudj’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn, vol. 10 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) p. 908
- Zachariadou, Elisabeth A., ‘Orkhan’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2nd edn, vol. 8 (Leiden: E. J. Brill) pp. 175-177
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., ‘The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks’, in her *Romania and the Turks (c. 1300-c. 1500)* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1985), pp. 211-217
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., ‘The Emirate of Karasi and that of the Ottomans: Two Rival States’, in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon 11-13 January 1991*, ed. by Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 225-236
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth A., ‘Εφήμερες απόπειρες για αυτοδιοίκηση στις ελληνικές πόλεις κατά τον ΙΔ΄ και ΙΕ΄ αιώνα’, *Ariadne*, 5 (1989), 345-451
- Zachariadou, Elizabeth, ‘Holy War in the Aegean during the Fourteenth Century’, in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. by Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton and David Jacoby (London: Frank Cass, 1989), pp. 212-225
- Zakythenos, Dionysios A., ‘Μελέται περί της διοικητικής διαιρέσεως και της επαρχιακής διοικήσεως εν τω Βυζαντινώ κράτει’, *Epeteris tes Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*, 18 (1948), 42-62
- Zakythenos, Dionysios A., ‘Μελέται περί της διοικητικής διαιρέσεως και της επαρχιακής διοικήσεως εν τω Βυζαντινώ κράτει’, *Epeteris tes Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*, 22 (1952), 159-182

Maps

- Bıyıklıođlu, Tefvik, *Trakya'da Millî Mücadele, II. Cilt Vesikalar, Resimler, Plan ve Haritalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992), Harita 1, 1287 (1970) Tarihli Edirne Vilâyeti Salnâmesine bađlı Harita
- Hellenic Military Geographical Service, Alexandroupolis-Dhardenellia, Greece-Turkey, 1987, scale: 1:250.000
- Hellenic Military Geographical Service, Kavála, Greece-Turkey, 1993, scale: 1:250.000
- Hellenic Military Geographical Service, Kháskovo, Greece-Bulgaria, 1972, scale: 1:250.000
- Hellenic Military Geographical Service, Orestias-Adhrianoúpolis, Greece-Turkey-Bulgaria, 1985, scale: 1:250.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Edirne (ulusal), 1976, scale: 1:500.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, İstanbul, 1975, scale: 1:500.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Bandırma, scale: 1:250.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, İstanbul, scale: 1:250.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Çanakkale, scale: 1:250.000

- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Bursa, scale: 1:250.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Edirne, scale: 1:250.000
- Ministry of National Defence, General Directorate of Mapping, Republic of Turkey, Kırklareli, scale: 1:250.000
- Pitcher, Donald Edgar, *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire from Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), map VIII, Asia Minor and the Aegean Sea c. 1360 showing the conquests of Osman I and Orhan, and map X, The conquests of Murad I & Bayezid I 1362-1402
- Ramsay, W. M., *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (New York: Royal Geographic Society Supplementary Papers Volume IV, Cooper Square Publishers, 1972), Hellespontus and Bithynia
- Talbert, Richard J. A., ed., *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000), Thracia (1:500,000), p. 51, Byzantium (1:500,000), p. 52