MARTRYS AND DERVISHES AS WITNESSES:
THE TRANSFORMATION OF BYZANTINE IDENTITY
IN THE LANDS OF RUM (THIRTEENTH-FIFTEENTH CENTURIES)

Thesis submitted to the
École doctorale de Lettres et Sciences Humaines-
l'Université de Paris 1-Panthéon-Sorbonne
and
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences-Boğaziçi University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorat de l'université / Doctor of Philosophy
in
History

by
Buket Kitapçı Bayrı

Université de Paris 1-Panthéon-Sorbonne
and Boğaziçi University
April 2010

Thesis Abstract

Buket Kitapçı Bayrı, « Martyrs and Dervishes as Witnesses :
The Transformation of Byzantine Identity in the Lands of Rum
(Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries) »

The transformation of Asia Minor and the Balkans between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries constitutes one of the last chapters of social and cultural change in the Mediterranean basin in the Middle Ages. The focus of the dissertation is on the transformation of Byzantine identity between 1261 and 1453 in the former Byzantine lands, which were named as the lands of Rum by the Muslim sources. Due to incursions, raids, conquest, recolonization and reconstruction following the Turco-Muslim migrations and settlement, the physical and symbolic boundaries of the Byzantines as a group were trespassed, there was an encounter with the "other" and through conversion, enslavement and changing sides and places the Byzantines as a group became smaller. The effect of this change on Byzantine identity is researched through the examination of the definition of "self" and "other" in Byzantine *martyria* and Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources (*menakıbnames*) and heroic epics. In this inquiry both Byzantine identity and the identity of "other" are historicized and underlined. The changing meanings of terms such as Christian, *genos*, *patris* and *barbaros* which appear most in the *martyria* and Muslim, Turk, *Rumi* and *kafir* in the *menakıbnames* and heroic epics which are used to identify "self" and "other" are examined. The close analysis of terminology and the relation of the "self" with the "other" in the sources reflect that while the Byzantine self identity became exclusive as a defense against the shrinking of the group, the Turco-Muslim identity formation was quite inclusive having fluid boundaries between "self" and "other". A dialectic formation of identity can be perceived where the newcomers were themselves being transformed while transforming their environment. This study brings a new approach and interpretation to the frequently assumed sealed civilizational identities.

Tez özeti

Buket Kitapçı Bayrı, "Şehit ve Dervişlerin Tanıklığı :
Rum İlinde Bizans Kimliğinin Değişimi
(Onüç-Onbeşinci Yüzyıllar) "

Anadolu ve Balkanlarda onbir ve onbeşinci yüzyıllar arasında yaşanan politik, sosyal ve kültürel değişim Ortaçağ Akdeniz havzasında yaşanan önemli değişimlerin sonuncusudur. Bu tezin ilgi odağı 1261 ve 1453 yılları arasında Müslüman kaynakları tarafından Rum toprakları olarak adlandırılan eski Bizans topraklarında yaşamını sürdüren Bizanslıların kimliklerindeki değişimdir. Söz konusu dönemde Türk-Müslüman göçlerini izleyen akınlar, yağmalar, fetihler, kolonizasyon ve tekrar yapılanma süreçlerinde Bizanslıların grup kimliklerini belirleyen fiziksel ve sembolik alanların sınırları geçilmiş ve esaret, ihtida, taraf değiştirme gibi sebeplerden grupları giderek daralmıştır. Bu küçülmenin Bizans kimliği üzerindeki etkisini anlamak için Bizans şehitlik hikayeleri ile bu dönemde Türk-Müslüman toplumlarında üretilmiş menakıbnameler ve kahramanlık destanlarında " kendi " ve " öteki " ni tanımlayan terminoloji incelenmiştir. Dönemin Bizans kimliğinde öne çıkan Hıristiyan, *genos*, *patris* ve *barbaros* kavramları ve yine dönemin Türk-Müslüman kimlik tanımında önemli Müslüman, Türk, Rumi ve kâfir gibi terimlerin zaman içinde uğradıkları anlam değişiklikleri ve " kapsama alanları " tartışılmaktadır. Kimlik üzerinden yapılan bu araştırma Bizans topraklarına göç eden Türk-Müslüman gruplarının diyalektik bir dönüşümle etraflarını değiştirirken kendilerinin de dönüştüklerini göstermiştir. Toprak ve grup olarak giderek küçülen Bizanslıların dışlayıcı bir kimlik tanımı oluştururken, yayılan ve grup olarak büyüyen yeni yerleşimcilerin hudutları silik ve kapsayıcı kimlik tanımını benimsedikleri öne sürülmektedir. Bu çalışma söz konusu sosyal ve kültürel değişimi kimlikleri mühürlü, zaman içinde değişmeyen ve birbirine değmeyen uygarlıklar arasında gören genel kanıya yeni bir yorum ve bakış açısı getirmektedir.

Résumé

Buket Kitapçı Bayrı, "Le Témoignage des martyrs et des derviches:
La Transformation de l'identité Byzantine dans le pays de Rum
(XIII^e-XV^e siècles) "

La transformation politique, sociale et culturelle vécue entre les XIII^e et XV^e siècles en Anatolie et dans les Balkans, constitue le dernier changement important vécu dans le bassin méditerranéen médiéval. Le changement identitaire, entre 1261 et 1453, qu'eurent à connaître les Byzantins vivant sur le territoire de l'ancienne Byzance, appelé Pays de Rum par les sources musulmanes, constitue le thème principal de cette thèse. À cette époque, au fur et à mesure des incursions, des pillages, des conquêtes, et des processus de colonisation et de restructuration qui se sont succédé au cours des migrations turco-musulmanes, les frontières des espaces physiques et symboliques déterminant l'identité communautaire des Byzantins furent fortement ébranlées et leur groupe se rétrécit à cause de leur assujettissement, des conversions, et des changements de camp. Pour pouvoir comprendre l'effet de ce rétrécissement de l'identité byzantine, nous avons examiné la terminologie définissant le "soi" et l'"autre" dans les *martyria* byzantines, les *menakıbnamés* et les narrations épiques produites dans la société turco-musulmane de l'époque. Les notions de chrétien, *genos*, *patris* et *barbaros*, que l'on retrouve dans l'identité byzantine de l'époque, et les termes de musulman, turc, *rumi* et *kafir*, qui occupent une place importante dans la définition de l'identité turco-musulmane de l'époque, sont traités en fonction de leur évolution sémantique dans le temps et de leur champ d'influence. Cette recherche menée à travers un questionnement sur l'identité, révèle que les groupes turco-musulmans migrant sur les territoires byzantins, se sont transformés tout en transformant leur environnement. Nous avançons que les Byzantins ont survécu autour d'une définition exclusive de l'identité, en se rétrécissant au sens territorial et en tant que groupe, tandis que les nouveaux habitants se sont répandus et sont devenus plus nombreux en tant que groupe, en adoptant une définition identitaire aux limites imprécises et englobante. Ce travail tente d'apporter une nouvelle approche et une nouvelle interprétation par rapport à la conviction générale qui considère que le changement socio-culturel s'opère entre des civilisations aux identités scellées, invariables dans le temps et ne se touchant pas.

Mots-clé
Empire byzantin – Paléologues – Ottomans – hagiographie –martyrs - derviches

Université Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne
UFR d'histoire
Centre de recherches d'histoire et de civilisation de Byzance et
du Proche-Orient médiéval
17 Rue de la Sorbonne
75231 Paris cedex 05

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Buket Kitapçı Bayrı
PLACE OF BIRTH: Izmir, Turkey
DATE OF BIRTH: 21 March 1969

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:
Ph.D. Joint Ph.D. program (co-tutelle) at University of Paris I and Boğaziçi University, 2010.
DEA d'Histoire du Monde Byzantin et Post-Byzantin University of Paris I, Sorbonne, 2003.
MA in Byzantine and early Ottoman History, Boğaziçi University, 2000.
BA in History, Boğaziçi University, 1996.
AA in Tourism and Hotel Management, Boğaziçi University, 1988.

AREAS OF INTEREST

Social and cultural transformation of Asia Minor and the Balkans 13th-15th centuries; Byzantine identity; late Byzantine and early Ottoman social and cultural history; Hagiography; Greek-orthodox neo-martyrs; *menakıbname*s.

AWARDS
Allocation de recherche du consortium d'appui
à l'Université de Galatasaray, Paris, DEA scholarship, 2002-2003.
French Governmental fellowship and L'Institut Français d'études anatoliennes, Istanbul (IFEA), Ph.D. co-tutelle scholarship, 2003-2006.
Research Center For Anatolian Cultures -Koç University, Istanbul, junior fellowship, 2007.
Suna-İnan Kıraç-Istanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü research fellowship, 2008.
ARIT Turkish fellowship, 2008.
Coulson and Cross Aegean exchange fellowship, summer 2009.
L'Ecole Français d'Athènes (EFA) summer fellowship, summer 2009.

ARTICLES
"George d'Adrianople. Le récit byzantin d'un néo-martyr bulgare au XVe siècle" in Actes du conférence scientifique internationale du Centre Ivan Dujcev. "Byzance et les Slaves", Mai 2006, Sofia, Bulgaria (forthcoming).
"The martyrdom of Niketas the Young: a case of forced conversion under the Seljuk Sultan, Masud II or a reflection of the policy under Emperor Andronikos II ?" in The Proceedings of 1st Sevgi Gönül Conference of Vehbi Koç Foundation on Transformation in the Byzantine World, 12th and 13th centuries, June 2007, Istanbul (forthcoming).
"Byzantium as represented in Turkish Cinema: The case of Battal Gazi Films," in The Proceedings of symposium held by Istanbul Studies Center at Kadir Has University on Contemporary Perceptions of Byzantium, November 2009, Istanbul (forthcoming).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation was completed with the support of a number of individuals and institutions whom I would like to thank.

I would like to start with the three members of my dissertation committee whose continuous counsel, consistent help and encouragement have been most valuable. I am deeply indebted to Professor Nevra Necipoğlu, who initiated me to Byzantine studies during my undergraduate years at Boğaziçi University. Since then she has been a role model for me with her perfectionism, tact and discipline. As well as guiding me in the resolution of many problems that I have faced along the way, she has tutored me attentively in all aspects of my graduate training. She generously shared her knowledge and her library. I very much appreciate the reassurance that she has provided. I believe that during the long years of research and writing one becomes the adoptive child of his/her thesis advisor. This thesis was completed within the joint program of two universities, in two countries and with the support of two advisors and thus I have been lucky to have an adoptive mother, Professor Nevra Necipoğlu, and an adoptive father, Professor Michel Kaplan. I would like to thank Professor Michel Kaplan for his confidence in me and in my project. He was the one who proposed a joint Ph.D. program between Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne and Boğaziçi University, which enabled me to pursue my research both in Istanbul and Paris. His precise and insightful comments and remarks especially on hagiographical inquiry and his seminars at Sorbonne have been most helpful to me in the analysis of my sources. I am grateful for his willingness to guide and help me even over long-distances. I wish to express my thanks to Professor Derin Terzioğlu of Boğaziçi University for her generous acceptance to advise me on Turco-Muslim hagiography and Ottoman historiography. Her insights into this period and her careful reading of the drafts of the thesis, her advice and comments during the writing and rewriting process have been most useful.

Several other scholars have contributed to this dissertation. I would like to thank Cemal Kafadar for his interest in my project. I profited much from the graduate seminar that he conducted together with Derin Terzioğlu. During this seminar and a field trip I found the opportunity to develop my ideas and to discuss these with them. I thank Elizabeth Zachariadou who very kindly accepted to listen to and discuss my ideas on the neo-martyrs. I thank Ahmet Insel for his interest in my project and for his support. I am very much indebted to Marie-France Auzepy, Vincent Déroche, Brigitte Pitarakis and Vangelis Kechriotis for having spared their time in discussing certain problems which I have encountered during my research. I wish to thank Kostis Smyrlis, who helped improve my reading of Ancient Greek and was always ready to help me with a text that was difficult to decipher or interpret. I thank André Bingelli and Anestis Vasilakeris who controlled some parts of my translations from Byzantine Greek. Georges Kiourtzian's presence at Thomas Whittemore-Byzantine studies library at Collège de France made my research a colorful experience. I also thank him for having helped me acquire certain texts and manuscripts from the Patriarchal Center of Patristic Studies in Thessaloniki. Diana Pasquier-Chambolle kindly provided me a manuscript from IRHT-Greek section in Paris.

Several institutions supported the research and the writing process. Initial support for the research of this project was provided by the co-tutelle fellowship of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Institut français d'études anatoliennes-Istanbul between the years 2004 and 2006. During my IFEA years, the support of Paul Dumont, Pierre Chuvin, Annie Pralong and Ümit Topuz was very precious. Further support came from BÜVAK-Fahir Ilkel fellowship (2004-2006). In 2007, I received a junior fellowship at Koç University-Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations where I had to opportunity to meet many scholars, create new friendships and have a very studious environment to process my research. I would like to thank Scott Redford, Alessandra Ricci, Esra Erol and Duygu Kızılaslan for this fruitful year. The Suna-Inan Kıraç Foundation-Istanbul Research Institute fellowship and the Turkish fellowship of American Research Institute in Turkey supported my research conducted in Greece and France in 2008. In summer 2009, thanks to the short-term fellowship provided by the Coulson-Cross Aegean Exchange program of the American Research Institute in Turkey-Ankara and the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and another one by Ecole française d'Athènes, I was able to work in various libraries at Athens. Finally, I am very much indebted to Anthony Greenwood and Gülden Güneri for their comprehension and for having provided me a warm and friendly environment at the American Research Institute in Istanbul where I have been working since 2009 as librarian.

I would like to thank Işık Tamdoğan and Bertrand Lafont for their friendship and their initiative without which this adventure may have never started. Işık and many other friends opened their houses to me during my sojourns in Paris. I would like to thank Anne-Marie Lycuong, Manuel Gasquet, Katarina and Dimitri Amprazogoula, Diane Pasquier and Thomas Chambolle, Hubert and Michèle Lafont, Onur Soyer and Pascal Laugier for their continuing friendship.

Last but not least I would like to thank my family. My deep gratitude goes to Haldun Bayrı and Leyla Bayrı who have accompanied me in this struggle, which was not theirs. I am mostly grateful for their love and presence in my life especially during this long process. This dissertation is dedicated to them. I thank my parents Birsin and Emin Kitapçı and my sister Evrim Kitapçı for their love and thoughtful help in taking care of my daughter Leyla and thus soothing my bad conscience whenever I was conducting research in far away lands.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION --1-24

Aim of the Thesis
Scholarship on the Question of Identity
    Byzantine Identity
    Turco-Muslim Identity
Sources and Methodology
Outline of the Dissertation

CHAPTER 2: SOURCES--25-96

Martyr, Neo-Martyr, *Martyria*
    Theodore Gabras (BHG 1745)
    XIII Martyrs of Cyprus (BHG 1198, 1198A, 1198B)
    Niketas the Younger (BHG 2302, 2303)
    Michael of Alexandria (BHG 2273)
    John the Younger (BHG 2194)
    Antonios, John, Eustathios (BHG 2035)
    Martyrs of Philadelphia (BHG 801Q)
    Theodore the Younger (BHG 2431)
    Anthimos, the Archbishop of Athens (BHG 2029)
    Arsenios, Metropolitan of Berroia
    George of Adrianople (BHG 2160)
    Andreas of Chios (BHG 2024d)
    Michael Mauroeides (BHG 2274e)
Dervishes, *Menakıbnames*, Heroic Epics
    Danişmendname
    Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbü'l Ünsiyye
    Vilayetname. Menakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli
    Menakıbü'l Arifin
    Saltukname
    Vilayetname-i Hacım Sultan
    Vilayetname-i Abdal Musa
    Düsturname
    Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan
    Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin
    Velayetname-i Otman Baba

CHAPTER 3: "NEO-MARTYRS' MESSAGE" RE-VISITED : *MARTYRIA* AS A MEANS OF REAFFIRMING BYZANTINE UNIVERSALISM-------------------97-143

Group 1 : High Level Administrators of Andronikos II
Group 2 : Hesychast Authors
Group 3 : Individual Authors
Conclusion

CHAPTER 4: BEING BYZANTINE OR BECOMING THE " OTHER "--------------------------------------144-181

- The "Self" and the "Other"
- Terminology
- Social Typology, Social Space and Threats Perceived Against the Byzantine Identity

CHAPTER 5: WHO WAS *KAFİR* ? WHO WAS RUM ? FLUID IDENTITIES IN THE LANDS OF RUM-------------------------182-232

- Historiography on Proselytizing Dervishes
- Re-reading of the Conversion Narratives in the *Menakıbnames*
- Religious Definition of "Self" and "Other":Muslim and *Kafir*
- The Cultural and Ethnic Definition "Self" and "Other"
    - Turkish Identity
    - Lands of Rum, Rums and *Rumi* Identity
- Conclusion

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION--------------------------------------233-240
BIBLIOGRAPHY---241-269

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Aim of the Thesis

The transformation of Asia Minor and the Balkans between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries constitutes, with the Christianization of Iberia, one of the last chapters of social and cultural change in the Mediterranean basin in Middle Ages. The existing scholarship has so far focused primarily on political, demographic and institutional changes of Asia Minor and the Balkans,[1] while the question of the transformation of Byzantine identity has been discussed mostly either in relation with the effects of the Latin conquest of Constantinople or within the framework of change in religious identity during the process of "Islamization," against the background of Turco-Muslim migrations and conversions.

At the same time in the modern scholarship it has been frequently assumed that during this period of transformation two sealed cultural identities of peoples (Turks versus Greeks) came into contact within the framework of a larger bipolar division of sealed civilizational identities (Muslim versus Christian or nomadic versus urban). This conception of identity is very problematic because even in the present world where identity is defined within the political culture of nation-states and where, through the creation of standardized state education, language and "official national" history, self identity is being standardized, one can still find variations of self identification among people of the same "nation".

---

[1] Among the scholars who have dealt with political, demographic and institutional changes one can count Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, Claude Cahen, Speros Vryonis, Halil Inalcık, Heath Lowry, Melek Delilbaşı, Michel Balivet, Nicolas Oikonomides and Nevra Necipoğlu. See the bibliography for their relevant works.

In medieval society, the question of identity was largely the preoccupation of an elite who around the symbolic universe of identity justified their hold on power. It is hard to know to what degree the people living in the Byzantine Empire or in the former Byzantine lands shared or continued to share the Byzantine group markers as they were defined by the ruling elites. Angeliki Laiou has suggested that the changing allegiances of certain common Byzantines and their passage over to the side of Turco-Muslim groups during the twelfth century may be attributed to the weaker Byzantine self-identification than that of the aristocracy and the *literati*. She has argued that these people went over to the Turks perhaps because the Turks appeared less foreign to them than their Constantinopolitan rulers from whom they felt alienated.[2]

The issue of identity and why people chose to change sides, however, seem to be more complicated. For example, Demetrios Kydones, a member of the Byzantine *literati,* explained his conversion to Catholicism on the grounds of his belief that Latin theology showed greater respect for the Hellenic tradition than did the Orthodoxy of his own day. He, in fact, changed "sides" due to his strong attachment to his perception of Byzantine identity.[3]

Between 1261 and 1453 in the former Byzantine lands due to the incursions, raids, conquest, settlement, recolonization and reconstruction following the Turco-Muslim migrations, the physical boundaries of the Byzantines as a group were trespassed, there was an encounter with the "other," and through conversion, enslavement, changing places and changing sides the Byzantines as a group became smaller. All these posed a threat to the Byzantine physical and symbolic universe, which in turn resulted in a certain redefinition of identity. The aim of the present study is to find out the effect of these changes and transformations on the Byzantine identity. The inquiry on the transformation of Byzantine identity must be approached from three angles. First, how the Byzantines in Turco-Muslim societies identified themselves and the difference of this identification from the self-identification of the Byzantine elites. The second issue that must be discussed is how the Turco-Muslims identified the Byzantines. Did the Byzantines represent the "other" for Turco-Muslim groups? And if not, who represented the "other" for them? Thirdly, we must also explain how the "self" was defined by the Turco-Muslims in order to understand the various methods of integration and propitiation inherent in the transformation of Byzantine identity.

---

[2] Angeliki Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger in 12th century Byzantium: Means of Propitiation and Acculturation," in *Fremde der Gesellschaft. Historische und sozialwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Differenzierung von Normalität und Fremdheit*, ed. Marie Theres Fögen (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1991), p. 96.

[3] Michael Angold, " Autobiography & Identity. The Case of the Later Byzantine Empire," *ByzantinoSlavica* 60 (1999), pp. 54-55.

Scholarship on the Question of Identity

Byzantine Identity

Before reviewing the scholarship on the questions of Byzantine identity, it will be useful to give a traditional and official definition of "being Byzantine." It was Hieronymus Wolf (1516-80) who introduced the term "Byzantium" as a designation for the medieval continuation of the Roman Empire and the "Byzantines" for its subjects into the modern scholarship. According to the official and traditional usage, however, the Byzantines called themselves Romans (*Rhomaioi*), their state, the state of the Romans (*basileia ton Rhomaion*) and the lands encompassed within the Roman State, *Rhomais* and *Rhomania*. The state of the Romans was considered as the highest form of political living, the emperor (*basileus ton Rhomaion*) as the highest of earthly rulers, and Constantinople as the greatest city on earth. The Empire was a Christian entity where all Romans were necessarily Christian. The Byzantine Emperor had a sacral role as the earthly equivalent of the divine ruler of the kingdom of heaven over all the other "lesser" rulers. Being Roman was equivalent to being ancient, urban and civilized. All the other people outside the Roman rule were considered to be barbarians (*barbaroi*), who were non-Christians, unsettled newcomers without worthy institutions.

Being Roman had political, territorial, religious and other cultural implications. Politically, it meant to be loyal to the emperor in Constantinople. The political identity had territorial associations, all territory that had historically been a part of the empire being considered potentially Roman. Religiously, the Byzantine Empire- the *oikoumene*- was seen as the earthly realm of the Christians. The Emperor was an earthly ruler having a sacral role. The cultural markers of being Roman implied speaking Greek, having a certain dress code and appearance, and being urban.

The Byzantines expressed the concept of the other or the foreigner with terms defining differences in ethnic origin, political affiliation, cultural status, way of life and religious faith. These terms included, among others, *ethnikos* and *barbaros*. *Ethnikos* meant in general those who were foreign to the Byzantine people and to the Byzantine state. The term *barbaros,* originally used by Ancient Greeks for non-Greek speaking people, later came to signify an uncivilized person. The Byzantines continued the ancient Roman tradition where the word *barbaros* described a moral attitude more than an ethnic origin.

The conventional division between *Rhomaioi* and *barbaroi* was no longer clear-cut after the thirteenth century. While on the eve of the Fourth Crusade westerners could be identified as *barbaroi*, during the years following the fall of Constantinople some writers did not use this term for the westerners. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the primary reference of *barbaros* was religious. It was used for non-Christians, Muslims and also for Tatars and Turks.[4]

Most of the scholarship on the transformation of Byzantine identity between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries concentrates on the blow that Byzantine identity suffered due to the loss of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204 after the Fourth Crusade.[5] There are also studies on the effect of the loss of Constantinople to the Latins over the Orthodox *oikoumene*.[6] Since most of the available sources were the products of the Constantinopolitan and Nicaean elite, the studies reflect the changes in the identity of this group. Recently, there have been studies on the transformation of Byzantine identity in areas where the influence of the Constantinopolitan elite was less apparent, as in the case of the Empire of Trebizond.[7]

---

[4] Gill Page, *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity Before the Ottomans, 1200-1420* (New York: Cambridge University, 2008), pp. 176, 256; Alain Ducellier, "L'Islam et les Musulmans vus de Byzance au XIVe siècle," *Byzantina* 12 (Thessalonica, 1983), pp. 95-134; idem., "Mentalité historique et réalités politiques: L'Islam et les Musulmans vus par les Byzantins du XIII^ème siècle," *BF* 4 (1972), pp. 31-63.

[5] Michael Angold, "Byzantine Nationalism and the Nicaean Empire," *BMGS* 1 (1975), pp. 49-71; Paul Magdalino, "Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium," in *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium*, study XIV (Aldershot: Variorum, 1991); Ruth Macrides & Paul Magdalino, "The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism," in *The Perception of the Past in the 12th Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino, (London: Continuum International, 1992), pp. 117-56; Dimiter Angelov, "Byzantine Ideological Reactions to the Latin Conquest of Constantinople," in *Urbs Capta: the Fourth Crusade and its consequences*, ed. Angeliki Laiou (Paris: Éditions P. Lethielleux, 2005), pp. 293-310; idem, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330* (New York: Cambridge University, 2007).

According to the modern scholarship, the loss of Constantinople to the Latins in 1204 aggravated the tendency of separatism from imperial rule and strengthened the local loyalties which had already started forming before 1204.[8] The Byzantines had experienced defeat on distant lands, but for the first time they lost their sacred Queen of Cities to a Latin Christian emperor and to a Latin Christian patriarch who in return had claims to Romanness. In addition, there were now three rival Byzantine successor states, Epiros, Nicaea and Trebizond, which all had claims over the Roman imperial throne.

Within these circumstances, the elites and the rulers of the Nicaean State developed an idea of Roman identity that continued to preserve the traditional imperial aspects but also accommodated the "universalist" claims within a new context. The Nicaean emperors sought to give a universalist image to their rule especially as the protector of the Orthodox Church, claiming to have authority over the whole Orthodox community outside the boundaries of the Byzantine state. They called church councils and distributed largesse throughout the Orthodox world. They took under their protection those Orthodox who lived under the rule of the Latins and the Seljuks of Rum.[9]

---

[6] Antony Eastmond, " Art and Regional Identity in the Orthodox World after the Fourth Crusade, " *Speculum* 78/3 (2003), pp. 707-49.

[7] Antony Eastmond, *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-Century Byzantium. Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004).

[8] Nicolas Oikonomides, "La décomposition de l'Empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: A propos de la Partitio Romanie," *15e Congrès international d'études Byzantines. Athènes-Septembre 1976. Rapports et co-rapports* (Athens: np., 1980), reprinted in *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*, study XX (Aldershot; Varioum, 1992).

In fact, the fall of Constantinople was not only a blow to Byzantine identity and ideology but also a shock for the Orthodox world, the Byzantine "commonwealth." Although the rulers of the Byzantine successor states and especially of the state of Nicaea continued to proclaim their power as Christ's vice-regent on earth, they lost their credibility as the ultimate source of secular and spiritual power on earth upon the loss of Constantinople. The former Byzantine commonwealth members began to reformulate their power and to redefine their authority which no longer relied on reference or deference to Byzantium and promoted more decentralized models of power.[10]

Due to the incompatibility of the traditional political and religious identity with reality, the traditional framework of the ideas on being Byzantine was given a new meaning. To stress the gulf that separated them from the Latins, who also had claims to be considered "Romans", the Nicaean Byzantines searched for alternative identities such as the Hellenic identity. Two synonymous terms served to express Hellenic identity: *Hellenes* and *Graikoi*. Their use in Nicaea was not a novelty but during this period they began to be utilized in official and public discourse.[11] In the early and middle Byzantine periods, *Graikoi* appears in unofficial or semi-official sources and it was prefered to *Hellenes* because of the connotations of paganism inherent in the latter term. *Graikos* began to be used by Byzantine writers in later centuries with reference to ethnic Romans especially when writing to churchmen in the west.[12]

---

[9] Angold, "Byzantine Nationalism and the Nicaean Empire," p. 59.

[10] Eastmond, "Art and Regional Identity in the Orthodox World," pp. 707-49.

In early Byzantium, the Christian meaning of "Hellene" as a pagan shadowed the ethnic significance of the word in Byzantium. In the eleventh century the word began to be regain its original sense and to be used in learned circles as a term of self-identity. In Nicaea the word "Hellene" entered the official discourse of state in cases pertaining to relations with the Latins. In official discourses the term "Hellene" was used to point out to descent from the ancient Hellenes. While the term *Graikos* designated Orthodox Byzantines and thus pertained to matters of religio-ethnic identity, the term "Hellene" had secular connotations.[13] The reinterpretation of universal Roman ideology along Hellenic lines was cut short by the reconquest of Constantinople by Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1261. The trend of Byzantine self -identification with the ancient "Hellenes" would be revitalized in Mistra in the fifteenth century.[14]

---

[11] Angelov, "Byzantine Ideological Reactions," p. 300.

[12] See Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, pp. 95-96.

[13] Angelov, "Byzantine Ideological Reactions," p. 302.

The material evidence from the Empire of Trebizond shows that identity developed differently in another Byzantine successor state. The church of Hagia Sophia in Trebizond, built by the Byzantine Trebizond emperor Manuel I Grand Komnenos (r. 1238-63), reveals that the self-identification of the Trebizondine elites was both similar to and different from the Nicaean and the Constantinopolitan elites. The similarity was the emphasis on the divine right of the emperors and their universalist ambitions. According to Antony Eastmond, the columns imported from Constantinople, the paintings copied from the Constantinopolitan church of the Holy Apostles, and the donor portrait of the emperor Manuel I himself were elements of conscious imperial policy to promote the traditional rights and ambitions of Byzantine emperors which were inherent in the political Roman identity. On the other hand, because

---

[14] Christopher M. Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), pp. 107-9, 223-8; François Masai, *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956); Ernest Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), pp. 196-219; Speros Vryonis, "Byzantine cultural self-consciousness in the fifteenth century," in *Twilight of Byzantium: Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire*, ed. Slobodan Curcic, Doula Mouriki (Princeton: Princeton University, 1991), pp. 5-14. For the cultural connotation of the term Hellene from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, see Steven Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970), pp. 15-23. For selected articles on the subject, see *Byzance et l'héllenisme: l'identité grecque au Moyen Age. Actes du congrès international tenu à Trieste du 1^er^ au 3 octobre 1997* (Paris: Boccard, 1999). For theories on Greek nationalism having its roots in the Hellenic revival of the Nicaean state, see Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, *The Origins of the Greek Nation 1204-1261* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1970). For a criticism of Vacalopoulos' thesis, see Cyril Mango, "Review of A.Vacalopoulos, The Origins of the Greek Nation 1204-1261," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 88, pp. 256-8. For the analysis of both Vacapolopoulos' and Mango's theses, see Angold, "Byzantine nationalism and the Nicaean Empire". For Modern Greek nationalism and its appropriation of the Hellenic and the Byzantine past into the construction of the modern Greek identity, see the articles in *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. David Ricks and Paul Magdalino (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998). Also see Michael Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece* (New York: Pella, 1986).

Manuel's empire was composed not only of Orthodox Greeks but also of Laz and Armenians, the interior of the church had been decorated to appeal to this diverse audience. The exterior of the church, moreover, was built to impress the non-converted outsiders as well as non-Greek Christians, Seljuks, Georgians, Armenians and Laz, whose integration was needed for the success of the Trebizondine imperial claims. In contrast to the exclusionary identity model of the Nicaean and Constantinopolitan elites, a more inclusive Roman identity was formulated in the Trebizond Empire.[15]

The transformation of Byzantine identity after the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 has not yet drawn the attention of scholars as much as the period between 1204 and 1261. Among the few studies on the subject, one can count the abstract published by Anthony Bryer on late Byzantine identity.[16] Bryer has argued that there was not one single Byzantine identity but rather a variety of identities in the late Byzantine period. The widest self-designation for this period was "Christian," a term which implied spiritual subject of the Patriarch of Constantinople and which therefore embraced more people than the secular subjects of the Byzantine emperor. Beside religion and ruler, family, culture and place (*patris*) became the most important marks of late Byzantine identity according to Bryer.

---

[15] Eastmond, *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-Century Byzantium.*

[16] Anthony Bryer, "The Late Byzantine Identity," in *Byzantium: Identity, Image, Influence. XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies. University of Copenhagen, 18-24 August, 1996,* ed. Karsten Fledelius and Peter Schreiner (Copenhagen: Eventus Publishers, 1996), pp. 49-50.

In an article published in 1999, Michael Angold has shown that even among the Constantinopolitan elite there were variations in the perception of "self".[17] By analyzing "autobiographical" texts found in the form of preambles, wills, monastic rules (*typika*) and collected works of scholars between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, Angold has observed that family and home (*genos kai patris*) were particularly important for the identity of Byzantine aristocrats. The disintegration of the Empire especially in the late thirteenth century increased the emphasis on these personal elements of Byzantine identity rather than on the formal elements, which were empire, capital and Orthodoxy. These sources reflect the belief that if personal attachments like family and home were lost, one's attachment to Orthodoxy or to Constantinople would not be strong.

A recent book by Gill Page has shown the disintegration of Byzantine identity as a result of the disintegration of Byzantine territory. Page has analyzed and compared the histories written by the Nicaean and Constantinopolitan elite with the *Chronicle of the Morea.*[18] She has observed a very strictly defined cultural and ethnic identity among the Constantinopolitan elite after 1261. Although the profession of Orthodox Christianity, Greek language and appearance were important in the expression of cultural Romanness, the diglossia between educated and demotic forms of Greek became a divisive force during this period. The provincials began to be perceived as less Roman than the Constantinopolitans.

---

[17] Angold, " Autobiography & Identity," pp. 36-59.

[18] Page, *Being Byzantine*.

The Chronicle of the Morea, however, written by a native speaker of Greek who was ready to eulogize the Frankish rulers, reflects a Byzantine identity in which ethnic markers such as Greek language, Orthodox religion and legal systems became more significant. In Frankish Morea, there seemed to be a less fundamental contrast between the Romans and the non-Romans. What one understands from the *Chronicle* is that the boundaries between ethnic groups were more nebulous and negotiable. It was a polyglot society where the Byzantines spoke Frankish and Franks spoke Greek but Greek seemed to be the common tongue in the region. The political aspect of loyalty to the Byzantine state played a minimal role.

Another study conducted on late Byzantine identity concerns Byzantine émigrés of the fifteenth century in Renaissance Italy.[19] In this study Jonathan Harris has shown how the identity of these émigrés was transformed under the new contexts and circumstances. These Byzantine émigrés always described themselves as Greeks and never as Romans. They employed the adjective Roman as an adjective for all things papal because now they substituted the universal claims of the papacy for the role of the universal Byzantine emperor.

These few studies on late Byzantine identity demonstrate that due to the disintegration of the Byzantine Empire Byzantine identity began to show variations among people who lived now under different rules. Among the Constantinopolitan elite, an exclusive Byzantine identity developed, which emphasized the personal elements of identity, family and home. The loss of these components was believed to lead to the loss of Orthodoxy and political loyalty to the emperor in Constantinople. The widest self-designation which can be perceived in all the studies on the late Byzantine period was Orthodox Christianity.

---

[19] Jonathan Harris, "Common Language and the Common Good: Aspects of Identity among Byzantine Émigrés in Renaissance Italy," in *Crossing Boundaries. Issues of Cultural and Individual Identity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Sally McKee (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), pp. 189-202.

If we return to the problematique of the present study, the question is in which sources we can find evidence to trace the changes and transformations of identity of the ex-Byzantine subjects who now lived under Turco-Muslim rule. Until the fall of Constantinople, under Turco-Muslim rule no known ex-Byzantine subject had written a source similar to the *Chronicle of the Morea.*[20] There are however two types of hagiographical sources in which one can meet many ex-Byzantine subjects who lived under Turco-Muslim rule. First one is the Byzantine *martyria* and the second one is the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources and also heroic epics.

---

[20] The history of Chalkokondyles (ca.1423-ca.1490) and the history of Kritoboulos (d.1470) date after the fall of Constantinople. In his history of ten books covering the period 1298-1463, Chalkokondyles tried to show the downfall of the great empire of the Hellenes and the growing power of the Turks. For Chalkokondyles, the *basileus* is the Turkish sultan. The Byzantine emperor is designated as *basileus Hellenon.* He attributes the Romanness to Habsburg rulers and to the papacy. Nicolaos Nicoloudis, *Laonikos Chalkokondyles. A Translation and Commentary of the "Demonstrations of Histories" (Books I-III)* (Athens: Historical publications St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996). Kritoboulos, who sought an accommodation with Mehmed II, wrote a history in five books covering the period 1451-67. He gives a flattering portrait of Mehmed and refers regularly to the sultan as *basileus* and *autokrator.* For a very brief survey of the epithets utilized by Chakokondyles and Kritoboulos in designating Byzantines, see Vryonis, "Byzantine Cultural Self-Consciousness in the Fifteenth Century," pp. 7-9.

The period between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries is extremely rich in terms of Byzantine hagiographical sources.[21] Among these hagiographical sources, the *martyria*, martyrdom stories which narrate the questioning, torturing, and finally execution of the martyrs, are the most interesting for my purpose. The heroes of these stories, the martyrs, were Byzantines living in former Byzantine lands which had come under either Turco-Muslim or Latin rule. These martyrs sacrificed their lives in order to preserve an integral and important component of late Byzantine identity; namely, Orthodox Christianity. According to lexical definition, these texts were written by people from the Christian community who witnessed the event or who heard it from other members of the community so that the memory of the martyr's struggle would be remembered and venerated. Therefore, even if the martyrs themselves could not tell us their stories, the authors of the *martyria* who lived in the same area and who belonged to the same community as the martyrs can give us some ideas on what it was to be a Byzantine under Turco-Muslim rule. And the ones under the rule of the Latins may serve as comparative material.

The Byzantines are also found in the heroic epics and Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources. In this study, I propose to analyze the totality of these sources which were written between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries to find out how the Byzantines are identified. This question, moreover, cannot be studied separately from how the Turco-Muslim groups identified themselves and who represented the "other" for them. The following section will provide information on the scholarship on Turco-Muslim representation of the Byzantines and self-definition of Turco-Muslim groups.

---

[21] In the fourteenth century, hagiographical writing flourished within this context where 36 Vitae were devoted to 32 contemporary men and 125 works were written by 45 different authors on saints who lived before the thirteenth century. For the saints' lives of the pre-Palaiologan period reedited during the Palaiologan period, see Alice Mary Talbot, "Old Wine in New Bottles: The Rewriting of Saints' Lives in the Palaiologan Period," in *The Twilight of Byzantium*, pp. 15-26, rp. in *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*, Study X (Aldershot: Variorum, 2001); For an overview of the contemporary saints of the Palaiologan period see Angeliki Laiou, "Saints and Society in the Late Byzantine Empire," in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1980), pp. 84-114.

Turco-Muslim Identity

Among the meager scholarship on how the Byzantines are represented in Turco-Muslim sources between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, one can count Speros Vryonis's analysis of the *Menakıbü'l Arifin*, the *vitae* on Mevlana. Vryonis, by examining the social world of Mevlana and the utilization of ethnic epithets to designate different groups in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Seljuk Konya, points out the usage of *Rumi* as a designation for Greek-speaking Christians, hence the Byzantines.[22]

In terms of the "self" designation of Turco-Muslim groups, there have been few studies that try to historicize the self-identifying terms and to study their different meanings over time and place. It was comfortably assumed that there were basically two groups "Muslim Turks" and "Christian Greeks." At best it was argued that these two groups were not in constant conflict but shared many cultural aspects as well as the same territory.[23]

---

[22] Speros Vryonis, " The Economic and Social Worlds of Anatolia in the Writings of the Mawlawi (Mevlevi) Dervish Eflaki, " in *Cultural Horizons. A Festschrift in Honor of Talat S. Halman*, ed. Jayne L. Warner (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 2001), pp. 188-197.

Cemal Kafadar is among the few scholars who argued about the necessity of questioning the identities and discussing their meanings over time.[24] In his book on the construction of the Ottoman State, he examines the possible meanings of *gaza* and the self definition *gazi* by especially focusing on heroic epics and hagiographies. He believes that these types of narrative played a prominent role in formulating the historical consciousness of the people of the frontiers.[25] In a more recent article, Kafadar has again elaborated on the question of Turco-Muslim identity but this time around the geographical and cultural aspects of the *Rumi* identity.[26]

Among the studies on the subject of Turco-Muslim identity in medieval Asia Minor, one can also count an article by Robert Ousterhout in which he examines the methods of wall construction and the decorative details bearing the hallmarks of local Byzantine practices used out of practical reasons in early Ottoman architecture. These details, which were encompassed in a larger architectural plan and vaulting forms borrowed from Islamic architectural plans and forms, showed how the local cultural elements were appropriated under a new symbolic form and hence revealed the ethnic identity and cultural appropriation.[27]

---

[23] Michel Balivet, *Romanie Byzantine et pays de Rum Turc. Histoire d'un espace d'imbrication gréco-turque* (Istanbul: ISIS, 1994).

[24] Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds. The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California, 1995), pp. 19-28.

[25] Ibid., pp. 62-90.

[26] Cemal Kafadar, "A Rome of One's own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum," *Muqarnas* 24 (2007), pp. 7-25.

Rhustem Shukurov, who is one of the few scholars elaborating on the question of Turco-Muslim identity, has analyzed twelfth-century Anatolian Turcoman coins. These earlier Turco-Muslim emirs utilized Greek inscriptions, Byzantine imagery such as those of Jesus, St. Gregory and Byzantine emperors along with Muslim titles. On the other hand, they did not give up identifying themselves with the Muslim world. According to Shukurov, by doing so they claimed to share the Byzantine territory and sphere as Roman Muslim petty rulers inferior to the *basileus*. While the Constantinopolitan elite regarded the Anatolian Turkic areas as lands temporarily separated from their indivisible universal *Rhomania*, the Turcoman rulers of the twelfth century considered *Rhomania* as factually divided between several rulers. By referring to specific geographical regions in their titles, they put themselves on a lower dignity level in relation to the *basileus* in Constantinople. Hence they determined their own place in the traditional Byzantine space into which they had intruded. These examples of early Turcoman self-identification demonstrate the profound ambition of the Turcoman new comers in Anatolia to be both Romans and Muslims at the same time. Shukurov has argued that in their Muslim heritage the Iranian heritage of Sassanid universal Empire and Arabic played an important role. Adopting Christian imagery in their self-representation, the Turcoman emphasized their right to the Christian Byzantine heritage remaining at the same time true Muslims.[28]

---

[27] Robert Ousterhout, "Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995), pp. 48-62.

Oya Pancaroğlu, by examining the image of a figure killing a dragon which was present both in the Byzantine and Turco-Muslim traditions in medieval Anatolia, has argued how certain figures played a distinct role in forging associations between the traditions and identity.[29]

Sources and Methodology

The major sources of inquiry in this research are Byzantine and Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources, specifically Byzantine *martyria* and Turco-Muslim *menakıbnames*, as well as Turco-Muslim heroic epics, which were also related with the milieu in which some of the *menakıbnames* were produced.

The hagiographical sources are the raw data of the collective memory narrating the conduct of a holy person. The protagonists of these sources, Christian saints or Muslim dervishes, were "real" individuals who resided in the social imagination. The saint's reputation for holiness was socially generated: "to be a saint is to be a saint for others."[30] The authors of the hagiographical texts selectively perceived the saint's actions according to the shared experiences, faith and religious doctrines of the society or group to which they belonged. Therefore, by first looking at the author and his audience and then by analyzing the saint's behavior, we can obtain information on a precise type of social perception.[31]

---

[28] Rhustem Shukurov, "Turkoman and Byzantine self-identity. Some reflections on the logic of the title-making in twelfth and thirteenth-century Anatolia," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999*, ed. Antony Eastmond (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 259-276; idem, "Christian Elements in the Identity of the Anatolian Turkmens (12th-13th Centuries)", in *Spoleto. Cristianita D'Occidente e Christianita D'Oriente*, vol.1 (2004), pp. 707-59.

[29] Oya Pancaroğlu, "The Itinerant Dragon-Slayer: Forging Paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia," *Gesta* 43/2 (2004), pp.151-163.

[30] Vincent J. Cornell, *Realm of the Saint. Power and Authority in Moroccan Sufism* (Austin: University of Texas, 1998), p. xxxi.

There are two major reasons for bringing these types of sources together. First while the *martyria* are the rare sources concerning the Byzantines living under Turco-Muslim rule, it is in the Turco-Muslim heroic epics and the *menakıbname*s that we can more frequently come across Byzantines. Another reason for bringing these two types of sources together is that the modern scholars who considered religious conversion as a change of identity par excellence attributed a primary role to the martyrs and to the dervishes within the social and cultural transformation of medieval Asia Minor and the Balkans. While the Byzantine martyrs are considered to be the ones opposing the conversion to Islam,[32] the dervishes are believed by many scholars to have been one of the most significant factors in the conversion to Islam through colonization and through their syncretistic and latitudinarian approaches.[33]

---

[31] For the methodology in the analysis of hagiographical data and on the sociology of sainthood, see Hippolyte Delehaye, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1934); idem., *Les Légendes hagiographiques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1955); idem., *Les Passions des Martyrs et les genres littéraires* (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1966); idem., *L'ancienne hagiographie Byzantine: les sources, les premiers modèles, la formation des genres* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1991); Pierre Delooz, *Sociologie et Canonisation* (Liège: Faculté de Droit Liège, 1969); René Aigrain, *L'hagiographie: Ses sources, ses methodess, son histoire* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 2000). For the analysis of Byzantine hagiographical sources to understand the society, one can count among numerous works Harry J. Magoulias, "The Lives of the Saints as Sources of Data for the History of Byzantine Medicine in the VIth and VIIth Centuries," *BZ* 57 (1964), pp. 127-150; Evelyne Patlagean, "Ancienne hagiographie Byzantine et histoire sociale," *Annales* 23 (1968), pp. 106-126, rp. in *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance (IV-XIe siècle), study* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1981); Laiou, "Saints and Society in the Late Byzantine Empire"; Peter Brown, *Society and Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California, 1982); Alexandre Kazhdan, "Byzantine Hagiography and Sex in the Fifth to Twelfth Centuries," *DOP* 44 (1990), pp. 131-143; Henri Maguire, "Byzantine Hagiographical Texts as Sources on Art," *DOP* 45 (1991), pp. 1-22; Alice Mary Talbot, "Byzantine Women, Saint's Lives and Social Welfare," in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, ed. Emily A. Hanawalt, Carter Lindberg (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University, 1994), pp. 105-122; Michel Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VI^{e} au XI^{e} siècle: propriété et exploitation du sol* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1992); Marie-France Auzepy, *L'Hagiographie et l'Iconoclasme byzantin. Le cas de la Vie d'Étienne le Jeune* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999). For the implementation of these theories in the analysis of Muslim hagiographical sources see Cornell, *Realm of the Saint*. See especially the Introduction for a general review of the theories on sainthood and its social implications.

I assumed that these two different groups of hagiographical sources may serve as witnesses to the transformation of Byzantine identity by providing their own perspectives. For example, the antagonist in a *martyrion* could be the protagonist of a *menakıbname*. At the same time, if the dervishes played a major role in the conversion of non-Muslims in the former Byzantine lands, then it is more likely to find the

---

[32] As selected literature on the issue, see Speros Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California, 1971), pp. 343-62; Demetrios J. Constantelos, " The Neomartyrs as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 23/3-4 (1978), pp. 231-234; E.M. Walsh, "The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites' Neon Martyrologion," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol.36/1 (1991), pp. 71-91; Tijana Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam: The Dialogue of Texts and Practices in Early Modern Balkans* (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2004), pp. 245-303.

[33] Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir Iskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), pp. 235-259; Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*; idem., "The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamisation from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century: The Book in the Light of Subsequent Scholarship, 1971-98," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999*, ed. Antony Eastmond (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2001), pp.1-15; idem. "Religious Changes and Patterns in the Balkans, 14th-16th Centuries," in *Byzantina kai Metabyzantina. Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks and Ottomans* (Malibu: Undena,1981); Frederick William Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, ed. Margaret M. Hasluck, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929); Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Bazı Menakıbnamelere göre XIII. ve XV. Yüzyıllardaki Ihtidalarda Heterodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü," *Journal of Ottoman Studies* 2 (1981), pp. 31-42; Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam.*

Byzantine subjects in the *menakıbnames*, which narrate the deeds and lives of the dervishes.

On the other hand, I do not analyze the *martyria* and the *menakıbnames*, solely looking for information on the transformation of the religious component of the Byzantine identity, that is conversion, but I also seek insights into the transformation of all components of this identity: political, territorial and cultural. While examining these sources, the following questions will be posed: Who were the authors of the *martyria*? Were they from the same society and social group to which the martyrs belonged? Why did these authors write these texts? In what ways did the ex-Byzantine subjects feel threatened? Was it only the threat of conversion or were there other factors? Who threatened them? Whom did they view as the "other"? Were they dervishes who are thought to have led some kind of missionary activity to convert the non-Muslims or were they some other groups? In what kind of social spaces did the martyrs feel more vulnerable in terms of defending their identity? What kind of terminology is used to identify "self" and "other"? Can one perceive any difference between Byzantine identity as defined in the *martyria* and Byzantine identity of the earlier periods? Are there any differences in terms of threats to the "self" under Turco-Muslim rule and under Latin rule?

Who were the authors of the *menakıbnames* and what was the message that they wanted to transmit to their readers or audience? Who was the audience? Who is the protagonist in the *menakıbnames*? How is he defined? To what type of social group did he belong in Turco-Muslim society? Who is the "other" in the *menakıbnames*? Are they the non-Muslims whom the dervishes aimed at converting? How is it possible to find the ex-Byzantine subjects in the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources? What kind of terminology is used to identify them? Is this terminology similar to that used in the *martyria*? To which social groups did these ex-Byzantine subjects belong in the *menakıbnames*? In what kinds of social spaces did these ex-Byzantine subjects interact with the groups which were defined as the "other" in the *martyria*? Do these social spaces show similarities in the *martyria* and the *menakıbnames*?

Outline of the Dissertation

The first chapter introduces and presents the major sources of the study, *martyria*, *menakıbnames* and Turco-Muslim heroic epics. *Martyria* and *menakıbnames* are hagiographical sources but they are the products of different traditions and cultures. At the same time, their analysis has been done within the tradition of different historiographical approaches. Although the chapter may seem mostly descriptive, I find it necessary to present these different types of hagiographical sources and certain related terminology which may help the reader to understand the different context and traditions in which they were written.

The second chapter entitled " 'Neo-martyrs' message" revisited: *Martyria* as a means of reaffirming Byzantine Universalism," is on the authors of the *martyria*. By analyzing the authors and the possible reasons behind the production of these texts, I revisit Elizabeth Zachariadou's views on the "neo-martyrs' message" expressed in her article published in 1991.[34] In this chapter, I recategorize the *martyria* according to the social group to which the authors belonged. Hence I show the existence of three groups: High level administrators of Andronikos II, hesychast authors, and individual authors. It will be argued that in each group the authors' choices of a particular martyr, location of martyrdom and cause of martyrdom were closely related with the ideology of the group to which the author belonged.

Once the social group to which the authors belonged in the Byzantine society and the reasons behind the production of these texts have been established, in Chapter Three I aim to give a profile of the martyrs as the representatives of the "Byzantines." The chapter tries to problematize and historicize Byzantine identity. The terminology used for the identification of "self and the "other", the social typology of the martyrs, the social space in which they encountered the "Other" and the threats that they perceived through this encounter will be examined. The analysis of the Byzantine *martyria* in Chapter Two aims to show whose perception of identity we are dealing with, while the analysis in Chapter Three points out certain definitions and components of this identity as well as the social spaces where threats to this identity were perceived.

Chapter Four is on the identification of "self and "other" in the *menakıbnames* and heroic epics. It aims to show that terms of religious identity, like Muslim or *kafir* (infidel), or ethnic and cultural identifications, like Rum or *Rumi,* were not clear cut and exclusively defined. In this chapter three issues are examined. The first one is the thesis about proselytizing dervishes as the primary agents of conversion, for which the *menakıbnames* have been utilized as the primary references in the attribution of the role of the dervishes in the transformation of religious identity. Then I offer a re-reading of the *menakıbnames* and the heroic epics in order to find out a pattern of conversion visible in the areas where the dervishes were active. The *menakıbnames* and the Turco-Muslim heroic epics are categorized in this section in accordance with the environment in which the activities of the dervish took place, in a rural, urban or frontier environment. The possible reasons behind the absence or existence of non-Muslims and conversion narratives in certain *menakıbnames* and heroic epics are discussed.

---

[34] Elizabeth Zachariadou, " The Neomartyr's Message, " *Bulletin of the Center for Asia Minor Studies*, Vol.8 (Athens, 1990-91), pp. 51-63.

Once the places of interaction between the Muslims and non-Muslims are established, in the third section of the chapter, I discuss the religious markers of "self" and "other". The terms utilized to define the "self", such as Muslim and *gazi,* and the "other", such as *kafir,* will be discussed. Finally in the fourth section of the chapter, the ethnic and cultural components of identity as they are reflected in these narratives are examined. The emphasis is on the terms Turk, Rum and *Rumi*. This section tries to present how the Rum identification, which included all the components of the Roman (Byzantine) identity in the fourteenth century and which usually signified Greek-speaking Christians, began to signify in the fifteenth century Turkish-speaking Muslim inhabitants of the former Byzantine lands.

CHAPTER 2:

SOURCES

Although the Palaiologan period is extremely rich in terms of hagiographical sources, no hagiographical database is available for this period.[1] There are few articles and the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeaca* to serve the student of the subject to start the research, but it is an extremely time consuming and difficult task to gather information on all the available manuscripts and texts concerning the saints and martyr saints of the period. There are also very few critical analyses of the texts and their interpretation within the historical context.

Although most of the *martyria* analyzed in this thesis have been published, few studies examine the saint dossier of each martyr in terms of its text, author and historical context, which would provide a firm basis for the historians to use these sources.[2] Since some of the martyrs were also venerated in Slavic countries, there are Slavonic texts, translated either from a Greek original or written originally in Slavonic. On the other hand, the Slavonic and the Greek texts have not been studied together to find out their relations in terms of manuscript traditions and provide a critical edition including the texts in Greek and in Slavonic.

---

[1] For the earlier periods see the Dumbarton Oaks hagiography database. http://www.doaks.org/document/hagiointro.pdf. I learned that Ms. Elenora Kountoura from the Greek National Research Center is working on a project to form a database of Palaiologan hagiography.

Another difficulty posed by the *martyria* of the Palaiologan period is the confusing terminology especially in terms of the saints martyred under Turco-Muslim rule. The tendency is to call them neo-martyrs. In this chapter I aim to clarify the confusing terminology used for these martyrs and to provide a basic saint dossier for each martyr. In these dossiers, only the Greek texts are considered. The dossiers are listed in chronological order with respect to the date of the martyrdom. In the saint's dossier, the date of the martyrdom, the date of the composition of the *martyrion*, the author, the commemoration date of the saint, the cult of the martyr, the historical context of the martyrdom and of the composition of the text are presented. For some martyrs, I also suggested new martyrdom and composition dates with relevant arguments. I also gave the dossiers of three martyrs who fall outside the chronological limits of this study either for comparative reasons or because they are very frequently cited martyrs.

The second section is on the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources and heroic epics. In terms of the *menakıbname*s, although some of the scholars studying Turco-Muslim Asia Minor used them as historical sources,[3] most of the time they have been considered as sources having little

---

[2] Nicolas Oikonomides, " 'Ακολουθία τοῦ 'Αγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," *Neon Athenaion* 1 (Athens, 1965), pp. 205-221.

[3] Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La conquete d'Andrinople par les Turcs: La penetration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomans," *TM* 1 (1965), pp. 439-461; Claude Cahen, " Baba Ishaq, Baba Ilyas, Hadjdji Bektach et quelques autres," *Turcica* 1 (1970), pp. 53-64; Speros Vryonis, "The Family in 13th-14th Century Anatolia as Reflected in the Writings of the Mawlawi Dervis Eflaki," in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389)*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University, 1993), pp. 213-223; idem., "The Political World of the Mevlevi Dervish Order in Asia Minor (13th-14th Century) as Reflected in the Mystical Writings of Eflaki," in *Philhellen: Studies in Honour of Robert Browning* (Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e post-bizantini di Venezia, 1996), pp. 411-419;

historical value. Today, especially the Ottomanists show a growing interest in the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources in historical inquiry.[4] Yet, these texts have not been analyzed in terms of manuscript traditions and in terms of delineating the different layers pointing to the additions and amendments done in different periods. A satisfactory philological study of these *menakıbnames* and heroic epics, which considers all the available manuscripts, determines the relations of the manuscripts and identifies the composition date, is still needed. Such an analysis cannot be accomplished by this study. A team work of philologists, anthropologists and historians is needed to delineate the paths and mechanisms of transmission as well as the motifs, strategies, concepts, cosmology, geographic consciousness, topographies of legendary sites and the interface between the oral and the literal elements.

In the dissertation, the published editions of the manuscripts are utilized. Whenever it is available, I give the production date of the edited manuscripts. This will be done in the second section of this chapter. In this section, I will also give the meaning of *veli* (saint) and of *menakıbname* to be able to show the difference between the conceptions of a saint in Islam and in Christianity. I will also briefly mention the importance of orality in the

---

Halil Inalcik, " Dervish and Sultan: an Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilayetnamesi," in idem, *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1993), pp. 19-36.

[4] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*; Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam*; Zeynep Yürekli Görkay, *Legend and Architecture in the Ottoman Empire: The Shrines of Seyyid Gazi and Hacı Bektaş* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2005); Nicholas Trépanier, *Food as a Window into Daily Life in Fourteenth Century Central Anatolia* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2008).

transmission and communication of these stories, which also makes them different from the *martyria*. The *menakıbnames* will then be examined in chronological order in accordance with the death date of the saints. For the saints and heros for whom we do not have much historical information, the century in which he lived was considered. In addition, in each section, brief information on the saint, on his cult and on the author and on the reasons behind the production of the text will be given.

Martyr, Neo-Martyr, *Martyria*

In Christian teaching, the saint is a person venerated as an heroic example of Christian life. Such a person was, at the beginning of Christianity, the martyr.[5] Etymologically, a martyr is a witness to the Christian faith. But the term designates a saint who heroically confesses his or her faith before the persecutors and sacrifices his or her life for the Christian faith. The martyr rejecting all compromise and dying for his faith is considered to have produced the Passion of Christ through his suffering and death and have ultimately escaped the human condition. His body is transfigured. Visions and wonders are produced. The Christian community, standing firm with the martyr, looking on during his torment, collecting his body after death, celebrating his memory by visiting his tomb revitalizes the Church and reinforces its cohesiveness.[6]

---

[5] The social profile of saints in Byzantine Christianity changed within the centuries. While between the fourth and the seventh centuries the ascetic-desert fathers, prostitutes and women in disguise, wild holy fools were saints par excellence, between the ninth and the eleventh centuries they were the founders of local churches and monasteries, ideal matrons; from the thirteenth century onwards people having played important roles in political and ecclesiastical struggles were considered as saints.

Alongside the numerous oriental and occidental martyrs of the first centuries of Christendom, new martyrs were added to the Orthodox Church calendar during the Arab invasions, Iconoclastic period, during the wars with Bulgarians and lastly during the Turkish invasions. Apart from the martyrs who died for their faith, there was also bloodless martyrdom where the person endured difficulties and torture but did not die. These saints are called *homologetes*, confessors.[7]

One also comes across another term, neo-martyr, in the Byzantine sources and modern secondary literature. Who is the neo-martyr? In Modern Greek dictionaries, the neo-martyr is a person who died for the Orthodox Christian faith as a result of refusing to convert to Islam.[8] Or he/she is a martyr of the Orthodox Church during the Turkish occupation.[9] In fact, today in the Balkan countries which had been under Ottoman rule and where the population is in majority Orthodox Christian such as Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia, neo-martyr is a generic term signifying an Orthodox Christian martyred during the period of Ottoman rule as a result of not accepting to convert to Islam.[10]

---

[6] *ODB*, vol. 2, s.v. "Martyrs"; Bernard Flusin, " Martyrs," in *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G.W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, Oleg Grabar (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2000), pp. 567-8; Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1933); François Halkin, *Martyrs grecs II^{e}-VIII^{e} siècle* (London: Variorum, 1974); Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints.Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981).

[7] Confessor is an honorific title designating primarily those who, during the persecutions of the the third and the fourth centuries, proclaimed themselves Christians. The difference between a confessor and a martyr was still vague in the third century. The term is also applied to some ardent defenders of Orthodoxy who suffered exile or imprisonment, but not death, for their beliefs. *ODB*, vol.1, s.v. "Confessor". In the Patristic Dictionary, the *homologetes* is defined as the one who confesses his faith under persecution, under sentence of death, suffering mutilations and forced labor. Hence they are associated with martyrs and apostles. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G.W.H. Lampe (Oxford, 1968), p. 957. In the texts on the martyrdoms of the XIII monks of Cyprus and of Anthimos, the archbishop of Athens, the word new confessor, *neon homologetes*, is used for the Orthodox Christians who suffered imprisonement under Latin rule and died afterwards.

[8] D. Demetrakos, *Μέγα Λεξικόν ὀλῆς τῆς 'Ελλενικής Γλωσσής*, vol.10 (Athens, 1964), p. 4874.

The meaning of the term "neo-martyr" however, was quite different in Byzantine times. When we look in the *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, the term neo-martyr is defined as a recent martyr.[11] Similarly, in the hagiographical texts on the martyrs during the Arab invasions and during the Iconoclastic period, the term neo-martyr instead of martyr is used in some texts to designate the recent martyrdom of the persons with regard to the first martyrs of Christianity.[12] In the hagiographical texts of our concern, that is the texts concerning the martyrdoms between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries, the term "neo-martyr" is utilized not as a generic term for the martyrs martyred under Turco-Muslim rule but as a term designating the recentness of their martyrdoms with respect to the martyrs of early Christianity.

---

[9] G.Ph. Galanis, H. Tonnet, *Dictionnaire grec-français* (Athens, 2000), p. 666.

[10] For its usage in Bulgaria, see Rozitsa Gradeva, *Rumeli under the Ottomans, 15th-18th Centuries: Institutions and Communities* (Istanbul: ISIS, 2004), pp.201-209. For some neomartyr cults in Serbia, see Machiel Kiel, *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1985) pp. 319-328.

[11] G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 904.

[12] For the Greek texts on some of the martyrdoms during the Arab invasions, the Iconoclastic period and the Byzantine wars with Bulgaria, see Dumbarton Oaks hagiography database online, http:/www.doaks.org/saints2. Some of these martyrs are LX Martyrs of Jerusalem (d. 717) *BHG* 1217; Stephen the Younger (d. 767) *BHG* 1666; Andrew in Tribunal (d. 767) *BHG* 111; Paul of Kaioumas (d. 775) *BHG* 1471; Stephen the Sabaite (d. 778) *BHG* 1670 ; Elias of Heliopolis (d. 795) *BHG* 578, 579; Martyrs in Bulgaria (d. 811) *BHG* 2263; XLII Martyrs of Amorion (d. 845) *BHG* 1213, 1214. In the hagiographical texts on these martyrs, νέο μαρτὺς is used in the texts on the martyrdoms of the LX Martyrs of Jerusalem, Elias of Heliopolis and Andrew in Tribunal. In the text concerning the XL Martyrs of Amorion written by Michael (*BHG* 1231), ʹνεοφανεῖς ʹαθλοφοροι, recently appeared victorius ones (martyrs) are used for the forty martyrs, p. 29.13 and p. 36. For the confessors, the term νέος ʽομολόγετος is used in a similar fashion. See Theophilos the Confessor (d. 750).

The evolution of the meaning of the term "neo-martyr" from a "recent martyr" to an "Orthodox Christian martyred under the Ottoman rule" is due to the great influence of the *Neon Martyrologion*, an eighteenth-century compilation of martyrdoms under Ottoman rule written by Nikodemos the Hagiorite, an Athonite monk (1749-1809).[13] Nikodemos gathered about 83 passions on the martyrs who had been martyred under Ottoman rule between 1492 and 1794 and identified them as the neo-martyrs of the Anatolian Church.[14] The *Neon Martyrologion*, which was published first in 1794 in Venice, became a standard source on these martyrs and played a major role in their appellation as neo-martyrs.[15]

---

[13] In his article Tzedopoulos shows how important the work of Nikodemos the Hagiorite in the conception of the Greek national martyrs in the 19th century. Georgos Tzedopoulos, " 'Εθνικὴ Ὁμολογία καὶ Συμβολικὴ στὴν 'Ελλάδα τοῦ 19ου Αἰώνα. Οἱ 'Εθνομάρτυρες" *Mnemon* 24 (2002), p. 109, note 6.

[14] *Νέον Μαρτυρολόγιον. Ἤτοι Μαρτυρὶα τῶν Νεοφανῶν Μαρτυρῶν τῶν μετά 'τήν ''αλωσίν τῆς Κωνσταντίνουπόλεως κατά διαφόρους καιροὺς καὶ τόπους μαρτυρησάντων*, ed. P.B. Paschos (Athens, 1961), pp. 9-25. Paschos' edition is the third edition of the *Neon Martyrologion*. The second edition was published in Athens in 1856. In the second edition some other neo-martyrs were added. While the neomartyrs, who had been martyred between 1492 and 1794 were included in the first edition, the ones after 1794 until 1838 were added in the second edition. ibid. p. 5. The third edition is similar to the second one.

[15] There exists another seventeenth-century collection of *martyria* by Ioannes Karyofylles (d. 1692), a high ranking official in the Patriarchate in Istanbul. Although Nikodemos cites this collection as one of his sources, the collection of Karyofylles did not seem to enjoy the popularity of that of Nikodemos. Marinos Sariyannis, " Aspects of Neomartyrdom : Religious Contacts, Blasphemy and Calumny in the 17th century Istanbul," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005/6), pp. 249-62.

After the publication of the compilation of Nikodemos, many *Neo-martyriologia* were published, especially after the Greek independence war of 1821.[16] This collection of Nikodemos offered an example and vocabulary for the narratives of national martyrs during the Greek independence war of 1821 and later during the Balkan wars and the formation of the *megale idea.*[17] The neo-martyr as a symbol of opposition and liberation seems to have played a similar role during the formation of the Bulgarian nation-state. For example the neo-martyrs from Sofia known as Georgi Novi and St. Nikolay of Sofia who were martyred in sixteenth century Sofia were considered as Bulgarian national saints during the formation of the Bulgarian nation-state.[18] The neomartydom phenomenon has received a great deal of attention in the historiographies of the Balkan states and featured prominently in the history of the Orthodox Church.[19]

---

[16] *Νέον Λειμωνάριον* (Venice, 1819); K. CH. Doukakis then inserted these *martyria* in a 12 volumes Μέγας Συναξαριστῆς πάντων τῶν ῾αγίων (Athens, 1889-96); Many augmented *Neon Martyrologia* have been published since then. Some of them are J.M. Perantones, *Λεξικὸν νεομαρτύρων* (Athens, 1972). This work is published for the 150th anniversary of the independence of Greece. In a recent publication on neo-martyrs, Vaporis tells in the introduction, his main source for the preparation of his compilation is J.M. Perantones's Λεξικὸν νεομαρτύρων. Nomikos Michael Vaporis, *Witness for Christ. Orthodox Christian Neomartyrs of the Ottoman Period (1437-1860)* (Crestwood: Saint Vladimir's Seminary, 2000). In those collections, martyrdoms in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries are more numerous than the ones in Nikodemos's compilation. Most of the martyrs are simple folk of the Ottoman society. The main issue in those passions is conversion and apostasy. The agenda of Nikodemos did not only have a salutary plan but also a social one. It aimed at ethnically molding the Orthodox Christian flock, by showing that between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries different individuals of the Orthodox Community witnessed similar experiences under Ottoman rule. Nikodemos was a pioneer in the process of the creation of a collected memory for the reconstitution of an imagined community. For chronological, geographical and thematic distribution see Constantelos, " The Neomartyrs as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire." For the importance of Nikodemos as a pioneer in the creation of symbols and vocabulary of an imagined community see Tzedopoulos, "Οἱ ’Εθνομάρτυρες", pp. 111-116. I am indebted to Vangelis Kechriotes who pointed to me the articles and books concerning the formation of Greek national identity and especially the article of Tzedopoulos.

[17] Tzedopoulos, "Οἱ ’Εθνομάρτυρες," pp. 111-116.

[18] For their significance in the formation of the Bulgarian nation state and their importance in the Serbian Church see Kiel, *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period*, pp. 324.

In this thesis, the martyrs of the Byzantine period, who were martyred under Turco-Muslim rule, are not named as neo-martyrs, because the authors of the Byzantine *martyria* of the period between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries did not utilize the term neo-martyr in the same sense as it is used today. Defining all martyrs under Turco-Muslim rule since the eleventh century as neo-martyrs leads to an ahistorical assumption that all the Turco-Muslim political entities, societies, institutions and their relations with the Orthodox Christians since the eleventh century were the same. Another problem is that there were other martyrdom cases between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries which did not take place under Turco-

---

Georgi Novi or Georgi Sofijski is called Georgi Kratovski by the Serbians. His pictures are depicted in many of the post-Byzantine churches of Serbia.

[19] These studies analyse the neo-martyrs and the hagiographical sources on them as a corpus reflecting the sufferings of the Orthodox Christians under *Tourkokratia*. The studies on the subject mostly provide listings of the neo-martyrs and their chronological, geographic and thematic distribution and categorization. Hippolyte Delehaye, "Greek Neo-Martyrs," *Subsidia Hagiographica* 42 (1966), pp. 246-55; Constantelos, " The Neomartyrs as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire"; Walsh, " The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites' Neon Martyrologion"; Vaporis, in *Witness for Christ. Orthodox Christian Neomartyrs of the Ottoman Period*; Recently, the article of Elizabeth Zachariadou initiated a new approach to neo-martyrs, analyzing them not as a corpus in itself out of historical context, as it has been usually done, but in a comparative manner by looking at the martyrs under Ottoman rule with those of under Latin rule during the same period initiated. Elizabeth Zachariadou, " The Neomartyr's Message, " *Bulletin of the Center for Asia Minor Studies*, Vol.8 (Athens, 1990-91), pp. 51-63. For the recent more analytic studies following Zachariadou's example see the articles of Eleni Gara, Phokion P. Kotzageorgis and Marinos Sariyannis in *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005/2006) and the book of Rozitsa Gradeva mentioned in the note 34. See also Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam: The Dialogue of Texts and Practices in Early Ottoman Balkans*, pp. 245-303. In spite of this new approach and many inspiring studies done on the subject, a thorough philological study and a critical edition of the neo-*martyria,* which would allow the historians to study each case within its historical, social and ideological context, are absent. At the same time some studies base their interpretations on the secondary literature. For example, Krstic who consacrated a chapter on the neo-martyrs in her dissertation, apart from few Slavonic manuscripts, utilized mainly the book of Vaporis, which is a collection of neomartyrdom stories mostly based on M. Perantones collection.

Muslim rule but under Latin or some other rule. By naming the martyrs under Turco-Muslim rule since the eleventh century as neo-martyrs and other Orthodox martyrs of the same period as martyrs leads one to categorize them separately and hence to miss certain points about late Byzantine society, state and ideology, which can be grasped only when they are analyzed in totality.

The martyrdom stories in which the author narrates the questioning of the martyrs by authorities, their torturing and finally their executions are called *martyria* (sing. *martyrion*) in Greek and *passio* in Latin.[20] In the first centuries of Christendom, *martyria* were written to venerate the martyrs and confessors and to create a template for an ideal Christian behavior as well as to document the event. These stories were in the form of a letter from the Christian community reporting the saint's execution or in the form of official court records.[21] Later *martyria* acquired the form of a drama with a liturgical purpose.

For the period between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries, there exist fourteen martyrdom cases. Most of these are listed in *BHG*. Although brief information on the saint's dossier for each of the fourteen saints is given in this chapter, not all of them will be included in the detailed analysis of the further chapters. If there was a vast separation between the date of the martyrdom and the date of the composition of the text on this martyrdom and if there is no possible recession to an earlier text, then the *martyrion* of the martyr is not included in the analysis. The Slavonic texts and copies are also not included in the analysis.

---

[20] *Martyrion*, a type of hagiography, is a modern term for a genre of Byzantine literature. The other major types are: *Vita*, a saint's biography; *Apophthegmata Patrum*, a collection of wise sayings of hermits; and *Miracula*, description of post-humous miracles. There are also stories on the relics and their transfers. Apart from individual saint's lives, there are collections such as *synaxarion*, either a Church calendar of fixed feasts or a specific hagiographical collection of brief historical notices; *menologion*, a collection of *vitae* arranged according to the date of each saint's celebration in the Church calendar; and liturgical *typika*. For a useful bibliography on hagiography and hagiographical sources of the Iconoclast Era see, Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca.680-850). The Sources* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 204-206.

[21] Delehaye, *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*; Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

Theodore Gabras (BHG 1745) (d. 1098)

(Duke of Trebizond martyred in Paipert-Theodosiopolis (Bayburt-Erzurum) by a Turkish Emir. Commemoration date today, October 2)[22]

Theodore Gabras is a historical figure known to us from the Byzantine sources. The Gabras family was an important family, whose members served as independent rulers of Trebizond and bureaucrats in the service of Byzantine emperors and Seljuk sultans. The contemporary of Theodore Gabras, Anna Komnena, gives information on him but does not mention his martyrdom.[23] He was appointed as the duke of Trebizond by the Byzantine Emperor Alexios Komnenos (r. 1081-1118) no later than 1067. He defended the city of Trebizond against the Turks in 1075.

---

[22] Doukakis, *Μέγας Συναξαριστής οκτόβριον*, p. 25; Sophroniou Eustratiadou, *῾Αγιολόγιον τῆς ὀρθόδοξου ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, n.d.), p.187.

[23] Anne Comnène, *Alexiade (Régne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène 1081-1118)*, ed. Bernard Leib, vol.1 (Paris : Les Belles Lettres, 1967), p. 151 ; Ibid., vol. 3 (Paris, 1945), pp. 29-30.

The saint dossier of Theodore Gabras has been studied in detail by Anthony Bryer, Archibald Dunn and John W. Nesbitt.[24] Theodore was first identified as a martyr in the twelfth century by Zonaras.[25] His reliquary skull was brought to Trebizond by Konstantine Gabras, the duke of Trebizond in 1119-20.[26] In the fourteenth century, his cult seemed to be venerated in Trebizond as we understand from the chrysobulls for the Venetian quarter dating from 1364 and 1367.[27] Theodore Gabras is mentioned in the Turkish warrior epic *Danişmendname*, an epic composed in the fourteenth century narrating the deeds of the twelfth-century Turkish emir Melik Danişmend.[28]

In 1884 Papadopoulos-Kerameus saw a Trapezuntine manuscript with a *synaxarion* on St.Theodore Gabras, which he described and published in part in 1906, proposing that it was a copy of a much older presumably Byzantine text.[29] The prime manuscript containing the *synaxarion* (*bios* and

---

[24] Anthony Bryer, Archibald Dunn, John W. Nesbitt, "Theodore Gabras, Duke of Chaldia (1098) and the Gabrades: Portraits, Sites and Seals," *Byzantium State and Society. In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, ed. Anna Avramea, Angeliki Laiou, Euangelos Chrysos (Athens: Ethniko Hidryma Ereunon, 2003), pp. 51-71. For the members of the Gabras family in the service of the Seljuk sultans see, Claude Cahen, " Une famille byzantine au service des sultans seldjoukides d'Asie Mineure, " in *Polychronion*, pp. 145-9; Balivet, *Romanie Byzantine et pays de Rum Turc*. Other literature on Gabras family see *ODB*, vol. 2, s.v. "Gabras,"; Anthony Bryer, "A Byzantine Family: the Gabrades," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1970), pp. 164-87; Nicolas Oikonomides, "Les Danishmendids entre Byzance, Bagdad et le Sultanat d'Iconium," *Revue Numismatique* 25 (1983), pp. 189-207.

[25] Ioannes Zonaras, *Epitomae Historiarum*, ed. T. Büttner-Wobst (Bonn, 1897), vol. 3, p. 739.

[26] Bryer, Dunn, Nesbitt, "Theodore Gabras, Duke of Chaldia (1098)", pp. 55.

[27] Anthony Bryer and David Windfield, *The Byzantine Monuments and the Topography of Pontos*, vol. 1(Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1985), p. 237.

[28] For *Danişmendname* see the article further down in this chapter and in chapter four.

[29] A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, " Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν Τραπεζοῦντος, "

akolouthia) of St.Theodore Gabras has not survived. According to the surviving text, Theodore Gabras was martyred near Paipert-Theodosiopolis (modern Bayburt-Erzurum) by a Turkish emir called Amirulis. As the only surviving text is the one edited by Papadopoulos-Kerameus from an eighteenth-century manuscript, this martyrdom will not be considered in this study.

XIII Martyrs of Cyprus (BHG 1198, 1198a, 1198b) (d. 1231).

(Orthodox monks martyred in Leukosia-Cyprus under Latin rule.
Commemoration date today, May 19.[30])

There are five manuscripts on the thirteen monks of Cyprus. The first one (BHG 1198) is found in the Codex Marcianus gr 575, ff. 354v-361v (fifteenth century)[31] and edited by C. Sathas.[32] This manuscript was written in August 9, 1426 with the approval of the hieromonk Bartholomaios of

---

Vizvrem 12 (1906), pp. 132-138.

[30] In the *Synaxarion* of Doukakis and in the *Agiologion* of Eustratiadou, these martyrs are mentioned. The monks are celebrated not as XIII martyrs of Cyprus but by their names such as Theoctistus of Kantara, Theognostus of Kantara and soforth, in the *Synaxarion* by Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra, *The Synaxarion. The Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church* (Athens : np., 2008). In the Cypriot *menologia,* they are celebrated as thirteen martyrs of Cyprus, on the 19th of May. *Κύπρια Μηναία* (Leukosia : np., 2000), p. 132.

[31] Elpidius Mioni, *Codices Graeci Manuscripti. Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum. Thesaurus Antiquus*, vol. 2 (Rome : Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1985), p. 487.

[32] " Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων τῶν δια πυρὸς τελειωθέντων παρὰ τῶν Λατίνων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Κύπρῳ ἐν τῷ 6739" in Sathas *MB*, vol. 2 (Venice, 1873), pp. rkd v-rke v, 20-39. According to S.G. Mercati the edition of Sathas is a defective edition, which can be improved with the aid of a Ms. Codex Paris.1335, ff. 311-320. Silvio G. Mercati, "Macaire Calorités et Constantin Anagnostès," *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, vol. 2 (1920-21), p. 167. Silvio G. Mercati on the other hand gives a wrong codex number for the manuscript whih Sathas had used. He gave Codex Marcianus graecus 475 for the manuscript but it should be Codex Marcianus graecus 575.

Skaranos.[33] The second manuscript (BHG 1198a) is an untitled *apologia* found in the Codex Vatican 1409 f. 239rv. The third one (BHG 1198b) is an unpublished brief *passio (martyrion)* in an epitome in Codex Vatican 1409 f. 239v. The fourth manuscript, which is not indicated in BHG, is Vat. Pal. gr. 367, ff. 178-179v (thirteenth-fifteenth centuries).[34] In this manuscript, there are two poems written by Makarios Kalorites in prison. Kalorites might have been one of the thirteen monks who were martyred. On the same manuscript f. 178, there is a commemoration of the martyrs.[35] A fifth manuscript is found in the fourteenth-century Codex Paris.1335, ff. 311-320, which includes a list of Cypriot Orthodox Episcopal sees and an account of the martyrdom of the thirteen Kantariotissa monks. This manuscript is not mentioned in *BHG*.[36] There are also documents related to the martyrdom of the thirteen monks in the Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia in the record of Church Legislation known as *Synodicum Nicosiense* (1196-1373)[37] and in the letters of Patriarch Germanos II (January 1223-June 1240), of Pope Gregory IX (March 19,1227-August 22, 1241), of

---

[33] *PLP* 26033.

[34] *Codices Manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1885), p. 235.

[35] Mercati, "Macaire Calorités et Constantin Anagnotès," p. 171.

[36] Catia Galatariotou, *The Making of a Saint. The Life, Times and Sanctification of Neophytos the Recluse* (New York: Cambridge University, 2004), p. 24, note 91. Neophytos the Recluse must not be confused with Neophytos, the Archbishop of Cyprus.

[37] Angel-Nicolaou Konnare and Chris Schabel, *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374* (Leiden : Brill, 2005), pp. 196-197, notes 82-85.

Neophytos[38], Archbishop of Cyprus (1222-1251), of Eustorge de Montaigu (1217-1250), the Latin Archbishop of Cyprus.[39] For this study, I used the *martyrion* which was published by Sathas (BHG 1198).

Niketas The Younger (BHG 2302, 2303) (d. 1282).

(Reader at the Orthodox Church in Ankara and merchant. Martyred under the Seljuk Sultan Masud II in Nyssa-Cappadocia. Commemoration date, December 17.[40])

There are three manuscripts of the *martyrion* on Niketas the Younger. The first one is a *logos* written by Theodore Mouzalon (d. 1294) and the second one is an abridged version of the first one. The *logos* found in Athon Lavra 456, Δ 80, ff. 324r-337 (thirteenth century) (BHG 2302), has been edited by François Halkin.[41] In a seventeenth-century manuscript (Athon Lavra 1965, Ω 153, ff. 27r-39), there is short version of the logos.[42] There is also another abridged version, which was probably written by a certain

---

[38] Vitalien Laurent, " La succession épiscopale des derniers archevêques grecs de Chypre. De Jean le Crétois (1152) à Germain Pèsimandros (1260), " *REB* 7 (1949), p. 38.

[39] *Sathas MB*, pp. 39-46. For this letter, also see *RegPatr*, vol.1, Fasc.IV, n.1256 (Paris, 1971), p. 62. The response of the Pope, in *Sathas MB*, pp. 46-49. For the letter of Eustorge to Pope Gregory IX see, Nikolaos Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195-1312* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), p. 282.

[40] Doukakis, *Μεγάς συναξαριστὴς δεκεμβρίον*, p. 421; Eustradiates, *Ἁγιολόγιον*, p. 351.

[41] François Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon. BHG 2302," *Hagiographica inedita decem*, Corpus Christianorum 21 (Turnhout : Brespols, 1989), pp. 127-154.

[42] Sofronios Eustratiades, *Συμβλερωμα αγιορειτικον καταλογον Βατοπεδιου και Λαυρας* (Paris : l'Ermitage, 1930), p. 57.

Pachomios (BHG 303). [43] There are three other copies of the abridged version. One of them is in Ambrosienne of Milan 290 (E.64 Sup.), ff. 219v-220v (fifteenth century) and it was edited by H. Delehaye.[44] The other is in Codex 51 of Dousikos monastery, ff. 19-22v.[45] And the last one is in Codex Ven.Marc.II 103 (Nan.125) (sixteenth century), ff. 245-47. I will be analyzing the two edited versions.

The text on the martyrdom of Niketas does not provide a precise date for the martyrdom of Niketas the Younger, but it gives useful information such as the names of the reigning Byzantine emperor and of the Seljuk sultan, and we also know that Theodore Mouzalon is the author of the text.[46] In *BHG* the death of Niketas was noted as post 1282.[47]

---

[43] According to Hippolyte Delehaye, the name Pachome is inscribed before the title on the manuscript of Ambrosienne of Milan. Hence the name Pachome might indicate the author. Again according to Delehaye, this Pachome can be Pachomios Rousanos who had written many dogmatic treaties. Hippolyte Delehaye, " Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le jeune, " *Mélanges offerts à M.G. Schlumberger*, ed. Adrien Blanchet and Gabriel Millet, vol. 1 (Paris : P. Geuthner, 1924), p. 207.

[44] Delehaye, " Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le jeune, " pp. 208-211.

[45] Ph.A. Demetrakopoulos, *B Z* 72, n. 2 (1979), pp. 90-91.

In fact the information given in the text may help us to date the event more precisely. We know from the text that the event took place when Andronikos II, who reigned between 1282-1328, was the Byzantine Emperor and Masud II was the on Seljuk throne. This Masud must be Sultan Gıyasseddin Masud II, who reigned between 1282 and 1296 and for a second term between 1302 and 1308.[48] Therefore the event must have taken place between 1282-1308. Theodore Mouzalon, the author of the text, died in 1294.[49] The *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the text is then 1294.

---

[46] On a fifteenth-century manuscript on the martyrdom of Niketas, Theodore Mouzalon's name is mentioned as the author of the text. See Delehaye, " Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le Jeune, " p. 207; A. Martini and D. Bassi, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (New York: G. Holms, 1978), vol.1, p. 323; Vitalien Laurent, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (1928) vol.10, pp. 2581-2584. Theodore Mouzalon was the *megas logothete*, *mesazon* and later *protovestiarios* of the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II. *Mesazon* was the head of the private office of the emperor. On *mesazon* see, Jean Verpeaux, " Contribution à l'étude de l'administration byzantine, " *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955) pp. 272, 276, 281f. Also *ODB*, vol. 2, s.v. "Mesazon". Under the Palaiologan dynasty, the *megas logothetes* was the head of diplomacy and foreign affairs and can be considered as a veritable prime minister. On *megas logothetes* see, Rodolphe Guilland, " Les Logothètes. Études sur l'histoire administrative de l'Empire byzantin," *REB* 29 (1971), pp. 100-110. *Protovestiarios* was the keeper of the emperor's wardrobe. In the fourteenth century, it was one of the highest Byzantine titles. *ODB*, vol. 3, s.v. " Protovestiarios"; Rodolphe Guilland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1967), pp. 216-36.

[47] The post 1282 is given due to a study cited in footnote 41, which found its datation on a Codex 51 of the monastery of Dousikos in which on ff. 19-22v, there is the *synaxarion* of the Niketas the Younger. *BZ* gives the death as between 1282-1294. 1282 as it is the date of the beginning of the reign of Andronikos II and 1294 as the year of the death of Theodore Mouzalon.

[48] On Masud II see *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfi, Islam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 29, s.v. " Mesud II "; Kerimüddin Mahmud-i Aksarayi, *Müsameretü'l-Ahbar*, tr. M. Öztürk (Ankara, 2000) pp. 53, 104-44, 158, 165-89, 236-243; Osman Turan, *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmi Vesikalar. Metin, Tercüme ve Araştırmalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988) pp. 11-13, 32-33; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 294-303.

[49] *La version brève des Relations historiques de Georges Pachymérès*, ed. Albert Failler, vol. 3, (Paris: Institut français d'études Byzantines, 2004), p. 215.

We also know that the martyrdom took place during the month of Ramadan of the Muslim calendar, which was, according to the text, December of the Byzantine calendar.[50] The conversion table from the Muslim to the Christian calendar indicates that between the years 1282 and 1294, the Ramadan fell in December only in the year 1282.[51] We may then suggest an exact date for the martyrdom, that is December 1282. It must be after December 11, after the death of the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII, the father of Andronikos II.[52]

Michael of Alexandria (BHG 2273)(d. 1311-1325).

(Mamluk soldier martyred in Alexandria. His martyrdom not commemorated.)

The sole existing manuscript on Michael of Alexandria is Vindobonensis Philosophico gr, Vieanna 95, ff. 303r-315r (fourteenth century), which has been published in *Acta Sanctorum*.[53] The author of the text is Theodore Metochites (1270-1332), who served in important positions in the Byzantine state.[54]

---

[50] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon. BHG 2302," p.150.

[51] Faik Reşit Unat, *Hicri Tarihleri Miladi Tarihe çevirme Kılavuzu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994), pp. 46-47.

[52] During the martyrdom, the reigning patriarch was either John XI Bekkos (26 mai 1275-26 December 1282) or Joseph I (31 December 1282-Mar.1283) but I believe that it is more likely to be Joseph I if we keep in mind that Andronikos II's first action as new emperor was to return to Orthodoxy and to depose John XI Bekkos from the post of patriarch, as Bekkos had been supporting the Union of Churches. During the composition of the *martyrion* by Theodore Mouzalon, the patriarch was either Gregory II of Cyprus (28 mar.1283-juin 1289) or Athanasios I (14 october 1289-16 october 1293).

[53] Theodore Metochites, " Oratio de S. Michaele Martyre," *AS*, Nov. IV (1925), pp. 670-78.

The martyrdom of Michael of Alexandria is hard to date. We know that Theodore Metochites wrote the *logos* upon the request of the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II and that the martyrdom took place during a Byzantine embassy to Egypt. From the Byzantine and Arabic sources we know that there were several Byzantine embassies to Egypt during the reign of Andronikos II in 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315/7, 1317/18, 1320/21 and in 1325.[55] Ihor Sevcenko cannot date the text on Michael of Alexandria, but he says that the martyrdom must have taken place long after the beginning of the reign of Andronikos II and that the text must have been written not long after the event of the martyrdom.[56] Sevcenko mentions that the *Logos* on the martyr Michael is the *Logos* 12 of Theodore Metochites and the *Logos* 9 dates to 1303 while the *Logoi* 13 and 14 date posterior to 1316/17 and the *Logos* 15 can be placed between 1328-1330. Therefore the *Logos* on Michael can be placed between 1303-1328. If we then consider the dates of the Byzantine embassies to Egypt, the date of the martyrdom and the composition of the *Logos* can be any embassy between the years 1311 and 1325.

---

[54] Theodore Metochites was also the author of many literary and scientific works and the restorator of the Chora Monastery. On Metochites' career, see JeanVerpeaux, " Le cursus honorum de Théodore Métochite, " *REB* 18 (1960), pp. 195-98. For Methochites's works, see Christianu Godofredus Müller, *Theodorus Metochites. Miscellanea, Philosophica et Historica* (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1966); Ihor Sevcenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussel: Byzantion, 1962), pp. 129-135, 274; idem, "Theodore Metochites, the Chora and the the Intellectual Trends of His Time," in *The Kariye Djami*, ed. Paul A. Underwood, vol. 4 (Princeton: Princeton University, 1975), pp. 17-91; Jeffrey M. Featherstone, *Theodore Metochites's poems "To himself"* (Vienna : Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000); B. Bydén, *Theodore Metochites Stoicheiosis astronomike and the study of natural philosophy in early Palaiologan Byzantium* (Göteborg, 2003); Dimiter Angelov, " Theodore Metochites : statesman, intellectual, poet, and patron of the arts, " in *Restoring Byzantium : the Kariye Camii in Istanbul and the Byzantine Institute restoration*, ed. Holger A. Klein (New York : Colombia University, 2004), pp. 15-22 ; Marina Bazzani, " Theodore Metochites, a Byzantine humanist, " *Byzantion* 76 (2006), pp. 32-52; *Kariye : from Theodore Metochites to Thomas Whittemore : one monument, two monumental personalities*, ed. Holger A. Klein, Robert G. Ousterhout, Brigitte Pitarakis (Istanbul : Pera Müzesi, 2007).

[55] Sevcenko, *Etudes sur la Polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, p. 141, n. 3.

[56] Sevcenko, ibid., p. 141; David Jacoby, in his article on the Byzantine traders in Mamluk Egypt, dates the oration to the 1290's by giving reference to the dating of Sevcenko in his book on the polemical discourse between Metochites and Choumnos. However Jacoby seems to have confused the dating of *Logos* 3 written on Michael the Archangel with the *Logoi* 10-12 in which the oration on neo-martyr Michael exists. David Jacoby, " Byzantine

The information that the text provides concerning the capture of Michael near Smyrna from Ionia and then his adventure of becoming a Mamluk soldier may also offer some hints for the dating of the martyrdom and the composition of the *Logos*. The inhabitants of the Aegean coast seem to have been carried off as slaves since 1284 by the Turks, who were established in the south-west coast of Asia Minor, after the dissolution of the Byzantine fleet by Andronikos II.[57] We know that the Emirate of Aydın had control over Ionia and took the city of Smyrna in 1304[58] after the departure of the Catalan army, but the city of Smyrna, from where Michael was carried off, had already been encircled by the Turks in 1300 according to a letter of

---

Traders in Mamluk Egypt, " *Byzantium State and Society in Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, ed. Anna Avramea, Angeliki Laiou, E. Chrysos (Athens: Ethniko Idryma Ereunon, 2003), pp. 251-252.

[57] These Turks were probably from the Emirate of Menteshe see Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Menteshe. Studien zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15.Jh* (Amsterdam : Oriental Press, 1967) ; For the Turkish translation, *Menteşe Beyliği. 13-15inci Asırda Garbi Küçük Asya Tarihine Ait Tetkik*, tr. Orhan Ş. Gökyay (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1944).

[58] Paul Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident : recherche sur " La geste d'Umur pacha "* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1957), pp. 15-18, 37.

Maximos Planoudes.[59] Once the Emirate of Aydın was settled in the Ioanian region, we would not expect them to continue enslaving the non-Muslim population, for the non-Muslims then came under the protection of the Islamic law. Therefore the enslavement of Michael was probably between 1284 and 1304.

John the Younger (BHG 2194) (d. 1341-3 or 1344-45).[60]

(Greek merchant from Trebizond martyred by the Mongols of the Golden Horde in Vospro-Kertch in Crimea.[61] Commemoration date today, June 2.)[62]

---

[59] Hélène Ahrweiler, " L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Symrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317), particulièrement au XIIIe siècle, " *TM* 1 (1965), pp. 41-42.

[60] Matei Cazacu, " Saint Jean le Nouveau, son martyre, ses reliques et leur translation à Suceava (1415), " *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, ed. Petre Guran (Bucarest : New Europe College, 2001), p. 156.

[61] The place of the martyrdom of John of Trebizond has been recognized as Asprokastron (today Bilhorod Dniestr in Odessa Oblest province of Ukraine). The other names of Asprocastron were Moncastro or Monacastrum (Latin name), Cetatea Alba (Moldavian and Roumanian name), Belgorod Dnestrovski (Slavonic name) and Akkerman (Turkish name). There is a chapel today on the rocks of the port of Dniest, in which there is a so-called tomb of the martyr John the Younger of Trebizond. According to the inscription on the tomb, John was martyred in Akkerman on June 2, 1492 and that his relics are now in Suceava. According to Nasturel and Cazacu, this is an apocryphical attribution and the place of the martyrdom of John of Trebizond is Vospro-Kertch. Petre S. Nasturel, "Une prétendue oeuvre de Grégoire Tsamblak: Le martyre de Saint Jean de Nouveau," *Actes du Premier Congrès international des etudes balkaniques et sud-est européens, Sofia, 1966*, vol. 7 (Sofia: Bibliothèque centrale, 1971), pp.122-136; Cazacu, " Saint Jean le Nouveau," pp. 137-9. According to Cazacu, during the transfer of the relics of John the Trebizond to Suceava, the boat stopped at Asprokastro. This was the reason for the confusion of the martyrdom place of John of Trebizond. ibid, p. 158. Bryer and Winfield also accept Cimmerian Bosphoros (Kertch) as the place of the martyrdom of John of Trebizond. Bryer & Winfield, *Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos*, p. 349.

[62] Nikodemos the Hagiorite, Doukakis and Eustradiades give Asprokastron as the place and 1492 as the date of the martyrdom of John of Trebizond. In the *Neon Martyrologion,* the Turks instead of Mongols kill John, and the Jews instead of the Catholic Latins hand him to the persecutors. Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Neon Martyrologion* (Athens : Ektotikos oikos Aster, 1961), pp. 27-29.

John the Younger is known as the protector saint of the Moldavian state. On his martyrdom we have three manuscripts. The first one is the Moldavian manuscript which is now in the collection N.P. Likhacevde of the Institute of History of the Scientific Academy of St. Petersburg. The manuscript is dated to the years between 1390 and 1426. It is assumed to have been the translation of a Greek text, now lost.[63] Another manuscript is the Slavonic one which is found in the Slav 164 of the Library of the Romanian Academy and it dates to 1439. This Slavonic text was published with a translation in Romanian by bishop Melchisedec Stefanescu in 1884.[64] Rusev and Davidov reedited this text with a translation into Bulgarian in 1966.[65] The third manuscript is the Greek manuscript, which dates to the eighteenth century. It is found in Vatopedi 812, ff.57a-64 (*BHG* 2194) and has not been edited. There is also no study on the relations of the eighteenth-century Greek manuscript and the earlier Slavonic and Moldavian manuscripts.

The Moldavian *martyrion* of the saint was probably written twenty years or so after the translation of the relics. The author of the text is thought to be Gregory Tsamblak (1365-1419)[66], who was a Bulgarian from Turnovo.

---

[63] Cazacu, " Saint Jean le Nouveau," p. 141.

[64] Nasturel, "Une prétendue œuvre de Grégoire Tsamblak: Le martyre de Saint Jean de Nouveau," p. 346.

[65] Angel Asev Davidov and Peno Rusev, *Gregoire Camblak en Roumanie et dans l'ancienne littérature roumaine* (in Bulgarian) (Sofia : Izdvona Bulgarskata akademiiano naukite, 1966), pp. 91-122.

[66] For the reasons for which Gregory Tsamblak is considered as the author of this text see Nasturel, "Une prétendue oeuvre de Grégoire Tsamblak: Le martyre de Saint Jean de Nouveau," p. 346. According to Nasturel and to some other scholars Tsamblak is not the

He was sent on a mission to Moldavia in 1402-3 by the Patriarch Matthew I of Constantinople (1397-1402, 1403-1410).

Since the Greek text on the martyrdom of John the Trebizond dates to the eighteenth century and as no study has been conducted in terms of the relation of this text with the earlier Slavonic ones, this martyr will not be included in the analysis.

Antonios, John and Eustathios (BHG 2035) (d. 1347)[67]

(Orthodox Lithuanians martyred in Vilnae[68] by the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Olgerd (1345-77). Commemoration date today, April 14.[69])

The dossier of the three Lithuanian martyrs includes a fourteenth-century Greek *enkomion* (a panegyric, speech of praise),[70] a fifteenth-century

---

author. Nasturel thinks that the author is another Gregory, a monk and presbyter of the great Church of Moldovalachie. Nasturel, ibid., pp. 346-49. Cazacu, on the other hand, argues that Gregory Tsamblak is indeed the author of the text. " Saint Jean le Nouveau," pp. 141-46. Tsamblak wrote a wide range of hagiographical, homiletic and liturgical works in Slavonic. His work on the translation of the relics of St. Petka (Paraskeve) gives rich historical information especially on the Ottoman invasion of Bulgaria. *ODB*, vol. 1, s.v. " Tsamblak ". On Gregory Tsamblak, see Muriel Heppell, *The Ecclesiastical Career of Gregory Camblak* (London : np., 1979); Francis J. Thomson, *Gregory Tsamblak. The Man and the Myths* (Ghent : Gent University, 1998).

[67] *BHG* gives the year 1342 for their martyrdom date, according to John Meyendorff it is 1347.
John Meyendorff, " Is Hesychasm the Right Word ? Remarks on Religious Ideology in the Fourteenth Century, " in *Okeanos. Essays presented to Ihor Sevcenko*, ed. Cyril Mango and Omeljan Pritsak, vol. 7 (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1983), p. 452.

[68] Modern Vilnius in Lithuania.

[69] The saints are included in today's Orthodox calendar. See Makarios of Simonos Petra, *Synaxarion*. But they are not included by Doukakis or by Eustratiades.

[70] The Greek *enkomion* is the earliest hagiographical source relating to the martyrdom of the three martyrs of Vilnae. The eulogy was published by M.N. Speransky, " Serbskoe zhitie litovskikh muchenikov, " pp. 35-47 and in *Ἀρχεῖον ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας*, vol. 1 (Constantinople :np., 1911), pp. 152-174. Darius Baronas signals a new critical edition of the Greek *enkomion* prepared by T. Alekniene. Darius Baronas, " The Three

Slavonic Vita, its south Slavonic and east Slavonic redactions,[71] a Latin *Passio*,[72] the major *sakkos*[73] of Metropolitan Photios on which there is the image of Antony, John and Eustathius and a golden reliquary-cross, which was a gift made by Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos to St. Sergius, the founder of the Monastery of the Trinity-St. Sergius in Zagorsk.[74] The so-called fifteenth- century *Voskresenskaia Chronicle* also signals the martyrdom of three young Christians in Vilnius by the pagan grand prince of Lithuania, Olgerd.[75]

The earliest text is the fourteenth-century Greek *enkomion*. The Greek text is found in the Vatopedi gr. 541, ff. 116r-129r.[76] The South

---

Martyrs of Vilnius. A Fourteenth-Century Martyrdom and Its Documentary Sources, " *Analecta Bollandiana* 122 (2004), p. 85, n. 3.

[71] For the original critical text and a detailed analysis of the various versions of the Slavonic text, see M.N. Speransky, " Serbskoe zhitie litovskikh muchenikov, " in *Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (Moscow : np., 1909), pp. 1-47. For a detailed dossier of the three Lithuanian martyrs see, Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius," pp. 83-134. For a detailed analysis of the reasons behind the composition of fourteenth-century Greek and fifteenth-century Slavonic texts, see John Meyendorff, " The Three Lithuanian Martyrs : Byzantium and Lithuania in the Fourteenth Century," in *Eikon und Logos : Beiträge zur Erforschung byzantinischer Kulturtraditionen*, ed. H. Goltz (Wittenberg : Martin Luther-Universitat Halle, 1981), pp. 179-197.

[72] Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " pp. 97-100. For the sixteenth-century Latin *Passio* see *AS*, April, vol. 2 (1675), p. 266. This Latin version is a translation from a Slavonic text. But during the translation, the Catholic author of the Latin text modified the *Passio* according to the Catholic wording and Catholic practices.

[73] A form of tunic. As well as being an imperial garment, it is also a church vestment. Wearing the *sakkos* was a patriarchal prerogative but by the thirteenth century it was permitted to certain metropolitans.

[74] Photios of Kiev (1408-1431), Metropolitan of all Russia with the title of Metropolitan of Kiev and Vladimir.

[75] Meyendorff, " The Three Lithuanian Martyrs, " p. 179, n. 1; Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " pp. 87-88.

[76] Sophronios Eustratiades, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos* (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1924), p. 110.

Slavonic redaction was translated from Greek before the second half of the fifteenth century. The earliest East Slavonic redaction dates to the end of the fifteenth century, which served as a basis for the Latin Catholic *Passio*, edited in *Acta Sanctorum.*[77] The Greek *enkomion* was composed by Michael Balsamon, a patriarchal official whose name appears in the patriarchal registers after 1380 with successive titles of *megas skevophylax*, *rhetor*, *protonotarios* and *chartophlax*[78] during the patriarchates of Neilos (1379-1388), Anthony IV (1391-1397) and Matthew (1397-1410).[79] The title of the Greek *enkomion* designates Balsamon as the "rhetor of the Great Church". John Meyendorff argues that Michael Balsamon had the title of the "rhetor of the Great Church" between 1390 and 1394. Therefore, he dates the composition of the *enkomion* between 1390 and 1394. Baronas with reference to *PLP* dates the composition to the years between 1390 and 1397, both of the dates correspond to the reign of the patriarch Anthony IV.[80] The author of the Slavonic text can be the Serbian monk Isaiah, abbot of the Rus monastery on Mt. Athos.[81]

---

[77] Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " p. 101.

[78] For the responsibilities of the offices of *megas skevophylax, protonotarios* and *chartophylax* see, Jean Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les Offikia de l'Église byzantine* (Paris : Institut français d'études byzantines, 1970), pp. 314-318, 355-359, 334-352.

[79] Meyendorff, " The Three Lithuanian Martyrs, " p. 184. Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " p. 85; For Michael Balsamon and his posts at the patriarchate see *PLP* 2123, 2120; Jean Darrouzès, *Le régistre synodal du patriarcat byzantin au XIVe siècle : étude paléographique et diplomatique* (Paris : Institut français d'études byzantines, 1971), pp. 123, 126, 129, 137.

[80] Meyendorff, " The Three Lithuanian Martyrs," p. 185, n. 20 ; Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " p. 85. Also see *PLP* 2120. The synodical patriarchal registers to which Meyendorff refers and *PLP* to which Baronas refers do not name Michael Balsamon as rhetor but as *protonotarios* between 1390-1394 or 1390-1397. Both Meyendorff and Baronas, assumed that the rhetor of the Great Church had also held the office of the *protonotarios*.

Part of the relics of the Lithuanian martyrs were transferred to Constantinople in 1374 during the reign of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (1353-1354 and 1364-1376)[82] and the martyrs were canonized during the reign of the same patriarch.[83] The three Lithuanian martyrs were canonized by the Moscow synod in 1549. The cult of the three martyrs of Lithuania is venerated today in Lithuania as well as in Russia.[84]

Martyrs of Philadelphia[85] (BHG 801q) (d. March 7, 1348)

(No commemoration date today)

The text is found in a manuscript of Istanbul, Patriarchal library, Panaghias 58, ff.11-12v.[86] It was edited, translated to French and commented upon by Matoula Kouroupou with an additional note by Elizabeth Zachariadou.[87] Panaghia 58 is a *synaxarion* of summer (March-August) dating to the fourteenth century, in which the liberation of the city of Philadelphia through the intercession of Jesus Christ, Virgin Mary and Saint Michael was commemorated. Although it is not a *martyrion*, but a historical notice on the liberation of the city, there is a commemoration of sixteen soldiers who died while fighting against the Turks at the end of the text.[88] We understand from this section that they were received as saints and crowned by God and were therefore considered as martyrs.

---

[81] Meyendorff, " Is Hesychasm the right word ? " pp. 453-4.

[82] Ibid., pp. 447-456.

[83] *RegPatr*, vol. 1, Fasc. 6 (Paris, 1979), no. 2681a gives 1354/55 as the canonization date whereas in *ODB* , vol. 2, pp. 1237-8, the date of canonization is 1364. Meyendorff does not agree with the year 1364 as the canonization date and suggests that it must be after the transfer of the relics to Constantinople in 1374. Meyendorff, " The Three Lithuanian Martyrs, " p. 183 ; Under the Patriarch Philotheos, Gregory Palamas, the theorician of hesychasm in the fourteenth century, was also canonized. See *RegPatr,* n. 2540. Canonization was uncommon in the Byzantine Orthodox tradition but it seems to have started during the Palaiologan period. For further aspects of the beginning of canonization in the Byzantine Empire in the fourteenth century see, Ruth Macrides, " Saints and Sainthood in the Early Palaiologan Period, " in *The Byzantine Saint,* ed. Sergei Hackel (London : The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1981), pp. 83-86.

[84] For the cult of the three Lithuanian martyrs of Vilnae, see Baronas, " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius, " pp. 122-132.

[85] Today's Alaşehir.

[86] *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Œcuménique. Les manuscrits du monastère de la Panaghia de Chalki,* ed. Matoula Kouroupou & Paul Géhin, vol.1 (Turnhout : Brepols, 2008). The microfilm of the manuscript is in IRHT,

As Zachariadou has pointed out, the recognition of soldiers who died in fighting as martyrs is an exception to the rule of the Byzantine Church, which refused to attribute martyr status to a person killed by an infidel while fighting in war.[89] The text was composed very close to the event, most probably in 1349 for the anniversary of the event, by Makarios Chrysokephalos (1336-1382), the bishop of Philadelphia, or someone from

---

l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (Paris). I am indebted to Diane Pasquier-Chambolle, who obtained a photocopy of the microfilm and sent it to Istanbul while I was working on the subject.

[87] Matoula Kouroupou, " Le siége de Philadelphie par Umur Pacha d'après le manuscrit de la Bibl.Patriarcale d'Istanbul, Panaghias 58, " in *Geographica Byzantina*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1981), pp. 67-77 ; Elizabeth Zachariadou, " Note sur l'article de Matoula Couroupou, " in *Geographica Byzantina*, pp. 78-80. For further analysis of the same text with a translation to French, see Paul Lemerle, " Philadephie et l'Émirat d'Aydin, " in *Philadelphie et autres études,* Byzantina-Sorbonensia (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1984), pp. 60-61.

[88] *BHG* 801q places the text under the miracles of Jesus Christ, concerning the miracle by the well probably due to the fact that the text interprets the liberation of the city as a miracle of Jesus Christ and also because this event took place during Easter.

[89] Zachariadou, " The Neomartyr's Message, " p. 55.

his entourage.[90] The text is the first Greek source on one of the sieges of Philadelphia by Umur Paşa,[91] the ruler of the Aydınoğlu Emirate. This siege is not mentioned in the *Düsturname*, the Turkish epic on the exploits of Umur Paşa.[92] This text, although not a *martyrion*, will still be examined as it shows how in the autonomous city of Philadelphia the soldiers who died in battle were venerated against the Byzantine tradition.

Theodore the Younger (BHG 2431) (d. 1349-1369).

(Apostate from Islam. Martyred in Melagina-Bithynia under Ottoman rule.
No commemoration date today)

The only existing manuscript on this martyr is an *akolouthia* followed by a *synaxarion* which is in the National Library of Athens 2118, ff.149-157v (fourteenth-fifteenth century). The author of the text is unknown. The text was published and analyzed by Nicolas Oikonomides,[93] who suggested dates for the capture of Theodore, for his martyrdom and for the composition of the text.[94] We know that Theodore was captured from Adrianople but there is no indication that the city had fallen to the Turks during his capture. Therefore Oikonomides dated the capture of Theodore and his martyrdom before 1362, which used to be the accepted date of the capture of Adrianople. This date can be extended to 1369, according to the findings of more recent studies. [95] The text does not mention the civil war between Anna of Savoy (ca.1306-ca.1365)[96] and John VI Kantakouzenos (ca.1325-1383)[97]; therefore, Oikonomides argues that the martyrdom should be after the first Byzantine civil war (1341-1347). He then dates the martyrdom between the end of the civil war and the conquest of Adrianople, 1349-1362. If we accept the year 1369 for the conquest of Adrianople, we can date it to 1349-1369.

---

[90] Lemerle, " Philadephie et l'Émirat d'Aydin, " pp. 59, 61, 67.

[91] On Philadelphia and the situation of the city in the fourteenth century see Lemerle, " Philadelphie et l'Emirat d'Aydin, " pp. 57-58, n. 11.

[92] Mükrimin Halil Yınanç, *Düsturname-i Enveri* (Istanbul : Istanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1928) ; Irène Melikoff-Sayar, *Le destan d'Umur Pacha (Düsturname-i Enveri).Texte, traduction et notes* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1954) ; Lemerle, *L'Émirat d'Aydin*; Himmet Akın, *Aydınoğulları Tarihi hakkında bir Araştırma* (Ankara : Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1968).

[93] Oikonomides, "'Ακολουθία τοῦ ῾Αγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," pp. 205-221.

[94] Ibid., pp. 208-211.

For the capture of Theodore, Oikonomides refers to the information given by the Byzantine historian Nikephoros Gregoras, who mentions the first Turkish incursions in Thrace around the 1340's.[98] We can deduce that Theodore was probably captured by Turkish groups among whom there were also the Ottomans. He was definitely martyred under the Ottomans as he had been brought to Melagina, which was a residence of the Ottoman sultans. The date of the composition of the text, according to Oikonomides, is before the conquest of Adrianople and very close to the martyrdom.

---

[95] There are various hypotheses on the date of the capture of Adrianople by the Turks. Oikonomides refers to George Ostrogorsky, *Geschicte des Byzantinischen Staates* (München, 1952) for this date. 1361 has been accepted by some scholars as the date of Andianople's (Edirne) conquest. Halil Inalcık, " Edirne'nin Fethi (1361), " *Edirne. Edirne'nin 600. Fethi Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965), pp. 137-59. On the other hand Irène Beldiceanu convincingly argues that the date of the conquest of Adrianople is 1369. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, " La Conquête d'Adrianople par les Turcs, " pp. 439-461.

[96] Byzantine empress, wife of Andronikos III Palaiologos (r. 1326-1365) and mother of John V Palaiologos (1341-91).

[97] John VI Kantakouzenos, Byzantine emperor between 8 February 1347 and 3 December 1354.

[98] Nicephori Gregorae, *Byzantina Historia*, XI.7, vol.1 (Bonn : Bonnae Weber, 1829), p. 548.

The dating suggests that Theodore was captured when Orhan was the reigning Ottoman sultan (r. 1324-1362) and that he was most probably martyred during the reign of Orhan or Murad I (r. 1362-1389). We know that during the reign of Orhan, the region of Bithynia passed into Ottoman hands from the Byzantines. Orhan took the city of Prusa (Bursa) in 1326 upon a peace agreement.[99]

Anthimos, the Archbishop of Athens (BHG 2029) (d. 1371).

(Martyred in Crete under Latin rule. No commemoration date)

We have two manuscripts on the martyrdom of Anthimos, the Archbishop of Athens, martyred in Crete. The first one is a *logos* (sermon) to the deceased father, the archbishop Anthimos of Athens, the confessor, and is found in Paris Coislin, n.243, ff.191a-204b (fifteenth century).[100] The author of the sermon is Neilos Kerameus, the Patriarch of Constantinople (1380-1388).[101] The second one is also a sermon titled "a *logos* written when Anthimos came out of prison". This manuscript is in Bibliotheca Angelica, n.30 (C.3.16), ff. 3v-4r (fourteenth century).[102] The author of this text is not known, though the copyist is a certain Ioseph of Philagre, who copied it in the years between 1393 and 1394.[103] Both of the sermons have been edited by K.I. Dyobouniotes.[104]

---

[99] For the reign of Murad I see *Türk Diyanet Vakfi Islam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. " Murad I " and for Orhan see *Türk Diyanet Vakfi Islam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. " Orhan ".

[100] Robert Devreesse, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs, II Le Fonds Coislin* (Paris: imprimerie nationale, 1945), pp. 223-24.

[101] *PLP* 11648 ; *ODB*, vol. 2, pp. 1449-50.

There is a difference between the one written by Neilos and the anonymous one in terms of their contents as well as their length. The first one is much longer and mentions the death of Anthimos in prison while the anonymous one is shorter and does not mention his death. The author of the anonymous one is most probably an Orthodox Cretan living on the island because from the text one can understand that he was acquainted with the feudal organization in Venetian Crete.[105] The sermon by Neilos is in some ways similar to a saint's *vita*, in which there are commonplaces concerning the parents and the wise childhood of Anthimos. There is a long discourse on inner and outer wisdom, as well as on the question of *filioque* and on the primacy of the Roman Church.

Although the sole evidence of the martyrdom of Anthimos is the sermon written by Neilos Kerameus, we have another historical evidence concerning the transfer of Anthimos to Crete as archbishop. A register dating from the Patriarchate of Philotheos Kokkinos (1364-1376) notes the transference of the Metropolitan of Athens, Anthimos to the seat of Crete. According to Jean Darrouzes, Anthimos was ordained as the archbishop of Athens at the beginning of the reign of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos in 1364[106] and then in 1365 he received Crete as a supplement (*epidosis*) and then he was transferred to Crete before May 1366.[107] Darrouzes dates the martyrdom to 1371.

---

[102] Christa Samberger, *Catalogi codicum graecorum qui in minoribus bibliothecis italicis asservantur in duo volumina collati et novissimis additamentis aucti*, vol. 2 (Lipsiae: Zentral-Antiquariat, 1968), pp. 64-65.

[103] K.I. Dyobounites, "Ὁ Ἀθηνῶν Ἄνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ὁ ὁμοληγητής," *Epeteris Buzantion Spoudon* 9 (1932), p. 51.

[104] Ibid., pp. 47-79.

[105] Ibid., p. 54, lines 1-10.

Arsenios,[108] Metropolitan of Berroia.[109]

(Martyred in Berroia in the fifteenth century. No BHG number. No commemoration date)

There exists no life or *synaxarion* on Arsenios, except an *akolouthia*, which is in the codex of the Monastery of the Transfiguration of Meteora 269, ff.102r-111v (fifteenth-eighteenth centuries).[110] His name was added to the list of the bishops of Berroia between 1911-1922 by the bishop of Berroia. There is no reference to this martyr apart from these sources. The text was edited and commented by G.X. Chionides[111], who dated the codex to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries in terms of the style of the writing. He dated the martyrdom of Arsenios to 1373/4-1448/9, the period when the Ottoman attacks against the city were taking place. Chionides, unconvincingly, deduced this date from a sentence in the *akolouthia* which reads that the murder of Arsenios was revenged by divine justice.[112] Divine justice according to Chionides, took the form of Timur capturing Bayezid I (1389-1402) during the Battle of Ankara (1402) and the internal strife within the Ottomans following this event. The text does not give much information on the martyr or on the martyrdom. It only states that God abandoned the Romans by reason of their immense erring and the *Ismaelites* (i.e. Muslims) ravaged the lands of the Romans. The martyr was tortured and put into a prison for a long time and then executed. We also learn that the inhabitants of Hellas of Berroia were celebrating his memory during the composition of the text.[113]

---

[106] *RegPatr*, vol. 5, n. 2463.

[107] *RegPatr.*, vol.5, n. 2507.

[108] *PLP* 1399.

[109] Berroia in Macedonia is a city at the west end of the central Macedonian plain. It is sometimes confused in the sources with Beroe-Stara Zagora in Thrace. It changed hands between the Serbians and Byzantines between 1343/4 and 1375. The Ottomans seized the city several times after 1375 and definitely around 1430s.

[110] Nikos A. Bees, *Les manuscrits des Météores. Catalogue descriptif des manuscrits conservés dans les monastères des Météores*, vol.1 (Athens : Akademia Athenon, 1967), p. 294.

---

[111] Georgios X. Chionides, *'Ανέκδοτος ἀκολουθία τοῦ νεόμαρτυρος 'Αρσενίου μητροπολίτου Βεροίας (14^{ου} η 15^{ου} αἰ.)* (Thessalonike : Ekdosis tes metropoleos Veroias, 1971), pp. 7-32.

[112] Ibid, p. 29, lines 6-8.

[113] Ibid., p. 28, lines 21-24.

George of Adrianople (BHG 2160) (d. 26 March, 1437).

(Christian soldier in the Ottoman army. Martyred in Adrianople.

No commemoration date.[114])

The sole manuscript on George of Adrianople is the Greek *martyrion* in Marcianus Venise II.50 (Nanianus 71), ff.235-242 (fifteenth-sixteenth centuries).[115] It was edited by Christos G. Patrinelis.[116] The author of the text is unknown. According to Patrinelis, the language of the text shows that the author was not someone very educated, even though he seemed to know some ecclesiastical texts and tried to imitate them. From the text we can understand that the author was the witness of the martyrdom. He must have written it just after the event which took place in March 1437, at least before the death of Patriarch Joseph II (1416-1439), whose name is mentioned in the text as the reigning patriarch. The text is not a liturgical text, for the author uses first person narrative and at the end of the text, asks help from the martyr, who is in heaven now, for his personal needs. Both of these aspects are very uncommon in liturgical texts. The copyist of the text is also not known.

---

[114] There are no entries in Doukakis, in Eustradiades or in the *Synaxarion of the Orthodox Church* edited by Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra concerning this martyr. The date of the martyrdom as indicated in the Greek *martyrion* edited by Patrinelis is 26 March, 1437. *BHG* also notes this day as the saint's commemoration date with no reference. *BHG. Nov. Auct*, p. 237.

[115] Elpidius Mioni, *Codices graeci manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum*, vol. 1, Pars Prior (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1981), p. 160.

[116] Christos G. Patrinelis, " Μία ἀνέκδοτη διήγηση γιὰ τὸν ῎αγνωστο Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο (d.1437), " *Orthodoxos Parousia* 1 (1964), pp. 64-72.

Although the author's name is not mentioned in the text, the information he gives on George and his particular references and details to the *tasimanioi*, the *amir*, the *hegemones* and the chief *hegemon* indicate his familiarity with the Ottoman realities of the time. Therefore, he may well have been an Orthodox Christian who lived in Edirne or who had close relations with the city. Moreover, though not very educated, he might be a religious person since the text contains many references and quotations from the Old and New Testaments.

Andreas of Chios (BHG 2024d) (d. May 29, 1465)

(Martyred in Galata-Istanbul. No commemoration date)[117]

We have two texts on Andreas of Chios, who was martyred on May 29, 1465 in Galata Istanbul. The first one is a Latin text published in *Acta Sanctorum*[118] and translated to Greek and commented upon by Emilia Sarou.[119] The other one is an unpublished Greek text which is in Codex Oxon.Bodleian.gr, canon126, ff.18-22 (fifteenth-sixteenth centuries)[120]. Both of these texts are attributed to George of Trebizond (1395-1472/3), a

---

[117] Andreas of Chios is not mentioned by Doukakis. Eustradiades included him in his *Agiologion* but with no commemoration date. Eustradiades, pp. 40-41.

[118] "De B. Andrea Chio. Martyre Constantinopoli Sub Turcis," *AS*, Mai VII (1738), pp.185-188.

[119] Emilia Sarou, *Βίος ʽΑγίου ʼΑνδρέου ʼΑργέντη τοῦ Χίου καὶ ἀκολουθία αὐτοῦ πονηθείσα ʽυπὸ τοῦ οἰκονόμου Μάρκου ʽΑγ. Βασιλάκη μετὰ πρόλογου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ʼΑρχιεπισκόπου ʼΑθηνῶν κ. Χρυσοστόμου* (Athens : Hestia, 1935).

[120] H.O. Coxe, *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues I.Greek Manuscripts. Reprinted with Corrections from the edition of 1853* (Oxford : Bodleian library, 1969), pp.106-7.

Catholic Greek humanist teacher, rhetorician and translator,[121] who came to Istanbul as emissary of Pope Paul II (1464-1471) to Mehmed II in 1465 but his mission was unsuccessful. On his return to Rome in 1466, he was briefly imprisoned for having praised the sultan. His most famous work is the Greek treatise "On the Truth of the Christian Faith" where he expressed his view to the Ottoman sultan that if the Sultan converted to Christianity, he would be able to conquer the whole world.

It has not yet been established whether or not Andreas of Chios was a Latin martyr or a Greek martyr. Emilia Sarou argued that Andreas was a Greek Orthodox martyr, whose memory was stolen from the Greek Orthodox by the Latins. E. Dalleggio d'Alessio argued that Andreas was a Catholic martyr and did not find Sarou's arguments convincing.[122] The analysis of the unpublished Greek text in the Bodleian library comparatively with that of the Latin text edited in *Acta Sanctorum* may provide us more information. On the other hand, if George of Trebizond was the author of the text, I do not think that he would write a *martyrion* on an Orthodox martyr as a Catholic, who was on a papal mission to convert the Ottoman sultan to Catholicism not to Orthodoxy. In addition, he failed his mission in

---

[121] *PLP* 4120; Michel Balivet, *Pour une concorde Islamo-chrétienne. Démarches byzantines et latines à la fin du moyen-âge (de Nicolas de Cues à Georges de Trébizonde)* (Rome : Pontificio Istituto di studi arabi e d'islamistica, 1997), pp.11-86 ; John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond. A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden : Brill, 1976) ; George of Trebizond, *De la vérité de la foi des chrétiens*, Corpus Islamo-Christianum, ed. & tr. Adel Th. Khoury (Altenberge : CIS Verlag, 1987) ; Angelo Mercati, " Lettres à Mehmed II, " La due lettere di Giorgio da Trebisonda a Maometto II, " *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 9 (1943), pp. 65-99 ; *OBD*, vol. 2, s.v. "George of Trebizond".

[122] E. Dalleggio d'Alesso, " Un néo-martyr catholique à Constantinople André de Chio (1465), " *Memorial Louis Petit* (1948), pp. 64-77.

Istanbul and on his return he was imprisoned for having pro-Turkish tendencies. He had all the reasons not to write about an Orthodox martyr but more likely about a Latin one to please the Pope and to get rid of the accusations made against him. This martyrdom is not included in the analysis.

Michael Mauroeides (BHG 2274e) (d. before ca. 1490).[123]

(Rich Greek Orthodox martyred in Adrianople. Commemoration date is February 17)[124]

On Michael Mauroeides's martyrdom, there are two manuscripts. The first one is Codex 1295 of the Greek fond of National Library in Paris, ff.314r-319v (fifteenth-sixteenth centuries).[125] This is an office on Michael Mauroeides, which contains an *akolouthia* and then a *synaxarion*, a historical notice, (ff.316-317v). The author of this work is John Moschos (d. 1494)[126], who was a Greek writer and professor, from Lacedomonia, but lived in Corfu. He had a famous school in Corfu to which young people came from Italy to learn Greek. Apart from this office on Michael Mauroeides, he also wrote a funeral oration for Loukas Notaras. The text in the Parisian codex was published by Leontopoleos Sophroniou Eustratiades and by Demetriou Z. Sophianou.[127]

---

[123] This dating is given by Demetriou Z. Sophianou, *'Ο νεομάρτυρας Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ 'Αδριανουπολίτης χα.1490, 'Αδριανούπολη* (Athens : np., 1984).

[124] There are two neo-martrys with the name Michael Mauroeides. The second one was a bread seller martyred in Thessalonica on March 10, 1544. Due to the existence of these homonym neo-martyrs, there are confusions in the date of commemorations in the *Synaxaria* and the *Agiologia*. Nikodemos the Hagiorite noted only the one martyred in 1544. Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Neon Martyrologion*, pp. 52-57. Eustradiades gives two commemoration days, February 17 and March 10. Eustradiades, p.338. Doukakis gives only 10 March 1544 for his martyrdom. Doukakis, p. 167.

[125] Henri Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements* (Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1898), p. 291.

[126] *PLP* 19386 ; Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique ou Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles*, vol.1 (Paris : G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose, 1885) and (Brussels, 1963), pp. 88-93 ; Sophrone Pétridès, " Le néo-martyr Michel Mauroeides et son office, " *Echos d'Orient* 14 (1911), pp. 333-4.

The second manuscript by Manuel the Rhetor[128] is in Codex Athon Iviron 512 (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries).[129] Between ff. 164v-175v of this Codex, there is the *akolouthia* and *synaxarion*. Between ff.256r-270v, there is an *enkomion* on Michael Mauroeides. This manuscript was edited by Sophianou.[130] Martyr Michael Mauroeides is also mentioned in the Episcopal list of the Synodikon of the metropolis of Adrianople which dates to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[131]

The event took place in Adrianople, Ottoman Edirne, where the Ottoman sultans continued to have a residence even after the conquest of Constantinople. I have not found a historical character called Michael

---

Vitalien Laurent, " Encore le néomartyr Michel Mauroeides, " *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939), p. 372.

[127] Leontopoleos Sophroniou Eustratiades, " *Ὁ Νεομάρτυς Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ 'Αδριανουπολίτης,* " *Thrakika* 10 (1938), pp. 7-28. Laurent made some corrections to the edition of Eustratiades. " Encore le néomartyr Michel Mauroeides, " pp. 377-79. Sophianou, " *Ὁ νεομάρτυρας Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδης ὁ Αδριανουπολίτης,* " pp. 54-64.

[128] *PLP* 16712. He was the great rhetor of the Great Church in Constantinople (1504-1530).

[129] Spyridon P. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts of Mount Athos 2* (Amsterdam: A.M.Hakkert, 1966), p. 160.

[130] Sophianou, " *Ὁ νεομάρτυρας Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ Αδριανουπολίτης,* " pp. 65-105.

[131] Vitalien Laurent, " La liste épiscopale du synodicon de la métropole d'Andrinople, " *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939), pp. 31-34.

Mauroeides in the sources. Taking into consideration the dating of the martyrdom to 1490 by Sophianou, the event can be placed to the reign of Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512).

Dervishes, *Menakıbnames*, Heroic Epics

The protagonists of the *menakıbname*s are the *veli*s. The term is most often translated as "saint" in English. The terms *velayet* and *vilayet* are used interchangeably for sainthood in Islam.[132] The term sainthood, which is associated with Christianity, however, does not actually render the meaning of these Islamic terms within their context. The terms *veli*, *velayet* and *vilayet* are described comprehensibly by Vincent J. Cornell.[133]

Veli Allah means an intimate or a friend of God. The term is utilized in the Kur'an as manager, protector or intercessor. The *Veli* possesses both *velayet* and *vilayet* at the same time. *Velayet* is everything, which the Şeyh imparts to his disciples and other people about God. The *vilayet* of the *veli*, however, is what takes place between the Şeyh and God. This is a special kind of love that the Şeyh takes with him when he leaves the world. He can, on the other hand, confer his *velayet* on someone else. So from this interpretation, one can argue that Allah is the source of all power and authority. Since *veli Allah* is Allah's friend, he must be close to Allah. Therefore, he is seen by others as Allah's protégé, who is an intermediary between Allah and the other people. He is also a patron, for others rely on him to intercede for them before Allah.[134] Not all *veli*s were Sufis but the saints' cults and the spread of the Sufi brotherhoods began to converge in the twelfth century.

---

[132] *Velayet* is a verbal noun in Arabic and *vilayet* is a gerund.

[133] Cornell, *Realm of the Saint*, pp. xvii-xliv.

Menakıb, plural of the Arabic noun *menkıbe*, signifies qualities, virtues, talents and praise-worthy actions of an individual. With the development of the Sufi orders in the eleventh century, a specific *menakıb* genre blossomed. This genre began to take the shape of a monograph or a general work concerning either the life of a famous ascetic or of the founder of a Sufi order. These works initially focused on the Sufis as transmitters of religious knowledge, but they gradually expanded from sayings of the *veli*s to the voluminous literature containing the stories of the deeds of the *veli*s. In the end, *menakıb* began to signify the marvelous aspects of the life, the prodigious acts or wonders (*keramet*) of a Sufi or of a *veli* having thaumaturgical talents. In the popular culture, the term *menakıb* became a synonym for "wonders" or "prodigious" acts. Among the narratives, which will be analyzed in this thesis, the *vitae* of the dervishes, who are named as *Abdalan-ı Rum* in their *vitae*, including the one on Hacı Bektaş but excluding the one on Sarı Saltuk, were entitled as *Velayetname/Vilayetname*. The Persian suffix, -name, designates a written document.[135]

---

[134] Ibid., pp. xix-xx.

[135] For the definition of *menakıbname*, see *Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "menakıb"; for the *menakıb* literature in Anatolia in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries see Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, " Epic of the Deeds of Saints (Evliya Menkabeleri), " in *The Seljuks of Anatolia : their history and culture according to local Muslim sources*, tr. Gary Leiser

The earliest examples of Anatolian Turco-Muslim *menakıbname* literature date to the thirteenth century. The hagiographical sources that will be analyzed in the thesis were produced by authors affiliated with various kinds of Sufi brotherhoods, which began to be formed in Anatolia from the thirteenth century onwards.[136] Most of the dervishes, Sarı Saltuk, Hacım Sultan, Abdal Musa, Seyyid Ali Sultan and Otman Baba, belonged to the group called *Abdalan-ı Rum*, which was a group of ecstatic mystics leading an anchorite life. According to Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the group mainly included Kalenderi, Yesevi, Haydari and Vefai dervishes, who assembled around the Babai group in the middle and at the end of the thirteenth century. According to Ocak, in the fourteenth century, they identified themselves as *Abdalan-ı Rum.*[137] By the sixteenth century, many of them began to be integrated into the Bektaşi order.[138]

Danişmendname and *Düsturname*, which will be analyzed along with the Turco-Muslim hagiographies are heroic epics portraying the lives and deeds of two frontier warriors of post-Mantzikert Anatolia. On the other

---

(Salt Lake city : University of Utah Press, 1992), pp. 38-52 ; Ahmed Zeki Velidi Togan, " Haberler : a) Şifahi Haberler, " in *Tarihte Usul* (Istanbul : Enderun, 1981), pp. 48-50 ; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Kültür Tarihi Kaynakları Olarak Menakıbnameler. Metodolojik bir Yaklaşım* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997).

[136] Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (Ankara : Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, 1993); idem. " Anadolu Selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları, " *Belleten* 7/1 (1943), pp. 379-599, translated and reprinted by Gary Leiser in *The Seljuks of Anatolia : their history and culture according to local Muslim sources* ; Ocak, *Kültür Tarihi Kaynakları Olarak Menakıbnameler.*

[137] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIII^e siècle* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), pp. 132-34.

[138] Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends. Dervish groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period* (Salt Lake City : University of Utah Press, 1994), pp. 83-84.

hand, these warrior epics are interrelated with most of above-mentioned *menakıbnames*. Their analysis together with the *gazi*-dervish (warrior-dervish) hagiographies help us to understand the ideals and the motives of the Turco-Muslim frontier societies in Anatolia and in the Balkans. As the "Byzantines" are one of the principal actors of these Turco-Muslim frontier narratives, these sources will help us to understand what it meant to be a Byzantine in the frontier regions, on which we do not get much information from the Byzantine sources for the Palaiologan period.[139] These narratives were produced and told within a milieu that was conscious of the earlier Muslim military exploits.[140]

An important point that has to be considered in the analysis of the below-mentioned *menakıbnames* and the heroic epics is the tradition in the transmission of these texts. In examining the transmission of the Byzantine saints' lives, whether or not these texts were included or omitted in the local or Constantinopolitan *synaxaria* or *menaia* over different periods and places, the iconographic representation of these saints in the Churches and monasteries and the movements of their relics are examined. In a medieval society in which literacy was low, although the reading of these texts in liturgies helped to transmit the stories of the saints to people, visuality through iconographic representation was the most important mean of transmission, which continued along with the written tradition.

---

[139] The Byzantine warrior epic, *Digenis Akritas* was composed in the early twelfth century, pre-Palaiologan period. The narrative depicts the Byzantine-Arab frontier of Cappadocia from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. The narrative shows that the Byzantine-Arab frontier regions were different in character from the territories behind them, having specific cultural, social, economic traits. There are many editions and translations of *Digenis Akritas*. For the critical edition of the Grottaferrata and Escorial manuscripts see Elizabeth Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis, the Grottaferrata and Escorial versions* (Cambridge : Cambridge University, 1998) ; For Grottaferrata version, see John Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites, Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford : Clarendon, 1956) ; For a French translation of the Grottaferrata version, see Corinne Jouanno, *Digénis Akritas, le héros des frontières. Une épopée byzantine* (Turnhout : Brepols, 1998). For an analysis of the Grottaferrata version and for the bibliography on the massive secondary literature on Digenes Akrites, see Catia Galatariotou, " Structural Oppositions in the Grottaferrata Digenes Akrites, " *BMGS* 11 (1987), pp. 29-68 ; On how Digenis Akritas stands outside the Byzantine cultural and literary norms of his time and why this poem survived see Elizabeth Jeffreys, " Akritis and Outsiders, " in *Strangers to Themselves : The Byzantine Outsider. Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998*, ed. Dion C. Smythe (Aldershot : Ashgate, 2000), pp. 189-202.

[140] For the importance of these sources in the understanding of the Turco-Muslim frontier societies see Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, pp. 62-90.

For the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics, oral transmission was very important. These stories were usually told by believers who were not a homogenous group and spread further by storytellers, preachers, who were itinerant or associated with a particular public space such dervish lodges and coffee houses. The texts we have in hand were probably prompt-books of these storytellers. Most of the textual convergences of the manuscripts including major variations in the sequence of the narrative may reflect the divergences of the different performances. Nevertheless, the oral tradition of performance and tradition continued concurrently with a written tradition. In the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics analyzed in the thesis, one sees a compilation of different oral and written traditions rather than metaphrastic texts, which represent corrupted versions of the archetype copies.[141] The problem in the analysis of such texts is the lack of critical analysis of the available manuscripts to see the development of written transmission and the lack of analysis of the different layers in the text, which are indicative of the oral and written traditions. The authors of these texts then can be considered as compilers and what we call as authorial intention in this case is the compiler's intention, which is inserted between the compilated stories. The compiler's intention can be traced in relation with the patron of the compilation.

---

[141] Yorgos Dedes, *Battalname*, vol. 1 (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1996), pp. 74-76. Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam*, pp. 58-60.

The *menakıbnames* and the heroic epics below are listed in chronological order in accordance with the death date of their principal protagonists.

Danişmendname

(The heroic epic narrating the military exploits of Melik Danişmend, a Turkish emir who founded an emirate in 1096/7 in Septentrional Cappadocia.)

The period in which the historical Emir Danişmend was active is difficult to date. According to his legendary *vita*, which was analysed by Irène Melikoff,[142] his military exploits extended from the 1080's until the 1100's.

The oral epic tradition on Melik Danişmend was reassembled in a written form for the first time in 1245 by Mevlana Ibn Ala for Izzeddin Keykavus II (r. 1246-1257), the eldest son of Gıyaseddin Keyhüsrev II

---

[142] Irène Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend. Étude critique du Danişmendname*, 2 vols, (Paris : Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1960).

(r. 1237-1245). Although the House of the Danişmends represented a serious challenge to the Seljuk supremacy until 1180, the composition of the epic was during a time of rivalry between the sons of Gıyaseddin over succession to the Seljuk throne. It was a time of reconciliation between Izzeddin Keykavus II and the subdued march warriors. Therefore the author had the delicate task of praising the ancestor of the rivals of the Seljuk dynasty without displeasing his patron, Izzeddin Keykavus II. Hence in the epic, he placed the exploits of Melik Danişmend a century before the apparition of Melik Danişmend in history, a period when the Seljuks had not yet consolidated their power in Anatolia. He made the Seljuks enter into the scene only at the end of the text when Melik Danişmend was defeated and a matrimonial union was created between his son and the Seljuk family. According to the epic, all the territory conquered from the Byzantines by Melik Danişmend was lost after his death and it was the Seljuks who reconquered these areas.[143] Therefore although the events in the epic were dated to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the details in the epic such as the military groups who helped the Byzantines against the activities of Melik Danişmend belonged to the historical atmosphere of the thirteenth century.

The first text, which is now lost, was found a century afterwards by Arif Ali of Tokat, who rewrote it in 1360/61 in "better Turkish", adding verses and dividing the text into chapters. Irène Melikoff utilized the manuscript Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Ancien Fonds Turc 317

---

[143] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend,* vol. 1, p. 139.

(sixteenth-century copy of the fourteenth-century text of Arif Ali), which was entitled as *Kıssa-i Melik Danişmend.* She amended the text found in Paris with the manuscript of Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi in Ankara no. A/431 (eighteenth-century copy), with the manuscript Muallim Cevdet K. 441 of Istanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi (seventeenth-century copy) and with the manuscript Turc 578 of Public Library of Leningrad (seventeenth-century copy). According to Melikoff, the Paris manuscript was a copy of the fourteenth-century text as it shows the grammatical syntax of the fourteenth-century Turkish.[144]

Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye Fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye

(*Vita* of Baba Ilyas, dervish from Khorasan (d. 1240), who revolted against the Seljuk authorities in 1239-40)

This *menakıbname* is on a Turcoman dervish, Baba Ilyas-ı Horasani, who revolted against the Seljuk authorities in 1239-40 and on his family and disciples. Baba Ilyas- ı Horasani was among the dervishes who came to Asia Minor with the second wave of Turco-Muslim migrations during the Mongol invasions. There is no information on his life before arriving to Asia Minor but his name indicates that he was from Khorasan. The revolt, the events related with the revolt and the activities of the disciples of Baba Ilyas, as it is narrated in the *menakıbname*, took place mainly in Central Anatolia, around Amasya, Tokat, Konya, Kırşehir.

---

[144] Ibid., pp. 53-70.

According to Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, Hacı Bektaş and Şeyh Edebali, the father-in-law of Osman *Gazi*, who was the founder of the the Ottoman dynasty, were among his disciples.[145] His name is mentioned as Baba Resul not as Baba Ilyas in the historical sources, which were contemporary to the revolt.[146] The *menakıbname* was written in 1358-9 by his great son, Elvan Çelebi (d. after 1359).[147] His intention was to defend the family of Baba Ilyas, who had revolted against the Seljuk authorities.[148] The dervish lodge of Elvan Çelebi is in Çorum-Mecidözü, Byzantine Euchaita, and built on the Byzantine monastery of St. Theodore.[149]

---

[145] Elvan Çelebi, *Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye. Baba Ilyas-i Horasani ve Sülalesinin Menkabevi Tarihi*, ed. Ismail E. Erünsal & Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), pp. lxvi, 168-69.

[146] Elvan Çelebi, *Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye*, pp. xliv-xlv. The contemporary historical sources, which mention the revolt were Ibn Bibi, *El Evamirü'l-ala'iye fi'l-umuri'l-ala'iye*, tr. Mürsel Öztürk (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996) ; Bar Hebraeus, *The chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj, the son Aaron, the Hebrew physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus: being the first part of his political history of the world*, tr. and ed. Ernest A. Wallis (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2003) ; Simon de Saint Quentin, *Historia Tartarorum*, tr. and ed. Jean Richard (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1965) ; idem., *Bir keşişin anılarında Tatarlar ve Anadolu: 1245-1248*, tr. Erendiz Özbayoğlu (Antalya: Doğu Akdeniz Kültür ve Tarih Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2006).

[147] The *menakıbname* has two editions. Elvan Çelebi, *Menakibu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye.* ; Mertol Tulum, *Tarihi Metin Çalışmalarında Usul. Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye Üzerinde Bir Deneme* (Istanbul : Deniz Kitabevi, 2000). For an analysis of the *menakıbname*, see sOcak, *La révolte de Baba Resul*. For a brief but a more recent interpretation of the revolt see, Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, " La " Révolte " des Baba'i en 1240, visait-elle vraiment le renversement du pouvoir seldjoukide ? " *Turcica* 30 (1998), pp. 99-117.

[148] Elvan Çelebi, *Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye*, pp. xxxv.

[149] Semavi Eyice, " Çorum'un Mecidözü'nde Aşık Paşa oğlu Elvan Çelebi Zaviyesi, " *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 15 (1969), pp. 211-46.

The sole manuscript of the *menakıb* is in Konya Museum of Mevlana no. 4937 and the copy dates to fourteenth century.[150] The manuscript is published twice first by Ismail E. Erünsal and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak and for a second time with certain amendments by Mertol Tulum.[151]

Vilayetname. Menakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli

(*Vita* on Hacı Bektaş (d. 1270), dervish from Khorasan around whose cult the *Bektaşi* order was founded in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.)

There is not much information on the historical figure of Hacı Bektaş. Most of the information that we have on him comes from a fifteenth-sixteenth century *Velayetname* of his. Nevertheless he was an important personality in thirteenth-century Anatolia as we understand from the information given in other *menakıbnames* such as *Menakıbü'l Arifin* and *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbü'l Ünsiyye*.

The *Bektaşi* brotherhood[152] integrated and assimilated many religious movements and brotherhoods such as Abdalan-ı Rum, Yesevis, Haydaris,

---

[150] Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*, vol. 3 (Ankara : Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Eski Eserler ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, 1967), pp. 417-420.

[151] Elvan Çelebi, *Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye* ; Mertol Tulum, *Tarihi Metin Çalışmalarında Usul. Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye Üzerinde Bir Deneme* (Istanbul : Deniz Kitabevi, 2000).

[152] There is an abundant literature on the Bektaşi order because of its importance in the Ottoman Empire. Here are some major references : For the Bektaşi order in Anatolia see Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, " Les origines du Bektachisme, essai sur le développement historique de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Asie Mineure, " *Actes du congrès international d'histoire des religions, Paris octobre 1923* (n.p., 1926) ; John Kingsley Birge, *The*

Vefaiis and Kalenderis[153] between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries.[154] In the *Vilayetname*, some of the dervishes whose vita I analyze in this thesis such as Hacım Sultan, Seyyid Ali Sultan and Sarı Saltuk are cited as the disciples of Hacı Bektaş. Reciprocally, some of the *menakıbnames* such as *Velayetname-i Otman Baba*, recognize his superiority among the Anatolian dervishes.[155]

The *menakıbname* of Hacı Bektaş, which is in general referred as the *Vilayetname*, is a widely read and known text. It is on the activities and the wonders of Hacı Bektaş and of his disciples. Although the exact date of the composition of the text is not known, it was probably written after 1480 during the reign of Bayezid II, probably by Hızır b. Ilyas, called Uzun Firdevsi (1453-after 1512).[156] There are around forty or more copies of the

---

Bektashi Order of Dervishes (London : Hartford Seminary Press, 1937) ; Ahmet Yasar Ocak, *Bektaşi menakıbnamelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri* (Istanbul : Enderun, 1983) ; *Bektachiyya : Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach*, ed. Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (Paris : Paul Geuthner, 1995); Suraiya Faroqhi, *Anadolu'da Bektaşilik* (Istanbul : Simurg, 2003). For a critical evaluation of recent books on Bektashis and Alevis published in Turkey also see idem, "Alevilik ve Bektaşilik hakkındaki son yayınlar üzerinde (1990) genel bir bakış ve bazı gerçekler," *Tarih ve Toplum* 8 (1991), pp. 20-25 and 7 (1992), pp. 115-120. Also see Suraiya Faroqhi, "The Bektashis a Report on Current Research," *Bektachiyya* , pp. 9-28 and eadem, " Conflict, Accommodation and Long-term Survival : The Bektashi Order and the Ottoman State (Sixteenth-seventeenth centuries) " in *Bektachiyya*, pp. 175-184.

[153] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Sufilik : Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII ; Yüzyıllar)* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992); Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends.*

[154] For a brief review of the Muslim religious orders in Anatolia, see Abdülkadir Gölpınarlı, *Türkiye'de Mezhepler ve Tarikatler* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1997).

[155] Filiz Kılıç, Mustafa Arslan and Tuncay Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi (Tenkitli Metin)* (Ankara : np., 2007), pp. 12, 46, 103-4, 202

[156] *Manakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. Vilayetname*, ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı (Istanbul, 1958) ; *Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. " Uzun Firdevsi". In this article on Firdevsi, *Vilayetname* is not listed as one of his works; For Ocak, Uzun Firdevsi is the most probable author. Ocak, *Kültür Tarihi Olarak Menakıbnameler*, p. 53.

Vilayetname found in the Turkish libraries, abroad and in private collections. Despite the importance of the *Vilayetname*, and the warning of Mehmed F. Köprülü on the contextual and authorial differences between the different manuscripts,[157] there has been no critical edition done including all these manuscripts. The widely used edition by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı is not a critical edition but rather a simplified version of one of the oldest known prose copies.

Gölpınarlı published this copy (1624-1625), which is in the National Library in Ankara. The facsimile copy of the manuscript can be found at the end of the 1958 edition of the book. The later edition done in 1995 did not have the same manuscript but a facsimile of another manuscript dating to the nineteenth century. [158] According to Gölpınarlı, the earliest seventeenth century manuscript is the copy of the original manuscript written between 1481 and 1501.[159]

---

[157] Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında ilk Mutasavvıflar*, p. 76.

[158] *Manakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. Vilayetname*, ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1958); There is also a German translation of *Vilayetname* done by Erich Gross based on five manuscripts. This edition does only give the translation, but not the text itself or its facsimile copies. Erich Gross, *Das Vilajet-name des Haggi Bektasch. Ein Türkisches Derwischenvangelium* (Leipzig : Mayer & Müller, 1927). I used the facsimile copy in the 1958 edition.

[159] *Manakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. Vilayetname*, p. xxix.

Menakıbü'l Arifin

(*Vita* on Baha al-Din Sultan al-Ulama Walad b. Husayn b.Ahmad Khatibi, shortly known as Celaluddin-i Rumi (1207-1273)[160] or as Mevlana, a dervish and poet from Khorasan)

Mevlana was a Persian poet and dervish around whose cult the Mevlevi order was founded in the fourteenth century. He came with his father from the city of Belh in Khorasan to Anatolia in 1217 or a year before. He settled in Konya in 1228 upon the request of the Seljuk prince Aladdin Keykubad. He studied in Aleppo and Damascus. In the Sufi formation of Mevlana, a wandering dervish, Şems-i Tebrizi played a crucial role.

Menakıbü'l Arifin is a very important source not only because of the information it gives on Mevlana, and the formation of the Mevlevi order but also for the information on the daily and social life in the city of Konya in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It also provides information on the Turkish emirates of the western Asia Minor, which were founded in the first half of the fourteenth century. It was written in the first half of the fourteenth century by Ahmet Eflaki (d. 1360),[161] who was originally from Iran and who settled in Konya in 1291. He then became the disciple of Ulu Arif Çelebi (1272-1320), the grandson of Mevlana. The work was written in Persian under the auspices of Ulu Arif Çelebi. The Turkish and French translations of the text are utilized in the thesis. The Persian text, which was edited by Tahsin Yazıcı is consulted to check certain terminology.[162] Tahsin Yazıcı used mainly the earliest fifteenth century copy of the fourteenth century original found in the Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi 1749 (the copy dates to 1424), a copy found in Bursa General Library Eşref-Zade dergahı 1203 (the copy dates to 1432) and another in the Museum of Konya Asar-ı Atika 2158 (copy dating to 1464).[163] An earlier publication of *Menakıb'ül Arifin* was done by Clément Huart, who utilized a manuscript of his own collection which dates to 1608. Huart also signaled seven manuscripts of the *Menakıb* in the French National Library, among which the oldest copy dates to 1556 and two other copies in British Museum and another copy in the Library of Vienna.[164]

---

[160] On Mevlana and his works see, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana Celaleddin : hayatı, felsefesi, eserleri eserlerinden seçmeler* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1985) ; idem. *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1983) ; Asaf Halet Çelebi, *Mevlana ve Mevlevilik* (Istanbul : Turgut Atasoy ve Ortağı, 1957) ; Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında Ilk Mutasavvıflar*, pp. 217-31; Annemarie Schimmel, *The Triumphal Sun : A Study of the Works of Jalaloddin Rumi* (London : East-West Publ., 1980).

[161] On Ahmet Eflaki and copies of the text, see Şams al-Din Ahmed Al-Aflaki Al-Arifi, *Manakıb al-Arifin*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, vol. 1 (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1976), pp. 7-28.

---

[162] Şams al-Din Ahmed Al-Aflaki Al-Arifi, *Manakib Al-Arifin*, 2 vols. ; Ahmed Eflaki, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı (Istanbul : Remzi Kitabevi, 2006); *Les Saints des derviches tourneurs*, tr. Clément Huart, 2 vols. (Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1918).

[163] Şams al-Din Ahmed Al-Aflaki Al-Arifi, *Manakib Al-Arifin*, vol. 1, pp. 22-25.

Saltukname

(Hagiographic and epic work on Sarı Saltuk, a *gazi*-dervish who is known to have engaged in *gazi* activities in Dobrudja and Crimea in the thirteenth century.)

Neither *Saltukname* nor any other historical source provide much biographical information on the saint. The earliest work mentioning Sarı Saltuk was found in an Arabic hagiographic compilation of Kemaleddin Muhammed es-Serac er-Rıfai (d. fourteenth century).[165] A later mention of Sarı Saltuk is in Ibn Battuta's travel accounts. The author mentions a city named Baba Saltuk in the *Dest-i Kıpçak* (probably near the lower Dnieper in the Ukraine), which got its name from "ecstatic devotee".[166] By the fifteenth century, he was considered to be a *Bektaşi* saint.

The only historical source on his life is the Ottoman chronicle of Yazıcıoğlu Ali. Accordingly, Sarı Saltuk, after 1263-64, came to Constantinople with Sultan Izzeddin Keykavus (d. 1280), who was then a refugee in Byzantium. [167] The Byzantine historians Pachymeres and

---

[164] *Les Saints des derviches tourneurs*, tr. Clément Huart, vol. 1, p. II.

[165] This *menakıbname* compilation was found by Michael Kiel and translated to German and cited by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Sarı Saltık. Popüler Islam'ın Balkanlar'daki Destani Öncüsü (XIII. Yüzyıl)* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000), p. 5 ; Michael Kiel " Sarı Saltuk : Pionier des Islam auf dem Balkan im 13. Jahrhundert, " in *Aleviler Kimlik ve Tarih = Alewiten : Identität und Geschichte*, ed. Ismail Engin and Erhard Franz (Hamburg : Deutches Orient-Institut, 2000), pp. 262-4.

[166] H.A.R. Gibb, B.R. Sanguinetti, C. Defrémery, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta : A.D. 1325-1354*, vol. 2 (Cambridge : CUP for the Hakluyt Society, 1962), pp. 499-500. *EI*^{2}, s.v. " Sarı Saltuk Dede".

[167] Paul Wittek, " Yazijioghli Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobrudja, " *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14/2 (1952), pp. 639-68 ; *EI*^{2}, s.v. " Sarı Saltuk

Gregoras mention Izzeddin Keykavus's arrival to Constantinople with his family and then his imprisonment and finally Berke Han of the Golden Horde saving him from the prison, but Sarı Saltuk is not mentioned.[168]

Saltukname was written by Ebu'l Hayr-i Rumi in 1480 upon the request of the Ottoman prince Cem Sultan (1459-1495). Ebu'l Hayr-i Rumi, as he indicates in the work, visited the dervish lodges of Sarı Saltuk and compiled the stories which he heard from the dervishes. There are three manuscripts of the *Saltukname*. The oldest copy is an incomplete work dating to the sixteenth century. The complete work is the one found in the Topkapı Palace.[169] The copyist of the complete copy in the Topkapı Palace made certain additions relevant to the historical realities of the sixteenth century.

The *Saltukname* is not a typical example of the *menakıbname* genre. Although it is a *menakıbname* about a *gazi*-dervish, the *Saltukname* belongs

---

Dede". For a detailed analysis of the sources and of the historiography on the settlement of the Turcomans and Sarı Saltuk in Dobrudja region see Aurel Decei, " Le problème de la colonisation des Turcs seljoukides dans la Dobrogea au XIII^e siècle, " *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10-11 (1968), pp. 85-111.

[168] On Izzeddin Keykavus and his stay in Byzantium see Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, vol. 1, pp. 183-85, 301-309 ; ibid., vol. 4, pp. 671-675 ; Albert Failler thinks that Sarı Saltuk was the uncle of Izzeddin, see ibid., vol. 1, p. 301, n. 6. For a refutation of this hypothesis see Decei, " Le problème de la colonisation des Turcs seljoukides dans la Dobrogea au XIII^e siècle, " For the analysis of the chapter on Izzeddin Keykavus in Pachymérès also see Albert Failler, " Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère, " *REB* 39 (1981), pp. 150-55. Nicephori Gregoraes, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L Schopeni (Bonn, 1829), pp. 82, 100-101.

[169] This manuscript has been published by Fahir Iz and Gönül Alpay Tekin, *Saltukname. Ebu'l Hayr Rumi'nin sözlü rivayetlerden topladığı Sarı Saltuk menakıbı,* 7 vols. (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1974-84). A critical edition was made by using the three available manuscripts by Şükrü H. Akalın, *Saltuk-name*, 3 vols. (Ankara : Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1988-90). For the analysis of *Saltukname*, see also Kemal Yüce, *Saltukname'de Tarihi, Dini ve Efsanevi Unsurlar* (Ankara : Kültür Bakanlığı, 1987).

to the sequel of *Battalname*[170] and *Danişmendname*, which are the main representatives of the heroic cycle of legends that deal with different aspects and periods of the Muslim efforts to achieve the conquest of Byzantium.

In terms of the geographical areas in which the heroes of the *Battalname* and of the *Danişmendname* led their activities, the geographical limits of the activities of Sarı Saltuk were incredibly vast. While Battal *Gazi* led his activities on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier region of the ninth century, which mainly consisted of Malatya (Melitene), Amorium, Syria and Antioch and Melik Danişmend in Malatya and in the Cappadocia region, Sarı Saltuk's activities took place in a territory extending from India to Mecca, Magrib, Baghdad, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, Ethiopia, Morea, all the Balkans, the Aegean islands, Wallachia, Moldavia, Portugal, Spain, Hungary, Russia and Crimea.

While Battal *Gazi*'s and Melik Danişmend's efforts, as they are depicted in their epics, were local and focused on the conquest of certain parts of the Byzantine lands in Anatolia, Sarı Saltuk of the *Saltukname* reincarnates in different places and different periods as the head of each and every known Muslim confrontation with the infidels between the time of Seyyid Battal *Gazi* until the rise of Osman *Gazi* of the Ottoman Emirate and of Umur *Gazi* of the Aydın Emirate. He can be seen in Spain fighting against the Christians along with the Muslims of Magrib or in India against the Hindus or in the Straits of Gibraltar confronting the Portuguese.

---

[170] Among these Anatolian heroic epic genre, one can count *Ebumuslimname*, *Battalname* and *Danişmendname*. For *Danişmendname* see above article. Yorgos Dedes, *Battalname*, 2 vols (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1996) ; Irène Mélikoff, *Abu Muslim, le porte-hache du Khorasan, dans la tradition épique turco-iranienne* (Paris : Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962). The *Battalname*, which is perhaps the earliest prose works of Islamic Turkish literature in Anatolia, narrates the heroic actions of Seyyid Battal *Gazi*, who has been identified with a historical Arab commander of the Umayyad period, who died in 740 during an Arab defeat at Akronion. In the twelfth century, there had been an epic transfer of the historical Umayyad Battal of the eighth century to the legendary Abbasid Battal of the ninth century. The composition of the *Battalname* was related with the raider-commander (*gazi*) families, who were also the patrons in the renovation of the convent of Battal *Gazi* in the thirteenth century in the Byzantine Nacoleia in Phrygia. Until the seventeenth century, the tomb of Seyyid *Gazi* was one of the most important sites for the wandering dervishes, the Abdals of Rum, who also venerated the cults of Hacı Bektaş, Otman Baba and Sarı Saltuk. For a detailed analysis and critical edition of the *Battalname* see Dedes, *Battalname*. See also Yürekli, *Legend and Architecture in the Ottoman Empire: The Shrines of Seyyid Gazi and Hacı Bektaş*.

In all these activities, the role of the *gazi*s is considered to be the most crucial in the conquest of the infidel lands. Sarı Saltuk of the *Saltukname* is representative of not only the Turco-Muslim *gazi*s in the Byzantine lands, in Asia Minor or in the Balkans but of all Muslim groups trying to extend the Abode of Islam. Without Sarı Saltuk, all these groups are depicted as helpless. Thus we see in the *Saltukname* that when Sarı Saltuk leaves for adventures in the worlds of the genies and witches, the lands conquered by the Muslims were lost back to the infidels.

The *Saltukname* in that respect can be considered as a legendary history of the transformation of *Darü'l küfr* into *Darü'l Islam* since the rise of Islam where the central importance in this pattern is attached to the role of the *gazi*s, whose prototype was considered to be Seyyid Battal *Gazi*. Through Sarı Saltuk's figure, an uninterrupted chain was created between the *gazi*s of the past such as Seyyid Battal *Gazi*, Eyne *Gazi* (?), Melik Danişmend and the *gazi*s of the future such as Osman *Gazi* of the Ottomans and Umur *Gazi* of the Aydınoğulları.

The *Saltukname*, which consists of forty-three episodes in three volumes, though full of legends, fairy tale figures and hagiographical elements and *topoi*, does contain historical elements and has a universal, providential, apocalyptic and periodized structure. Through the appropriation of all Muslim confrontation with the infidels around the figure of the *gazi*-dervish Sarı Saltuk, this history acquires a universal character. All events and actions including those of Sarı Saltuk are explained through God's providence. Sarı Saltuk's prophesies especially on the city of Istanbul and on the arrival of the Messiah are the apocalyptic parts of this narrative. The periodization is also very interesting. Between the narration of certain historically known Muslim conquests of the infidel lands, Sarı Saltuk visits the lands and the world of the genies, witches and monsters. These fairy-tale like stories in fact play a role of transition from one period and geography in which there had been a Muslim expansion to another. During those intervals, Sarı Saltuk leaves the actual world and returns whenever there is a necessity or occasion to undertake *gaza*. These stories explain why during certain times *gazi*s and *gaza* activities disappeared. It was because Sarı Saltuk headed for adventures in the world of the genies, the witches and the giants.

The necessity to write a universal history of the *gazi*s was probably due to the historical context in which the *Saltukname* was written. Prince Cem's patronage of the work must have been motivated by a political bid against his brother Bayezid II (1481-1512) for the throne to draw the support of resented *gazi* circles, who were against the systematic pursuit of the imperial policies of Mehmed II. *Saltukname* in this sense can be considered an alternative history to the chronicles of the Ottoman dynasty. It did not exclude the Ottoman dynasty but reminded the Ottoman rulers that they were first and foremost *gazi*s. If they could conquer the infidel lands and Constantinople, it was thanks to God's providence and to the help and initiation of the *veli* Sarı Saltuk. And if they had his help, it was because they were *gazi*s. Therefore they must not forget the *gazi* values and milieu from which they had issued. The advices that Sarı Saltuk gave to Osman so that he must not leave the *gazi* values, the prophesies concerning the fall of Constantinople and the danger of transferring the capital from Edirne to Constantinople and the critic of the employment of devshirmes in the high state administration, they all serve this end.

Apart from being a *gazi*, Sarı Saltuk was also depicted as a Kalenderi dervish.[171] As a *gazi*-dervish, he continuously travels, wanders and only very rarely comes to rest in specific areas such as Dobrudja region, Edirne, Crimea and Sinop. The miraculous deeds of Sarı Saltuk are prominent in the text. His *veli* status puts him above the terrestrial authority of the Seljuk sultan Izzeddin or that of Ottoman Begs or Sultans, as in the *Velayetname* of Otman Baba. Sarı Saltuk gives them advice, offers or retrieves his help according to their behaviour and their attitude.

---

[171] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, p. 190.

Vilayetname-i Hacım Sultan

(*Vita* on Hacım Sultan, a dervish from Khorasan who has known to have lived in western Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries).

The *Vilayetname* of Hacım Sultan was written by Dervish Burhan, one of the disciples of Hacım Sultan. The critical edition of the text with its German translation was done by Rudolf Tschudi, who used a manuscript in his private collection and which cannot be dated precisely but which he considered to be a copy of a thirteenth century original.[172] Tschudi gives a list of some other available manuscripts of the *Vilayetname*.[173] According to the *Vilayetname*, Hacım Sultan accompanied Hacı Bektaş from Khorasan to the lands of Rum, Asia Minor in the thirteenth century. The same *Vilayetname* mentions his activities in the Germiyan and Menteşe emirates and hence places Hacım Sultan to the fourteenth century. At the same time it mentions the Akkoyunlus, which were founded in the fifteenth century. There are also certain sections in the *Vilayetname* of Hacım Sultan, which seems to be extracted from the *Vilayetname-ı Hacı Bektaş*. Therefore, one can say that the text cannot simply be a copy of a thirteenth-century text but that there are multiple layers indicating additions of later centuries in the *Vilayetname* as in most of the *menakıbname*s which are examined in the thesis.

---

[172] Rudolf Tschudi, *Das Vilajet-name des Hadschim Sultan* (Berlin :Mayer & Müller, 1914).

[173] Ibid., pp. ii-xiii.

Vilayetname-i Abdal Musa

(*Vita* on Abdal Musa, a dervish who is known to have lived at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century in Western Anatolia.)

All the information on this dervish-saint is based on oral tradition and on his hagiographical life. According to the *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi*, Abdal Musa was the disciple of Hacım Sultan, who established his hospice in Teke köyü-Elmalı near Antalya. He also led activities in Denizli, Isparta, Muğla and Aydın. Seyyid Ali Sultan, who will be discussed in the below article was Abdal Musa's disciple according to *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi.*

There are two historical inscriptions, which hint at the establishment of his cult in the fifteenth century around Denizli and Teke ili.[174] One of them is an inscription dating to 1408, on a fountain of a dervish convent of Abdal Musa in Denizli. The other is a document dating to the reign of Mehmed II (r. 1444-46, 1451-81), which mentions a dervish convent of Abdal Musa around Teke ili. According to this document, the convent was built in the fourteenth century. The Ottoman writers in the later centuries mentioned his participation in the conquest of Bursa with the Ottoman sultan

---

[174] Teke-ili or Teke-eli, " Country of the Teke, " a region in southern Anatolia around the Gulf of Antalya. Roughly corresponding to the classical areas of Lykia and Pamphylia. It took its name from Teke beys, Turcoman leaders, who establised a principality in the region in the fourteenth century. The Turcoman raids started in the twelfth century, intensified after the conquest of Antalya by the Seljuk ruler, Keyhüsrev in 1207 and the Turcoman presence increased after 1243. *EI*^{2}, s.v. " Teke-eli ".

Orhan *Gazi*.[175] His *velayetname*, however, does not mention Orhan *Gazi* but Umur (d. 1348), the ruler of the Aydınoğulları emirate. Today the convent of Abdal Musa is in Tekke köyü-Elmalı. In the Teke-ili, there are many convents of the dervishes, who are known to be the disciples of Abdal Musa.[176]

There are two copies of *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi*, which are in the private collection of Abdurrahman Güzel, who edited the one dating to the seventeenth century. According to the editor, the manuscript is a copy of an original dating to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The text was written by a certain Veli Baba, who has been unidentified until now.[177]

Düsturname

(Heroic epic concerning the life and exploits of the Turkish emir Aydınoğlu Umur Bey (d. 1348))

Düsturname relates the exploits of a historical figure, the Turkish emir Umur Beg of Aydın (d. 1348), who was the antagonist of the *martyrion* on the soldier matryrs of Philadelphia, mentioned above. The epic was written by Enveri on whom we have very little information in 1465 under the patronage of the grand vizier of Mehmed II, Mahmud Paşa (d. 1474). According to Stavrides, the commission on the part of Mahmud Paşa of an epic dealing with the leader of an Anatolian Turkish emirate, which had been annexed by the Ottomans forty years earlier (1425), was very significant.[178]

---

[175] *Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. " Abdal Musa"; Also for Abdal Musa, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, " Abdal Musa, " *Türk Kültürü* 11/124 (1973), pp. 198-207.

[176] Abdurahman Güzel, *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), p. 13-14. For Tekke köyü, see H. Hellenkemper & F. Hild, *TIB 8. Phrygien und Pisidien*, vol. 2, pp. 874-5.

[177] Güzel, *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi*, p. 59-63.

Umur Beg had been a sea-faring *gazi* and his exploits created a cult among the sailors of the Aegean for several generations. It is revealing that the *Düsturname* was composed in 1464, one year after the outbreak of the Ottoman-Venetian war, which necessitated greater Ottoman naval control of the Aegean Sea, in order to protect Istanbul and the islands. The commission of such a work was an indication that the Ottomans was trying to bring this cult under their control, at a time when there was a need for a powerful navy.

The world depicted in the *Düsturname* is a frontier milieu where there was constant war with the infidels, the *küffar*. Umur Beg, the leader of the Aydınoğulları Emirate with the leaders and soldiers of some other Turco-Muslim emirates such as Karasi and Saruhan[179] and sometimes with the help of the Uygur emir of Eretna,[180] was leading *gaza* activities against the Aegean islands and against areas such Morea, Monemvasia, Mistra, Didymoteichon, Thessaloniki, Kilia or Licostone and Wallachia. They were leading *gaza* on land and on sea, attacking infidel boats on the sea.[181] The headquarter of Umur Beg was Ayasoluk, near Ephesus.

---

[178] Theoharis Stavrides, *The Sultan of Vezirs. The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelovic (1453-1474)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 294-96.

[179] Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, p. 123.

[180] *Ibid.*, p.117. For Eretna see the footnote 1 on the same page.

Due to many raids and razzias that Umur Bey carried out against the Aegean islands held by the Latins, a Crusade was organized against him (1344). The lands of Umur Bey's descendants were subdued and their lands were annexed by the Ottomans in 1425. The cult of Umur Bey continued for many years among the sailors of the Aegean sea.

There are two known copies of the *Düsturname*. One is housed in the Bibliothèque nationale Paris, ancient fonds turc 250 (not dated but probably dates to fifteenth century).[182] The other one is in the Izmir National Library 22/401 (dates to 1489). The Paris manuscript was first published by Mükremin Halil Yınanç.[183] The critical and commented edition of the Paris edition using the Izmir edition for amendments and its translation into French were done by Irène Mélikoff.[184]

---

[181] For example once on their way from Monemvasia to Ayasoluk, they met a boat full of valuable stones and gold coming from Crimea. The *gazis* under the command of Ibrahim beg, took all the valuables, left the people on the boat on the seashore and put fire on the boat. The burning of the boat by Ibrahim Beg was highly criticized by Umur. Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, p. 72.

[182] Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, p. 27.

[183] Mükrimin Halil Yınanç, *Düsturname-i Enveri*. He also analyzed the text in *Düsturname-i Enveri. Medhal* (Istanbul : Evkaf Matbaası, 1930)

[184] Melikoff, *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha*. For the analysis of the text with respect to the Byzantine history see Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident* ; On the Emirate of Aydınoğulları see Akın, *Aydınoğulları Tarihi Hakkında bir Araştırma* ; Also see Elizabeth Zachariadou, " Sept traités inédits entre Venise et les émirats d'Aydın et de Menteşe (1331-1407), " in *Studi preottomani e ottomani, Atti del convegno di Napoli (24-26 settembre 1974)*, ed. Aldo Gallotta (Napoli : Istituto Universitario Orientale , 1976), pp. 229-40 ; Ahrweiler, " L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317). "

Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan

(*Vita* on Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıl Deli) (d. 1402 or 1412),[185] a *gazi*-dervish who participated in the conquest of Rumelia in the fourteenth century)

We do not have much information on the biography of Seyyid Ali Sultan but from the Ottoman registers, together with his *Vilayetname,* one can understand that he participated in the conquest of Roumelia, mainly the conquest of Gelibolu, Bolayır, Dimetoka and Edirne with Süleyman Paşa

(d. 1357), the son of Orhan *Gazi* (1326-62). According to Irène Beldiceanu since Süleyman Paşa died in 1357, this date is the *ante quem* for the death of Seyyid Ali Sultan. [186] Rıza Yıldırım taking into consideration a *vakf* donation granted to Kızıldeli in 1402 by Bayezid I and by Musa Çelebi in 1412 concluded that Kızıldeli's death must have been after 1412 or earliest after 1402.[187] After the conquest of Didymoteichon (Dimetoka in Turkish) and of

---

[185] Bedri Noyan, *Seyyid Ali Sultan Velayetnamesi* (Ankara : Ayyıldız Yayınları, 1999), p. 3 ; Rıza Yıldırım, "History Beneath Clouds of Legend: Seyyid Ali Sultan and His Place in Early Ottoman History According to Legends, Narratives, and Archival Evidence," International Journal of Turkish Studies 15/1-2 (2009), p. 47 note. 130 and p. 55.

[186] Irène 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)*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon : University of Crete, 1996), pp. 45-63. Beldiceanu analyzes in detail the sources, the Ottoman registers and the documents as well as the *Vilayetname* of Seyyid Ali Sultan, which was published by Bedri Noyan, *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli Sultan) Vilayetnamesi.* For a recent edition of the *Vilayetname* see Rıza Yıldırım, *Seyyid Ali Sultan ve Velayetnamesi* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007). For the available manuscripts of on the *Vilayetname* of Seyyid Sultan, see Yıldırım, ibid., pp. 45-48. Also see idem., "History Beneath Clouds of Legend: Seyyid Ali Sultan and His Place in Early Ottoman History According to Legends, Narratives, and Archival Evidence," pp. 21-57.

[187] See note 185 above.

Edirne, he was settled to the west of Didymoteichon near a *derbend*, pass or defile. His convent is still in this area.[188]

The oldest copy of the *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Gazi* is the one found in the dervish convent of Kaygusuz Abdal in Cairo, which is now in the United States. This was the copy used by Birge.[189] Bedri Noyan and Rıza Yıldırım, who published the *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Gazi*, used the manuscript in Ankara National Library no. 1189 (dates to 1897), which is the only complete manuscript of the *Vilayetname.*[190] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak claims that this nineteenth century copy shows linguistic characteristics of the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries.[191] At the same time, the author of this manuscript is a certain Cezbi and the only known Cezbi was a late seventeenth and early eighteenth century poet. [192] Yıldırım also provides information on the other copies of the *Vilayetname* in public and private collections.

One of the reason behind the production of the text seems to be a possible attempt to confiscate the *vakf* land granted to the hospice of Rüstem

---

[188] For the economic activities of the Seyyid Ali Sultan convent see, Suraiya Faroqhi, " Agricultural Activities in a Bektashi Center : The Tekke of Kizil Deli, 1750-1830, " *SF* 35 (1976), pp. 69-96.

[189] See Beldiceanu-Steinherr, " Seyyid Ali Sultan d'après les registres ottomans. L'installation de l'Islam hétérodoxe en Thrace, " p. 49, n. 22. Birge copied this manuscript by hand and utilized it in his book. John Kingsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London : Hartford Seminary Press, 1937), pp. 51-52, 56.

[190] Noyan, *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli Sultan) Vilayetnamesi* ; Yıldırım, *Seyyid Ali Sultan ve Velayetnamesi.*

[191] Ocak, *Bektaşi menakıbnamelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri*, p. 13.

[192] Yıldırım, *Seyyid Ali Sultan ve Velayetnamesi*, p. 49.

Gazi, who is known to be the closest subsidiary of Kızıldeli.[193] This section of the *Vilayetname* when considered with the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century author Cezbi and with the date of the restoration of the Rüstem *Gazi* hospice in 1759-60, makes one think that the nineteenth century copy published by Noyan and Yıldırım can well be a copy of the eigteenth-century original, which contains parts about earlier traditions of Seyyid Ali Sultan.

Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin b. İsrail

(*Vita* on Şeyh Bedreddin of Simavna (1358/59-1416), a *fakıh* (an expert of canonical jurisprudence) and a Sufi şeyh, who revolted against the Ottoman sultan Mehmed I (1413-21) in 1416.)[194]

Bedreddin unlike some of the dervishes who have been mentioned above was a historical character on whom we have information. He was the son of *Gazi* Israil, also a *kadı*, who was among the first seven *gazis* to cross the Dardanelles to engage in *gaza* activities.[195] He served Musa Çelebi as *kadıasker.*[196] He was a scholar who received his education in Edirne, Bursa, Konya and Egypt. In Cairo, he became the disciple of a Sufi şeyh called Hüseyin Ahlati. He organized a revolt against Mehmed I, which was also mentioned by the historians contemporary to Bedreddin such as Doukas and Ibn Arabşah and Şükrullah.[197] The revolt was suppressed by Mehmed I and Bedreddin and many of his disciples were put to death.

---

[193] Ibid., p. 180-81.

[194] This *menakıbname* is a manuscript, which is found in Istanbul Atatürk Library. Muallim Cevdet Collection. It was edited by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı and Ismet Sungurbey under the title *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Menakıbı* (Istanbul: Eti, 1967). Another *menakıbname* collection on Bedreddin is found in Süleymaniye Library dating to the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The stories in this collection is more like a fairytale. As in Sarı Saltuk, we see Bedreddin with genies in India and Egypt. For this collection of *menakıbnames* see Zeynep Yürekli Görkay, " Şeyh Bedreddin ve Ecinniler : Alışılmışın ve Çalışılmışın Dışında bir Menakıbname, " in *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlardan Osmanlıya,* ed. Günay Kut and Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz (Istanbul : Simurg, 2005), pp. 721-729.

Şeyh Bedreddin's uprising in 1416 was a serious challenge to the Ottoman empire-building project and it reflected certain tensions created by this project.[198] Apart from the importance of its analysis for the political tensions after the Interregnum period and during the early periods of the Ottoman Empire, the *Menakıb* on Şeyh Bedreddin also provides rich information on the subject of identity. The world of Şeyh Bedreddin comprised of a vast territory from the Balkans to Egypt and to Mecca, and from Tebriz to Wallachia and Chios.

---

[195] Orhan Şaik Gökyay, " Şeyh Bedreddin'in Babası Kadı mı idi ?, " *Tarih ve Toplum* 2 (1984), pp. 96-8; Halil Erdem Çapa, " Contextualizing Şeyh Bedreddin : Notes on Halil b. Ismail's Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin b. Israil" in *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlardan Osmanlıya,* ed. Günay Kut and Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz (Istanbul : Simurg, 2005), p. 287.

[196] Çapa, "Contextualizing Şeyh Bedreddin," pp. 288-289.

[197] Doukas, *Historia Turco-Byzantina. Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks,* tr. Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit : Wayne State University, 1975), pp. 120-1 ; the section on Bedreddin in Ibn Arabşah's *Ukudü'n-nasiha* was translated and quoted in Gölpınarlı and Sungurbey, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin,* pp. x-xi ; Şükrullah, *Behçetü'l-tevarih,* in *Osmanlı Tarihleri,* ed. Nihal Atsız (Istanbul : Türkiye Yayınevi, 1949), p.60.

[198] See for these political tensions and the reign of Musa Çelebi during which Bedreddin served as *kadıasker*, the highest judicial authority of the empire after the *şeyhülislam*, the

Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin b. Israil, written between 1455 and 1460 by Halil b. Ismail, the grandson of Şeyh Bedreddin, was aimed at posthumously rehabilitating the şeyh's name at the court of Mehmed II during whose reign with the centralizing attitude of the newly constructed Ottoman State, many of the properties of the dervishes were confiscated.[199]

From the *Menakıb*, one can gather Halil Ismail's personal reasons in the rehabilitation of his grandfather's memory at this given moment. Thus, according to Halil Ismail, during the reign of Murad II (1404-1451), with the support of Molla Hüsrev (d.1480), the famous Ottoman jurist,[200] Halil

Ismail became the imam of the Great Mosque in Edirne but then he was imprisoned with some of his relatives. They were released with the intervention of the daughter of Murad II. He then came to Bursa where Akşemseddin (d. 1459), a saint of the Bayramiyya order, poet and the teacher of Mehmed II,[201] welcomed and took care of him and of his relatives. He was married to the daughter of Akşemseddin and also participated in the

---

head of the hierarchy of *ulema,* Dimitris J. Kastritsis, *The Sons of Bayezid. Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402-13* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

[199] The hints of this rehabilitation can be seen in the *Menakıb* where according to Halil Ismail, Bedreddin escaped from Iznik because the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed I did not allow him to go to pilgrimage to Mecca. When he arrived to the Emirate of Isfendiyar in Sinop, Bedreddin was willing to go to "east" or to the "Tatars." The Beg of Isfendiyar, however, did not find it suitable for Bedreddin to go the lands under the control of Timur's son, Şahruh, suggested to send him to Crimea instead. Bedreddin accepted this offer reluctantly and ended up in Wallachia "against his will" because the captain changed the course of his ship. Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı*, pp. 102-106. On Bedreddin's unfair treatment and punishment see ibid., pp. 123-130.

[200] *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Khosrew Molla"; *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v."Molla Hüsrev."

[201] *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ak Shams al-Din"; *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Akşemseddin."

Battle of Kosovo in 1448 with Murad II. As someone who still lived and worked within the Ottoman administration but at the same time as the grandson of a personality who was known to have revolted against Ottoman rule, he probably wished to whitewash the family's name and secure his position.

This *menakıbname* is a manuscript, which is found in Istanbul Atatürk Library, Muallim Cevdet K 157. It was edited by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı and Ismet Sungurbey. According Ahmet Yaşar Ocak the manuscript dates to the end of the fifteenth century.[202]

Velayetname-i Otman Baba

(*Vita* on Otman Baba (1378/9-1478) ,a dervish who came from Azerbaijan to Western Anatolia[203] with the founder of the Mongol Timurid dynasty, Timur (d. 1405),[204] in 1402.)

Otman Baba was a historical character known to us by his *Velayetname,* which was completed in 1483, after the conquest of Constantinople, by one of Baba's dervishes, Küçük Abdal. The *Velayetname-i Otman Baba* constitutes an important source for an authentic account of Baba's life, the Sufi doctrine of abdalism and the history of *Rum*

---

[202] Ocak, *Bektaşi menakıbnamelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri,* pp. 56-57.

[203] For Germiyan and Saruhan, see note 1 in the Introduction.

[204] *EI*^{2}, s.v. " Timur Lang".

Abdalları.[205] The *Velayetname* is found in two copies. One was in Cebeci Il Halk Kütüphanesi n. 495, which has been transferred to National Library in Ankara (the nineteenth century copy of the fifteenth century original). The second one is found in Ankara Genel Kütüphanesi n. 643 (undated).[206]

One of the most important reasons for the production of the text seems to convince the readers that Otman Baba possessed *vilayet* and that he was the promoter of it in the outer and inner worlds. *Vilayet* according to the author is the shepherd of prophethood (*nübüvvet*) and the *veli* was the caliph of God in the universe and enjoyed a total freedom from worldly ties. What distinguished Otman Baba from the other *evliya* (pl. of *veli*) was that he claimed to embody the Divine truth as well as the Prophets Muhammad, Jesus, Moses and Adam.[207] Apart from being a *veli*, according to Küçük Abdal, the author of the text, Otman Baba was also *Kutb al-Aktab*,[208] that is, God's emissary, who was in control of two worlds. Titles such as *sultan*, *şah*, *padişah* were given to him to refer his absolute sovereignty in the whole universe.

---

[205] Inalcık, " Dervish and Sultan : An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilayetnamesi, " pp. 19.

[206] For the critical edition of *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi*, see Filiz Kılıç, Mustafa Arslan and Tuncay Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi (Tenkitli Metin)* (Ankara : np., 2007). For a partial transcription of the *Velayetname* by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı and published by Murat Bardakçı, see Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, " Otman Baba Vilayet-namesi, " in *In Memoriam Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı Hatıra Sayısı*, ed. Ahmet T. Kut & Günay Kut (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1995), pp. lvii-cv. A manuscript found in a private collection was edited by Şevki Koca, *Odman Baba Vilayetnamesi. Vilayetname-i Sahi Göçek Abdal* (n.p., 2002) This is not a critical edition but a latin transcription of the manucript. For the manuscripts of *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba*, see Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi*, p. xv-xvi. In the thesis, Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül's edition is used.

[207] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi*, p. 16.

[208] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Similar claims to being *kutb* and to the denial of the legitimacy of the sultan's rule or anything representing the present order of the world, can be found in the socio-religious or mystico-political upheavals of the Babai's in 1240 or of Şeyh Bedreddin in 1416. Otman Baba's claims did not culminated to an open revolt against Mehmed II, nevertheless one can see the challenge to the worldly authority of the Sultan and a constant reminding that if Mehmed II could conquer Constantinople or other infidel countries, it was with the spiritual aid of Otman Baba. [209] Unless his superiority was recognized by Mehmed II, Otman Baba and his *abdal*s continued to be a threat in the Balkans and in Istanbul by causing disturbances especially in the cities.

Halil İnalcık, who examined the *Velayetname* of Otman Baba, pointed out that the *kutb* claim of Otman Baba combined with the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II's autocratic rule, made Otman Baba choose him as the one to challenge.[210] In the *Velayetname*, we see why such a challenge did not culminate in a revolt. Apparently Otman Baba and his *abdal*s through their connections with the nomads (*yürüks*), frontier begs (*gazi* lords of the previous decades) and with the dervish circles formed an important pressure on Mehmed II. Nevertheless, they still could not challenge Mehmed II's authority through an open revolt as the Ottoman Sultan seemed to have gained considerable power upon the conquest of Constantinople. This is probably why in the *Velayetname*, Otman Baba kept reminding Mehmed II that his conquests were realized upon the will of God and hence upon the will of Otman Baba, who was God's emissary on earth. We see that a certain kind of consensus was reached at the end of the *Velayetname* between Otman Baba and Mehmed II. While Mehmed II gradually recognized Otman Baba's superiority, Otman Baba and his *abdal*s began to get reconciled with Mehmed II's authority.[211] Finally Otman Baba and his *abdal*s gave up their wanderings and settled near Edirne.[212]

---

[209] *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 39, 41, 115, 178-79, 183-184, 192, 195, 216, 218-220, 253, 254, 268.

[210] İnalcık, " Dervish and Sultan," p. 24.

In the *Velayetname*, there are clear indications of Otman Baba's belonging and well-acceptance within the *gazi*, *yürük* and *abdal* groups, while some other groups within the Ottoman society disliked him. Otman Baba and his *abdal*s were closely related with the nomads and the villages. They are seen in the *Velayetname* as constructing roads and bridges around the villages.[213] Wandering around from one place to another, Otman Baba worked in the villages as shepherd, beekeeper, ironworker, woodcutter or as miller. Apart from these activities of income for both Otman Baba, his *abdal*s and the villagers of the region, the *Velayetname* also cites "raiding" as one of the means of income.[214]

---

[211] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* p. 232.

[212] *Ibid.,* p. 261.

[213] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* p. 31.

[214] *Ibid.,* p. 34.

CHAPTER 3:

"NEO-MARTYRS' MESSAGE" RE-VISITED: *MARTYRIA* AS A MEANS OF RE-AFFIRMING BYZANTINE UNIVERSALISM

Most of the *martyria* analyzed in the thesis have been examined in the past as evidence of conversion to Islam and as a part of neo-martyrdom literature. Elizabeth Zachariadou, for the first time, approached these texts in terms of the ideology behind their compositions. As the saint is a person whose acts and behavior are in accordance with the principles and ideals of his Church, the saint's *vita* or *martyrion* reflects the ideology of the Church and includes a message to Christians. Taking this fact into consideration, Zachariadou argued that the *martyria* of the concerned period reflect the ideology of the Byzantine Church. She also looked at the patterns of martyrdom in the few martyrdom narratives of the period of Arab conquests and those under the Latin conquest.

For the Christian martyrs of the Arab invasions, the pattern consists of a war between Christians and infidels; the faithful is captured and forced to conversion; despite the cruelty of the infidel, the Christian persists in his faith and dies as a martyr.[1] In the stories of the martyrs under Latin rule, first there is a dialogue, then the Greek Orthodox are punished for their religious belief and finally martyred.[2] The stories of martyrdom under Ottoman rule on the other hand do not describe war, pillage, captivity and massacre, and the idea of resisting does not appear in the *martyria.*

---

[1] Zachariadou, "Neomartyrs' Message," p. 56.

[2] Ibid., p. 57.

Thus, looking at these patterns and pointing out the pro-Ottoman tendency of the Church, which was reflected in the instances of the collaboration of metropolitans with the Ottoman sultans and of some monastic centers accepting protection and tax exemption from the Ottoman sultans, Zachariadou concluded that these hagiographical texts were composed to warn the Orthodox Christians against Islamisation. At the same time, they aimed to prove to the Roman Catholics, who disdained Christians living under Ottoman rule, that Christians who lived under Turkish rule were by no means less faithful than those who lived under Byzantine or Latin rule. These messages given by the authors of these texts reflect the choice that the Byzantine Church had to make between the Latins and Turks. According to Zachariadou, the Church preferred the Turks because it knew that Greek Orthodox Christianity, though it would be degraded, could survive under the Sultan and a bitter conflict started between the Byzantine State and the Church.[3]

As *martyria* are religious texts and as the protagonists of these narratives are martyrs, Zachariadou took for granted that these texts were written by members of the Byzantine Church. She therefore related the martyrdom patterns in the texts with the ideology of the Byzantine Church of the late Byzantine and early Ottoman period. But were all the authors members of the Byzantine Church? If not, who were they? What did the patterns, which were pointed out by Zachariadou, signify?

---

[3] Zachariadou, "Neomartyrs' Message," p. 54; see also eadem, " Early Ottoman Documents from the Prodromos Monastery (Serres), " *SF* 28 (1969), pp.1-12; eadem, " Ottoman Documents from the Archives of Dionysios (Mount Athos), " *SF* 30 (1971), pp. 1-35; Nicolas Oikonomides, " Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane, " *SF* 35 (1976), pp.1-10.

The *martyria* of the period between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries can be grouped in three categories in terms of their authors. The first group consists of the texts written by the high level administrators of the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II. These are the texts on Niketas the Younger and on Michael of Alexandria. The second group consists of texts that were written by or related with the hesychast Byzantine Church members. The ones on the XIII Martyrs of Cyprus, John the Younger, the Lithuanian martyrs and on Anthimos, the Archbishop of Athens are in this group. And the third group consists of *martyria* written by authors, who were probably religious men of the Byzantine Church, but not related with the hesychast groups. These are the *martyria* on Theodore the Younger, George of Adrianople, Michael Mauroeides and the Martyrs of Philadelphia. By analyzing their authors and the authorial intentions, I will argue in this section that the authorial intention of the first two groups is closely related with Andronikos II's and the hesychast Byzantine churchmen's efforts to defend and to impose Byzantine universalism and ecumenism against the damage that this ideology received in the post 1204 period within the Byzantine society and within the Orthodox world. Each of the martyrdoms in the third group has its own individuality in terms of authorial intention.

Group 1: High Level Administrators of Andronikos II

The authors of the *martyria* on Niketas the Younger and Michael of Alexandria were respectively Theodore Mouzalon and Theodore Metochites. What these two personalities had in common was that they both served the same Byzantine emperor, Andronikos II, as *megas logothetes*. They were the closest counselors of the Byzantine emperor, in different periods but both in the first half of his reign. Apart from being the closest counselors, they were also the officials who acted as the head of Byzantine diplomacy and of the foreign affairs of the Byzantine state. Hence they were the first ones to receive information from the foreign lands. The information on the martyrdoms of Niketas the Younger and of Michael of Alexandria probably reached them through the diplomatic embassies in the case of Michael of Alexandria and through the news sent by the Christians from Seljuk lands in the case of Niketas the Younger. Theodore Mouzalon in fact states that he received the information on the martyrdom of Niketas the Younger from the reports of the "Christ-loving troops," who were probably the Christians living in the Seljuk state.[4] For Michael of Alexandria, we know from the text that he was martyred as he was about to depart with a Byzantine embassy on its way back from Alexandria.

Both Theodore Mouzalon and Theodore Metochites stated directly or indirectly in their narratives that they were writing for Andronikos II. At the very end of the *logos*, Theodore Mouzalon begs the martyr Niketas to strengthen the "Christ-loving rule" of the Emperor Andronikos II, "who rules over the conflicts, the people and who breaks into pieces all the revolting nations, who do not prostrate before God."[5] Theodore Metochites, as well, indicates that he wrote the martyrdom of Michael of Alexandria because the Emperor, "as someone who wanted the well-being of the subjects of the Empire and of all Christians, liked this story a lot and wanted that everybody should hear about this martyr."[6] We can then say that these texts were written under imperial patronage and therefore the choice of the subject matter in the texts must be closely related with the concerns and policies of Andronikos II.

---

[4] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," p. 129.

What were the concerns of Andronikos II which led to the composition of these two texts? The first visible concern behind the composition of both *martyria* seems to be the Turkish advance. The two *megas logothetai* served Andronikos II during a period in which the Byzantine emperor was passionately concerned with the Turkish incursions and destructions and with bringing peace and unity to the Church through the restoration of Orthodoxy.

In the text on Niketas the Younger, the author asks the martyr to stop the "Persian hurricane,"[7] which was most probably the Turkish menace to the eastern parts of the Byzantine Empire, taking place since 1267.[8] During the last years of his reign, between 1280 and 1282, the father of Andronikos II, Michael VIII, understood that he could no longer ignore the eastern problem and sent his son to the Meander region in 1280. During this visit Andronikos II fortified the defenses on the Sangarios region and reconstructed and repopulated the city of Tralles (modern Aydın). The city of Tralles would be destroyed by the Turkish invasions in 1284-85.

---

[5] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," p. 153.

[6] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, " p. 678.

[7] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," p. 153.

In nearly all the orations in praise of Andronikos II, which also served as a medium of lobbying, one can see that the focus was on Asia Minor and Turco-Muslim menace.[9] The long sojourn of Andronikos II in Asia Minor with Theodore Mouzalon during 1290-93 was also aimed at the fortification of defenses against Turkish incursions. Andronikos II would use some diplomatic measures by supporting one of the brothers of Masud II to stop these incursions, but this brother of Masud would be defeated in 1292 by the Mongol army headed by Masud II.[10] The measures that Andronikos II took until 1294 were mostly defensive in nature and they did not help to stop the Turkish advance. Theodore Mouzalon probably wrote the text in the aftermath of the defeat in 1292.

---

[8] Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, vol. 2, pp. 402-6.

[9] Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, pp. 101-102, 169-172.

[10] Elizabeth Zachariadou dated this event to 1292 in "Pachymeres on the Amourioi of Kastamonu," *BMGS* 3 (1977), pp. 57-70, reprinted in *Romania and the Turks (c. 1300-c. 1500)*, Study II (Aldershot,1985), p. 69. Zachariadou rightly argued that Masour mentioned by Pachymeres was not Masud II but a brother of Masud. However she could not identify this brother. The historian Aksarayi, contemporary to the reign of Masud II, talks about this event and gives the name of the brother who revolted against Masud in Kastamonu. Accordingly, his name was Melik Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan Ibn Sultan Izzeddin. Aksarayi, *Müsameretü'l-Ahbar,* p. 137.

One of the court officials who wrote orations in praise of Andronikos II and who emphasized the importance of the defense of Asia Minor against the Turkish advance was Theodore Metochites, the author of the text on Michael of Alexandria.[11] Metochites wrote the *logos* on Michael of Alexandria sometime between 1311 and 1325.[12] As Angeliki Laiou pointed out, the concern and the efforts of Andronikos II for the eastern question continued until 1310.[13] By 1310, it was clear that his efforts had not paid off and almost all parts of the eastern Byzantine empire were conquered by the Turco-Muslim groups.

The composition of the text on the martyr Michael of Alexandria was in the immediate aftermath of 1310. Maybe for this reason, Theodore Metochites does not ask the intervention of the martyr Michael to stop the Turkish advance as Theodore Mouzalon. On the other hand, the place of birth of Michael, the area from which he was captured, hints to Andronikos II's and Theodore Metochites's ongoing concern for the fate of these parts of the Empire and of the Byzantines living there. The text mentions that Michael's *patris* was an area near Smyrna in Ionia. He was most probably enslaved during one of the Turkish expeditions which had been taking place since 1284. By 1304, this region began to be controlled by the Emirate of Aydın.

---

[11] The two orations of Metochites to Andronikos II are found in Metochites, Cod. Vindob. phil gr. 95. Also see Angeliki Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronikos II 1282-1328* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1972), p. 77; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, pp. 102, 169-73.

[12] See the section on Michael of Alexandria in Chapter Two for a discussion on the date of the composition of the text.

[13] Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 32-37, 76-93.

One of the differences between the text of Theodore Metochites and that of Theodore Mouzalon is that the former is related with the Byzantine relations with the Mamluk state, which was an important internal and external issue during the composition of the text. Since the beginning of the Mamluk-Ilkhanid hostilities and the closure of the land route which passed through Mesopotomia, Byzantium had become an important ally for Mamluk Egypt due to the sea route passing through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. [14] The diplomatic and commercial relations between Mamluk Egypt and Byzantium had been continuing since the reign of Michael VIII. [15] The Mamluks began to transport slaves from Central Asia and from the

---

[14] Traditionally, manpower for the needs of the Mamluk army was supplied from central Asia and from the Caucasus, arriving in Egypt via Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. From 1243 onwards, this land route came under the control of the Ilkhanid Mongols who had the ambition of overpowering the Mamluks in Syria and Egypt. For this reason, they put an embargo on the transit and export of slaves. Under such circumstances, the Mamluks were in need of another route that would supply them slaves to replace war casualties and to rejuvenate the army. After the re-establishment of Byzantine authority in Constantinople in 1261, the Byzantine-Genoese treaties in 1261 and in 1263 permitted the Genoese to have access to the Black Sea. The Mamluk Sultans focusing on the Black Sea area made treaties with the Byzantines, Genoese and Mongols of the Golden Horde for the importation of slaves over the sea route from the Black Sea through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles between 1263 and 1323. Andrew Ehrenkreutz, " Strategic Implications of the Slave Trade between Genoa and Mamluk Egypt in the Second Half of the Thirteenth century, " ed. Abraham L. Udovitch *The Islamic Middle East. Studies in economic and social history* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1981), pp. 336-37. The early fourteenth-century Venetian sources reveal that slave trade was established from the coasts of Asia Minor to Crete then to western Europe, with the Turks raiding and carrying off the inhabitants who were sold as slaves to the Latins. Elizabeth Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade. Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300-1405)* (Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1983), pp. 160-61. The evidence of Michael of Alexandria reveals that Asia Minor was not only supplying slaves for western Europe but also for the Mamluks of Egypt.

[15] For the treaties and relations between Mamluk Egypt and Byzantium during the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronikos II, see Marius Canard, " Le Traité de 1281 entre Michael Paléologue et le Sultan Qala'un, " *Byzantion* 10 (1935), pp. 669-80; Henri Lammens,

Caucasus and supply the manpower needed for their army through the sea route which passed through the Byzantine lands.

In 1311, when the Council of Vienna proclaimed a crusade against Egypt, the Council agreed that the success of their plan depended on the disruption of Egyptian trade with the Byzantine Empire. Marino Sanudo Torsello, a crusading propagandist against Egypt, for example, argued that the boycott to trade with Egypt should be enforced by a force of ten galleys, which would patrol the Mediterranean and intercept any ships going to Alexandria. If the trade and diplomatic exchange could be stopped between the Byzantine Empire and Egypt, it would be easier to subject Egypt. After the fall of Egypt, the areas inhabited by the Turks and by the schismatic Greeks would be conquered easily.[16] There was equally some internal opposition in the Byzantine Empire against diplomatic and commercial relations with Mamluk Egypt.[17]

Against these internal and external oppositions, we see an apology or an attempt to whitewash the on-going Byzantine diplomatic relations with Mamluk Egypt in the text on Michael of Alexandria. Theodore Metochites states in the text that the *basileus* sent embassies to Egypt only to be able to

---

" Correspondance diplomatiques entre les sultans mamelouks d'Égypte et les puissances chrétiens, " *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 9 (1904), pp. 151-87, 359-92.

[16] Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins,*. pp. 240-42; eadem, " Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks : The Backgroud of Anti-Turkish League of 1332-1334, " *Speculum* 46 (1970), pp. 376-77.

[17] Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, vol. 3, pp. 272-276 ; *RegPatr*, n. 1569.

regulate the affairs of the Orthodox Christians and of the monastic complexes and to draw treaties for their well-being.[18]

There were two other less obvious but no less important reasons for the composition of both of these texts. The martyrs are considered to be the heroic defenders of the Christian faith who do not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for Christ. The tortures and hardships that a martyr had gone through were usually compared to a combat in the Byzantine *martyria* and his endurance and death to a victorious struggle. Niketas and Michael, by opposing the Muslims, not only witnessed the revelation of Christianity in the middle of the Muslim lands but also, as members of the Christian *oikoumene*, gained a victory for the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II. The diplomatic ploys of Andronikos II against Masud II did not work, western Asia Minor was lost to the Turco-Muslim emirates and the Byzantines were enslaved and sold, but even under these conditions, the martyrdoms symbolically showed, at least spiritually if not militarily, that Andronikos II's rule was successful.

On the other hand, to point out the spiritual victory of Andronikos II, his counselors could have chosen some other events. We know that the theme of spiritual victory was applied in previous times by imperial orators to Byzantine emperors. The defeat at Myriokephalon in 1176, for example, was interpreted as a spiritual victory of Manuel I by giving credit to his bravery.[19] Why did the authors choose to use the martyrs to prove the spiritual victory of Andronikos II? Martyrs who were martyred out of Byzantium?

---

[18] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, " p. 672.

The interest of Andronikos II in the Christians living in those lands was related with the role of the Byzantine Emperor as the protector of the Christian *oikoumene*. Thanks to the work of Angelov, we now understand how important was the imperial propaganda during the reign of Michael VIII Palaiologos and of his son Andronikos II Palaiologos through which these Emperors attempted to persuade their audience in the legitimacy and exalted status of their monarchy. We also see in the imperial panegyrics, which served as the means of imperial propaganda, the emphasis made on the universalist claim of the imperial office for domination over the entire civilized world, *oikoumene*.[20]

Theodore Metochites stated this clearly in the text on Michael that the *basileus* was not only concerned about the Christians under his rule but even if there were small numbers of Christians living in far off lands, he took pride in caring for them.[21] In the *martyria* written for Andronikos II, we see the effort of this Byzantine Emperor reformulating his power and defining his authority in a new way by the creation of new saints (martyrs) through the production of their hagiographical texts. The emphasis on the power and authority of Byzantine emperors through the authority of saints was not strange to post- Iconoclastic Byzantium and other Orthodox cultures where the saints gained a new authority. The choice of these two martyrdom stories foreshadowed the good omen and God's will, which supported the sacred role of the Emperor as the protector of the Christian *oikoumene*.

---

[19] Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (New York: Cambridge University, 1993), pp. 314, 320.

[20] For the universalist claims of Michael VIII and Andronikos II as reflected in the panegyrics, see Angelov, *Imperial Ideology,* pp. 83-84.

[21] Metochites, “Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, ” p. 673.

The two *martyria*, composed by the closest counselors of Andronikos II, can be counted among the documents aiming at imperial propaganda. Apart from the emphasis on the universal role of the Byzantine emperor, which was visible in other Palaiologan propaganda documents, one can also see the emphasis on miracles and divine predestination, which were seen in the imperial biographies. With the rhetoric of the miraculous, the imperial panegyrists tried to legitimize the Palaiologan rule. In these biographies, for example, the birth of Michael VIII Palaiologos was associated with miraculous events, prophecies and divine omens. In the case of Andronikos II, the imperial panegyrists saw an omen in the fact that he was born on a major feast day.[22]

A similar concern is also evident in the martyrdom of Niketas the Younger. As I attempted to show in the section on Niketas the Younger in Chapter One, the date of the martyrdom of Niketas the Younger coincides with the month of Andronikos II's ascent to the imperial throne and his return to Orthodoxy. I do not think that this hidden detail in the narrative was accidental. We can speak here of an attempt of Theodore Mouzalon to legitimize the rule of Andronikos II with the rhetoric of the miracle of martyrdom.[23]

---

[22] Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, pp. 110-11.

Another question is the audience of the *martyria.* At whom did Theodore Mouzalon and Theodore Metochites target their work? Was it the Christians living in the Seljuk lands and in the Mamluk lands? Was it the Christians within the Byzantine lands? Or was it the Byzantine elite or some members of this elite? By looking at the Atticized and difficult Greek utilized in these texts, especially in the one written by Theodore Metochites, I have serious doubts that these texts were aimed at a general public such as the Christians living in Egypt or in Seljuk lands or even the ones living in the Byzantine lands. These texts could hardly be understood by a general Greek-speaking public except the Byzantine elite.[24] We can then say that these texts were aimed at a small group of Byzantine elites and can be considered as a part of internal imperial propaganda in order to legitimize the rule of Andronikos II and to give a spiritual meaning to his ruling. They were to aspire hope for the defeats against the Turkish advances.

At the same time, these texts aimed to emphasize the universal role of the Emperor as the protector of all Christians even in times of military defeat and territorial loss. These points were transmitted to their audience through the rhetoric of the miracle, that is the martyrdoms of two Orthodox

---

[23] According to the Christian tradition the martyrs did not need to perform any miracles to prove their saintliness. The sufferings, the struggles and the death that they experienced are considered as miracles.

[24] Even the Byzantine elites seemed to have problem understanding the writings of Theodore Metochites and they were criticizing his obscure style. For these criticism of his style, see Sevcenko, *Études sur la Polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, pp. 35-41.

Christians, who were both related to Asia Minor and both martyred under Muslim rule.

Group 2: Hesychast Authors

The *martyria* on the thirteen Martyrs of Cyprus, John the Younger, the Lithuanian martyrs and Anthimos, the Archbishop of Athens, were written by Byzantine Churchmen who were related with the heyschast movement.

The author of the text on the thirteen Martyrs of Cyprus is anonymous. We only know that the codex, in which the *martyrion* is found, was written in 1426 by a certain Nikolaos Fagianeos with the approval of the hieromonk Bartholomaios of Skaranos.[25] The thirteen monks were martyred during a period when there were complex and contradictory relations between the Byzantine State of Nicaea, the Patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea, the Lusignan rule in Cyprus, the Papacy, Frederick II and the autocephalous Church of Cyprus.[26] The text on the thirteen Martyrs of Cyprus, however, shows absolutely no sign of such complexity. There are only hescyhast monks facing the Latin ecclesiastical and lay hierarchy over the azyme dogma. The author represents the conflict as a conflict between two "races", between "our race" and the "Latin race".

---

[25] I have not found any information concerning Nikolaos Fagianeos. For very brief information on Bartholomaios of Skaranos, see *PLP* 26033.

[26] Galatariotou, *Making of a Saint;* Konnare and Schabel, *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374*; Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195-1312*.

It is interesting to come across hesychast monks in a story where it is historically known that the thirteen martyrs lived and were martyred in 1231. It is surprising because although the term *hesychia* is seen in monastic and patristic literature as early as the fourth century, the unification of the entire tradition in the doctrinal thesis of Gregory Palamas (1296-1359)[27] took place only in the fourteenth century. The controversy over the question of azyme between the Latins and the Byzantines goes back to the ninth century,[28] but azyme in the Eucharist theology played a very prominent role in the theological debates of the fourteenth century between the defenders of Hesychasm as formulated by Palamas and their opponents.

Gregory Palamas and the defenders of Palamism in no way favored dogmatic compromises with the Latins and due to their attitudes, they were seen as the fiercest adversaries of religious union with Rome and as fiercest anti-Latins.[29] Although the author is unknown and we do not know much about the copyist of the codex, the emphasis on hesychast monks defending the Orthodox doctrine of the Eucharist against the Latins over the question of azyme hints to a hesychast author.[30]

---

[27] On Gregory Palamas, see John Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1959); idem, *Grégoire Palamas : Défense des saints hésychastes*, 2 vols. (Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, 1973); On hesychasm, see John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm : Historical, Theological and Social Problems* (London: Variorum reprints, 1974); Aristeides Papadakis and John Meyendorff, *The Christian East and the Rise of Papacy* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994), pp. 275-319.

[28] Azyme (*azuma* without yeast, leaven) unleavened bread used by the Armenian and Latin churches in the eucharistic sacrifice based on the tradition that such bread was used at the Last Supper, at which Jesus instituted the Eucharist (*eucharistia*, thanksgiving) principal Christian liturgical service. Based on Jesus' command to repeat in memory of him what he did at the Last Supper, it is seen as a ritual meal in which wine and bread are offered and blessed as Jesus' body and blood in memory of his sacrificial death. *ODB*, s.v. " Eucharist ". The Byzantines used leavened bread. Between the Greeks and the Latins, the controversy on this subject began in the ninth century. The issue of azyme as well as of *filioque* and the primacy of Rome were the reasons why in 1054 Cardinal Humbert excommunicated Patriarch Michael I Keroularios and his followers as heretics. Among the Byzantines, the symbolic meaning of leaven was important because they thought that leaven gave life to bread, just as the soul gave life to body. Consequently Armenians and Latins were seen as denying the existence in Christ of a human soul. *ODB*, s.v. " Azymes".

[29] Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*, p. 113.

The other *martyrion*, which was written by an author who was connected to the hesychast circles, is the one on the Lithuanian martyrs. Parts of the relics of these three martyrs were transferred to Constantinople in 1374 and the martyrs were canonized during the patriarchate of Philotheos Kokkinos. The Greek *enkomion* of the Lithuanian martyrs was written by Michael Balsamon, a patriarchal official, between 1390-1394, some twenty years after the transfer of the relics either during the patriarchate of Neilos Kerameus or the patriarchate of Antony IV. All the patriarchs mentioned above, Philotheos Kokkinos, Neilos and Antony IV, were Athonite and Palamite (hesychast) personalities.

The *logos* on Anthimos, Archbishop of Athens, was written by the Patriarch Neilos Kerameus. Although the unique evidence on the martyrdom of Anthimos is the *martyrion* written by Neilos, from the patriarchal register dating from the reign of Philotheos Kokkinos, we know that Anthimos did occupy the metropolitan seat of Crete. The first anonymous *logos* on Anthimos also narrates his presence and imprisonment in Crete but does not mention Anthimos's death in prison. In this martyrdom case, there was an involvement of Church authorities in the events which led to the imprisonment and to the probable death of Anthimos. He was sent by a hesychast patriarch to Crete and the *logos* on his martyrdom was written by another hesychast patriarch.

---

[30] The author was probably a native of the island of Cyprus because when he talks about it, he usually refers to it as " our island," (καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς νῆσον Κύπρον, ἐν τῆ καθ᾿ ἡμας νήσω). "*Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων*," pp. 20, 24.

Although the *martyrion* on John of Trebizond is not treated in the thesis as its composition dates to the eighteenth century, when we consider the Moldavian text on the martyr, we see an author related with hesychast circles. The author is Gregory Tsamblak, who was from an aristocratic Bulgarian family of Byzantine origin. He was educated in Turnovo, on Mount Athos and in Constantinople. In 1402-3, the patriarch of Constantinople sent Tsamblak on a patriarchal mission to Suceava, which was the area where the relics of John of Trebizond were transferred from Vospro in 1415. The patriarch who sent him was Patriarch Matthew I of Constantinople (1397-1402, 1403-1410), who was a disciple of Neilos Kerameus on Mount Athos and who, similar to his master, was a staunch Palamist.

In the periods following the composition of two *martyria* by two high imperial officials of Andronikos II, we see the revival of a new wave of interest in the new martyrs of the Byzantine Church under the Patriarchs of Constantinople who all had Athonite origins and who were all Palamists. While the subject matter of the *martyria* written under the reign of Andronikos II was common people from Asia Minor who were martyred under Muslim rule, the hesychast authors were interested in martyrdom cases which took place in the historical Byzantine lands under Latin rule or in eastern Europe. All the martyrs martyred under Latin rule were Orthodox monks. Why were Palamist patriarchs interested in the new martyrs under Latin rule and in eastern Europe?

Since the thirteenth century a sort of monastic monopoly in the patriarchate in Constantinople can be traced. This became a trend in the Byzantine Church especially at the end of the civil war (1354) and with the victory of Palamites (1357/8), when an uninterrupted series of monastic and almost exclusively Athonite personalities became patriarchs.[31] Mount Athos, with which all these patriarchs were related, was a place of retreat and of spiritual exploration both for the Byzantine monks and religious men, as well as for non-Greek-speaking Orthodox communities such as Bulgarians, Serbians and Russians. Athos during the late Byzantine period became a landmark and a generator of spiritual movements and the center of gravity of Orthodoxy. Ideas were exchanged, books were translated from Greek to Slavonic languages and thus Athonite monasticism played a key role in the spirituality or political formation of several groups in eastern Europe.

The Byzantine Church, through the fourteenth century revival of Byzantine monasticism on Mount Athos and also through the efforts of the Byzantine Patriarchs, increased its influence in the Crimea, Moldavia and Wallachia, Lithuania and in Moscow. The expansion of Byzantine culture under the patronage of the Byzantine Church owed much of its success to Mount Athos, where Gregory Palamas laid the theological foundations of Hesychasm, the crucial element of fourteenth-century monasticism.

---

[31] John Meyendorff, "Mount Athos in the 14th Century: Spiritual and Intellectual Legacy," *DOP* 42 (1988), p.160. The Hesychast patriarchs of the fourteenth century were as follows: Isidoros (1347-50), Philotheos Kokkinos (1353-54, 1364-76), Kallistos (1350-3, 1354-63), Neilos Kerameus (1379-88), Anthony (1389-90, 1391-97).

Hesychasm, which is in its strict sense the practice of mental prayer sustained by the breathing discipline and a highly individual form of spirituality, also served as a major element for the promotion of Byzantine universalism in eastern Europe. Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, who was related with some of the martyrs cited above, was among the main promoters of Hesychasm, whose attachment to it was more concerned with administrative, political, intellectual and literary pursuits, which maintained the universalism and dynamism of Orthodox Christianity.[32] Although Philotheos Kokkinos and the other hesychast patriarchs of Constantinople throughout the fourteenth century defended the Byzantine emperor's universal and ecumenical role in caring for Orthodox Christians, in contrast to the gloom surrounding the imperial apparatus, they carried out the universal Byzantine claim. But what did the Byzantine universal claim, which was carried out in the fourteenth century by the hesychast patriarchs, have to do with the new saint-martyrs of the Byzantine Church?

In the Byzantine world, especially after the Iconoclastic period, saints and their cults were used as markers of political and religious identity. In the pre-1204 period, the Orthodox saints and their relics played an important role in efforts to create a centrality of cults, which would connect the universality of Byzantine imperial rule and the Byzantine Church with the city of Constantinople and which would promote Byzantine Universality in the Christian *oikoumene*. The saints were considered to be a part of the imperial armory.[33] This was also the reason behind the transfer of local saints' relics to Constantinople since the time of Justinian.

---

[32] Meyendorff, "Is Hesychasm the Right Word," p. 451.

Through the transfer of relics to Constantinople and the composition of hagiographies on the saints, Constantinople became the center of the Byzantine and Orthodox world. The presence of the relics in Constantinople created a link between Constantinople, the provinces and other Orthodox states.[34] In other words, the saints' relics collected in Constantinople through the efforts of different emperors and the Byzantine Church symbolized Byzantine universal ideology and the centrality of Constantinople in this ideology.

The loss of Constantinople in 1204 and the looting of the relics in Constantinople changed this perception for the once Byzantine commonwealth members. What happened in the post-1204 period is that the ruling elites of the states in the Byzantine Orthodox commonwealth realized the power of the saints' relics in the legitimization of their local power and localized forms of Christianity, without the threat of interference and absorption by the center, that is Constantinople.[35]

The interest in the composition of *martyria* of new martyrs during a period when the Church was dominated by the Palamist patriarchs, reflects the concerns of these patriarchs in reasserting Byzantine universalism in reconsolidating the power of Constantinople and the Byzantine Church in Constantinople as the center of this ideology. The Byzantine Church played a crucial role in the political and spiritual competition between the Lithuanian prince Olgerd, who martyred the Lithuanian martyrs, and Moscow for the inheritance of Kievan Rus. The Byzantine Church sometimes gave its full support to the metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia, residing in Moscow and sometimes sent patriarchal envoys in an effort to reconciliate the relations between the principalities of *Ros* and Lithuania. Considering this role, the transfer of the relics of the Lithuanian martyrs to Constantinople, their canonization and the composition of a *martyrion* can easily be read as the effort of the Byzantine Church under Philoteos Kokkinos to reassert the Byzantine claim of universality over the principalities of *Ros* and Lithuania.

---

[33] Eastmond, " Art and Regional Identity in the Orthodox World after the Fourth Crusade, " pp. 745-6.

[34] Angold, " Autobiography & Identity. The Case of the Later Byzantine Empire," p. 39.

[35] Eastmond, " Art and Regional Identity in the Orthodox World after the Fourth Crusade," p. 746.

Most of the territories under the rule of Lithuanian and *Ros* principalities were not historical Byzantine territories. Here the Byzantine Church's efforts were aimed at consolidating Orthodox Christianity in those lands, imposing the universality of the Byzantine Church and to compete with the Latin Church, which was also trying to expand its control over these areas. The efforts of the Byzantine Church in eastern Europe can be then considered as having an offensive and expansionist character. The Byzantine Church was able to pursue such a policy thanks to Mount Athos, which served as the spiritual center of Byzantine Orthodoxy during the Palaiologan period.

Cyprus and Crete under Latin rule were different from the Lithuanian and the *Ros* principalities. They had both been under Byzantine rule before the arrival of the Crusaders and hence were considered as historical Byzantine territories. Cyprus passed over to Lusignan rule in 1192, after the Crusade organized by Frederick II Barbarossa, Philip II Augustus and Richard the Lionheart. Crete, on the other hand, came under Venetian rule after the Fourth Crusade in 1204. In both of these territories, while the rulers were Catholic Latins, the majority of the population was Orthodox Greek. With the arrival of Latin rulers in Cyprus and Crete after the Crusades, the power of the Catholic Church increased in these areas. Latin dioceses were founded in order to establish the Latin Church.

In Cyprus in the thirteenth century, with the intervention of the Papacy, the Orthodox priests and deacons were forced to give obedience to the Latin bishops of the area. The movement of the Orthodox Church members was restrained. The number of Greek bishops decreased and was controlled so that it would not exceed the number of Latin bishops. The Orthodox bishops were forced to reside at the periphery of the Latin sees.[36]

In Crete, any Byzantine intervention was rigidly excluded by the prohibition of entrance of any Orthodox bishops, priests and monks from outside Crete. The Orthodox priests were ordained only to fill the places of the deceased. In both Cyprus and Crete, papal intervention aimed at leading all Greeks to enter the Roman Church. Despite these measures and pressure, as the text on the thirteen Martyrs of Cyprus as well as other historical documents reflect, the Orthodox monastic establishments in Cyprus flourished and there was still an important and locally strong Orthodox Church on the island. In Crete, there was a strict social, ethnic and religious separation between the Orthodox Greeks of the island and the ruling Catholic Christians. This separation pushed the Orthodox Greeks of the island to the rural areas, while the Latin Catholics mainly inhabited the cities. While under Latin rule the Orthodox Church degraded, it nevertheless remained a strong and influential institution among the local Orthodox Christians.

---

[36] The years immediately after the Latin occupation of Cyprus seem to have brought no significant change to the status of the Cypriot Orthodox Church or of the Orthodox monasteries. The first indications of persecution of the Cypriot Church came during the reign of Aimery of Lusignan (r. 1194-1205) when he applied to pope Celestine III for permission to establish Latin dioceses in Cyprus, in order to give roots to the Latin Church in Cyprus but also to convert " Schismatic Greeks " to Catholicism. The tension between the Greek and the Latin Church started in the 1220s with the designation of a convention by Pope Honorius III. Galatariotou, *Making of a Saint*, p. 234; Joseph Gill, " The tribulations of the Greek Church in Cyprus, " *BF* 5 (1977), p. 75.

Both Muslim and Latin rule in Asia Minor, in the Balkans or on the islands seem to have weakened the Byzantine Church. There was, however, one important difference between Muslim and Latin rule and this was related to the rights of the Byzantine Church in Constantinople over the Orthodox Greeks living in these lands. Under Seljuk and Mamluk rule under which two martyrdoms took place, the Seljuk and Mamluk sultans recognized the universal and ecumenical role of the Byzantine emperor and of the Byzantine Church over the Orthodox Christians of the area. Andronikos II's mention in the Churches of Seljuk Cappadocia along with the name of Masud II was a sign of the recognition of this role. Mamluk rulers as well recognized this role as the diplomatic correspondences between Byzantium and Mamluk Egypt reflect. The Byzantine commercial relations with the

Mamluks of Egypt had a strong political and military component for the Byzantines, with an emphasis on the special role of the Byzantines in the protection of the Orthodox Christians in the realms of Mamluk Egypt.[37]

The Latin rulers in Cyprus and Crete, by contrast, perceived the Byzantine interference in the affairs of the Orthodox Christians with suspicion and considered it to be the reason behind the upheavals and stirrings of the local Orthodox communities against the Latin presence. The Latin rulers were not totally unjustified in their claims. The Byzantine emperors and the Byzantine Church did not want to give up their claim as protectors of the Orthodox Christians in Cyprus and Crete, persisting on the Byzantine claim of universality. The Orthodox Archbishop of Cyprus sought the confirmation of the Byzantine emperor in Nicaea for his election, which in return consolidated his power in Cyprus. The imperial confirmation also served the interests of the Byzantine emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea, who were in competition with other Byzantine states of the post-1204 period for legitimacy over the succession of the Byzantine state and Church in Constantinople. Upon the confirmation of the Archbishop's election, the Patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea, Germanos II, interfered in the affairs of the Cypriot Church in 1229 by censuring all

---

[37] For the recognition of the right of the Byzantine emperor as protector over the Orthodox Churches of Egypt and Syria, see Lammens, " Correspondances diplomatiques entre les Sultans mamlouks d'Egypte et les puissances chrétiennes, " p. 361, n. 5. Also see Angeliki Laiou and Cecile Morrison, " Byzantine Trade with Christians and Muslims and the Crusades, " in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World,* ed. Angeliki Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), p. 187. If certain clauses of the treaties signed between two parties were not respected by the Byzantine Emperors, then Mamluk Sultans seemed to threaten the Byzantines with elimination of this right of protectorate. See Mohamed T. Mansouri, " Byzantins, Mamluks et Mongols aux alentours de 1265. La politique étrangere de Michel VIII Paléologue au début de son régne, " *Byzantiakon* 12 (1992), p. 322.

Orthodox clergy who had been conforming to the Latins. This interference stirred some of the Orthodox clergy and monks against the Latins and the martyrdom of the thirteen monks in Cyprus could also be related with the censure of Germanos II.

In Crete, the Latins were suspicious of the Byzantine involvement on the island through the influence of the Byzantine Church. In fact, the *archontes*, the Orthodox Christian peasants and the Orthodox Church mutually supported each other in Crete during the revolts of *archontes* against the Venetian feudatories. They received aid from the Byzantines and the Genoese during these revolts. The Latin rulers forbade the entrance of the Byzantine clergy to Crete in order to prevent a possible Byzantine aid or influence.

The Latin rulers in Cyprus and in Crete were not willing to recognize the ecumenical role of the Byzantine Church over the Orthodox Christians of their territory. The first reason may be the pressure of the papacy, which had its own claims of universality and which wanted to convert the " schismatic " Greeks. The other reason was the fear of the Latin rulers that any type of Byzantine interference would cause a stirring among the Orthodox Christians against themselves.

The *martyria* on the thirteen monks of Cyprus and on Anthimos, the archbishop of Athens, who was also a monk-bishop, written by hesychast monks and by a hesychast patriarch, therefore can be read as efforts of the Byzantine Church under the hesychast patriarchs, who were insisting on the Byzantine universal and ecumenical claims over the Orthodox Christians.

Although the emphasis on the universalistic and ecumenical claims of the Byzantine ideology can be read in the *martyria* written by Andronikos II's counselors and similarly by the hesychast monks, these claims were put forth for different purposes for the two parties. Andronikos II was an emperor who was also responsible for the military victories of the Byzantine Empire. The responsibility of the Byzantine emperor was reflected in the mirrors of princes of the late Byzantine period, which stated the importance of warfare. The Palaiologan imperial propaganda was also preoccupied with military virtues. Theodore Metochites considered that one of the chief duties of the emperor was to be prepared for war. These considered war to be not offensive but a defensive enterprise undertaken in response to a past wrong. Andronikos II's rule was not militarily successful in either offensive or defensive manner.[38] Therefore the authors of *martyria* were concerned to show the spiritual victory of the emperor, by two martyrs, who were connected with Asia Minor, the areas lost due to the Byzantine diplomatic and military defeat. At the same time, the authors linked this aspect of spiritual victory with the success of the emperor in the protection of the Orthodox Christians, hence his universal role.

If we look at the patterns of martyrdom in the *martyria* written by Andronikos II's counselors, we do not see a positive description of the Seljuk or Mamluk officials. Here the martyrs are common people. Niketas the Younger was a reader in the Church and was also a merchant. Michael of

---

[38] Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, pp. 82-3, 101-2.

Alexandria, a common boy from Ionia, was enslaved and became a Mamluk soldier.

For the hesychast authors, the composition of *martyria* was also related with the Byzantine universal and ecumenical claim over the Orthodox Christians of the lands outside Byzantine rule. But they were more concerned with the areas under Latin rule, where the universal and ecumenical role of Byzantine emperors and the Byzantine Church was not recognized. Their interest in eastern Europe went hand in hand with the expansion of the power and authority of the Byzantine Church over these lands. Through the transfer of the relics of the new saint-martyrs, through the composition of *martyria*, they reclaimed the authority of Constantinople as the center of saints' cults and hence as the center of Orthodox Christianity.

The *martyria* written by hesychast circles show an anti-Latin attitude. The pattern of martyrdom under Latin rule, as Zachariadou pointed out, starts with a dialogue and the Orthodox refusing to accept the Latin propositions were punished and martyred. The principle roles in the narratives are given to the Orthodox religious men, who were monks.[39] The conflict is always between the Orthodox and the Latin religious men. The major issues of conflict are over doctrinal differences between the Orthodox and Latin faith; the role of azyme in the Eucharist, the *filioque* and the primacy of Rome. From these patterns, we can say that the main concern of the authors was the rupture of the link between the local Orthodox Church and the Byzantine Church in Constantinople, which would result in the adoption of Latin doctrines by the local Orthodox Church.

---

[39] We understand from the text of Neilos Kerameus that Anthimos was a monk-bishop. Dyobounites, " 'Ο 'Αθηνῶν Ἄνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ὁ ὁμοληγητής," p. 59.

In these martyrdom narratives, although the authors mention unease and suffering among the Orthodox common people living under Latin rule, these common people are like movie extras. The authors do not attribute to them any major role in the narrative other than being a massive group admiring the martyrs or praying for them. In the *martyrion* on the XIII Martyrs of Cyprus, the Orthodox Christian commoners are only mentioned when the monks were put in prison. Upon hearing the imprisonment of the monks, " the Romans on the island trembled with fear and prayed to God so that he would give strength and power against the ruling tyrants and so that Orthodoxy shall be free."[40] In the *martyrion* on Anthimos, we see the Orthodox Christians of the island, as a mass, sending ambassadors to Constantinople to ask the Patriarch so that he would send them a bishop. Then they greet Anthimos upon his arrival at the island. Their suffering economically under the Latin rule and revolting against them are mentioned but these do not constitute the backbone of the conflict.

By looking at the authors, authorial intentions, patterns of martyrdom and representation of the major characters in these patterns, we can say that the *martyria* written by hesychast authors do reflect an anti-Latin sentiment on the part of the Byzantine Church, which was headed by successive Palamist patriarchs in the fourteenth century. But the anti-Latin character of these texts does not prove that these authors had pro-Ottoman tendencies.

---

[40] "*Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων*," pp. 30-31.

As Nevra Necipoğlu pointed out in relation to the Byzantine Church in Thessalonica during 1382-1430, the hesychast monks formed a group who objected to any rapprochement with either the Latins or the Ottomans, an attitude which can be described as anti-Latin/anti-Ottoman. The hesychast monks in Thessalonica, while opposing union with the Latins, do not seem to have formulated an alternative policy for resistance against the Ottomans. What some of these monks did was to accept the status quo once the Ottomans came to power.[41]

In the former years, however, the hesychast Patriarchs of Constantinople such as Philotheos Kokkinos, who sent Anthimos to Crete in 1365, while opposing the pro-Latin policies of the Byzantine Emperor John V, did seek as an alternative military aid in 1369 from the East European Orthodox countries, where the Byzantine Church had a prestigious authority, against the Turkish advance. Nevertheless, this alternative plan failed, with the defeat of the Serbian army by the Ottomans in 1371 near the Maritza River.[42]

Group 3: Individual Authors

There is one martyrdom narrative in which one can speak of a pro-Unionist tendency of the author and this, contrary to Zachariadou's argument, is the *martyrion* on George of Adrinople.

---

[41] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium Between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 52-4.

[42] Today called river of Meriç.

There are indications in the text which suggest pro-Unionist tendencies of the author, who remembers the good old days when Adrianople was a Christian city and laments its having become a city of the infidels. He then prays to God so that the Byzantine Emperor shall overcome the present difficulties and that Adrianople shall become a Christian city.[43]

The difficulties which the author hints at may be Murad II's military and political successes in the Balkans and his decision to besiege Constantinople. We know from the courtier, diplomat and historian George Sphrantzes (1401-1477/78) the reactions of Murad II to the Union of Churches and to John VIII's decision to participate in the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Sphrantzes explains how John VIII asked the opinion of Murad II on his participation in the Council and Murad II's anger when he learned that John VIII decided to attend the Council against his opinion. When out of anger Murad II decided to attack Constantinople, not to conquer it but to warn the Emperor, it was the grand vezir Halil Paşa who calmed down the sultan and who argued against taking military action on the grounds that this could result in the acceleration of the crusade plans against the Ottomans. Before discovering that Halil had changed the sultan's mind about attacking Constantinople, Sphrantzes and other people from the Byzantine aristocracy dispatched Thomas Palaiologos (1428/30-1460) to John VIII. There was great confusion and debate in the city until they learned that Halil's advice had prevailed.

---

[43] Patrinellis, "Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο," pp. 72-73.

Çandarlı Halil Paşa was known as the promoter of Murad II's policies aiming to pacify Hungary and the western powers so that a crusade against the Ottomans in the Balkans would be prevented. Later in his career, he would be known as a "friend of the Greeks" due to his opposition to Mehmed II's (r. 1444-6, 1451-81) plans to lay siege to Constantinople. He also had private commercial relations with Constantinople.[44]

The author then makes *tasimanioi* (*danişmend*s)[45] and the people claiming to be the descendants of the prophet Mohammed (*seyyid*s and *şerif*s)[46] to evoke two Christian cities, Rome and Constantinople, which were symbolically on the eve of a religious Union. In 1437, the same year when George was martyred, the Byzantine emperor John VIII and the Patriarch of Constantinople Joseph II, for whom the author prays in the text, left Constantinople to participate in the Council of Ferrara-Florence in order to achieve the Union of Churches. In return they were hoping to obtain Western military aid against the Ottoman advances. All along the year 1437, the Byzantine delegates were preparing to join the council.[47]

---

[44] For his commercial relations with Byzantium see, Necipoğlu, " Ottoman Merchants in Constantinople, " p. 162. Also see, Cemal Kafadar, " A Death in Venice (1575) : Anatolian Muslim Merchants Trading in the Serenissima, " in *Raiyyet Rüsumu. Essays presented to Halil Inalcik*, in *Journal of Turkish Studies* 10 (1986), pp. 193-4.

[45] The *tasimanioi* mentioned in the text can be identified as *danişmends*. The *danişmend*s were learned men in Islamic law or the students of higher Muslim education. Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958), p. 300; Halil Inalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600* (London: Phoenix, 1995), p. 219. Moravcsik does not give explicit reference to the text on George of Adrianople, but to Palamas' text of his captivity, where the same term appears with slightly different spelling. The presence of the *tasimanioi* at the council is in line with the Ottoman judicial tradition. I believe that they were the scholars invited by Murad II to Edirne. When the Ottoman sultans wished to establish a new *medrese* (higher institute of Muslim education) they invited scholars from the old Anatolian cultural centers or from elsewhere in the Islamic world. We know that in the reign of Murad II, Muslim scholars such as Molla Fenari and Fahreddin Acemi were in the court of Murad II. Fahreddin Acemi came to Adrianople from the East, from Persia. He served as *mufti* (an officially appointed interpreter of *shari'a)* during 1421-1451. Inalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, pp. 166-7.

[46] *Seyyid* and *şerif* are the terms used for all direct descendants of Mohammed in many Muslim societies. As many Sufis and other saintly figures have often also claimed Prophetic descent, the title *seyyid* is also used for them. These people were highly respected in Muslim societies and enjoyed many material and spiritual privileges. In the Ottoman Empire, for example, they were exempt from taxes. This privileged status resulted in many people claiming to have prophetic descent. To be able to distinguish the false *seyyid*s and *şerifs* from the true ones, a state administrator, called *nakibü'l eşraf*, was appointed. The *seyyid*s and *şerifs* were not a homogenous group. They could be merchant, farmer, poet, *şeyhülislam* (head of the hierarchy of ulema), *müderris* (chief teacher in medrese), *kadı* (a judge), şeyh or vizier. Some of the dervishes, who are examined in this thesis such as Sarı Saltuk, Hacım Sultan, Abdal Musa, Seyyid Ali Sultan were *seyyids*. Seyyid Battal Gazi of the *Battalname* and Melik Danişmend of the *Danişmendname* were also *seyyid*s. Therefore it was probable that there were dervishes among the people, who are described as the ones claiming to have been descended from their prophet and who insisted on the death penalty for George. For the meaning, place and importance of *seyyid* and *şerif* in the Islamic society, see *EI*^{2}, s.v.

An anti-unionist author would not be expected to mention Rome, the seat of the Papacy, which had been imposing the Union of Churches on the Byzantine State in return for military aid against the Ottomans. In similar respect, an anti-Unionist author would not pray for an Emperor and Patriarch who were about to conclude a Union with the Catholic Church.

In this martyrdom narrative, the Ottoman state officials were depicted as tolerant people. The chief *hegemon*,[48] for example, did not give a death

---

" Sayyid " and "sharif". For *seyyids* and *şerifs* especially in the early Ottoman Empire see, Rüya Kılıç, *Osmanlıda Seyyidler ve Şerifler* (Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005).

[47] Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1961), pp. 74-88.

[48] In the Ottoman judicial system, the criminals were questioned first by the *kadı*, the judge, who came from the *ulema* (Muslim learned men) and who represented sultan's legal authority. His decisions and applications were based both on the *shari'a* (Muslim religious law) and on the *kanun* (the secular law or laws issued by the sultan, as distinct from the *shari'a*). I assumed that George was first brought in front of *kadı*, which was mentioned as one of the *hegemons*. Cemal Kafadar very kindly pointed that the first *hegemon*, who questioned George could more likely to be a *vezir* or a *muhtasib*, who was the market police in the strict sense of the meaning. His duties consisted of the levying of taxes, dues, charges, inspecting markets and members of the trade-guilds, controlling the profit margins and weights. He was also responsible for the supervision of moral behaviour in the market place and of the respect shown by Muslims for their religious duties. For *muhtasib* in the Ottoman Empire see *EI*^{2}, v.s. " Hisba". If George was a soldier in the Ottoman army, it meant that he belonged to the Ottoman military class (*askeri*), whose members could only be judged by the imperial council, or by the councils under the presidency of the head of the military organization to which they belonged. In these councils, *ulema*, soldiers, *vezirs*, state officials and dervishes were also present. Heyd, *Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law*, pp. 221-4. Thus, in the light of this information, the chief *hegemon*, to whom George was

sentence for George, who had vituperated the prophet Mohammed. In fact, this act was one of the few acts punished with capital punishment, *katl*, according to *şeriat*. The other acts were apostasy from Islam and heresy.[49]

George, then, by insulting the Prophet Mohammed, was liable for the death punishment according to Islamic law. There was only one way for non-Muslims to escape this punishment and that was conversion to Islam. How could the chief *hegemon* then give a lighter punishment to George? According to the Ottoman Law system, in conformity with long-established Muslim practice and Turco-Mongol tradition, the ruler had the right, if the public interest or raison d'état required it, to inflict harsher or lighter punishments on criminals. Such punishments were based on the Sultan's or on his alter ego, the grand vizier's will for administrative and political reasons and they were called administrative punishments, *siyaset*.[50]

The punishment given to George by the chief *hegemon*, the grand vizier Çandarlı Halil Paşa, could be considered as a *siyaset* punishment considering the situation of the Ottoman State on the eve of a possible Union, which would result in Crusading activities against the Ottomans. At

---

subsequently taken, had to have been either the Rumeli *Beylerbeyi* (the commander in chief and the governor of the European region) or the grand *vezir*, both of whom acted in the place of the sultan when the latter was away. I am inclined to think that the chief *hegemon* in question was the grand *vezir*, given that George's trial took place in Edirne, the Ottoman capital, where it seems more likely for his case to have been judged by the grand *vezir*, who led the imperial council in the absence of the sultan. Patrinelis was mistaken in considering Koca Mehmed Nizameddin Pasha in 1437 as the *grand vezir*. Patrinelis, "Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο," p. 68, n.2. According to Uzunçarşılı, to the lexicon of Ottoman bureaucrats and to Inalcik, by 1429 or latest by the year 1436, Çandarlı Halil Paşa was the grand vezir (1429-1453). Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Çandarlı Vezir Ailesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1974), p. 56; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmani*, vol.6, (Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı & Tarih Vakfı, 1996), p. 1740; Inalcik, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, p.81.

[49] Heyd, *Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law*, p. 262.

such a conjecture, the grand vizier Çandarlı Halil Paşa was careful not to inflict a punishment over a Christian soldier, whose death might have caused irritations among the other Christians soldiers in the Ottoman army.

I believe that the information on Çandarlı Halil Paşa and his punishment of George, as they are mentioned in the text, were all in accordance with the historical realities of the time. They are not literary techniques of the author to pass the message that Orthodox Christianity could survive under Ottoman rule. The *martyrion* on George was most probably written because it was a spiritual victory, a sign from Divine Providence, foreshadowing the resolution of the problems of John VIII, in other words the defeat of Ottoman armies by a Crusade, which would be realized after the Union of Churches.

Another martyrdom narrative in which the author depicts the Ottoman administrators as tolerant is the one on Michael Mauroeides. The authors of the two texts on the martyrdom of Michael Mauroeides are known. One was John Moschos, a Greek professor living in Corfu, and the other was Manuel the Rhetor, the great rhetor of the Great Church in Constantinople (1504-1530). As the martyrdom took place in Ottoman society during the post-Byzantine period, the authors and their intentions in writing these *martyria* are out of the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, the plot organized against Michael Mauroeides, a well-known and respected Orthodox Christian in the royal court, by a certain fraction in Ottoman society reflects a historical fact of the reign of Bayezid II.

---

[50] Ibid., p. 192.

The reaction of a group of people in the Sultan's court against Mauroeides was a symbolic representation of the situation during the reign of Bayezid II when certain fractions in the Ottoman ruling classes were opposed to the policies of the previous sultan Mehmed II, who favored Christians at his court. Upon the accession of Bayezid II, these discontented groups put pressure on the new sultan to change his father's policies. It is known that many Greek notables in the fifteenth century and after the fall of Constantinople were in the entourage of the Ottoman sultans. These notables were conducting commerce, receiving rights for tax collection, some were responsible for the monopoly of certain goods and some members of their family, upon conversion, received high posts in the Ottoman administration.[51]

Another martyrdom which took place under Ottoman rule was the one on Theodore the Younger (d. 1349-1369). This is the earliest case of martyrdom under Ottoman rule, for which there is a notice from an unknown author. While George of Adrianople (1437) and Michael Mauroeides (d.1481-1490) were martyred in Ottoman Edirne, Theodore was martyred in Melagina, Ottoman Sultanönü.[52] Theodore, however, was also connected with Edirne. The city was his hometown, from where he was captured. He then became a war captive and was brought to Bithynia. In this text, there are no "tolerant Ottoman administrator." This is the earliest example of conversion and apostasy, which led to a martyrdom under the Ottoman rule.

---

[51] Elizabeth Zachariadou, "Les notables laïques et le patriarcat œcuménique après la chute de Constantinople," *Turcica* 30 (1998), pp. 119-133.

[52] According to E. Zachariadou, Byzantine Melagina can be located not far from the area where the river Karasu joins Sangarios. This is a meeting place of the roads leading from Nicaea to Eskişehir and from Bursa to the Sangarios region. It corresponds probably to the Ottoman sancak of Allagia or Malvagia, which was a residence of the Sultan. The metropolitan of Thessalonika Gregory Palamas was presented to Sultan Orhan there. According to Palamas it was a summer residence. Elizabeth Zachariadou, " Lauro Quirini and the Turkish Sandjaks (ca.1430), " in *Raiyyet Rüsumu. Essays presented to Halil Inalcik,* Journal of Turkish Studies 11 (1987), pp. 239-247 ; Vitalien Laurent, " La Vita Retractata et

The text is interesting as it can also be considered as a brief guideline of the Byzantine Church to possible renegades pointing out the process of becoming a martyr. If we look at the conditions in which Theodore was converted to Islam and the way he returned to Christianity and was finally crowned by martyrdom, we see a pattern which coincides with the principles of the Byzantine Church concerning renegades and their return to Christianity. We also see the Byzantine Church recommending martyrdom and crypto Christianity for the renegade Christians under Ottoman rule, a new policy that the Byzantine Church adopted in the fourteenth century as a result of the changing circumstances.

Conversion to Islam was a major concern of the Byzantine Church because with the Turco-Muslim conquest of Asia Minor the number of apostates from Christianity to Islam had increased in considerable numbers. The problem of renegacy, however, was not new to the Church. The principles which allowed the return of the renegade, whether from paganism, heresy or Islam, to Christianity had been laid down by the canons of the Church councils of the first centuries of Christianity and by the commentaries of Aristenos, Zonaras and Balsamon by the twelfth century.

---

les Miracles posthumes de Saint Pierre d'Atroa, " *Subsidia Hagiographica* 31 (1958), pp. 10, 66-74.

The classical ecclesiastical sources dealt with the renegades, taking into consideration their status before they denied Christianity. Their status was considered whether, for example, they were a child or an adult at the time of conversion.

The ecclesiastical sources also considered the gravity of the act by which the renegade manifested this denial. Upon his conversion, did the renegade participate in the hostile acts of non-Christians against the Christians (i.e. by participating in raids against Christian territories)? Did he participate in non-Christian ceremonies (i.e. consummation of sacrificial meat, circumcision etc.)? Or did he simply deny Christ without participating in such acts? The conditions in which the renegade was found at the time of conversion were also considered. Did the person, for example, deny Christ under serious threat to his life or threat of losing his goods and property or under threat of being chased out of his home? Did the person convert under pressure and force or voluntarily? The path and penitence that would be inflicted on the renegade in the process of returning to Christianity depended on these conditions.[53]

An adult renegade who had denied his faith under threat had to pass a longer "rehabilitation" period and had to go through heavier penitence than a child renegade. The voluntary renegade, on the other hand, had to go through the longest and most difficult process in order to return to Christianity. And even then, he would not receive the holy communion until the moment of his death. These procedures could be easier to apply in the Byzantine lands but what about the renegades under Muslim rule?

---

[53] Nicolas Oikonomides, " La brébis égarée et retrouvée: l'apostat et son retour, " *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Simon (Frankfurt: V. Klostermann, 1990), reprinted in idem, *Social and Economic Life in Byzantium*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), study II.

This was a burning issue for the Byzantine Church. Although Islam tolerated and the Muslim rulers protected the Christians and Jews in their territories under *zımmi* status as the people of the Book, if Christians and Jews ever converted to Islam, their return to their original religion was punished by death. The Church in the fourteenth century was not willing to admit that these people were totally lost for the Christian Church, and it urged renegades either to embrace martyrdom by publicly declaring their return to Christianity or to become crypto-Christians, practicing the Christian cult secretly while publicly practicing the Muslim one.[54]

Theodore's case was in accordance with the abovementioned rules and regulations of returning to Christianity. The text tells that he was captured from Adrianople and became a war captive when he was a child. He was then taken to Asia (i.e. Melagina), where he denied his faith and got circumcised. The author emphasizes that the conversion of Theodore to Islam was not the result of a reasonable and voluntary decision. He converted because he was a child, young and ignorant of error. He was also under extreme danger.[55] Therefore, Theodore's return to Christianity was the most favorable and the least serious renegade case according to the principles of the Byzantine Church. This was also the case of Michael of Alexandria, who was captured at infancy and converted to Islam.

---

[54] Two patriarchal *acta* addressed to the inhabitants of Nicaea about 1338 and 1340 reveal this new approach of the Byzantine Church, *MM*, vol. 1, pp. 183-4, 197-8. For the English translations of these *acta* see, Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 341-2.

[55] Oikonomides, "᾿Ακολουθία τοῦ ῾Αγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," pp. 216-7.

Upon his decision to return to Christianity, Theodore consulted a "spiritual" man (*pneumatikos aner*), who told him that it would not be right for him to take holy communion as he was carrying the sign of impiety, in other words, as he was circumcised. He advised him either to declare his return to Christianity in front of the Muslims, hence directing him to the path of martyrdom, or to go and see the Patriarch in Constantinople. For, according to the spiritual man, the Patriarch was the only person capable of binding and unbinding. Theodore went to Constantinople and consulted the Patriarch, who did not ask him to remain in Constantinople as a Christian and live safely, but told him to return to the same place where he denied Christianity and to declare his return to Christianity in front of the Muslims.[56] Theodore could not jump immediately into the stage of martyrdom, but he began to live in the wilderness as a shepherd. His situation was denounced to the Muslim authorities by someone who knew him.

As an apostate, Theodore first had to return to Christianity. This return was not so easy for the adults and especially for the ones who had converted voluntarily. For Theodore, who was captured and converted to Islam during his childhood and under conditions of extreme danger, the return was easy but living as a crypto-Christian was not a choice for him. The reason must have been his circumcision and the difficulty of being crypto-Christian as an individual in a Christian community without revealing his situation and also difficulty of practicing the Christian cults secretly in a Muslim community. The reason behind the composition of this text was then to encourage martyrdom and to warn the Christians about the irreversible consequences of their decision to convert to Islam.

---

[56] Ibid., pp. 217-18.

The text on the liberation of the city of Philadelphia, which celebrates the memory of sixteen soldiers who died while defending their city against the Turks of the Aydınoğlu Emirate, needs to be analyzed as an individual case as well. This text is a unique Byzantine *martyrion* commemorating soldiers who fell in war while fighting against the infidels. The soldier typology among Byzantine saints and martyrs was not new. In the echelons of Byzantine saints, there were many soldiers or generals. Some of these military saints were martyrs. In the pictorial or narrative depictions of these martyr military saints, however, there is no pattern showing their martyrdom during a war while fighting. They were all martyred because they openly declared their Christian faith or because they refused to sacrifice to pagan Gods. Even the Forty Defenders of Gaza, who had defended the city against the Arab conquerors, were put to death for refusing to apostatize.[57]

The reason for the absence of any martyr typology, dying in the course of a battle was related with the principle of the Byzantine Church, which did not admit as martyrs the soldiers who fell fighting for the empire. Behind this attitude of the Byzantine Church was the Byzantine political

---

theory. This theory did not mean the denial of warfare by the Byzantines, who acknowledged just war as a necessarily unpleasant means against the enemies of the God-protected realm of the Chosen people. The Byzantines justified war on the basis of self-defense, the recovery of historical Byzantine territories, averting a great evil or for the pursuit of peace as well as for the breach of an agreement.[58] While perceiving war as an unpleasant means, the Church nevertheless considered war a religious act in the defense of the Christian Empire. The Byzantine armies carried the Cross and icons of military saints during the battles. There was a period of three days of fasting and purification before starting a campaign. In the event of a victorious outcome, both Church and people were engaged in the triumphal reception of the soldiers.[59]

During the tenth century when certain magnate clans came to dominate the military leadership and administration of the Byzantine Empire, who played a major role in the reconquest of large areas from Muslim rulers, the idea that fighting the unbelievers should be rewarded more explicitly by the Byzantine church began to be discussed. This was the period when Byzantine society began to get militarized and hence this

---

[57] Christopher Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003). Also see Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les Légendes grecques des saints militaires* (New York: Arno Press, 1975).

[58] Vitalien Laurent, " L'idée de guerre sainte et la tradition byzantine, " *Revue historique du sud-est Européen* 23 (1946), pp. 71-98; John Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World (565-1204)* (London: UCL Press, 1999), p. 296, note 10; Angeliki Laiou, " On Just War in Byzantium, " in *To Hellenikon. Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis, Jr.*, vol. 1, pp. 153-74; Tia Kolbaba, " Fighting for Christianity. Holy War in the Byzantine Empire, " *Byzantion* 68 (1998), pp. 194-221.

[59] Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World*, pp. 13-34. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition, p. 280.*

tendency was reflected also in the depiction of the saints. While in early pictures warrior saints were portrayed in the same way as the other martyrs, in civil dress holding a cross, from the tenth century onwards the depiction of military saints became numerous and they began to be presented in military costumes. In the eleventh century, portraits of military saints were used on imperial coinage.[60]

It was during this period that the Byzantine Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (r. 963-69) proposed to the Church that soldiers who had fallen for the empire should be counted as martyrs. The contemporaries of Nikephoros and later commentators objected to and rejected this idea, which was never again raised.[61] The martyrdom narrative of the sixteen soldiers thus shows a great divergence from the common Byzantine soldier-martyr typology and an important deviance from the general principles of the Byzantine Church. What was the reason behind this deviance?

I believe that this was related to the special status of Philadelphia in the fourteenth century. The city of Philadelphia gained a strategic importance at the end of the eleventh century with the appearance of the Turkish menace. Its role was to serve as a frontier zone in opposing the pressure of the nomadic Turks. It was also the base of dissidence for some Byzantine commanders against Constantinople, such as John Komnenos

---

[60] Michael F. Hendy, *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 1081-1261* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1969); idem, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection IV : Alexius I to Michael VIII (1081-1261)*, 2 vols. (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1999).

[61] Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World*, p. 28.

Vatatzes and Theodore Maggaphas.[62] In fact, around 1203, the city of Philadelphia was not under the control of Constantinople.[63] With the installation of Nicaean rule in western Asia Minor, the city lost its independence between 1206 and 1261. From 1290 until its annexation by Bayezid I in 1390, it again became a politically independent city, powerful enough to regulate its own foreign affairs with the Mongols, Latins and Turks.

Philadelphia was at the same time an economically self-sufficient city.[64] Its relation with Constantinople was reduced only to ecclesiastical connections. As a Byzantine island in the middle of Turkish emirates, the city of Philadelphia witnessed many Turkish assaults and had to defend itself through its own means.[65] We know that two metropolitans of Philadelphia, Theoleptos of Philadelphia and Makarios Chrysokephalos, played an enormous role in administering and defending the city.[66] The text on the sixteen soldier martyrs of Philadelphia was in fact written during the metropolitanate of Makarios Chrysokephalos, who most probably did not hesitate to act independently in ecclesiastical as well as other affairs and accepted these soldiers as martyrs against the principles of the Byzantine Church. Their acceptance as martyrs shows how difficult it became for the Byzantine Church to control the local Churches and their practices, even during a time when the hesychast patriarchs were successful in asserting their universal role in different parts of eastern Europe.

---

[62] Jean C. Cheynet, " Philadelphie, un quart de siècle de dissidence, 1182-1206, " in *Philadelphie et autres études* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1984), pp. 39-54.

[63] The city of Philadelphia was absent in the document of *Partitio Romaniae*, in which the areas dependent on Constantinople were listed. Oikonomides, " La décomposition de l'empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée".

[64] Hélène Ahrweiler, " La région de Philadelphie au XIVe siècle (1290-1390), dernier bastion de l'hellénisme en Asie Mineure, " *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 127/1 (1983), pp. 175-197; Nicolas Oikonomides, "Pour une typologie des villes "séparées" sous les Paléologues," *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. W. Seibt (Vienna, 1996), pp. 171-75, reprinted in *Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, study XXI, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005). Although I was not able to consult it, see also frequently cited article of Peter Schreiner, " Zur Geschichte Philadelpheias im 14. Jahrhundert (1293-1390), " *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), pp. 375-431.

[65] For the analysis and dating of Turkish assaults against Philadelphia see Lemerle, "Philadelphie et l'Emirat d'Aydin".

Conclusion

From the analysis of authors, we understand that the *martyria* of the period between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries were not all written by religious men of the Byzantine Church. The ones written by the counselors of Andronikos II can be considered as instruments of imperial propaganda, emphasizing the spiritual victory of the Emperor in spite of his military defeats against the Turco-Muslim advances in Asia Minor. They were also aimed to show how Andronikos II was successful in the pursuit of his role as the protector of the Orthodox Christians outside his realms. Imperial universalism was in fact one of the principal emphases of the imperial propaganda of the reign of Andronikos II. The *martyria* written under this emperor were targeted to the Byzantine elite in order to legitimate

---

[66] For Theoleptos see Angela C. Hero, *The Life and Letters of Theoleptos of Philadelphia* (Massachusetts: Hellenic College Press, 1994); D.J. Constantelos, " Mysticism and Social Involvement in the Later Byzantine Church : Theoleptos of Philadelphia-A Case Study, "

Andronikos II's rule, which was not so secure due to Michael VIII's usurpation of the Byzantine throne and his decision in favor of the Union of Churches.

The *martyria* written by the hesychast authors were aimed at expanding and confirming the influence of the Byzantine Church in eastern Europe and in the historical Byzantine lands. Through the transfer of the relics of the new saint martyrs such as the martyrs of Lithuania and through their canonization and the composition of their *martyria*, the Byzantine Church in Constantinople was trying to reassert the centrality of Constantinople for the Orthodox world, which had been damaged after 1204. The *martyria* on the new saint-martyrs under Latin rule were written in order to defend the role of the Byzantine Emperor and the Church over the local Orthodox Christians, which was denied by the Latin rulers of the areas. We can say that the hesychast authors were using the authority of saints' cults to extend their influence in eastern Europe and to defend the Byzantine rights on the Latin lands.

The *martyria* written during the reign of Andronikos II and during the reigns of the hesychast patriarchs reflect the views of the center. We can expect to encounter a similar Byzantine identity in these *martyria* as in other Constantinople-centered historical sources. There are, however, differences between the martyrdom cases under Muslim rule and Latin rule in terms of the social typology of the martyrs and the reasons behind their martyrdom.

Byzantine Studies-Études byzantines 6 (1979), pp. 83-94 ; *ODB*, s.v. " Theoleptos"; for Makarios see *ODB*, s.v. " Chrysokephalos, Makarios ".

There are also differences between Muslim and Latin rule in terms of the social status of the martyrs.

Each of the *martyria* in the third group has its own specific authorial intention. The one on Theodore the Younger can be considered as a brief manual for the Orthodox Christians who had converted to Islam and who were willing to return to Christianity under Ottoman rule.

The author of the text on George of Adrianople was a pro-Unionist who saw a spiritual victory in the martyrdom of George, which foreshadowed the success of the Union of Churches, which would in turn provide the military aid that the Byzantines needed against the Ottoman advances.

The *martyrion* on Michael Mauroides reflects the opposition of a certain fraction of the Ottoman ruling elite against the policies of Mehmed II, who seemed to favor the non-Muslims in his administration. The author probably wanted to show the danger of close relations with the Ottoman elite and the jealousy which this could provoke.

The historical notice on the soldier martyrs of Philadelphia was written probably to enforce the spirit of defense among the population of Philadelphia by introducing the concept of martyrdom for the ones who fell while fighting for their cities. The text is revelatory of the situation of fourteenth-century western Asia Minor. An independent autonomous Byzantine city like Philadelphia could survive only by acting independently from the center. Apart from the decisions in foreign and commercial affairs, even in terms of ecclesiastical affairs a rupture from the center became inevitable. The text is interesting as it was written by and for people outside the center and hence can provide evidence of an alternative Byzantine identity and ideology compared to the ones written by the counselors of Andronikos II and by the hesychast authors.

CHAPTER 4:

BEING BYZANTINE OR BECOMING THE "OTHER"

The analysis of the authors of the *martyria* of the Palaiologan period showed that most of the martyrdom stories, especially the ones written during the reign of Andronikos II and during the reigns of the hesychast patriarchs, were told from the perspective of the Byzantine civil or ecclesiastical elite of Constantinople. Most of the authors were neither witnesses of the event nor did they live in the same society as the martyrs. At the same time, most of the martyrs in question were from the historical Byzantine territories, which were no longer under Byzantine rule. The two exceptions are the martyrs of Philadelphia and the Lithuanian martyrs. The martyrs of Philadelphia were inhabitants of territory, which was still ruled by the "Byzantines,s" but the city was ruled autonomously from Constantinople. The Lithuanian martyrs on the other hand, were from Lithuania, which had never been under Byzantine rule. Except the martyrs of Philadelphia, all the martyrs in question were considered to be members of the Byzantine *oikoumene* by the authors of the *martyria*, hence members of their own group due to the Byzantine universal ideology.

In this chapter, the identity of the martyrs and of the groups which the martyrs represented as well as the identity of the "other" against whom the martyrs were defined will be examined. The main inquiry will be on the terminology used for the identification of "self" and "other", the social typology of the martyrs, the social space in which there was an encounter with the “other”, and on the threat perceived through this encounter with the other groups.

The “Self” and The “Other”

The two *martyria* written during the reign of Andronikos II have some common features in terms of reflecting Byzantine identity. For their author, an important aspect of the respective identity of Niketas the Younger and of Michael of Alexandria was their Christian faith. Both authors pointed out that their heroes inherited their faith, Christianity, from their parents. Niketas the Younger and his friends belonged to a group that was by birth/family/race (*genos*) and by faith (*pistis*) Christian.[1] Although the term *genos* is not used in the text on Michael of Alexandria, the author emphasized that the religious identity of his hero was inherited from his ancestors. Accordingly, Michael who was captured from his fatherland (*tes patridos*), from his paternal estates (*ton oikeion patroon kleron*) and from the treasures of Christian piety and faith (*thesauron tes Christianikes theosebeias kai pisteos*), had lost his piety in Egypt.[2]

In the text on Niketas the Younger, the group boundary, which encompassed all the Christians including Niketas and his friends and which distinguished them from the “other” group, was the Christian laws

---

[1] Halkin, “ L’Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon,” p. 133. “Χριστιανοὶ τὸ γένος καὶ τὴν πίστιν τυγχάνοντες.”

[2] Metochites, “Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, ” p. 671, “τὸν ἐκ πατέρων σοι καὶ προγόνων κύριον καὶ δεσπότην Χριστόν;” “συναρπάξη.........τῆς τε πατρίδος αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν οἰκείων πατρώων κλήρων καὶ θησαυρῶν τῆς χριστιανικῆς θεοσεβεσίας καὶ πίστεως;” “αὐτὴν την πατρώαν εὐσέβειαν.”

(*Christianikoi nomoi*). The “other” group included people who were by *genos* Persians[3] (i.e. Seljuks) and who worshipped Mohammed. Their rule was “godless” and “barbaric”.[4] While Christians followed the Christian laws, the Persian nation (*to ethnos Person*) was guided and governed by the laws of Mohammed, who was an instrument at the hands of Satan.[5] The law of Mohammed, according to the text, was a deformed form of Christian law which aimed at deceiving the Christians. Mohammed, the pupil of Satan, stole from Christian laws in a fashion similar to the Hellenes (i.e. pagan Greeks) who diverted many elements of the ancient history of Moses and interpreted those in their own ways.[6] The Muslim fasting, which was a part of Mohammed’s law, was the major issue of conflict between Niketas and the Persians. The author gave in detail the differences between the Christian fasting and the Muslim fasting.

The author emphasized the separation of authority over bodies and over souls to justify his claim that Niketas and his friends were a part of the Byzantine *oikoumene* while living under Persian rule.[7] Accordingly, Niketas and his friends and the group which they represented were living under Persian rule, but this rule had authority only over their bodies. Niketas and his friends were paying “Caesar what was due Caesar” but they did not accept Persian authority over their souls, over which the Christian laws reigned.[8]

---

[3] Halkin, “ L’Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon,” p. 133.

[4] Ibid., p. 130.

[5] Ibid., p. 131, ”Μωάμετ, τὸ τοῦ Σατὰν ”οργανον, ὁ καὶ ἀθεῖας καὶ βδελυρίας πάσης ὑφηγητής, ἐπεὶ προυθετο, πάλαι θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντα ἀθετήσας, ”εθνος τὸ Περσῶν οἰκειώσασθαι καὶ πρὸς τὸν ῞ομοιον της ’ασεβείας ‘υπαγαγεῖν ”ολισθον, γέγονε καὶ νόμων ’εφευρετής”.

[6] Ibid., p. 132.

[7] Ibid., p. 134.

In the text on Niketas the Younger, the "other" group is well-defined. In the text on Michael of Alexandria, we do not see two groups opposing one another. We learn that Michael's fatherland was an area around the city of Smyrna in Ionia and that he was captured as a slave during a barbarian attack. What made Michael "Byzantine" was clear. It was his fatherland, his religion by birth which he inherited from his father and his ancestors. But who was the "other"?

The text gives information on the "barbarian" attacks, which corresponds to the historical reality. This region had been under Byzantine rule, but since 1284 Turco-Muslim groups were raiding the area and were carrying off the inhabitants as slaves. The attacks were named as barbarian attacks, Mohammed and his teachings were blamed, but for Theodore Metochites, the ultimate "other" was Egypt. He neither presented a clearly defined group of Muslims nor rulers confronting Michael. In the text on Niketas the Younger, the Seljuk Sultan Masud II's rule, for example, is defined as the "Persian political power of the ones honoring the godless impiety".[9] Instead Theodore Metochites personified Egypt and put the blame on it "for having exchanged the former glorious Christian conduct and dogma with the Muslim consecrations."[10]

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., p.150.

[10] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, " p. 672, "Καί σοι τοιαῦτα νῦν, Αἴγυπτε, πάσης αἰσχύνης καὶ ἀμαθέστατα σπουδάσματα καὶ νόμιμα, ἀντὶ τῆς πρὶν σοφίας περιφανοῦς ἐκείνης".

In the text on Michael, the emphasis is not so much on the differences between the two groups but rather on the Emperor as the protector of the Christians in the Christian *oikoumene*.[11] Michael, having decided to convert to Christianity, revealed his intention secretly to the distinguished Christians in Egypt as well as to their spiritual leader.[12] Michael, however, was able to put his thought into action only upon hearing of the arrival of the Byzantine embassy, which was sent to Egypt by the Byzantine emperor in order to conduct the affairs related to the Christians of this region. This decision of Michael is reflected in the text as his will to return to his origins, to the faith of his ancestors, to the faith of his fatherland.

Like Theodore Metochites, Theodore Mouzalon, the author of the *martyrion* on Niketas, mourned over the Christian past of certain territories, such as Ankara and Nyssa, which had long been under "atheist barbarian" rule.[13] In this text, however, these places are not personified. Instead we see a Muslim society with its members and rulers versus Niketas and his friends.

Emphasis on the role of the Byzantine emperor as the protector of the Christians can also be detected in the text on Niketas the Younger but this aspect is alluded to rather than openly discussed as in the text on Michael of Alexandria. The key issue here is the adherence to Christian law, which distinguished Niketas and his friends from the Persians.

---

[11] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, " pp. 670, 672-3, 678.

[12] Ibid, p. 672.

[13] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," p. 130.

According to Byzantine ideology, the link between Christians outside Byzantine territory and the Byzantine Empire was to be created by Roman law (*nomos rhomaios*). Theodore Balsamon (d. after 1195), a Byzantine canonist of the twelfth century,[14] for example, in his answers to the Patriarch Mark III of Alexandria (ca.1195),[15] stated that *Rhomaioi* were the ones who lived according to Roman law.[16] He emphasized the Byzantine emperor's role in the application of Roman law as a universal lawmaker and as a quasi-bishop. These issues can be traced in the text on Niketas the Younger. The difference is that the author of the text, Theodore Mouzalon, instead of identifying Niketas, his friends and the group that they represented as Romans, identified them as Christians and the law to which they were attached as the Christian law.

---

[14] Theodore Balsamon occupied high positions in the church hierarchy; first as patriarchal *nomophylax* and *chartophylax*, then as the nominal patriarch of Antioch (1185-1190). His major work was his commentary on the *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*, the most important source of Canon law in Byzantium. In his political program, he supported strong imperial power and imperial political aspirations. *ODB*, vol.1, p. 249. For the role of the Byzantine emperor as the universal legislator and for Theodore Balsamon's contribution to this idea, see Gilbert Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003), pp. 249-67; idem, "Lawful Society and Legitimate Power: " ῎Εννομος πολιτεία, ῎εννομος ἀρχή," *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth-Twelfth Centuries*, ed. Angeliki Laiou & Dieter Simon (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1994), pp. 27-51. For the relationship between civil (*nomos*) and ecclesiastical (*kanon*) law in Byzantium and for the Byzantine emperor's position in the Church and hence with regard to civil and ecclesiastical law, see Ruth J. Macrides, " Nomos and Kanon on Paper and in Court," *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. Rosemary Morris (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1990), pp. 61-86, reprinted in *Kingship and Justice in Byzantium, 11th-15th Centuries*, study VI, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999). Also see B.H. Stolte, " Civil Law in Canon Law: A Note on the Method of Interpreting the Canons in the Twelfth Century, " in *Byzantium in the 12th Century. Canon Law, State and Society*, ed. Nicolas Oikonomides (Athens: Society of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1991), pp. 543-554. On Theodore Balsamon and the Christians living outside Byzantium, see John Meyendorff, " Balsamon, the Empire and the Barbarians," *Byzantium in the 12th Century. Canon Law, State and Society*, pp. 533-542.

[15] *PG* 138, pp. 951-1011; *RegPatr*, n. 1184.

[16] *PG* 138, p. 953.

It is interesting that although the text mentions church officials, such as a bishop of the church of Koloneia-a suffragan bishopric of the metropolitan of Mokissos-[17] and two other priests,[18] these officials did not interfere with the debates of Niketas on Christian law. They only conducted burial rituals. The representation of the Church officials, responsible only for conducting rituals, can also be reflective of how Theodore Mouzalon perceived their role over the Christians in the Seljuk society in particular and under the foreign rule in general.

The term Roman is used very rarely in both of these texts. Theodore Mouzalon utilized it once in an adjective form in relation with the Roman royal power (*ton romaikon skeptron*) of Andronikos II.[19] Theodore Metochites used *Romaioi* once, with the word *genos*, while telling how in Alexandria people of different races witnessed the martyrdom of Michael.[20] Here the term *genos* seems to have a racial connotation.

---

[17] The name of Mokissos as a metropolitan seat was mentioned for the last time in the *notitia* 13 of the *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*. This *notitia* dates to the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, the end of the reign of Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180). See Jean Darrouzes, *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, (Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1981), vol. 1, pp. 136, 354. We see the name of Koloneia for the last time on the same *notitia*. Darrouzes, ibid., p. 361. On the other hand, in *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, last time we see the name of a suffragan of Koloneia is in an eleventh century document, while the last suffragan of Nyssa dates to 1370. See Giorgio Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis1. Patriarchatus Constantinopolitanus*, vol. 1 (Padova: Ed. Messaggero, 1988), p. 35. The suffragan of Nyssa is also cited in one of the registers of patriarchal acts of Constantinople. This act dates to the 6th of November 1370 and concerns the transfer of Joannice, the bishop of Nyssa to the metropolitan of Mokissos. The patriarch and the synod demanded Joannice to reside in his diocese and not to abandon it as he had done in Nyssa. *RegPatr*, vol. 5, p. 502.

[18] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," pp. 150-1.

[19] Ibid., p. 150.

[20] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michael Martyre, " p. 676. "ἀλλα ἠπείγοντο πάντες πρὸς τὴν καινὴν καὶ θαυμαστὴν θέαν καὶ παντὸς γένους ”ανθρωποι,

The authors of the respective *martyria* perceived certain threats for the members of their group, who were in contact with the "Other" groups. For the case of Niketas the Younger, the threat was Muslim law in general and Muslim fasting in particular which could deceive the Christians. This threat was mostly felt in the market place, a social space shared by both Muslims and Christians. The group in opposition to Niketas and his friends were Muslim commoners in the market place.

For the case of Michael, the barbarian attacks trespassed the physical group boundary and this resulted in the detachment from one's native town and faith through enslavement. Another perceived threat was the difficulty of returning to Christianity once being converted to Islam. In a fashion similar to the case of Niketas, the events that led to the martyrdom of Michael of Alexandria happened in a public place near the port and in the commercial area of Alexandria, where people from different "races" were present.

The *martyria* which were written by the two *megas logothetes* of Andronikos II took place under Muslim rule. The martyrs were common people who were inhabitants of the historical Byzantine territories in Asia Minor. They were identified as Christians. In the text on Niketas the Younger, although their numbers decreased, we see a small community of Christians living in different cities who had interactions with each other. The Byzantine Church, though weakened, still existed and continued to function. In the text on Michael of Alexandria, we see a cosmopolitan city where there were many people from different parts of

---

ʽΡωμαῖοι τῶν διὰ τὴν πρεσβείαν, ἧπερ εἴρηται, καὶ δια ἐμπορίαν παρατυχόντων τῆ πόλει, 'Ιταλοὶ...., Ρὼς..., "Αραβες, Σύροι..., Τριβαλλοὶ".

the Mediterranean as well as a local Orthodox Christian community with its Church functioning. In these texts, the role of Andronikos II as the protector of the Christians in the lands outside Byzantine rule was emphasized.

The "other" in the text on Niketas was the Muslim population in the market place and the *hegemon.* It was the Muslims near the port and the personified Egypt in the case of Michael of Alexandria.

The *martyria* written by the hesychast authors are concerned with martyrdoms under Latin rule or under the pagan rule of Lithuania. The social typology of the martyrs and the social spaces in which they encountered the "Other" group were quite different from those under Muslim rules mentioned above.

The thirteen martyrs of Cyprus martyred in Leukosia-Cyprus under Lusignan rule[21] were all hesychast monks. Their leaders Ioannes and

---

[21] The nominal ruler of Cyprus during this period was Henry I Lusignan, the King of Cyprus and the Lord of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1218-1253). As Henry I was only 5 months old in 1218, his kingdom was ruled by his regent mother Queen Alice of Champagne (d. 1228) between 1218-1225 and by a leading baron in Cyprus, Philip of Ibelin (d. 1228). Upon the marriage of Queen Alice to Bohemond V, the Prince of Tripoli (d. 1252) in 1225, Queen Alice wanted to assign her husband as the regent of the Latin Kingdom of Cyprus. On the other hand, Pope Honorius III (1216-1227) was not favorable to Bohemond V and supported Philip of Ibelin. When Philip died in 1228, his brother John of Ibelin (c.1179-1236) assumed the control of the island. The situation got even more complicated and a civil war started with the intervention of Frederick II Hohenstaufen (1212-1250) in the same year. Frederick II was claiming rights over the Kingdom of Cyprus as the suzerain king and argued that infant King Henry I was his vassal. During the civil war between 1228-1233, which took place between the Ibelins and the group of Latin Cypriot knights supporting Queen Alice, Frederick II interfered in the conflict and supported the party, which was against the Ibelin regime. It is noteworthy that around 1230s the Nicaean emperor John Vatatzes III (1221-1254) was in alliance with Frederick II in the hope that he would help him to recover Constantinople. The Ibelin party, on the other hand, was supported by the Papacy, which had excommunicated Frederick II in 1227. In 1232, as John Vatatzes began to lose hope of recovering Constantinople with the aid of Frederick II and as Tsar of Bulgaria, John Asen (1218-1241) became a contender for the throne of Constantinople after having defeated Theodore Doukas of Epiros (1215-1230) in 1230, Vatatzes started communications with pope Gregory IX (1227-1241). His actual communications for Church union started, however, after the papal forces defeated the forces of Frederick II at Parma in 1248. Peter W. Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991), pp. 48-73. *ODB,* s.v. "Frederick II

Konon were initiated to monastic life in Kalon Oros[22] and left this area for Cyprus around the 1220's. They traveled from one monastery to another in Cyprus to be able to find a suitable monastery to practice *hesychia*. Some other monks, who were originally from Cyprus or from Kalon Oros, joined them and finally they all settled in the Monastery of Kantariotissa.[23]

The author of the *martyrion* puts two groups in opposition to each other, "our Orthodox Christian race" (*tou hemeterou genous orthodoksous Christianous*) versus the "Latin race" (*tou ton Latinon genous*). Apart from the hesychast monks, "our race" included the

---

Hohenstaufen"; David Jacoby, " The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Collapse of the Hohenstaufen Power in the Levant, " *DOP* 40 (1986), pp. 83-101. *ODB*, s.v. " John III Vatatzes ". *RegPatr*, n.1256, p. 62. Sathas, *MB*, vol. 2, pp. 39-46. For synodal sessions between the Orthodox and the Latin Church in 1234 in which the conditions of the union of Churches were discussed, see *RegPatr*, n.1267-77; Joseph Gill, " Eleven Emperors of Byzantium seek Union with the Church of Rome, " *Eastern Churches Review 9* (1977), pp. 65, 73-74.

[22] Kalon Oros was the medieval Byzantine name for modern Alanya. The name Candelore, used by the Latin sources, is a derivative from this word. For the history of Kalon Oros see *TIB VIII, Lykien und Pamphylien*, vol. 2, pp. 587-594. Also Scott Redford, *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia. Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya, Turkey* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2000), pp. 6-29. We understand from the *martyrion* on the thirteen monks that there had been a monastic community in Kalon Oros where the monks got initiated before arriving to Cyprus. A monastic complex has been located on a rocky hill in the southwest end of Alanya peninsula (Cilvarda Burnu). The complex is dated according to its construction features to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Setton Lloyd and D. Storm Rice, *Alanya (Alaiyya)*, tr. N. Sinemoğlu (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1964), pp. 41-44; also Redford, *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia*, p.16. Monks probably restored this monastic complex in the thirteenth century. Kalon Oros was captured from the Cilician Armenian barons in 1221 by the Seljuk ruler Alaeddin Keykubad (1219-1237). The monks, who were mentioned in the *martyrion* as having arrived from Kalon Oros, probably left the area after the arrival of the Seljuk Turks. The text on their martyrdom does not specify when and why they had left. We can roughly calculate the date of their arrival from Kalon Oros. They were martyred in 1231 after having stayed three years in prison. Therefore it was in 1228 that they were thrown to the prison. Prior to 1228, they circulated around few monasteries in Cyprus before settling down in the one near Kantara. Therefore it seems reasonable that they have left Kalon Oros around 1220's. On the monks from Kalon Oros coming to Cyprus see also, *TIB VIII. Lykien und Pamphylien*, p. 588. In some studies Kalon Oros is interpreted as Mount Athos without giving any explanation. Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195-1312*, p. 282.

[23] "Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων," pp. 20-24.

Orthodox Christians[24] who were the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus and the author himself. This group was represented by the thirteen hesychast monks, the principal protagonists of the narrative. The people of the "Latin race" were the Latins (*Latinoi*), among whom there was a Latin monk, Gennadius,[25] pontifex Storggo,[26] various religious men from the Catholic Church (priests, scribes), the patriarch of Jerusalem,[27] the Latin King (*Rex*),[28] his horsemen, his policemen (*spathophoros*) and the public executioners (*oi demioi*). All the Latins were attached to the Catholic Church (*katholike ekklesia*) according to the text. The principal antagonist who represented the Latins, was Andreas, a Latin by "*genos*". He is described as *keryx* (preacher) and *maistoros* in the text.[29] He was the one who prepared their martyrdom upon the debate with the hesychast monks on the Latin *azyme*.

---

[24] Ibid.,p. 26.

[25] Ibid., p. 36.

[26] Ibid., p. 29. Storggo must be Estorge de Montaigu (1217-1250), the Latin Archbishop of Cyprus at that time.

[27] Ibid., p. 32. The patriarch of Jerusalem mentioned here should be Gerald of Laussane (1225-1238), the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Antioch intervened in the religious affairs of Cyprus as judge-delegates or executors of papal directives. Their intervention seriously undermined archiepiscopal authority. In 1233, Pope Gregory IX instructed them to exercise their legatine powers solely within the limits of their respective patriarchates, excluding the kingdom of Cyprus. Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus*, pp. 89-90.

[28] "Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων," pp. 37. The *Rex* was Henri I Lusignan who was the King of Cyprus and Lord of the Kingdom of Jerusalem during 1218-1253.

[29] "Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων," pp. 25, 30. According to Michael Angold, Andreas was a Dominican friar. Michael Angold, " Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile, " in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton, David Jacoby (London: F. Cass, 1989), p. 73; Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni 1081-1261* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000), pp. 518-522; Konnare, Schabel, *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374*, p. 196. Dominicans and Franciscans had been operating in the East by the early 1220's. They were learning Greek and acquainting themselves with Greek theology and then through preaching, debate and the use of reason aimed at persuading the Greeks to subscribe to the Latin teachings. It was the Dominicans who persuaded a monk of St. Mamas to subscribe to Latin teachings on the *azyme*. *RegPatr*, no.1287; Angold, " Greeks and Latins after 1204, " p. 78.

The Orthodox Christian inhabitants of the island are identified only once as Romans, when the Latins put the hesychast monks into prison. "They, the Romans dwelling on the island, trembled with fear when the monks were put in prison and they prayed to God for help."[30] In the text, when the author made the Latins speak, the hesychast monks were identified as Greeks (*Graikoi*).[31]

The group boundary between these two groups, as it is reflected in the text, was the Latin dogma of *azyme* in the Eucharist. The Latins were identified not as barbarians, but either as tyrants (*oi tyrannoi*)[32] or as heretics (*oi hairetikoi*). The text tells that the ones attached to the Catholic Church were once in the Orthodox *oikoumene*, but then they inclined towards heresy.[33]

The social space in which the Orthodox Christians and the Latins were in contact with each other was the monasteries. In the setting of the text, we rarely hear about Orthodox Christian commoners and never about Latin commoners. The plot was woven around the religious men belonging to the two religious groups. The role of the Latin civil authorities, such as the *Rex* and his council was minimal. We see them only in the High court or when they executed the penalty given by Andreas to the monks.[34]

---

[30] "Διήγησις τῶν ῾αγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ῾οσίων πατέρων," p. 30. "Φόβος καὶ τρόπος ἦλθεν ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντος ἐν ταύτη τῇ νήσω Ρωμαίους, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανὸν ῎αραντες μετὰ δακρύων ῎ελεγον."

[31] "Διήγησις τῶν ῾αγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ῾οσίων πατέρων," p. 38. Although the term *Graikos* was perceived as a pejorative term in the 13th century, we see the term *Graikos* used by the Patriarch Germanos II of Constantinople in Nicaea (January 1223- June 1240) in a letter to Pope Gregory IX (19 March, 1227- 22 August, 1241), in which he suggested conversations to restore harmony between the Churches. In this letter, he mentioned the martyrdom of thirteen monks as a proof of the bad treatments that Orthodox Christians had been suffering under the Latins and used the term Greeks (*Graikoi*) for identifying the Byzantines and the Orthodox Christians. *RegPatr*, n.1256, p. 62. Sathas *MB*, vol. 2, pp. 39-46. For synodal sessions between Orthodox and Latin Church in 1234 in which the conditions of the union of Churches were discusses see *RegPatr*, n.1267-77.

[32] "Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων," pp. 28, 30.

[33] Ibid., p. 35.

There are similarities in the social typology of the martyrs, in their identification and in the identification of the "other" between the texts on the thirteen monks of Cyprus and the one on Anthimos, the archbishop of Athens. Although Anthimos was serving as the archbishop of Athens and received Crete as a supplement (*epidosis*), he was a monk-bishop as it is emphasized in the text.[35] The author, Patriarch Neilos of Constantinople, included himself, Anthimos and the inhabitants of the island of Crete, whom he identified as the Orthodox ones (*orthodoksoi*) or the ones following the Orthodox faith (*tes orthes pisteos*) in the same group.[36] The inhabitants of the island of Crete following the Orthodox faith are never called Romans but always Cretans (*oi Kretes*). In fact, the term Roman is never used in the text. The Latins are defined as tyrants[37] and as heretics, as in the text on the thirteen martyrs of Cyprus.[38]

---

[34] Andreas probably took the case to the High Court. In the Latin Kingdom of Cyprus, the King's court was the highest tribunal in the realm. Concerning the members and the functions of the High Court, see Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades*, pp. 186-88. In the text, it is stated that the members of the court were only responsible for the public affairs and that the ecclesiastical affairs were not granted to them but to Andreas. Andreas, on the other hand, replied that due to his vow of guilt negation, he could not kill anyone. Therefore, Andreas decided on the punishment and the police executed it upon the *Rex*'s order. "Διήγησις τῶν ʽαγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ʽοσίων πατέρων," pp. 37-8.

[35] Dyobounites, " ʽΟ ʼΑθηνῶν ʼʼΑνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ʽο ʽομολογητής, " p. 59. In the text, the author tells how Anthimos was in search of obtaining inner wisdom since his young age and finally joined the chorus of monks, τὸν χορὸν τῶν μοναστῶν. While praising Anthimos's efforts to obtain inner wisdom, Neilos pointed out to the errors of the Hellenes (i.e. pagan Greeks) in trying to obtain outer wisdom Dyobounites, " ʽΟ ʼΑθηνῶν ʼʼΑνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ʽο ʽομολογητής, " pp. 57-58.

[36] Dyobounites, " ʽΟ ʼΑθηνῶν ʼʼΑνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ʽο ʽομολογητής, " p. 76.

According to Neilos, the borderline dividing these two groups, "our race" (*to hemeteron genos*), the Orthodox ones, and "them," the Latins, was the Orthodox dogmas in general,[39] and the question of *filioque*[40] and the supremacy of Rome in particular.[41] The Cretans, who did not want to err in the Latin dogmas, sent a messenger to the patriarch in Constantinople (*pros ton megan tes basileuouses poleos*) in order to ask him to appoint an Orthodox bishop to their island.[42] The competition between the patriarch of Constantinople and the Papacy over the spiritual guidance of the Cretans can be seen in a paragraph, in which Neilos made a Latin priest speak. Accordingly, the Latin priest tried to persuade Anthimos to accept the Latin dogma, claiming that except Anthimos, all the episcopates of "Byzantion" had agreed with the Latin dogma and with the fact that the seat of Rome was the head of the Church.[43]

Again as in the case of the thirteen martyrs, the groups are represented by the religious men of both parties. On the one hand, there was Anthimos, the monk-bishop, who had been appointed to the island by the Patriarch of Constantinople upon the request of the Cretans and, on the other hand, there were the Latin priests of Crete.

---

[37] Ibid.,pp. 68, 69, 76, 78.

[38] Ibid., pp. 72, 73.

[39] Ibid., pp. 71, 72, 78.

[40] Ibid., p. 62.

[41] Ibid., p. 74.

[42] Ibid., pp. 68-9.

[43] Ibid., p. 74.

In all the above-mentioned texts, the term Roman was rarely used. Instead the martyrs and the group that the martyrs represented were identified as Christians. The text on the Lithuanian martyrs is interesting in that respect. Here the three Lithuanians who had been converted to Christianity are never designated as Christians. Kruglets, Nezhil and Kumets were three young officials in the pagan Lithuanian prince Olgerd's court. The text identifies them as Russians (*Rossoi*) but associates them not with those "who had been coming to Byzantium on boats" but with those "who were called Lithuanians (*Litbous*) and who were fire-worshippers (*purolatras*)." [44]

Eventually they were converted to Orthodox Christianity by a priest named Nestor and received respectively the Christian names Antonios, Ioannes and Eustathios. Their conversion is described as a transformation from impiety (*asebeia*) to piety (*eusebeia*). The author emphasized that their ancestors were impious. Even though they were converted to Christianity and abandoned their "foreign, alien and strange" (*ksenes kai allotriou*),[45] Lithuanian pagan habits such as cutting their hair, shaving their beards and eating meat on a fast day, and most importantly even though they sacrificed themselves for Christ, these three youngsters were never designated as Christians in the text. The evidence in the *martyrion* on the Lithuanian martyrs with the *martyria* analyzed above show that the authors of these texts utilized the designation Christian only for people who were by birth, race and family Orthodox Christian.[47] It can even be said that it became synonymous with the Roman (*Romaios*) identity, as we have seen in the case of the thirteen monks of Cyprus.

---

[44] *'Αρχεῖον ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας*, p. 154.

[45] Ibid., p. 155.

[47] According to Jean-Claude Cheynet, two generations sufficed (father to son) for the development of Byzantine forms in the names of foreigners. If that can be taken as a mark of assimilation and if this understanding still continued in the fourteenth century, it meant that in two generations the offsprings of the Lithuanian converts would be considered Roman/Christian. Jean-Claude Cheynet, "Du prénom au patronyme: les étrangers à Byzance (X^e et XII^e siècles)," in *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography*, ed.

Three of the martyrdoms of the late Palaiologan and early post-Byzantine period took place under Ottoman rule. Interestingly, all of these martyrdoms were somewhat related with the city Adrianople. Theodore the Younger's hometown was Adrianople, from where he was captured as a war slave and then was brought to Melagina in Bithynia. Adrianople had not fallen to the Ottomans then, but Melagina, Ottoman Sultanönü, was under Ottoman rule. George of Adrianople was from Sofia but he was martyred in Adrianople, Ottoman Edirne. And finally Michael Mauroeides, who was the only post-Byzantine martyr in question, was again martyred in Edirne. The examination of the three martyrdom cases may provide information on how the "Byzantines" identified themselves under Ottoman rule before and after the fall of Constantinople.

Nicolas Oikonomides (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1987), pp. 57-66.

The earliest martyrdom case under Ottoman rule was that of Theodore the Younger. The emphasis on faith inherited by birth and from ancestors is also clear in the *martyrion* on Theodore the Younger. He was brought up by pious parents and was by birth from the city of Adrianos, which belonged to "the things of the Romans" (*ta ton Romaion*). Theodore, who had fallen into the hands of the "atheist barbarians" during an Ottoman raid, was brought to Asia. He rejected Jesus there because of his young age. He was circumcised and abandoned the light of the Evangel. He exchanged his veritable origin for a bastard origin.[48] Because of his ignorance of error and because of the great danger that the dominating ones represented, he inclined towards the religion of the "other".[49] In this text, it is clearly stated that one's religion from birth and from one's parents constituted an important part of his identity. The detachment from his fatherland and his parents, combined with his young age, caused the conversion of Theodore, i.e. his becoming the "other".

In this text, we do not see a community of Christians until the very end of the story, when Theodore is martyred. Until that instance, Theodore is represented as a lonely individual, who was in contact only with three characters; the spiritual man (*pneumatikos aner*) who guided him in his return to Christianity; the Patriarch in Constantinople, whom Theodore went to see and from whom he received advice; and the evil man (Christian or Muslim?) who denounced him to the Persians (i.e. Ottomans) upon seeing that he had been circumcised while they were swimming in a lake.[50]

---

[48] Oikonomides, " ʼΑκολουθία τοῦ ʽΑγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," p. 216. "μεθ'ων τὴν ʼΑσίαν καταλαβών, ʼενταῦθα, φεῦ, τὸν Χριστὸν ʼαρνεῖται βαρβαρικῶς ʽομοῦ καὶ ʼαθέως περιτομὴν καὶ παίδευσιν ʼαναδεξάμενος. ὑπό τε γὰρ τῆς τῶν φρενῶν διὰ τὴν ʽηλικίαν ʽαπαλότητος καὶ τῆς ʼεν τῆ βαρβαρικῆ διαίτη ʽραστώνης περὶ σάρκα τε ο"υσης καὶ τῆ πλατεία καὶ ευρυχώρω μάλα χαιρούσης ʽο καλὸς θεόδωρος κακῶς παρασυρεὶς τοῦ γνησίου τὸ νόθον ʼαντέλαβε καὶ τὸ φῶς ʼαφεὶς τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν τὴν σκοτίαν ʽυπέδυ τῆς πλάνης."

[49] Ibid., p.217. "Τὸ μὲν παρῆκε, τοῦ δὲ γέγομεν, ʼαλλὰ πρὸς τῆ νεότητι καὶ τῆ ʼαπείρω τῆς πλάνης, "ωσπερ "εφην, βλακεία, καὶ ʽο παρὰ τῶν κρατούντων ʼεν τοῖς ʼεσχάτοις ʼεπισειόμενος κίνδυνος εἰς τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας ʼαλλόφυλον τὸν νέον ὑπέκλινε."

Only upon his martyrdom do we see the community of Christians, who after witnessing his martyrdom, gathered the remains of his body and buried them "properly".[51] The loneliness of Theodore and the appearance of the Christians on the scene only upon Theodore's martyrdom can be taken symbolically as his acceptance by the Christian community only after his martyrdom. His circumcision or, in the words of the author, his "carrying the sign of impiety"[52] was an obstacle to his participation in the communion of the Christians before his martyrdom. At the end of the narrative, the author tells that the martyrdom of Theodore and the miraculous light coming out of his tomb "became an honor and glory for the pious ones, a dishonor and an incident which gave a bad conscience for the ones who had chosen error (i.e. who had converted) and a sort of exhortation for the ones who were willing to return to the truth but who were hesitating either because they were indifferent or because they were seduced by their present situation."[53]

---

[50] Oikonomides, "’Ακολουθία τοῦ ῾Αγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," p. 218.

[51] Ibid., p. 219.

[52] Ibid., p. 217. "τα σήμαντρα φέροντα τῆς ’ασεβείας".

[53] Ibid., p. 219. " οὕτω τοῖς μὲν εὐσεβέσι τὰ θεῖα καύχημα γίνεται καὶ στέφανος δόξης, τοῖς κατειλημμένοις δὲ τῇ πλάνη αἰσχύνη καὶ ”ονειδος τῆς οἰκείας ἀπάτης τοῦ τε συνειδότος κατηγόρημα μόνιμον, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ μεγίστη παράκλησις τῶν βουλομένων ῎ηκειν μὲν πρὸς τὴν ’αλήθειαν, ’οκνούντων δὲ καὶ ’αναβαλλομένων ῾ραθυμία φύσεως ῍η δελεασμῶ τῶν παρόντων."

Hence Theodore, who was a lonely individual up until his martyrdom, not only became part of the Christian community but also an exemplary hero of this group. Only at the end of the narrative do we see him declaring that he was a Christian.[54]

The "others" in the text were the Persians who were described as "atheist barbarians". They were the ones who carried on raids on the Roman lands and captured Theodore from his lands and caused him to change his veritable origin. They were the ones who reigned in Melagina. The Persians, except the unjust judge (*krites adikos*) who decided on Theodore's punishment, were represented as a group, not as individuals.

In the text on George of Adrianople, we can see similar patterns as in the one on Niketas the Younger, in terms of the social space in which the protagonist of the text got into contact with the antagonists. In George's case as well, the social space was the market place and the antagonists were the common people in the market place. The antagonists, however, different than in the case of Niketas and Theodore the Younger, were defined as *Hagarenoi*, Hagarenes.[55]

---

[54] Ibid., " Χριστιανὸς γὰρ εἰμὶ καὶ Χριστὸν ἐγὼ θεὸν σέβομαι."

[55] *Agarenoi* (Hagarenes) was a term used by the Byzantines to identify the Muslims. The word derives from the name of the mother of Ishmael, Hagar (Hacer). According to the Book of Genesis 16 and 18, Hagar was the servant of Abraham's wife Sarah and the mother of his eldest son, Ishmael. She and her son were sent to the wilderness because of Sarah's jealousy. *Holy Bible. The New King James Version* (New York, 1982), pp. 13-14, 18-19. The term was used in Judeo-Christian literature and in Byzantine sources for "the followers or descendants of Hagar," drawing a biological descent for the Arabs from Abraham through his slave wife Hagar. The word came to mean Muslim in general. Here the Hagarenes in questions were the Ottomans, who had made Adrianople the capital of their state. For the employment of ethnonyms such as Persians, Saracens and Hagarenes in various Byzantine sources see, Koray Durak, "Defining the "Turk": Mechanisms of Establishing Contemporary Meaning in the Archaizing Language of the Byzantines," in *JÖB* (2009) *forthcoming*. I thank K. Durak for having provided me the article before its publication.

As a soldier, George went to an arch repairer in the market place in Adrianople, which was under the rule of the Hagarenes (i.e. the Ottomans), and he began to quarrel with him on the divine nature of Christ. Finally getting angry at the remarks of the arch repairer, who denied the divine nature of Christ, George insulted the prophet of the Hagarenes (i.e. Mohammed). It was again the people in the market place who dragged him to the *hegemon* of the area. The group of the Hagarenes included the common people in the market place, the *hegemon*, the chief *hegemon* (i.e. grand vizier), the *tasimanioi* (i.e. *danişmend*s) and some other people who claimed to have been the descendants of the prophet of the Hagarenes (i.e. *seyyids and şerifs*) and who were highly respected among the Hagarenes. The major protagonists of the text, however, were the *tasimanioi* and the people descending from the prophet's lineage. These people were the ones who opposed the chief *hegemon*'s decision concerning George and demanded death penalty for him. We understand from the text that these people had arrived at Adrianople from the East.

The identity of both the antagonists and of the protagonist was linked with their religion, and as we have seen in most of the above-mentioned texts an emphasis is placed on the inheritance of a certain faith from birth or from ancestors. Hence, the Hagarene's religious identity and George's Christian identity were inherited from birth (*genos*). The term *genos* here seems to designate race as well. Thus, while the *tasimanioi* were talking, they compared their race (*tou hemeterou genous*) with the race of the Christians (*to ton Christianon genos*). They also made a distinction between the territories of the

Muslims and the Christians. Rome and Constantinople were cited by the *tasimanioi* as Christian territories (*en tois topois ton christianon*) and the city of Adrianople as having become their territory, their kingdom where their race began to grow.[56]

In the text, the term Roman is utilized by the *tasimanioi* in relation with Byzantines. They refer to the city of Constantinople as the pride of the Romans (*auchema ton Romaion*). The Hellenes are also mentioned with reference to the pagan Ancient Greeks when the author gives brief information on the history of the city of Adrianople. Accordingly, "the city of Adrianople, which was leading erring life under the Hagarenes, had also taken a similar path long before under the defiled race of the Hellenes (*to miaron genos ton Hellennon*)".[57]

The martyrdom of Michael Mauroeides is the only case that dates to the post-Byzantine period. In this text unlike the ones discussed above, there is no reference whatsoever to Constantinople or to the patriarch of Constantinople. As in the case of the above-mentioned martyrdoms which took place under Muslim rule, in this text as well the antagonists are identified as barbarians.[58] Barbarian identity was an aspect that came from birth and was in a way the characteristic of a race (*tou genous ton barbaron*).[59] These barbarians were defined as the descendants of Hagar (*apogonous tes Hagar*) as in the case of the *martyrion* on George of

---

[56] Patrinelis, "Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο", p. 70.

[57] Ibid., p. 67.

[58] Eustratiades, " *Ὁ Νεομάρτυς Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ Ἀδριανουπολίτης,* " pp. 15, 18, 19, 21.

[59] Ibid., p. 10.

Adrianople.[60] They were seen as the personification of demon or of evil forces and were represented with the iconographic image of a deceitful dragon, the enemy of the human race.[61] Michael through his martyrdom, vanquished the dragon and dashed it to earth.[62]

In the text, the barbarians were divided into two groups as the barbarians in Europe and those in Asia. Accordingly, the race of the barbarians had settled among the noble race and had been exercising authority with the guidance and teachings of the Devil.[63] The text informs us that the barbarians, apart from being guided by the Devil, also shared the same language. This is the only text where the author makes reference to the language of the "other" as an element of a group boundary. The barbarians shared the same language, which was qualified as a barbaric voice in the text.[64] The term barbaric was used here in its original sense, defining brutal, rude and non-Greek language.

---

[60] Ibid., p. 16.

[61] In the Byzantine textual and visual tradition, the dragon combat symbolized the triumph of good over evil. The battle between man and the beast came to be associated with Christian military saints. As early as the ninth century, two military saints, George and Theodore Tiron, were represented in iconography as spearing a serpent or dragon. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*, pp. 272, 281; The archetypal fighter against evil was an Old Testament character, Solomon, who was attributed to have the knowledge of art against the demons. Ibid, pp. 34-37. In the New Testament, in Apocalypse (The Revelation) 12:7, we see God's army under the leadership of the archangel Michael overcoming the Dragon. *Holy Bible. The New King James Version*, pp. 1210-11. Also see Walter, *The Warrior Saints*, p. 13. For the transference of the image of the dragon-slaying saint-hero between the Christian and Muslim societies of medieval Anatolia, see Oya Pancaroğlu, "The Itinerant Dragon-Slayer: Forging Paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia," *Gesta* 43/2 (2004), pp. 151-164.

[62] Eustratiades, " *῾Ο Νεομάρτυς Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ ᾿Αδριανουπολίτης*, " p. 18. " Νενίκηκας, πάντιμε, ῾ολοτελῶς τὸν ᾿αρχέκακον τὸν δόλιον δράκοντα καταπαλαίσας αὐτὸν τὸν πολέμιον τοῦ τῶν ᾿ανθρώπων γένους καὶ τοῦτον κατήσχυνας καὶ κατηδάφισας."

[63] Ibid., p. 10.

[64] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

The major antagonists in the text, however, were a person from the household of Michael and certain people who were jealous of Michael's wealth and his high esteemed position in the royal court and in the eyes of the *hegemon* (sultan or grand vizier?). These people committed treacheries against Michael. They went to the judge (*to dikaste*), saying that Michael had pronounced the name of their God with a barbaric voice while they themselves were praying.[65] In the text, the judge, who is also from the group of the barbarians, is portrayed as a just and honest man. The image of the *hegemon* is not totally negative either. He is portrayed as someone who can be persuaded easily. Hence the jealous ones were able to persuade the *hegemon* to issue a decree (*nomos*) which ordered that if someone denied his own religion and did not accept their religion (i.e. Islam), he shall be punished by burning.[66] Michael, however, was killed by decapitation, and then his dead body was burnt.

The martyr Michael Mauroeides represented "our race" (*tou genous hemon*), the faithful ones (*oi pistoi*) and God's flock, who were protected by the Virgin Mother.[67] With his martyrdom, he "dragged the faithful ones to worship and gathered all the (Christian) community together".[68] *Genos* and *patris* are also keywords in this text in relation with the identity of the martyr, who represented the faithful ones.

---

[65] Ibid., p. 11. Michael was accused of pronouncing the declaration of God's eternal unity (*Kelime-i şehadet*), the formula of Muslim faith. This declaration is considered as the essential act of accepting Islam.

[66] Ibid., p. 11.

[67] Ibid., p. 22.

[68] Ibid., p. 25. " Ἕλκει τοὺς πιστοὺς πρὸς εὐφημίαν ʽο μάρτυς ʼαθλήσαν ʽυπέρ σοῦ νῦν, δέσποτα, καὶ πρὸς ʼαγαλλίασιν πάντας κοινὴν ˝ηθροισε τοῖς θείοις σου προς τάγμασιν;"

Michael's hometown (*patris*) was the city of Hadrian and he was among those who came from a noble race. When he was martyred, he left his fatherland and his city for the heavenly Jerusalem.[69] The term Christian was used only once in the text as "your servant Christians" (*Christianon son doulon*) to refer to the Christian community.[70] Apart from this unique incident, Michael and the Christian community were defined frequently as the faithful ones, God's flock or as "our race."

The *martyrion* on the soldier martyrs of Philadelphia differs from the above-mentioned texts in terms of its authorship given that the author was not from the Constantinopolitan elite but a resident of Philadelphia, an independent Byzantine city in Western Asia Minor. Moreover, the veneration of those soldiers as martyrs in spite of their having been martyred in battle was a radical deviation from the Byzantine tradition of martyrdom, as it has been explained in the previous chapter.

Like the *martyrion* on Michael Mauroeides, which was a post-Byzantine martyrdom, in this text on the martyrs of Philadelphia, there is also no reference whatsoever to Constantinople, to the patriarch in Constantinople, to the Byzantine Emperor or to the Roman identity of the martyrs or the inhabitants of the city of Philadelphia.

The martyrs and the inhabitants of Philadelphia are described as the faithful people of Philadelphia who were leading a life suitable for the Christians.[71] In addition to this description, the martyrs were described as powerful men, who were called the "sons of strength" (*uious dunameos*) by the Holy Scriptures.[72] On the other side, there was the impious, atheist (*atheoi*), barbarian Turks (*Tourkoi*).[73] The Turks were led by emir Umur, who was the enemy of Christ (*christomachos*). He was accompanied by his brothers and by a certain person called Sachates.[74] The master of Umur was (the prophet) Mohammed.[75] Umur's tricks and guiles went beyond those of his father's, who convinced some of the people of Philadelphia to help the Turks to occupy the fortress of guard.[76] The Latins are mentioned in relation with the death of Umur in Smyrna, with no negative connotation.[77]

---

[69] Ibid., pp.10, 28.

[70] Ibid., p. 17.

[71] Kouroupou, " Le siège de Philadelphie par Umur Pacha," p. 73.

Within the framework of the analysis of the above *martyria*, the findings can be summarized under two headings. One concerns the terminology used to define self and other and the second heading concerns the social typology of the martyrs, the social space in which they encountered the other and the threats perceived against this identity.

---

[72] Ibid., p. 71.

[73] Ibid.

[74] For Sachates see Ibid., p. 69.

[75] Ibid., p. 72.

[76] Ibid., p. 71. "ἀναπεῖσαι τινὰς τῶν ἡμετέρων κρατῆσαι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, ἤτοι τὸ καστέλλιον τῆς φυλάξεως."

[77] Ibid., pp.72, 80.

Terminology

According to the prescriptive and legalistic definition given in the Introduction, being Byzantine was equal to being Roman and this Romanness had political, religious, territorial and cultural aspects.

The detailed inquiry of the Palaiologan *martyria* in terms of identity reveals that the definition of being Byzantine and the definition of the "other", while keeping certain coordinates of the prescriptive definition, changed in the late Byzantine period. The first important observation is the synonymous utilization of the term Christian with the term Roman. The term Christian, as it is utilized in the *martyria*, seems to carry most of the coordinates of being "Roman". The Christians were the ones who lived in the historical Roman lands and they were expected to be loyal to the Roman emperor, who played a sacral role over the Christian *oikoumene*.

Loyalty to the Byzantine emperor as a cornerstone of Byzantine identity is a major theme in the *martyria* written under Andronikos II. In these *martyria*, being Christian was closely related with the political aspect of Romanness. It meant to be under the protection of the Byzantine emperor. In the *martyria* written by the hesychast authors and which concern martyrdoms under Latin rule, being Christian meant being loyal to the Orthodox doctrines. Although in these texts, certain terms of local identity such as "Cretans" or "Cypriots" designating the inhabitants of the areas under Latin rule are used, the term giving them a communal identity is Christian or Orthodox Christian. In the text on Anthimos, the link between the Orthodox Christians of the island of Crete and the

Patriarch of Constantinople is emphasized. In the text of Theodore the Younger, we see a reference to the patriarch in Constantinople. In George of Adrianople, the political aspect of Byzantine identity was linked to loyalty both to the Byzantine emperor and to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Only in the text on the martyrs of Philadelphia and on Michael Mauroeides we see no reference to the Byzantine emperor, to the Patriarch of Constantinople or to Constantinople.

The term Christian did not include all the Christians. The Lithuanian martyrs, who were converted to Christianity, who began to let grow their beards and dress as Romans but who were by race or birth (*genos*) *Litbous*, were not defined as *Christianoi*, but as those who had the right faith. Again, the Latins who interpreted certain doctrines differently from the "Christians" and who were attached to the Catholic Church were not identified as Christians. Interestingly, the author of the martyrs of Philadelphia did not identify the martyrs and the inhabitants of the city of Philadelphia as "Christian" but as "the faithful people of Philadelphia who were leading a life suitable for the Christians." The cultural aspect of being Christian (read Roman) is emphasized only in the text on the Lithuanian martyrs, who did not only convert to Christianity but also changed their appearance. Their integration to the "race of the Christians", however, was not complete because these Lithuanians were not Christian by birth.

One can argue that the emphasis on the religious aspect of Romanness is due to the nature of the *martyria*, which are religious texts. On the other hand, as Bryer argued, this was a widespread phenomenon in the late Byzantine period where the widest self-designation was "Christian". The Christian, as our *martyria* show, was neither a Latin nor a Muslim. They were the chosen people awaiting the end of the world.[78]

Only in one of the *martyria*, the one on the thirteen monks of Cyprus, we hear the term *Graikoi* for defining the hesychast monks. *Graikos* was the terminology used by the western Latins to identify Byzantines. The Byzantines, who were keen to keep the name "Roman" to themselves, rejected it. Thus a Latin utilized the term in the text as the vocabulary of the "enemy". We see the term "Hellenes" utilized negatively and associated with the pagan Greeks. Only in the *martyrion* on Theodore the Younger, the designation "Hellenes" does not have a negative connotation. While the author gives information on the history of the city of Adrianople, he mentions Hellenes. Accordingly, the city of Adrianople was once called Orestias, which was built and populated by Orestos,[79] who was the son of the king, who commanded the Hellenes through Troy.[80]

In all the above-mentioned texts, except the one on the martyrs of Philadelphia, being Christian was seen as something inherited by *genos* (birth, race, family) and related with *patris* (fatherland, native land or city).[81] In fact *genos* and *patris* were inseparable in the thought world of

---

[78] Bryer, "The Late Byzantine Identity. An Abstract," pp. 49-50.

[79] The son of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra.

[80] Oikonomides, "Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ἁγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," p. 216.

[81] According to Bryer, *patris*, the place of origin however small but especially when it was blessed by the blood of a local hero, martyr or family to which it gave its name was the most significant coordinate of the late Byzantine identity. Bryer, "The Late Byzantine Identity. An Abstract," p. 50.

Byzantine rhetoric. *Genos Romaion*, which implied the free birth of the Byzantine people, differentiated them from the barbarian peoples having an "ignoble" nature (*dusgeneia*), from the Muslims in general and from the "Turks" specifically after the eleventh century, who were considered to be descended from the illegitimate offspring of the slave-girl Hagar.[82] Upbringing and life changes were capable of altering one's identity as in the case of the Lithuanian martyrs but could not change one's basic identity, which was termed as being Christian. This basic identity, which depended on birth, ancestors and fatherland, fundamentally rested on a transgenerational quality that was impossible to overcome.[83] Theodore the Younger, who came from Adrianople, and Michael of Alexandria, who was detached from his fatherland and from the properties of his ancestors near Smyrnam were both converted to Islam. Even though the years passed and they were raised like and lived among the "barbarians," it was not possible to erase the noble origin inherent in them. As they grew up and matured, they began to feel their original noble identity and with the help of either a spiritual man or a Byzantine ambassador, they returned to their original identity and did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for this identity.

All the martyrs except the martyrs of Philadelphia and the Lithuanians martyrs were depicted as belonging to the Christian race and their native lands, which were the historical Byzantine lands, are mentioned in these texts. Thus *genos* and *patris* seem to be the two basic co-ordinates of the social existence of the Byzantines,[84] who are defined as Christians in these texts. The nostalgia for the *patris*, which can be read as a reference to the territorial aspect of Roman identity, is visible in the narratives of the martyrdoms under Muslim rule. In the *martyrion* of Niketas the Younger, the author remembers the good old days of Ankara, the native town of Niketas and of Nyssa, the town where Niketas was martyred. According to the author, these two towns had lost their beauty because they were now under the sway of the Persian barbarians.[85] In a similar fashion, Theodore Metochites blamed Egypt for having exchanged the sacred and majestic piety of Christian conduct for evil.[86] Again in the case of George of Adrianople, the author yearned for the days when Adrianople was full of Christians.[87] In the *martyrion* on Michael Mauroeides, the author mentioned the *patris* of the martyr as the city of Hadrian and complained that the race of the "barbarians" had settled among "them".[88] A similar nostalgia for the loss of once Christian (read Roman) lands is not visible in texts concerning martyrdoms under Latin rule.

---

[82] Magdalino, "Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium," p. 8.

[83] A similar approach to the Roman identity, to its transgenerational quality, the necessity to be born into a certain group, can also be perceived in non-religious late Byzantine texts such as Akropolites, Pachymeres, Gregoras and Kantakouzenos. See Page, *Being Byzantine*, pp. 123, 131, 157.

---

[84] For the usage and meaning of *genos* and *patris* in medieval Greek texts and especially in Digenes Akrites and Kekaumenos see, Paul Magdalino, "Honour among Romaioi: the framework of social values in the world of Digenes Akrites and Kekaumenos," *BMGS* 13 (1989), pp. 183-218.

[85] Halkin, " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," p. 130-31.

[86] Metochites, "Oratio de S. Michaele Martyre," p. 672.

[87] Patrinelis, "Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο," p. 67.

[88] Eustratiades, " Ὁ νεομάρτυς Μιχαὴλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ Ἀδριανουπολίτης," p. 10.

In terms of the identification of the "Other", we see that the term barbarian was utilized for the Muslims and not for the Latins.[89] Only in the post-Byzantine martyrdom case of Michael Mauroeides, the term barbarian is also used with a cultural connotation referring to language. The utilization of the term barbarian for the Muslims in the *martyria* is in accordance with the usage of barbarian in other Byzantine texts of the late Byzantine period.[90]

In the text on Niketas the Younger the Seljuks and in the one on Theodore the Younger the Ottomans were defined as Persians. The text on Niketas is more explicit on the usage of the term. It is stated that these barbarians (i.e. Seljuks) were Persian by race (*genos*) and atheist by faith (*pistis*). They were atheists because they were following the laws of Mohammed. The distinction made between the faith and race of the Persians is interesting here. Did the author imply that there were some Persians by race, who were by faith God-loving people (i.e. Christians)?

---

[89] For the terms designating the Muslims and the Turks in other fourteenth-century Byzantine sources, see Alain Ducellier, "L'Islam et les Musulmans vus de Byzance au XIVe siècle," *Byzantina* 12 (Thessalonica, 1983), pp. 95-134. The evidence that I found in the *martyria* of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries contradict in some ways with the texts that Ducellier analyzed. For example, Ducellier observes that the term Hagarene was no longer in use in the fourteenth century for the Muslims, however, in the *martyria* we can see the designation Hagarene being utilized especially for the Ottomans. Again contrary to Ducellier's argument, we do not see the word "Turk" utilized synonymously for the Muslims. On the other hand, the texts that Ducellier analyzed show some similarities with the *martyria* as well. For example, the prophet Mohammed was considered as the tool of the Demon. Islam was considered as the religion of the Demon. And the term barbarian began to be utilized for the Muslims. For the way the Byzantines perceived Islam and the Muslims in the thirteenth century, see also idem, "Mentalité historique et réalités politiques: L'Islam et les Musulmans vus par les Byzantins du XIII$^{\text{ème}}$ siècle," *BF* 4 (1972), pp. 31-63. Ducellier argues in both of these articles that the historical mentality of the Byzantines towards Islam and the Muslims was not compatible with the way they acted towards the Muslims entities or reacted on a day-to-day basis due to the political realities of the time were.

[90] The examples in the histories of Pachymeres, Gregoras, Kantakouzenos and in the Funeral oration composed by Manuel II Palaiologos are cited in Page, *Being Byzantine*, pp. 133, 172, 173, 256.

The term nation (*ethnos*), which generally applied to people who were foreign, inferior and barbarian in Byzantine sources,[91] was also used for the Persians in the text on Niketas.

In the texts on George of Adrianople and on Michael Mauroeides, who were both martyred in Ottoman Edirne in the fifteenth century, apart from the designation of barbarian, the authors define the Ottomans as Hagarenes. In the text on Theodore the Younger, who was martyred under the Ottomans as well, however, the Ottomans are defined as Persians. The term *genos* is used with Hagarene, implying a racial feature rather than kinship and birth. These two texts differ from the other texts of martyrdoms under Muslim rule (from Niketas the Younger, Michael of Alexandria and Theodore the Younger) in the positive depiction of some of the Hagarenes. The chief *hegemon* (i.e. grand vizier) in the case of George of Adrianople and the *dikaste* (i.e. judge) in the case of Michael Mauroeides are depicted as good and just characters. We can also add to these characters the *hegemon* (i.e. sultan or grand vizier), who is depicted as an easy-going person even though he issued a decree, which would be used against Michael Mauroeides.

None of the authors writing on the martyrdoms under Seljuk or Ottoman rule defined them as Turks (*Tourkoi*). The definition *Tourkoi* was used only in the text on the martyrs of Philadelphia to designate the emir Umur and the soldiers of the Aydınoğulları emirate, who laid siege to the city of Philadelphia.

---

[91] For the usage of *ethnos* and *genos* in other late Byzantine sources see, Page, *Being Byzantine*, p. 135.

[93] Halkin, "L'éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon," pp. 141-2.

Apart from identifying the Muslims as barbarians, another element found in the text on Niketas the Younger is the comparison of the "evilness" of the Muslims with those of the Jews.[93]

The Latins or the pagan Lithuanians are not defined as barbarians but as tyrants. Latins are also identified as heretics, who were once in the Orthodox *oikoumene* but then deviated from the right path. The term *Latinoi* is not utilized in the sense signifying "Westerners speaking Romance languages," but with a mixed racial, religious and polemic meaning. The difference between the race of the *Latinoi* and the race of the Orthodox Christians is explained with religious dogmatic differences or with Latin adherence to the Catholic Church. None of the authors referred to any differences in language or physical appearance between the *Latinoi* and Orthodox Christians (Romans). The only example in which the term *Latinoi* did not have a negative polemic connotation is in the text on the martyrs of Philadelphia, where the *Latinoi* killed the major antagonist, Umur. No ethnico-political terms such as *Benetikoi* for the Venetians in Crete or *Phragkoi* or *Phragiskoi* for the Lusignans in Cyprus are utilized to identify and to distinguish the Latins from one another.[94]

---

[94] For the usage of the term *Latinoi* in Byzantine sources see, Johannes Koder, "Latinoi-The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources," in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo)*, ed. Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 2002), pp. 26-39.

Social Typology, Social Space and Threats Perceived Against the Byzantine Identity

There is a visible difference between the social typology of the martyrs under Muslim rule and the ones martyred under Latin rule. The ones martyred under Latin rule were all hesychast monks. Their major conflicts with the Latins were over dogma. Dogma represented the group boundary between these two groups. The social space in which they encountered each other was the monasteries as in the case of the thirteen monks. In the case of Anthimos, the social space is not clearly defined by the author. We do not understand where Anthimos lived or met the Latins during his sojourn in Crete. We hear very rarely about Orthodox Christian commoners, who did not seem to interact with the Latins. The Latins belonged either to the ranks of the Catholic Church hierarchy or were civil authorities. It is not possible to find one Latin commoner in these texts.

The ones martyred under Muslim rule, however, were all civil persons. Niketas the Younger was a reader at the Church of Ankara but this was the lowest rank in the Church hierarchy and he also conducted commerce. Michael was a soldier in the Mamluk army. We do not know about Theodore's occupation but he was not a member of the clergy. The martyrs of Philadelphia were soldiers. George of Adrianople was most probably a Christian soldier in the Ottoman army, and Michael Mauroeides was a rich and powerful man in the city of Adrianople.

The "other" was represented by the common people whom the martyrs encounteres in the public places, usually at the market place as in the cases of Niketas the Younger, George of Adrianople and Michael of Alexandria. In terms of the ruling authorities, one does not see a distinction between the civil and religious authorities as in the martyrdom cases under Latin rule. Only in the case of George of Adrianople, we see the *tasimanioi* and the descendants of the prophet (Mohammed) as religious figures. Their authority, as represented in the text, does not seem to be an institutionalized authority but they appear to have considerable power in Adrianople. Thus the chief *hegemon* was afraid of their fervent opposition to his decision on George's case and had to hand in George to their hands.

For the martyrdoms under Muslim rule, be it Seljuk, Ottoman or Mamluk, except the case of Theodore the Younger, all the events took place under an urban setting. The "Byzantines" seem to be an integral part of that urban life. I believe that the rural setting combined with Theodore's lonely depiction was symbolically suggesting how he had become an outsider upon his conversion and then his apostasy. In the case of the martyrs of Philadelphia, although the event did not take place under Muslim rule, the setting of the narrative is also the city.

In these urban spaces, the group which the martyrs represented and the "other" groups seem to have shared the same social space, participated in urban life and traveled freely. Niketas the Younger traveled from Ankara to Nyssa to see his family and to conduct commerce; George of Adrianople came from Sofia to Adrianople and went to the market place to fix his arch; Theodore the Younger traveled to Constantinople to talk with the patriarch; finally in the portal area in Alexandria, people from different races, from different parts of the world and from different religions shared the same social space and conducted their activities.

The threat to the identity of the martyrs was felt in these public places where co-existence and encounter with the "other" was most frequent. Niketas felt a threat to his identity in the market place during Ramadan. His group boundary was threatened over the question of fasting. George of Adrianople felt a threat again in the market place over the question of the divine character of Christ. For Michael Mauroeides, his intimate relations with the palace circles, his prosperity and his fame caused the jealousy of a group of people and hence he became a victim of their intrigues.

The martyrdom narratives reflect some differences in terms of the situation of the Byzantine Church in the cities under late Seljuk, Mamluk and Ottoman rule. In the text on Niketas the Younger, who lived in a late Seljuk urban setting, we see bishops conducting the funeral ceremony of Niketas. In Mamluk Alexandria, we also see Church members to whom Michael went and declared his will of returning to Christianity.

In the cases of Theodore the Younger, George of Adrianople and Michael Mauroeides, who all lived under Ottoman rule, however, there is no mention of any Church member. A "spiritual man" initiated Theodore the Younger's return to Christianity but it is not possible to understand what the author meant by a "spiritual man". Does this absence of Church members reflect a historical reality on the Church's situation in the early years of Ottoman rule? We know from the documents dating before the fall of Constantinople that there were Orthodox bishops or metropolitans in Ottoman territories who were appointed by an official patent (*berat*) of the Sultan and might even, like other Ottoman functionaries, be assigned a *tımar*.[95] But what was the relation of these bishops with the patriarchate in Constantinople? Did the Church in Constantinople recognize their authority over the Christian flock or not? Were the appointments regularly undertaken in each and every conquered area or did the nature of the conquest have an effect on the appointment of Church members to certain areas? Can we interpret the absence of bishops in Adrianople to be a consequence of the non-voluntary surrender of the city to the Ottomans?

In the cases of Theodore the Younger, Michael of Alexandria and the martyrs of Philadelphia, the group boundaries were the physical boundaries of the "Byzantine lands," which were trespassed by the "other". Theodore the Younger and Michael of Alexandria were cut out from their own people and their fatherland due the trespassing of the "barbarian" groups into their physical group boundary. This resulted in their conversion because as they were young and ignorant they could not cope with this threat. When they became adults, however, they reacted by returning to their original faith. For the martyrs of Philadelphia, the threat to the physical boundaries of their group was prevented by the successful defense of the city. They sacrificed themselves so that the "Other" would not overwhelm them. On the other hand, the existence of certain Philadelphians within the city who helped the emir Umur shows that there was an infiltration of the "Other" into the protected and well-defended physical boundaries even before the fall of the city, that is before the disappearance of the physical boundaries.[96]

---

[95] Inalcik, "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City," p. 237. Also see idem, *Suret-i defter-i sancak-i Arvanid*, nos. 148, 162, 186, 200.

Following continuous military defeat, raids, territorial loss, conversion and immigration, the "Byzantines" as a group were decreasing in size. The *martyria*, which were written mostly by Constantinopolitan authors, reflect a rather exclusive Byzantine identity that had strict and impenetrable borderlines. Except the text on the martyrs of Philadelphia, which was not written by a Constantinopolitan author, birth and fatherland were the decisive coordinates of Byzantine identity. This can be interpreted as a reaction to the infiltration of the "other", be it Latin or Muslim, into the physical and symbolic space of the Byzantines. The exclusive nature of Byzantine identity, however, is also visible in the case of the Lithuanian martyrs, who were martyred during the expansion of Byzantine influence over these lands. Thus, although the *martyrion* was not written in a defensive mentality, an exclusivity in terms of identity can still be detected in it.

---

[96] The infiltration of Muslims and Turks into Philadelphia can be traced in other sources which point out the existence of a mosque in the city of Philadelphia. One can also trace the influence of Turkish on the proper names of the Philadelphians and the usage of certain Turkish terminology in the sources written by Philadelphian authors in the thirteenth century. See Balivet, *Romanie Byzantine et pays de Rum Turc*, pp. 108-9.

CHAPTER 5:

WHO WAS *KAFİR*? WHO WAS *RUM*? FLUID IDENTITIES IN THE LANDS OF RUM

The choice of the *martyria* together with the *menakıbname*s as primary sources of inquiry in searching for the transformation of Byzantine identity was primarily based on the historiography, which attributed to the protagonists of these texts major roles in the transformation of religious identity.

The analysis of the authors of the late Byzantine *martyria* revealed that in the majority of the cases, the people who lived in the same society with the martyrs did not produce these texts. Rather, they were written by religious and civilian members of the Constantinopolitan elite. Thus the major components of Byzantine identity as they are defined in the *martyria* are similar to the ones seen in other late Byzantine sources which were written by the Constantinopolitan elite. In the eyes of these authors, what made the martyr a Byzantine and not a *zımmi* under Muslim rule or not the subject of Latin rule was Byzantine universal ideology.

While the theme of Latin monks and clergy who wanted to "convert" the "schismatic Greeks" are present in the *martyria* describing martyrdom cases under Latin rule, the dervishes willing to convert the ex-Byzantine subjects are absent in the martyrdoms that took place under Muslim rule. Thus the "other" was not the dervishes but rather the Muslim commoners. And contrary to the accepted view in modern historiography, the concern for religious conversion and apostasy under Muslim rule can only be seen in the cases related with enslavement due to raids and conquests. In most of the martyrdom cases under Turco-Muslim rule, the threat was perceived in urban settings particularly in market places where there was pressure or control by the Muslim community over the non-Muslims. This did not impose a dramatic act of immediate conversion but rather demanded a submission to Islamic community through the acceptance of certain language and behavior.

Why was conversion not the major concern of the authors of the *martyria*? Can this absence be related with the myopia of the Constantinopolitan authors, who did not share the same social and physical environment with the martyrs? Were these Constantinopolitan authors not aware of the influence of the dervishes, which could eventually result in the conversion of non-Muslims? Or must we consider the recent assertion that the thesis about proselytizing dervishes as the primary agents of conversion is a historiographical myth?[1]

Historiography on Proselytizing Dervishes

The *menakıbname*s discussed in this chapter are the primary references for the thesis about proselytizing dervishes. Mehmed Fuat

---

[1] Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam,* p. 92. I believe that there are serious methodological problems in Krstic's usage of neomartyrologies and the martyrdom stories. Except few Slavonic *martyria,* she based all her argument on the twenty-first century neomarytrology of Vaporis, who did not look at the manuscripts or published texts of earlier texts but used mainly a Modern Greek neomartyrdom compilation as the basis of his study. Nevertheless, neomartyrology is only one of the different kinds of sources that Krstic analyzed to enlighten the problem of conversion in Ottoman Rumelia. Her questions related with the thesis on the role of the dervishes as primary agents of conversion and her critics of the secondary literature on the subject provided me a guideline to evaluate certain questions in the analysis of the *menakıbname*s.

Köprülü was first to introduce dervishes as one of the primary social actors in the socio-political and religious life of pre-Ottoman Anatolia.[2] Ömer Lütfü Barkan developed this thesis in his article on the pious endowments of dervishes as a method of settlement and colonization during the era of conquests.[3] By looking at the patronymic Abdullah, which means "slave of god" and which was typically given to converts since their fathers were not Muslim, he noted "numerous" dervishes as "sons of Abdullah" and asserted that some of the administrators of the pious foundations were converted slaves.

Another influential study on the role of the dervishes is the work of Frederick Hasluck who argued about the Bektaşi order's systematic usurpation of both Christian and other Muslim sanctuaries.[4] The image of an "ambiguous sanctuary" where both Muslims and Christians worship in one sacred space has become a major reference in arguing about dervish syncretism to ease conversion to Islam.

Tijana Krstic who has worked on the question of conversion to Islam in Ottoman Rumelia questioned the thesis about proselytizing dervishes as the primary agents of conversion. When she re-examined the primary sources, which Barkan had utilized, she found out that there is only one "son of Abdullah" and only four manumitted slaves in the nine registers relating to the pious endowments in Ottoman Rumelia from Mehmed II's era to 1622 and covering around thirty-five dervish convents. Krstic presuming that Barkan presented all the material that he had to support the statement about the missionary role of the colonizing dervishes rightly concluded that the evidence was not enough to prove the thesis.

---

[2] Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*; idem., "Anadolu'da İslamiyet: Türk istilasından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinisine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menba'ları," *Darü'l-fünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmu'ası* 2 (1922-23), pp. 281-311; 385-420; 457-86. Also see the English translation of the article *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993).

[3] Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler."

[4] Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, pp. 564-96.

Concerning Hasluck's findings on the superimposition of the Bektaşi sanctuaries with the Christian sanctuaries, Krstic again convincingly argued that superimposition meant only the fusion of space but did not necessarily lead to the fusion of belief. Not undermining the significant force that Islamic mysticism had played in the overall process of Islamization, Krstic asked why there is no single piece of independent evidence for its being the primary impetus behind the process of conversion to Islam outside the hagiographic material that would suggest somebody's conversion was caused by missionary activity of any dervish order.[5]

While archival sources lack sufficient evidence to support the thesis on proselytizing dervishes, why are the themes of conversion and fighting with the religious "other" manifestly present in some of the *menakıbnames*? In answer, Krstic argued that these texts were partly produced and circulated by the new converts to Islam or affiliates with the Ottoman cause "to resolve the implicit contradictions resulting from a need to justify the present self in contrast to the former self." She considered these narratives within the conversion process of fitting in and distancing from the previous membership group. According to Krstic these narratives represented "the desire of the new converts to be a "greater Catholic than the Pope."'"[6]

---

[5] Krstic, *Narrating Conversions to Islam*, pp. 94-99.

She also tried to resolve the problem of the existence of conversion narratives in some of the *menakıbname*s and its absence in others. While the ones such as *Saltukname*, *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali* and *Vilayetname-i Demir Baba* (born at the end of the fifteenth century), which all have *gazi*-dervishes as their heroes, are full of conversion scenes, in the *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba* who was also a *gazi*-dervish, there is no conversion story related with Otman Baba. On the other hand, Bedreddin, who was not a *gazi*-dervish leads, missionary activities and converts non-Muslims in the *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin.* Krstic tried to explain the absence of conversion zeal in the vita of Otman Baba by arguing that the vita reflects the concerns and views of the holy man's closest circle of devotees. For Şeyh Bedreddin, who was the contemporary of Otman Baba, Krstic argued that Bedreddin's preaching to Christians was related with his claim to be the Messiah.[7]

Re-Reading of the Conversion Narratives in the *Menakıbname*s

Tijana Krstic used *Saltukname* as her primary source in hypothesizing the production and circulation of the *menakıbname*s among the newly converted. I believe that it is very difficult to find evidence to support her view. Concerning the *Saltukname*, I have not found a source on the author of this text, Ebu'l Hayr-i Rumi, which points to his non-Muslim background. It is true that Ebu'l Hayr-i Rumi is just the compiler and the text is actually composed of different layers of narratives belonging to different authors or story tellers. On the other hand, how is it possible to find out that these story tellers or authors were recent converts? At the same time as opposed to Krstic's argument, in the *Saltukname*, it is not Alyon-ı Rumi, a recent convert, who is depicted as obsessed by conversion but rather Sarı Saltuk himself.

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 109-110.

[7] Ibid., p. 91.

I contend that when the *menakıbname*s and the heroic epics concerning the period between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries are classified according to the setting in which the activities of the dervishes take place in these texts and thus when these texts are analyzed, a certain pattern in the attitudes of the dervishes can be traced. The texts can be categorized as frontier or *gaza* narratives, rural narratives, narratives concerning the revolts against the central authority and the urban narratives. The re-reading of these sources reveals that the attitudes of the dervishes towards conversion change according to the setting. While in frontier or *gaza* narratives and in urban narratives the conversion theme is abundant, in the rural narratives conversion is almost absent.

In the *Danişmendname*, the *Saltukname*, the *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan* and the *Düsturname*, which can be classified as frontier or *gaza* narratives, the dervishes or the warriors are depicted as running from one infidel land to another for raid, incursion and conquest. Although their short stays in certain villages and towns are mentioned, no details are given about their lives in those places except sometimes about their “colonizing” activities, which they led immediately after the conquest, such as building mills, bringing water to the town, planting trees, converting churches etc. These are the texts in which the interaction between the Muslims and non-Muslims is very frequent and in which the conversion is the major occupation of the most of the heroes.

In all frontier/*gaza* narratives, however, the conversion always takes place in the *darü'l harb* / *darü'l küfr* (abode of war / abode of infidels). All the conversion stories are eventually related with the conquest of an area and with its transfer from *darü'l küfr* to *darü'l Islam* (abode of Islam). This transfer can be considered as an entrance point, an act for the Islamization of space. The conversions of the soldiers, monks, clergy or women, which are present in these narratives, either take place before or in the immediate aftermath of the conquest. Once the place is conquered and the people are converted according to the nature of the conquest, the *gazi* or the *gazi*-dervish is occupied with some principal attempts to demonstrate the presence of Islam in the area. In the city, he builds a *mescid* (a small mosque) or a convent, converts a church into a mosque, leaves an imam and a *subaşı* (a responsible for the maintenance of order in the city). Or he builds mills, brings water to the area and plants trees. After leaving these preliminary marks that demonstrate the new rule, the hero heads off to another conquest. These actions can be considered as the first basic necessary steps for the transfer of the abode of the infidels into the abode of Islam. Once the area is included in the abode of Islam, no conversions take place.

While Melik Danişmend, Sarı Saltuk, Seyyid Ali *Gazi* seem to be interested in settling in the conquered lands and including them in the abode of Islam, in the *Düsturname,* which is also on the military exploits of a *gazi*, Umur Beg seems to have a different understating of *gaza*. He is more interested in raiding, acquiring booty especially young beautiful boys and girls (*güzel oğlan ve garavaş*)[8] or receiving poll-tax from the infidel lands. Umur Beg is depicted as forming alliances with infidel rulers, local lords and soldiers for his military exploits but he does not seem to be interested in settling in the abode of the infidels and its transfer into the abode of Islam. In the *Düsturname* there is no conversion narrative either of a place or of a person. I believe that the absence of any conversion episode is related with a different *gaza* understanding of Umur Beg. Only once in the whole narrative a certain Mumcila (Momitzilo), a Bulgarian from the Serbian lands, appears, who joins the forces of Umur Beg by putting on Turkish costumes (*Türk toni*).[9] Putting on *Türk toni*, not a act of change of faith, is an act which apparently makes Mumcila a member of Umur Beg's group. And again this act takes place outside the abode of Islam.

In the *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba,* which is also about a *gazi*-dervish, as Tijana Krstic has pointed out, there are no conversion scenes. I believe that the absence of the non-Muslims and conversion stories in the *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba* is related with the fact that all the activities of Otman Baba take place in the abode of Islam, in the areas, which had already been conquered from the infidels. Not only conversion narratives but the non-Muslims as well are almost inexistent in the texts. In the *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba gaza* and conversion are usually mentioned in relation with the deeds of Sarı Saltuk, a hero of the past and the non-Muslims appear only when the author mentions the military campaigns of Mehmed II and the frontier begs against the lands of the infidels, against *Üngürüs kafirleri* (Hungarian infidels) and *Karabogdan kafirleri* (Moldavian infidels).[10]

---

[8] Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, pp. 65, 68, 71.

[9] Ibid., p. 101.

A similar pattern of appearance of non-Muslims and conversion scenes only when the setting is the abode of infidels is also visible in the *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin*. *Menakıbname* mentions the conquest of Rumelia by *Gazi* Israil, the grandfather of Bedreddin. Accordingly, *Gazi* Israil was among the first seven *gazi*s to cross the Dardanelles under the command of Süleyman Şah to engage in the conquest of *Rum ili*, the lands of Rum.[11] These *gazi*s got together for the cause of installing Islam in the lands of Rum and keeping off the ritual of the infidels (*ayin-i küffar*) away from these lands.[12] Some of the Byzantine local lords, *tekur*s, collaborated with the *gazi*s. Bedreddin's mother was the daughter of a Christian *ban* (governor).[13] The Christian name of the daughter is not mentioned but we learn that she was given a Muslim name Melek, probably upon her conversion to Islam. The family of Bedreddin was settled in Simavna where his father converted the Church of the fortress into his residence, in which Bedreddin was born.[14] This stage was the immediate aftermath of the conquest. In the following stages of the narrative where Bedreddin's education and formation in Edirne, Bursa, Konya and Egypt are told one cannot find any non-Muslims or episodes of conversions.

---

[10] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* pp. 108, 128, 227, 231-32, 252, 268.

[11] Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı,* pp. 5-6.

[12] Ibid., p. 9.

[13] Modern Ammovounon, Greece.

Non-Muslims reappear in the text only during Bedreddin's visit to the island of Chios, which was then governed by the Giustiniani family, who was connected to the Genoese Commercial Council in Moana since 1347. Again we see our protagonist in the abode of infidel. The single conversion story related with Bedreddin takes place in Chios. The infidels of Chios, upon hearing the arrival of Bedreddin to Izmir, invite him to their island as they have long heard of his reputation. Seven monks in the island, who know Arabic, come to Izmir to invite Bedreddin.[15] Two priests from Enez also come to the island upon hearing of Bedreddin's arrival. Bedreddin preaches on the island and these two priests from Enez and five other people residing in the island convert to Islam.[16] The ruler of the area, on the other hand, although he "falls in love" with Bedreddin and is very much attracted by his spirituality, becomes a "believer in heart but remains an infidel in appearance."[17]

---

[14] Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı*, p. 13. Hafız Halil gave the date of his birth as the year 760 (1358-9) according to the Muslim calendar and mentioned that the city of Edirne (Adrianople) had not yet been conquered.

[15] Ibid., p. 90.

[16] Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı*, pp. 92-93.

[17] "Lik beglikten hevale virmedi. Zahiren eslemtü'ye dil irmedi. Kalbi mü'min kendi kafir zahiri. Hak bilür hakiykatin iy din eri." Ibid., p. 93.

Seven years after the visit of Bedreddin to Chios, one of the priests from Enez, who has converted to Islam, comes to Edirne. The priest also brings his family along with him. Apart from his sister, all of his family converts in Edirne. His sister, whose name was Harmana, does not wish to convert and gets married to an Armenian from Edirne. Her daughter from this marriage, on the other hand, is then married to the son of Bedreddin.[18]

The pattern in this story is similar to the pattern in the frontier/*gaza* narratives. Bedreddin leads "missionary" activities only in Chios, which is then under infidel rule and this missionary activity leads to the conversion of some priests and few members of his family.

Another example of the pattern of conversion in the lands of the infidels can be seen in the *Vilayetname* of Hacı Bektaş. The main concern of Hacı Bektaş, as it is depicted in the *Vilayetname,* is to impose his authority over the dervishes, who have already been in the lands of the Rum and to convert the Tatars to Islam.[19] The people of the Book, Jews and Christians (Rums and Armenians or Franks) are rarely mentioned in the text and there is no conversion narrative concerning the conversion of a person of the Book who reside in the areas ruled by the Muslims.

Once when a Christian woman from the Christian village of Sinesos offers Hacı Bektaş some rye bread, excusing herself that she is not able to offer bread made out of wheat, Hacı Bektaş rewards her hospitality by turning the rye of the village into wheat. The Christians of this village do not convert but pay respect to Hacı Bektaş by bringing goods and sacrificial animals to his lodge every year.[20]

---

[18] Ibid., p. 90.

[19] Gölpınarlı, *Vilayetname: Manakıb-ı Hünkar Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli*, pp. 38, 42-44.

The infidels with whom Hacı Bektaş is in relation, are usually the ones outside the lands of Islam; the infidels of Bedahşan (Badakhshan)[21], who have been converted to Islam by Hacı Bektaş before his arrival to the lands of Rum, a crypto-Muslim monk outside the lands of Islam to whom Hacı Bektaş sends flour because there is draught[22] and a Frankish monk, a disciple of Hacı Bektaş, in an island in Frengistan.[23] His disciples who engage in converting the infidel rulers such as Saru Saltuk in Georgia,[24] Saru Ismail in Tavas-Denizli[25] and Rasul Baba in Beşkarış[26] all lead these "missionary" activities outside the lands of Islam, when these lands are still under infidel rule.

In the *velayetname*s categorized as the rural narratives such as the ones on Hacım Sultan and on Abdal Musa interaction with non-Muslims is minimal. When Abdal Musa settled in the Teke region, while constructing his dervish lodge, his dervishes find a treasury, which according to Abdal Musa belong to the infidels (*kafirler*), who usually "come from the sea." The dervishes hand down the treasury to these infidels when they visit the area where Abdal Musa lives.[27] Only once we see a *kafir* (infidel) of the region, someone who brings wine to Abdal Musa's convent. Abdal Musa turns wine miraculously into honey, which in return results in the conversion of this *kafir*.[28]

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[21] North-east region of modern Afghanistan.

[22] Gölpınarlı, *Vilayetname. Manakıb-ı Hünkar Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli*, p. 55.

[23] Ibid., p. 65.

[24] Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[25] Ibid., p. 80.

[26] Ibid., p. 86.

For Hacım Sultan, the war against the infidels has already been an issue of the past, of the times of Seyyid Battal *Gazi*. There is no mention of any non-Muslim or any infidel in the text.

In the cities, however, or at least in the city of thirteenth century Konya as it is reflected in the *Menakibü'l Arifin*, interactions between Muslims and non-Muslims are frequent. This is the only text which features the conversion of people of the Book within the abode of Islam.

In the *Menakibü'l Arifin*, thirteenth century cosmopolitan Konya is a city where there are religious men, merchants from India, Egypt, Tebriz, Azerbeijan, Khorasan, Damascus, from the lands of the Franks and from Constantinople. There are equally Mongol soldiers, Turkish *fakih*s, Rum painters and builders, Armenian tavern keepers and butchers, Jewish rabbi, Orthodox monks, *Ahi*s, dervishes, false saints, whores, doctors, philosophers and powerful Mongol and Turkish emirs and Christian wives of the Seljuk administrators and rulers. The important public areas are *hamam*s, *medrese*s, *hangah*s (dervish monasteries), *mescid* (small mosques) and market places. In the *Menakıb*, the public area in which the Muslims and the non-Muslims cross each other and interact most is the market place.

---

[27] Güzel, *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi*, p. 141.

[28] Ibid., p. 146.

Menakibü'l Arifin is full of conversion stories. According to the *Menakıb*, eighteen thousand infidels either converted to Islam or became Mevlana's disciple during Mevlana's life.[29] Among the converted ones, one can count the forty ascetic monks living in a cave near the city of Sis,[30] an old priest in Konya,[31] hundred Rums in Konya, who converted after Mevlana had performed a wonder of resurrection,[32] a Rum named Siryanus, who was a criminal and who was saved from the death penalty thanks to Mevlana's intervention,[33] a Jewish rabbi,[34] Armenians in a tavern,[35] and a Rum icon painter called Aynüddevle.[36]

I believe that the presence of conversion narratives mostly in the frontier or *gaza* narratives are related with the Islamic concept of state of war. Whether the hero is a dervish like Sarı Saltuk, Seyyid Ali Sultan or a *gazi* like Melik Danişmend or Umur Beg, his mission entailed the submission of non-Muslims to Muslim rule. As it was ordered in the Koran, they fought against those who did not recognize God and his prophet Mohammed. The raiding and plundering of their lands and the enslavement of non-Muslims were considered to be permissible. This war could be stopped in three manners. First if these non-believers converted to Islam. Second if they asked *aman* (safe-conduct), a demand of refuge and security for their bodies and goods. Such a demand meant a pact between the Muslims and non-Muslims according to which the Muslims must protect the goods and the bodies of the non-Muslims who in return had to submit in humiliation to Muslim rule. And the third way to stop the war was to accept paying the *cizye* tax, which again implied a humiliation according to the Koran.[37]

---

[29] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, vol. 2, p. 57.

[30] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, vol. 1, p. 129.

[31] Ibid., p. 157.

[32] Ibid., p. 206.

[33] Ibid., p. 228.

[34] Ibid., p. 337.

[35] Ibid., p. 340.

[36] Ibid., p. 374.

While Umur Beg of the *Düsturname* was content with raiding, plundering and enslavement and the payment of *cizye* tax to humiliate the infidels in the war against the infidels, Melik Danişmend, Sarı Saltuk and Seyyid Ali Sultan were interested in the incorporation of the lands of the infidels into the Abode of Islam, thus in permanent conquest rather than perpetual raiding. According to the attitudes of individual infidels with whom they were in contact and according to the method of conquest, the conversions took place, but once the mission of inclusion of the lands of infidel into the lands of Islam was completed, they were interested in neither non-Muslims and nor in their conversions.

This attitude, which is also visible in the vita of Otman Baba, Şeyh Bedreddin and Hacı Bektaş, is in accordance with Islamic law, which considers that once under Muslim rule the people of the Book are considered to have concluded a pact, a contract with the conquerors. They pay *cizye* tax, which is indicative of their humiliated status but in return they receive the protection of the rulers, hence they obtain a *zımmi* status. They cannot be forced to convert and their status must be respected.[38] The *zımmi* contract can be broken if the non-Muslims do not show the humility that they a priori accept. Thus insulting of Mohammed and Islam as in the martyrdom cases of Niketas the Younger and George of Adrianople, for example, is considered to be one of the legitimate reasons to break the contract.[39]

---

[37] Surat 9, Surat at-Tauba (or Surat al-Bara'a). *The Qur'an. Translated with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs*, tr. Richard Bell, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960), pp. 171-190.

While the *gazi*s or *gazi*-dervishes, at least in their *menakıbname*s, seem to lack missionary zeal to convert the *zımmi*s, in *Menakibü'l Arifin*, that is not the case. In his vita, Mevlana considers it his duty. He claims that the *Rum halkı* (Rum people) who form a community who is the most worthy of mercy and compassion, are unaware of the world of love and of the blissful perception of God's presence. For this reason, God has done a pleasant favor and sent Mevlana's father from Khorasan to the lands of Rum so that his descendants would make this people aware of the spiritual knowledge of God."[40] At the same time, Mevlana also recognizes the status of the non-Muslims under Muslim rule. He warns his disciples who put pressure on the non-Muslims to convert telling them that the ones admitting their incapacity to convert can stay as an infidel and pay their poll-tax. This must be respected because at least this infidel is a honest person and that anyone who bothers such an infidel must be punished.[41]

---

[38] "Dhimma," s.v. *EI*^{2}. *Dhimma* is a term used to designate the sort of indefinitely renewed contract through which the Muslim community accords hospitality and protection to members of other revealed religions, on condition of their acknowledging the domination of Islam. The beneficiaries of *dhimma* are called *dhimmi*s (*zımmi*s) or collectively referred as *ahl al-dhimma* (*ehl-i zımmi*).

[39] For the Islamic doctrine and jurisprudence regarding the situation of *zımmi* upon insulting Islam see Abdelmagid Turki, "Situation du "Tributaire" qui insulte l'Islam, au regard de la doctrine et de la jurisprudence musulmanes," *Studia Islamica* 30 (1969), pp. 39-72.

[40] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, vol. 1, p. 193.

Mevlana's method of conversion, as it is reflected in the *Menakıb*, is always persuasion through the performance of wisdom, modesty and through protection and support of the individuals in the lower strata of the society. The non-Muslims who become his followers with or without converting are usually artisans and craftsmen who in thirteenth century Konya society are considered to belong to the lower middle class. Thus we learn from the *Menakıb* that at the top of the social pyramid are the sultans and the *meliks*, followed by the emirs, who all live in kiosks and palaces. Then come the merchants and *igdiş* (soldiers of mixed descendants) and then come the craftsmen and the artisans.[42]

A certain kind of Muslim pressure over non-Muslims can be detected in the *Menakıb*. Even Mevlana, who protects and shows compassion for them, admits their secondary status declaring that the God has spoiled the infidels' enjoyment of this world and of the other.[43] In another instance, an imam preaches in the mosque that a Muslim must be happy that God has not created him as a member of the group of the infidels.[44] Or there are Mevlevi dervishes who can look down upon a Christian disciple of Mevlana.

---

[41] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, vol. 2, pp. 84-5.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[43] Ibid., p. 157.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

Mevlana by giving his support and assistant to the people of the lower strata and people who were despised in society such as whores [45] or as criminals[46] and using his connections with the ruling class, probably played an intermediary role in calming down the social tensions in thirteenth century Konya and hence attracted many Muslims and non-Muslims as his followers.

The evidence from the above-mentioned *menakıbname*s and heroic epics points out that the role of the proselytizing dervishes is probably not a historiographical myth. While some dervishes or *gazi*s were mainly preoccupied with conversions during the conquest and/or during the incorporation of the infidel lands into the lands of Islam, they were less interested in the conversion of the *zımmi*s. The rural areas seem to be the settings where there were rare interactions between the Muslims and the non-Muslim and hence rare conversions in contrast to the frontiers and the cities where the interactions were more frequent. Although we cannot make a generalization about the role of proselytizing dervishes in the cities due to the lack of evidence, we can at least say for thirteenth century Konya that Mevlana's attitudes reflected in his *Menakıb* are revelatory of his "missionary" zeal.

On the other hand, whether on the frontiers or in the cities or in the rural areas what the dervishes or *gazi*s understood from conversion was not actually a change of faith but rather submission to the symbol or representative of Islam. Therefore this person could be a *gazi* in the marches or a şeyh in a city. In the following section on "self" and "other" in the *menakıbnames* and the heroic epics, I will try to show how the political and moral submission to a *gazi*, a dervish or a şeyh was as important as changing one's faith and as embracing Islam.

---

[45] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, vol. 1, pp. 375-6.

[46] Ibid., p. 228.

Religious Definition of "Self" and "Other": Muslim and *Kafir*

The dervishes and *gazi*s whose lives and deeds are recounted in the *menakıbnames* and heroic epics lived in different periods between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The productions or redactions of their lives do not date before the fourteenth century. *Danişmendname*, *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye* and *Menakıbü'l Arifin* date to the fourteenth century and all the others date either to the fifteenth century or contain layers which can be dated earliest to the fifteenth century.[47]

The words which define the collective "self" in frontier/*gaza* narratives such as the *Danişmendname*, *Saltukname*, *Düsturname* and *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan* are *leşker-i İslam* (the soldiers of Islam), *Muslimanlar* (Muslims), *İslam erleri* (the men of Islam), *Muhammediler* (Mohammedans) or *gazi*s.

The opposing group to the soldiers of Islam is represented in turn as *kafir*/*küffar* (infidels). In the *Danişmendname*, the infidels are mainly people designated as *Rum kavmi* (Roman tribe or nation) or as *Rumiler*

---

[47] See chapter Ⅱ.

(Romans),[48] who were politically loyal to *Kaysar*, the Byzantine emperor. *Rumiler* are the local Byzantine lords (*Rum begleri*) joining their forces with Şah-ı Sattat, who is "the beg of Amasya," and "the uncle of *Kaysar"* and who is the principal enemy of Melik Danişmend. Among the infidels, there are other Christian groups as well. They are named in connection with their ethnic or territorial origins; such as *Firenk*s (Latins), *Gürcistan çerisi* (Georgian soldiers), *Urus ve çerkez çerisi* (Russian and Circassian soldiers)[49], *Tarabuzun Begi* (The Beg of Trebizond) and *Ermen Sultanı* (the Armenian sultan).[50] Christians as a group are sometimes called *Mesih kavmi* (people of the Messiah)[51] or *Isaya tapanlar* (the worshippers of Jesus).[52]

In the *Saltukname* and the *Düsturname*, although the group of infidels comprises many sub-groups with different ethnic backgrounds, the most important *küffar* group was not the *Rum* people as in the *Danişmendname* but the Franks.[53] In the *Düsturname,* apart from the Franks, there are *Kadalan* (Catalans),[54] *Alanos* (Alans)[55], *Rum* (Roman), *Sırf* (Serbians, who are also called as *Laz*),[56] *Bulgar* (Bulgarians),[57]

---

[48] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend,* vol. 2, pp. 5, 16.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[50] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 196.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[53] Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, pp. 47, 50-51, 55, 58, 65, 66, 67, 69, 77, 81, 87, 96-7, 109-125, 129.

[54] Ibid., pp. 65-66, 69, 85-88.

[55] Ibid., p. 47.

[56] Ibid., pp. 47, 62, 87, 122.

Arnavud (Albanians),[58] and *Engürüs* (Hungarians) infidels.[59] As one can understand from the frequency of the utilization of the term *Firenk*, the major opponent of Umur Beg and his *gazi*s are the Franks, in other words, the Latins who control many of the Aegean islands and Morea. Apart from the Frank soldiers and leaders, another major opponent is the Pope, who is called as *Papos* or as *Babos* and who is capable of unifying the infidels against Umur.[60]

In the *Saltukname* as in the *Düsturname*, the Franks and the Pope are considered as major opponents but *Rum kafirler* (Rum infidels) are also present as opponents. The Frank infidels (*Firenk kafiri*) are the ones living in *Firengistan*, which also includes the Aegean islands. According to the *Saltukname*, there is a land called Latin in *Firengistan*. People from Latin are the *Milan* (Milanese), *Espan* (Spanish), *Gedlan/Gatalan* (Catalan), *Cinevis* (Genoese), *Banadik* (Venetian) and *Firenkal/Firenç* (French).[61] According to the text, the *Alaman* (Germans) are also Franks but not Latins.[62]

The *Rum kafirler* are not the local Byzantine lords gathering around the representative of the central Byzantine authority as in the *Danişmendname* but they are the Wallachian (*Eflak*), Moldavian

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 102, 110.

[58] Ibid., pp. 87, 110.

[59] Ibid., p. 118.

[60] Ibid., pp. 72, 93, 110, 111, 117, 118.

[61] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, pp. 98-9.

[62] Ibid., p. 178.

(*Boğdan*), Serbian (*Sırf* and *Laz*), Albanian (*Yuan*)[63] and Russian (*Rus*) infidels.[64] These areas were in fact under the cultural influence of the Byzantine Empire in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and they are named as the "Byzantine commonwealth" by modern historians.[65]

The Byzantine Emperor is named as *Kostantin tekuru* (tekur of Constantin) or as *Konstantiniyye tekuru* (tekur of Constantinople). According to the *Saltukname*, this *tekur* with the Pope (*Pap*) are the masters of the infidels.[66] The Pope, who is also called *Filyon Firenk,* is the head of the Frank infidels and lives in *Frengistan* (lands of the Franks).

While the *tekur* of Constantinople and Pope have an important place in the *Saltukname*, the Patriarch of Constantinople (*Petrik*) is seen only once in text. Here the author tells us that *Petrik* is the master of the clergy in Constantinople (*Istanbul papazlar ulusı idi*) and that although he claims to be the master of all infidels *("Küfür ehlinin dini ulusı benven" diyü da'va iderdi.*), he is in fact under the authority of the *Tekur* (*Tekur'dan aşağa ol idi*). His authority is rather over the metropolitans (*andan aşağı medrepolidiler idi.*)[67] This is in fact a simplistic but partially true observation on the nature of the relationship between the

---

[63] According to the *Saltukname*, the name of the Albanian Beg was Yuan. So that is why the Albanians are sometimes called as *Yuan* sometimes as *Arnavud* in the text. Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 93.

[64] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, p. 144.

[65] Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicoson, 1971).

[66] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 16.

[67] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, pp. 106-7.

Byzantine Emperor and the Patriarch, which the modern historians have termed as "cesaropapism".[68]

The city of Constantinople is more important in the text than the *Tekvur* of Constantinople. According to a priest called Rumas who meets Sarı Saltuk in *Rum eli*, the only way to secure Islam in the Rum lands is to conquer Konstantiniyye because the city is the pillar of the infidels (*küffar*).[69] While the conquest of Constantinople is considered to be a necessity, the author repeats in many places in the text that the city is not a pleasant place to live whereas Edirne (Endriyye, Andriyye) is the most suitable city to live in.[70]

The infidels are also categorized according to their power over the sea or over land. Accordingly Russian, Rum, Serbian and Wallachian infidels are from the land (*kurudan*) and Venetians, Portuguese (*Portukal*), Catalan, Milanese and other Latin infidels are the infidels of the sea (*denizden*).[71] The beg of Cyprus is a *Firenk* and the Mediterranean (*Akdeniz*) is called the sea of the French (*Firenç*

---

[68] See for example Gilbert Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre: Étude sur le « césaropapisme » byzantin* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996); English translation by J. Birrell, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium.*

[69] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 179-183. For very similar legends on Constantinople and Saint Sophia see Stefanos Yerasimos, *Türk Metinlerinde Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri* (Istanbul: İletişim yayınları, 1995).

[70] For few of the many arguments on this issue in the *Saltukname*, see Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, pp. 364-65 for Constantinople and ibid., pp. 209-10 for Edirne. According to Cemal Kafadar, the pro-Edirne attitude in the *Saltukname* was the expression of the *gazis*' dismay at the ascendancy of a *kapıkulu* dominated central administration in Istanbul. According to Kafadar, along with this opposition to Istanbul being the capital, there was a meaningful opposition of the *gazis* who felt that they were not getting a fair return for their services from the central government and for whom the conquest of Istanbul represented the final blow to their autonomy. Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, pp. 148-9.

[71] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 144.

denizi).[72]Apart from the Franks, there are Hungarian (*Üngürüs*/*Asfari*) infidels. In Crimea, Sarı Saltuk and his companions fight against the *Rus* (Russian) infidels. Among all the frontier/*gaza* narratives *Vilayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan* is the poorest in terms providing information on his infidel opponents. They are simply called as infidels providing no details on their cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

While as a group the Christians who pay political loyalty either to the Byzantine Emperor or to the Pope considered to be the "other," on an individual level being a Christian is not an obstacle to become of a member of the group of the *gazi*s. Although there are many converts who join the cause of the Melik Danişmend, Sarı Saltuk or Seyyid Ali, there are equally Christians whose loyalty to the cause of the hero is considered to be sufficient criteria to be accepted as a group member. Their world seems to be divided not into "us" and "them" but into "us" and "those who are not yet us" or "those who may someday be among us."[73]

In the *Danişmendname*, among the companions of Melik Danişmend, there are Muslims such as Süleyman bin Numan, Eyyüb bin Yunus, Osman bin Apiyya and Hasan bin Eyyüb, whose names hint to their Arabic origin. On the other hand, most prominent figures presented as the best companions of Melik Danişmend are Artuhi and Efromiya.

---

[72] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 70.

[73] Kafadar, Between Two Worlds, p. 72.

Artuhi is a Christian convert to Islam. He is the son of the leader of a nomadic group. We understand that he is literate in Greek[74] and has received a military education. [75] Efromiya, the other companion of Melik Danişmend, is the daughter of Şah-ı Sattat. Artuhi and Efromiya, who are in love with each other, but who cannot get married because Şah-ı Sattat wants to marry Efromiya with Nestor, who is another enemy of Melik Danişmend and who is the chief of the Byzantine army. Efromiya's desire to marry Artuhi motivates her decision to join Melik Danişmend's cause. She is depicted in the epic as a virtual Amazon participating in battles and *gazi* activities with men.

There are also other converts accompanying Melik Danişmend such as Abdullah, Abdurrahman,[76] a Christian from Mamuriya (Amorion) called Serkis (an Armenian?) who receives the name Ahmed upon his conversion to Islam.[77] Apart from these converts, some monks like Beyter Agos of the monastery of Erostos in the city of Zile, who help Melik Danişmend are not considered as infidels.[78]

In the *Saltukname* as in the *Danişmendname*, there are many converts who join the cause of Sarı Saltuk. One of them is Alyon-ı Rumi who decides to convert to Islam after having fought with Sarı Saltuk. In fact, he is the one who baptizes him with the name Sarı Saltuk.[79] The local Byzantine lords, such as Ayamuson and Ayadimitri surrender their fortresses to Sarı Saltuk and join him and eventually they convert to Islam.[80] The Armenians who help Sarı Saltuk in his exploits to defeat the Georgians[81] do not convert but still they are not named as infidels. They complain to Sarı Saltuk about the *Rumi*s (Byzantines), who have chased them out of their lands.[82] The Armenians in Karahisar appreciate the jokes of Nasreddin Hodja just as Sarı Saltuk does.[83] And Sarı Saltuk says in the text that he prefers the Armenians to the Rums and the Franks.[84]

---

[74] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend,* vol. 2, pp. 26, 259.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[76] Ibid. p. 115.

[77] Ibid., pp. 186-7.

[78] Ibid., pp. 47-8, 124. Also see, vol. 1, p. 151.

In the *Düsturname*, as the Byzantine chronicles also reveal, Umur Beg is depicted to have very close and friendly relations with Jean VI Kantakouzenos (1347-54), who is called *Domestikos*, *Domestikos firenk* or as *tekvur* in the text.[85] The city of Philadelphia, Alaşehr is praised, stating that Alaşehr is a great city having strong fortresses and many soldiers.[86]

The case of John VI Kantakouzenos is not the unique case in the *Düsturname* where we see collaborations or changing sides between two opponent groups, the *gazi*s and the infidels. Sasa Beg, who has been the

---

[79] Sarı Saltuk until that time is called as Şerif in the text. Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, pp. 15-19.

[80] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, p. 21.

[81] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 25.

[82] Ibid., p. 83.

[83] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, p. 181.

[84] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 23.

[85] Mélikoff, *Le Destan D'Umur Pacha*, pp. 93, 94, 98-106.

[86] Ibid., pp. 81-83.

subaşı of the emir of Menteşeoğulları in Caria for example joins the Christian forces. Although "he once was a believer (*mümin*), he is now the assistant of the Christians (*avn-i tersa*)."[87] Inversely, as it was mentioned above, a Bulgarian called Mumcila (Momitzilo), who lives in the *Sırf eli* (Serbian lands) joins Umur Beg and conducts *gaza* against the Christians.[88] He apparently does not convert to Islam but puts on *Türk toni* and he is never called as *kafir* in the text. Therefore as in other frontier/*gaza* narratives although there is a great emphasis on the religious identity of Muslim and Christian groups, political loyalty seems to be as important as changing one's faith. A Christian is not considered to be an infidel if he is loyal to the cause of the *gazi*s and if a Muslim serves the Christians, he is no longer considered to be a believer.

The same attitude is also visible in the *menakıbname*s other than the ones classified as frontier/*gaza* narratives. Hacı Bektaş, Hacım Sultan, Abdal Musa and Otman Baba are identified as *abdal*s or *Rum abdalları*. In these texts a *kafir* is the one who does not recognize the *vilayet* of the dervish. Christians of the village of Sinesos and the monk in the lands of the infidel who recognize Hacı Bektaş's sanctity are not named as infidels. For Hacım Sultan, who is a shepherd and an *abdal,* the *küffar* are the Muslim rulers and the inhabitants of the cities such as the beg of Karahisar, who does not have confidence in Hacım Sultan,[89] and the inhabitants of the city (*şehirli taifesi*) of Sandıklı, who are making fun of him.[90]

---

[87] Ibid., pp. 46-48.

[88] Ibid., p. 101. According to Melikoff Mumcila was the Bulgar Momitzilo that Kantakouzenos took in his service. She refers to the History of Kantakouzenos. *Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris Historiarum libri IV*, ed. Jacob Pontanus & Ludovicus Schopenus, vol. 2 (Bonn: Weber, 1828-1832), pp. 398-403.

[89] Tschudi, *Das Vilajet-name des Hadschim Sultan*, p. 36.

Similarly in the *Velayetname-i Otman Baba,* the "other", the *küffar*, are the city dwellers, the members of the central administration in the cities such as *kethüda* (the representative to the government of a city quarter), *subaşı* (a responsible for the maintenance of order in the city), *kadı* (a judge administrating both *şeriat* and *kanun*) as well as the religious authorities in the cities such as *ulema*, *seyyid*s and *danişmend*s.

In the *Velayetname-i Otman Baba* the citydwellers and the civilian and religious authorities in the Ottoman cities look down upon Otman Baba and his *abdal*s, who become a major source of disturbance in their cities. Otman Baba tries to convince them of his divine power by instilling fear in their hearts,[91] using his club, hitting them, cutting down the water supplies of the hamams,[92] cutting down the trees in and around the cities,[93] destroying their gardens, vineyards,[94] market places,[95] swimming naked in the river passing through the city[96] and drinking the dirty water of the hamams.[97]

---

[90] Ibid., pp. 38, 41, 47.

[91] For the place of fear in Sufi doctrine and in Otman Baba's *Velayetname* see, Inalcık, " Dervish and Sultan,"p. 20.

[92] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* pp. 54-56.

[93] Ibid., p. 130.

[94] Ibid., p. 119.

[95] Ibid., p. 162.

[96] Ibid., p. 83.

[97] Ibid., p. 72.

Especially in Edirne, there is a mutual dislike between the citydwellers and Otman Baba and his *abdal*s.[98] Despite this, Otman Baba insists on returning to Edirne. Once he returns to the city with *gazi* Ali Beg[99] and another time he goes there to declare that he is *Ene'l Hak.*[100] In the *Velayetname*, Edirne is cursed as "vile world" (*alçak dünya*).[101] Apart from his special dislike of Edirne, Otman Baba's attitude towards the cities and urban life can clearly be seen in his conversation with Mehmed II in Istanbul. Here he reminds Mehmed II that he himself is the worldly and divine authority, the *padişah* while Mehmed II is a simple citydweller (*şehirli*).[102]

In the *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye*, the "other" is not non-Muslims but *müfti* (an officially appointed interpreter of the *şeriat*), *müderris* (the chief teacher and administrator of *medrese*) and Köre Kadı who accuse Baba Resul for having claims over the Seljuk throne. The term *kafir* is utilized for these opponents. What made one an infidel according to the text is his/her opposition to or acceptance of Baba Resul's *vilayet*. In the fortress of Gevala near Konya, for example, there are few Muslims and numerous "pagans". These "pagans" are the

---

[98] Ibid., pp. 158-163.

[99] Ibid., pp. 171-72.

[100] Ibid., pp. 180-82, 189-193. *Ene'l Hak* means "I am the True". It was the statement for which Mansur-al Hallaj was condemned to death. Hallaj did not mean that he was the God, but that he had attained a level of consciousness that allowed him to realize in an intimate manner that he was nothing and that all existence was God. See Derin Terzioğlu, "The Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyazi-i Mısri (1618-94)," *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002), p. 147.

[101] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* p. 258.

[102] Ibid., p. 253.

Jews (*Cuhud*) and the Christians (*Nasrani*). These non-Muslims of the fortress of Gevala[103] who welcome Baba Resul and his followers are not named as infidels (*küffar*).[104] As Baba Resul knows the language and the religion of each one in the Rum,[105] of the Armenians (*Ermeni*), Jews (*Cuhud*) and Christians (*Nasrani*), they all weep after him.[106]

The *Menakıb* on Mevlana warns the reader not to have prejudice in judging someone as an infidel. Thus *kafir* is the one who is unaware of the faith of his *şeyh*.[107] Even a non-Muslim who respects the *şeyh* and believes in his authority is considered to be a faithful one. Therefore a "*Frenk dervişi*", Frank dervish,[108] a Christian frequenting the *sema* of Mevlana[109] or some monks respecting Mevlana's wisdom [110] are not considered as infidels. A believer one is also one who fears God. Thus a Rum, who cannot make up his mind whether or not to convert to Islam because of his fear of God's wrath is a believer and not an infidel. [111] Mevlana warns in his *Menakıb* that one must not despise an infidel because he/she may die as a Muslim.[112] In the *Menakıbü'l Arifin* as in all the texts analyzed above conversions take place but the loyalty to the şeyh's superiority is as important as changing faith.

---

[103] Erünsal, Ocak, *Menakıbu'l-Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye*, p. 178.

[104] Ibid., p. 79.

[105] Ibid., p. 74.

[106] Ibid., pp. 133, 144.

[107] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, Vol. 1, p. 248.

[108] Ibid., p. 136.

[109] Ibid., p. 271.

[110] Ibid., pp. 156, 374.

[111] Ibid., p. 334.

[112] Ibid., pp. 360-61

This was an approach which did not consider the change of faith as the only way of conversion. An act of submission to a Muslim military or spiritual leader was also perceived as conversion. This approach to conversion seems to have been present even in the earliest conversion stories to Islam where submission to Mohammed as a politically and militarily superior leader counted most. The religious meaning of this submission was discovered over time within the Islamic community.[113]

In the *Saltukname*, I believe that the understanding of conversion as political submission curiously extends to historical political figures who actually did not submit to Muslim rule but who abstained from assisting and helping their coreligionists against the Muslim advance even though they had the power to do so. Stories on the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius and on Pope regarding their secret faith in Islam can be interpreted within the context of the above-mentioned understanding.

In the *Saltukname*, the only Byzantine Emperor, who is not called *tekur* but *Kayser* is *Harkil Kayser*, Emperor Heraclius (610-641).[114] The text correctly states that he reigned during the Caliphate of Omar (634-644). These were the last years of the Heraclius reign and the period of Arab invasions into the Byzantine lands. According to the text, *Harkil* was a crypto-Muslim.[115]There is another similar story further down in the narrative where the author tells us that the Pope was not helping the *Rumi tekur*s full heartedly although he had the power to do so as the leader of the Frank infidels. The Pope's attitude according to the *Saltukname* was due to his secret belief in Islam.[116]

---

[113] Richard Bulliet, "Conversion Stories in Early Islam," in *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. M. Gervers and R.J. Bikhazi (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1990), pp. 123-133.

[114] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, pp. 97, 260

The depiction of Heraclius as a crypto-Muslim may be a trope which had been in use in the Arabic sources since the seventh century spread of Islam in the Byzantine lands and Pope's depiction as a crypto-Muslim can also be searched in the Muslim sources which were written during the Crusades or in Muslim apocalyptic texts. However when read within the above-mentality towards conversion, these stories may simply be the interpretations of the attitudes of Heraclius in the seventh century and the Pope between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries towards Muslim expansion. For during the last years of the reign of Heraclius, although Caliph Omar had broken into the Byzantine territory and advanced rapidly, Heraclius, who had led all the expeditions against Persia in person, took no real part in fighting against the Arabs. In *Saltukname*, Heraclius is considered to be a powerful general and Emperor. By not participating in the war against the Muslims he in a way helped the Muslims and therefore his action was probably interpreted by the author as his being a crypto-Muslim. Again the hesitation of the Pope who had the power to unite the Franks in helping the Byzantines against the Muslim advance (as we know unless the Union of Churches was realized) may have been the reason behind the interpretation of his attitude as his secret faith in Islam.

---

[115] Ibid., p. 97.

[116] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, pp. 27, 89.

The Cultural and Ethnic Definition of "Self" and "Other"

The religious component of identity in the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics differentiates the "self" from the "other" in relation with belonging or not belonging to a Muslim group either because one has embraced Islam or not or because one has political loyalty towards the leader of a Muslim group. As it has been partially discussed above, the non-Muslim groups are also identified in accordance with their ethnic and territorial backgrounds as well as in accordance with their military superiority over land and sea. Religious identity is not the only criterion by which the authors of the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics identify their heroes. Two components of self identification, Turkish and *Rumi* are also visible in these sources.

Turkish Identity

Not all the dervishes and *gazi*s are identified as Turks in their vitas. Among the fourteenth century texts, Melik Danişmend is only identified by his religious identity while Baba Resul's Turkish identity is all clear in his vita. In the *Menakıbü'l Arifin* there are plenty of anecdotes which are informative on the ethnic and cultural identity markers of people in thirteenth and fourteenth century Konya.

In *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye,* Baba Resul and his entourage are identified as Turk, a term which seems to have ethnic, physical and cultural aspects. One of the cultural aspects of being Turk was speaking Turkish (*Türk dili*).[117] Again culturally, the term Turk is used in a sense as opposed to the citydwellers (*Türk ü şehri kamu ana uyalar*).[118] Therefore the Turk was someone who was not urban. There were certain recognized physical features of a Turk hence Baba Resul was someone shining in the image of a rough Turk (*key kaba türk suretinde münir*).[119] The Turks are also opposed to the Mongols (*şehri vü ecnebi vü Türk ü Mongol*)[120] who were Genghizids.[121] And the Turk was not a Kazan Tatar (*Hitay*).[122] According to the text however, the Mongols were transformed into Turks and mixed with the Turks (*Türke kalb oldı Türke karışdı.*)[123]

In the *Menakıbü'l Arifin,* the term Turk has cultural and ethnic connotation. One of the cultural aspects of Turkish identity was speaking Turkish. For example, a Turk was trying to sell a fox fur in the market place yelling in Turkish.[124] There was a grammarian (*nahivci*) correcting the Arabic of a Turkish *fakih* (expert in Islamic canon law).[125]

---

[117] Erünsal, Ocak, *Menakıbu'l-Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye,* pp. 114-5, 166.

[118] Ibid., p. 49.

[119] Ibid., p. 105.

[120] Ibid., p. 134.

[121] Ibid., p. 157.

[122] Ibid.

[123] Ibid., p. 158.

In the *Menakıbü'l Arifin*, no distinction is made between the Turks and the Mongols as in the *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye* and the identification Turk is used for both the Turks and the Mongols. For example, Keygatu (Gaykhatu)(1291-95), the Ilkhanid Mongol ruler is identified as a Turk[126] as well as the Turkish emirs of western Anatolia. When Arif Çelebi (d. 1319), the grandson of Mevlana, came to visit the emir of Germiyan, Alişiroğlu, this emir did not show due respect to Arif Çelebi because of his ignorance. He was ignorant because he was a Turk, who was not aware of the world of the *velis*.[127] Mehmed Beg of Aydınoğulları, however, became immediately the disciple of Arif Çelebi, who preferred this emir most among all the Mongol and Turkish emirs.[128] As in the *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye*, it can be understood from Mevlana's letters to the Seljuk dignitaries of his time that the term Turk was considered to be the antonym of being urban, someone who lived in a haircloth tent and hence a nomad.[129] The Turkish identification in *Menakıbü'l Arifin* has also racial implications. Mevlana once said that he had disciples having facial features pertaining to Rum race and Turkish race.[130]

---

[124] Ibid., p. 271.

[125] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, Vol. 1, pp. 155-56.

[126] Ibid., p. 258.

[127] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, Vol. 2, p. 225.

[128] Ibid., pp. 226-7.

[129] Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana Celaleddin. Mektuplar* (Istanbul: Inkilap ve Aka, 1963), p. 161.

In fifteenth-century text, the *Saltukname,* the term Turk is utilized synonymously for being a Muslim. For example, the text states that Mohammed was sent as a prophet to Turks. (*Ol Muhammed'dir kim Türklere peygamber gelmiştir.*) Instead of Islam, the expression *Türkler dini* (Turks religion) is utilized. Or when the author relates the legend of Ebu Eyyub-i Ensari (Abu Ayyub al-Ansari) who was a close companion of the Prophet Mohammed and who was among the notables listed as accompanying Muawiyah's son Yazid against Constantinople in 674, he says that Ebu Eyyub was a Turk, but spoke Arabic (*Arap dilince*). [131]

In the *Düsturname*, *gazi* and Muslim identification for Umur Beg and his companions are utilized when the opposing groups are identified as *küffar*, infidels. The term Turk is used when the "other" is named with an ethnic terminology. For example for Franks versus Turks but *gazis* or Muslims versus *küffar.*[132]

---

[130] Ibid., p. 222.

[131] "*Ol Muhammed'dir kim Türklere peygamber gelmistir.*" Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 72; For *Türkler dini*, ibid., p. 336. For Ebu Eyyub-i Ensari, Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, p. 80. According to the tradition Ebu Eyyub-ı Ansari died during the siege of Constantinople and buried near the walls of Constantinople. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Mehmed II, a tomb was constructed above Ebu Eyyub's purported grave and a mosque built in his honor.

[132] "*Besertoya firenk oldi haber: Türk toldi ada toldi şur ü şer.*" Melikoff, *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha*, p. 58. "*Her ne yerden cıqmak isterse firenk Türk oq atup döndürür qılardı cenk,*" ibid., p. 77. "*Yüriyüp çünkim firenk etdi hücum Türk uzun oqlar alup eyledi hum,*" ibid., p. 112. Parakimomenos (Alexis Apokaukos) blames John Kantakouzenos for having handed in Philadelphia to the Turks. (*halqa dedi kim Alaşehri bular Türke verdi oldi eli tar u mar*), ibid., p. 93. Few exceptions to this rule where the term Turk is utilized together with terms having religious connotations "*ol elün küffarı tapu qıldılar, elleşürler Türk andan aldılar.*" Ibid., p. 64.

In *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin,* the term Turk is in most of the cases a linguistic marker. Turkish is the language of the *gazi*s in *Rum ili* and the *Rumi*s. The monks of Chios and the Genoese administrators of the island however call Bedreddin as *Türk'ün ulusu* (great Turk).[133] Turkish identification is not utilized by Bedreddin as self identification as in the case of Baba Resul, Sarı Saltuk or Umur Beg but it is the term utilized by Franks to designate Bedreddin. Bedreddin speaks Turkish but he is identified as a *Rumi* in the text.

And finally in the *Vilayetname-i Otman Baba,* Otman Baba, who was from Azerbeijan, is usually identified as *Rum abdalı.* In contrast to all other texts analyzed above he is stated as speaking not *Türk dili* but *Oguz dili* (the language of Oghuz) or speaking in an Oghuz-name manner (*Oguzname savtı*). [134]

Lands of Rum, Rums and *Rumi* Identity

As it has been explained in the introduction the Roman/Byzantine identity had territorial, political, religious and some other cultural markers. The word Rum in Persian and Arabic literature had territorial connotations. The word probably derives from the Greek ἡ ῾Ρώμη, Rome and first appeared in Sassanid Pahlavi literature in the form of *hrom,* denoting both the city of Rome and the Roman Empire. The Arabic form *al-Rum* is attested in the sixth century pre-Islamic Arabic literature and then in the Koran and the hadiths. *Bilad al-Rum* in Arabic and *diyar-ı Rum* in Persian acquired the meaning of the Roman lands that is Ῥωμανία as the Byzantines called it.[135]

---

[133] Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı,* p. 89.

[134] Kılıç, Arslan, Bülbül, *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi,* pp. 16, 260. Oghuz Turkish is a major branch of the Turkic language family. Modern Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, Gagauz Turkish, Azerbaijani Turkish, Khorasani Turkish and the Turkish spoken by the Turcomans of Iraq belong all to this group. *Oğuzname* or Oghuz-nameh is a heroic legend, also known as *Kitab-ı Dede Korkut* among Oghuz Turk people. *Dedem Korkudun Kitabı,* ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Istanbul: Kabalcı, 2007); English translation by Geoffrey Lewis, *Book of Dede Korkut* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972).

The use of the term Rum as early as the twelfth century on the copper coins of the Turcoman amirs[136] reflects that territorial Roman identity was shared by the Muslim rulers who now held some parts of the former Byzantine lands. Along with the coins, the terminological investigation of the historiographic works of the Seljuk period shows that as early as twelfth century the term Rum was a standard denomination for both Byzantium and the Muslim Anatolia and the *Rumi* attribute signified the Byzantines and the "Turcomans"[137] who shared the same geography.

In all of the hagiographical sources and heroic epics analyzed in this chapter the actions and deeds of the heroes take place in the lands of Rum and most of the heroes are designated with the attribute Rum or *Rumi*. In the fourteenth-century texts, the Rum attribute for the Muslims had territorial meaning. When it is used for the Byzantines the designation Rum carries all of the components of Roman/Byzantine identity. In then fifteenth century texts, however, the attribute *Rumi* utilized for the Muslims living in the lands of Rum does not only signify a territorial aspect but a cultural aspect as well. I want to inquire first on the territorial boundaries of the lands of Rum as it is reflected in these sources because as the boundaries of the Byzantine Empire changed between the appearance of the word Rum in the sixth century until the disappearance of the Byzantine Empire in the fifteenth century, the term probably signified different geographies at different times.

---

[135] Shukurov, "Turkoman and Byzantine self-identity," p. 266. Idem., "Christian Elements in the Identity of the Anatolian Turkmens (12th-13th Centuries)," pp. 717-8.

[136] For the analysis of the copper coin of the Danişmendid melik Muhammad (1134-1142) which also contains a Greek legend see, Paul Wittek, "Le sultan de Rum," in *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 6 (1938), pp. 361-390 and Nicolas Oikonomides, "Les Danishmendides entre Byzance, Bagdad et le sultanat d'Iconium," in *Revue Numismatique* 25 (1983), pp. 189-207 and for a more recent analysis of this coin with other Turcoman coins and the Rum identity see Shukurov's two articles noted in note 134.

[137] Shukurov, "Christian Elements in the Identity of the Anatolian Turkmens (12th-13th Centuries)," pp. 719-720.

The titles of the Mengüceks of Erzincan (Ca. 1118-128), the Seljukids of Erzurum (ca. 1116-1201), the Artukids (from ca. 1102) and the Danişmendids (from ca.1071-1178) amirs on twelfth and thirteenth century coins, which have been analyzed by Rhustem Shukurov provide some idea not on what the lands of Rum were but what they were not.[138] The Seljukid rulers of Erzurum called themselves as *malik bilad al Rum wa al-Arman* therefore the greater Armenia was not considered as part of the lands of Rum. The Artukid rulers of Amid named themselves as *malik al-umara sultan Diyarbakr wa al-Rum wa al-Arman*, so Diyarbakır was not included in the lands of the Rum.

The sources, which are analyzed in this chapter, provide some information on what it meant by the lands of Rum in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the *Menakıbü'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye* the boundaries of the lands of Rum are roughly given. Accordingly Iraq and Syria were not considered to be within the geographical limits of Rum

---

[138] Shukurov, "Turkoman and Byzantine self-identity," pp. 268-9.

(*Rum u Şam u Irak u alemde, ana benzer kim ola ademde*).[139] The boundaries given both in the twelfth and thirteenth century Turcoman coins and the fourteenth century hagiography are on the eastern and southern boundaries of the lands of Rum yet there is no information on the western boundaries.

The *Saltukname*, a fifteenth-century text provides more information on the western boundaries of the lands of Rum. Here the frequently used term is *Rum eli* which can also be translated as the lands of Rum. The difference between *Rum eli* and *Rum* are partially explained with the introduction of new terms such as *Anatolya* and *Yunan* which I have not come across in the other Turco-Muslim hagiographical texts or epics. The author explains that in the Greek language (*Rum dilince*) *Anatolya* means *Yunan*[140] and the throne of *Yunan* is Kayserriye (Ceasarea).[141] This explanation perplexes the modern reader for whom the term *Yunan* is a rendering of the word Ioanian used in Persian, Arabic and Turkish for the Ancient Greeks.

Then the author continues that Seljuk Sultan Alaü'ddin was ruling on the throne of *Yunan* (*Sultan Alaü'ddin Yunan tahtında oturur*).[142] Some further utilizations of the term *Yunan* and *Anatolya/ Anatoli* reveal that the author uses these terms to differentiate *Rum eli*, which he usually uses for the lands of Rum in the west of the Dardanelles from the lands of Rum in the east. For example, in his dream, Sarı Saltuk sees two falcons who fly from *Yunan* side to *Rum eli.* These two falcons are interpreted by Sarı Saltuk as Osman Beg and Umur Beg who will become prominent *gazi*s leading *gaza* activities in the Balkans.[143]

---

[139] Erünsal, Ocak, *Menakıbu'l-Kudsiyye fi Menasıbi'l Ünsiyye*, pp. 102-105, 227-228.

[140] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 21.

[141] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[142] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 129.

Another instance where we understand that *Yunan/Anatoli* had a geographical meaning is when the author talks about the battle between Bayezid I and Timur in 1402. According to the text, in the army of Bayezid there was no one from *Rum ili,* but only *Anatoli leşkeri* (Anatolian soldiers) and *kul taifesi* (devshirme soldiers).[144] Apart from its geographical connotation, once in the text, the term *Yunan* is used with a cultural meaning. Although the Greek language is called *Rum dili,* Greek letters are named as *Hatt-ı Yunani* (Ancient Greek calligraphy).[145]

On the other hand, while the term *Rum eli* usually signified the lands west of the Dardanelles, the terms *Rum* and *Rum eli* are sometimes used interchangeably and they can signify a larger territory. Thus the northern "door" of the *Rum* was the region of Amasya (Amassiye)[146] and in the east it was Ayurusapur.[147] Although I could not find what Ayurusapur signified, it is stated that further east of Ayurusapur was Kuhistan (*Ayurusapur diyarından elci gelip harac getirdi kim Rum'un*

---

[143] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 2, pp. 106-111.

[144] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 158.

[145] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 15.

[146] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 263.

[147] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 1, p. 178.

haddi oldur, andan ötesi Kuhistan'dur ve Keşmir'dir ve Türkistan'a ulaşır, Müslümanlıkdır.)[148]

The Aegean sea is considered to be the western limit of the Rum. In the Balkans certain regions are named as *Sırf eli* and *Arnavud eli* (Serbian and Albanian lands) and these lands are sometimes included in the boundaries of *Rum eli* or *Rum.* Earlier geographical extensions of Roman rule are sometimes included in the boundaries of the lands of *Rum.* We are told that *Girnada/Endülüs* (Granada/Andalusia) was the land of Rum[149] and that the place where the Pope lived (*Pap ili*) had been a part of the Rum land.[150]

If we do not consider in the *Saltukname* few passing remarks on *Girnada* and *Pap ili* being a part of the lands of Rum, the geographical definition of the lands of Rum given by Cemal Kafadar coincides with the ones given in the hagiographical sources. Traveling westwards from Iran or northward from Iraq, one entered the lands of Rum but as one crossed the Dardanalles or Bosphorus eastward, one entered Anatolia.[151] We can say that as Turco-Muslim groups moved westwards on the Byzantine lands they were more interested in the western borders of the lands of Rum as it can be seen in the *Saltukname*.

---

[148] Mountainous region running north-south from the Kuh-i Surkh range above Turbat-i Haidariyyeh down to the beginning of the lowlands around the fringes of the Lut depression. N.N. Ambraseys and C. P. Melville, *The Geographical Journal* 143/2 (1977), p. 179.

[149] Akalın, *Saltuk-Name*, vol. 3, p. 81.

[150] Ibid., p. 285.

[151] Cemal Kafadar, "A Rome of One's own", pp. 17-18.

Rumi designation is not attributed to all the heroes in the above studied texts. In the *Velayetname-i Abdal Musa*, for example, the *Rumi* designation is neither used for a specific geography nor for a specific group or individual. In the *Velayetname-i Seyyid Ali Sultan*, the term Rum is utilized only as a territorial designation for the lands west of the Dardanelles as in *Rum ili* or *canib-i Rum* (the Rum side). Seyyid Ali Sultan however is not identified as a *Rumi*. In the *Vilayetname-i Hacı Bektaş* and the *Velayetname-i Hacım Sultan*, the Rum and *Rumi* identifications are utilized in a very similar fashion. In these two texts Rum signifies the former Byzantine lands but more specifically Asia Minor. The attribute *Rumi* is utilized in defining Hacı Bektaş, Hacım Sultan and their disciples as *Rum abdalları* or as *Rum erenleri*.

In the fourteenth-century *menakıbname*s and heroic epics the term Rum is utilized for the Byzantines or ex-Byzantine subjects. The term seems to have carried all the aspects of the Roman/Byzantine identity, political, territorial, religious and cultural aspects.

In the *Danişmendname,* all the Byzantine lords and the Byzantines who speak Greek (*Rumi dili*), loyal to the Byzantine Emperor *(Kaysar)* and Christian are named as *Rum kavmi* (Roman tribe or nation) or *Rumiler* (Romans)[152] or as *Rumi*, a term which is usually utilized as an adjective form in the text. For the Byzantine lords, Kaloyan-i Rumi, Faytul-i Rumi etc., for the Byzantine soldiers, *Rum çerisi*, for the Byzantines in general, *Rum kavmi* (Rum people/nation) and for the Byzantine lands, *Rum ev*i (the House of the Rums) are utilized.

---

[152] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend,* vol. 2, pp.15, 16.

Although the Byzantines in general are named as the people of Rum, the people of each city are sometimes named separately, such as *Dokiya kavmi* (people/nation of Eudochia)[153], *Dokiya ehli* (people/community of Dokiya), *Sisiya kavmi* (the people/nation of Sis), *Malatiya kavmi* (the people/nation of Melitene), probably to emphasize their autonomous or semi-autonomous standing from Şah-ı Sattat and Nestor, who both represent Byzantine central authority in the text.

In the *Danişmendname*, Melik Danişmend and his friends seem to be acquainted with all the group markers of Byzantine identity: political, territorial and cultural. Most of these markers do not create a burden for Melik Danişmend and his friends. They can easily enter the *Rums*' social space by speaking Greek, dressing up in a monk's dress or by conquering a city. Melik Danişmend at the beginning of the *Danişmendname* can not speak Greek and asks Artuhi to be his interpreter[154] but at the end we see him speaking in Greek *(Rum dilince)* and[155] when necessary, Artuhi writes the letters or the notes in *Rum hattı* (Greek alphabet). [156]

Food seems to be an important marker of Melik's cultural identity. For example, at the very beginning of the narrative when Artuhi invites Melik to dine with him, he refuses because according to Melik, sharing food with someone means becoming blessed companions. Therefore if Melik shares Artuhi's food and if one day they find themselves in two different groups fighting each other, then Melik will be someone who is ungrateful (*küfran-i nimet*). This attitude of Melik makes Artuhi "fall in love" with the religion of Melik.[157]

---

[153] Dokiya is sometimes called Tokat in the text.

[154] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend,* vol. 2, p. 26.

[155] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[156] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

Apart from this incident, there are six other places where the author lists the food consumed by the infidel and by Melik and his milieu. While the Rums and Franks consume a lot of different sorts of fish, seafood, vegetables and pork meat, the Melik's and his friends' food includes all sorts of meat (except pork), sweet deserts, pastry, milk products, cereal, rice and dried fruits.[158]

In the *Menakıbü'l Arifin* the political aspect of being Roman is missing as the Rums were not the ones fighting in the name of the Byzantine emperor against a warrior like Melik Danişmend but rather the Rums who were living under Seljuk rule. The people depicted as Rum (*Rum halkı*) in this text identify the people, who were Christians, who were neither Armenians nor Franks. They are the ones who spoke Greek and who had certain special physical features. They were mostly artisans and craftsmen and women as we understand from the Greek sobriquets utilized for the women in the household of Mevlana.[159]

Both the Rum lands and Rum people are highly admired in the text. God, according to Mevlana, first created the Rums, "these heedless infidels" and gave them a long life and great force. These laborers, who were aware of nothing, began to construct and improve the world. They constructed many cities, castles on the top of the mountains and cultivated the lands. As they were not aware of the essence of God, the God created the Turks to destroy their constructions.[160]

---

[157] Mélikoff, *La Geste de Melik Danişmend*, vol. 2, pp. 20-21.

[158] *Ibid.*, pp. 91, 134, 165, 199, 219, 269.

[159] For the usage of Rum in *Menakibu'l Arifin* see also Speros Vryonis, " The Economic and Social Worlds of Anatolia in the Writings of the Mawlawi (Mevlevi) Dervish Eflaki, " in *Cultural Horizons. A Festschrift in Honor of Talat S. Halman*, ed. Jayne L. Warner (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 2001), pp. 188-197.

While in the *Danişmendname* and *Menakıbü'l Arifin*, which are fourteen-century texts, the Rum signified the Byzantines or Greek speaking Christians living under Seljuk rule, except in the *Düsturname*, in all of the texts which were produced after the fall of Constantinople Rums or *Rumi* designates Turkish speaking Muslims living in the lands of Rum, the former lands of Byzantine Empire. In the *Saltukname*, Sarı Saltuk differentiates himself from other Muslims such as Tatars of Crimea, Arabs and Persians (*Acem*) with his *Rumi* identity. Whenever he is outside the lands of the Rum, for example when he is traveling in Egypt, Ethiopia, Arabia, India or in the lands of the genies and witches, he identifies himself as *Saltuk-i Rumi.*

In the *Saltukname,* Rum identification is used both for the Byzantine lords and soldiers and other Orthodox Christians such as Wallachians, Moldavians, Serbians, Albanians and Russians as well as the Turkish speaking Muslim lords and soldiers. There are Muslim *Rumi*s and infidel *Rumi*s sharing the same geography.

In the *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin,* at the beginning of the text when Bedreddin's family and his family's *gazi* background is told, the Byzantine lands which they conquered are called *Rum ili.* The local Byzantines, however, are called as *küffar* not as Rums. There is a religious identification of the Byzantines simply as the infidels. There are some indications that these infidels were speaking a different language. Hence upon the conquest of a village, the *gazi*s changed its name with a Turkish name.[161]

---

[160] Yazıcı, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlana ve Etrafındakiler)*, Vol. 2, p. 115.

As the story moves from the family of Bedreddin to Bedreddin's own life and education, the author begins to use Rum and *Rumi* attribute to identify Bedreddin and some other personalities. For example, Molla Feyzullah, the teacher of Bedreddin in Konya is called the glory of Rum (*Rum'un Mefharin*). Bedreddin and his colleague Musa are called as the two seas of Rum (*Bahreyn-i Rum*). Recounting the stories on the sojourns of Musa in Semerkand and Bedreddin in Egypt, both Musa and Bedreddin are mentioned as *Rumi.* During a visit of Bedreddin to Jerusalem, the wise men of the area are called Arab wise men (*Arab kamilleri*).[162] Again when Bedreddin is introduced to the sultan of Egypt, Berkok, he is named as Mahmud-i Rumi.[163]

Bedreddin is not the only *Rumi* in the court of Berkok where there are other *Rumi*s.[164] As in the *Saltukname* the *Rumi* identification is utilized in the *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin* especially in the stories related with Bedreddin's travels out of the lands of Rum to point out his difference from other Muslims such as Arabs, Persians (*Acem*s) and

---

[161] "Bir Köy almışlar Defülsoka adı. Sonra Türk adını Ya'kubbig kodı," Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı*, p. 11.

[162] Ibid., p. 29.

[163] Mahmud was Bedreddin's birth name. Ibid., p. 13.

[164] Ibid., pp. 29, 31.

Indians (*Hindi*).[165] Muslim *Rumi* identity as it appears in Bedreddin's vita has certain cultural components apart from its geographical connotation. The designations *Rum*, *Acem*, *Arab* and *Hindi* are also utilized pointing out a certain quality (*vasf*). For example when Timur wants to meet Bedreddin, he expresses his desire to talk to him to see whether he has *Rum*, *Acem*, *Arab* or *Hindi* qualities.[166] The soldiers of Timur, on the other hand are identified as Tatars (*Tatar erleri*).[167]

In *Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin* as well as in the *Velayetname-i Otman Baba*, one sees no infidel *Rumi*s. The words Rum and *Rumi* are always used to designate the Muslims residing in the lands of Rum. They are used in the vita of Otman Baba to designate the west of the Dardanelles as *Rum ili* or *Rum vilayeti* or the *abdals*, begs or saints of the lands of Rum (*Rum abdalı*, *Rum begleri* and *Rum evliyası*).

As the sources analyzed above show the meaning of Rum changed from designating the lands of Byzantine Empire to depicting the lands ruled by Muslim rulers and finally to Turco-Muslims living in the former Byzantine lands. In the Ottoman Empire until the end of the seventeenth century the *Rumi* identity obtained a new meaning and was used to designate "a novel social and cultural constellation, the identity of those from a variety of backgrounds but with a shared disposition toward a certain style of expression in the arts as well as quotidian life."[168]

---

[165] Gölpınarlı, Sungurlu, *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakıbı*, pp. 35, 36, 38.

[166] Ibid., p. 53.

[167] Ibid., p. 58.

[168] Kafadar, "A Rome of One's own," p.15; On the *Rumi* in style in Ottoman architecture see "Gülru Necipoğlu, "Challenging the Past: Sinan and the Competitive Discourse of Early Modern Islamic Architecture," *Muqarnas* 10 (1993), pp. 169-180;

Conclusion

As the *martyria* reflect a Byzantine identity defined by the Constantinopolitan elite, the *menakıbname*s and the heroic epics reflect an identity defined by certain groups within the various Turco-Muslim political entities or societies. These groups were the *gazi*s or *gazi*-dervishes fighting on the frontiers to include the House of infidels into the House of Islam, some "rural" dervishes named as *abdal*s and some "urban" dervishes like Mevlana . These sources do not provide information on how other various groups within the Turco-Muslim societies defined themselves and the "other" and their attitudes towards this "other." Within the limits of these sources, however, we can say that the interaction between the heroes of these texts and the "other" was more dense in the frontier areas and in the cities, which resulted in changing sides, conversions and fluidity of the identities.

Two major terms for delineating the "self" from the "other" emerge from the analysis of the hagiographic and epic sources. The first one is *kafir* and the second one is *Rum*. The first one seems to be loaded with religious meaning and the other with ethnic and cultural meanings. But who really was *kafir* and who was Rum? As it is reflected in the above-analyzed sources, the term *kafir* (infidel) seems on the surface to be related with being non-Muslim therefore a change in faith was necessary to pass from one group to another. Upon change of faith, however, there

---

Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu, "In the Image of Rum: Ottoman Architectural Patronage in Sixteenth- Century Aleppo and Damascus," *Muqarnas* 16 (1999), pp. 70-95; Tülay Artan, "Questions of Ottoman Identity and Architectural History," in *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, ed. Dana Arnold, Elvan Altan Ergut, Belgin Turan Özkaya (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 85-109.

seems to be an immediate submission to the group where the religious meaning of this submission was expected to be discovered over time. The change of faith was not, however, the only way of becoming a member of the group. Being loyal to the cause of a *gazi* or recognizing the superiority of a Muslim military, political or spiritual leader was also considered to be a submission and the person who recognized this superiority was no longer considered to be an infidel. I think that conversion was not considered to be only an act of changing faith and the question who the *kafir* was could not (cannot) be easily answered without knowing the political or military or spiritual submission of that individual or group. The borders between the religious "other," *kafir,* and the "self," Muslim, can become quite indistinct and quite blurring for the modern reader.

The *Müslümanlar* or *Islam leşkeri* or *gazi*s in these texts do not only signify Melik Danişmend, Sarı Saltuk or Umur Beg and their Turco-Muslim compagnons but also Artuhi, Efromiya, Serkis, Alyon-ı Rumi, Ayadimitri, Ayamuson and Mumcila. When the Turcoman emirs such as the Danişmendids used Christian, Byzantine and Arabo-Persian elements on their coins, they probably desired simply to create a coin which could be meaningful for all the members of their group, not only for Süleyman bin Numan, Eyyüb bin Yunus and Osman bin Apiyya but also for Artuhi, Efromiya and Serkis.

While the religious "other" was allowed rather easily to pass over to the side of the "self", the "self" was also transformed due to this fluidity. The heroes of the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics first began to adopt the territorial component of the Roman/Byzantine identity of the "other" and overtime they transformed the meaning of this identity. This transformed *Rumi* identity was not like the Byzantine/Roman identity. It was neither a signifier for a state and nor a part of the official discourse and ideology as in the case of Byzantine/Roman identity. It was not an operational category but still an identity marker used for a group of people in the Ottoman society up until the end of the seventeenth century.

I think that not drawing strict borders for "self" enabled the "other" to pass easily over these borders and thus created fluidity between the identities. The main reason behind this attitude was probably the universalizing impulse of the *gazi*s and some dervishes striving to bring people under the umbrella of Islam. Unlike the exclusive Byzantine universalizing impulse seen in most of the *martyria* in which Byzantine emperor and patriarch in Constantinople is perceived as the unique source and driving force of the Byzantine universalist ideology, in the *menakıbname*s and heroic epics, what one sees a quite inclusive universalism which does not take its impetus from any central authority or institution. It seems to work in a very decentralized fashion.

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSION

The foregoing study of late Byzantine *martyria* and Turco-Muslim hagiographical and epic sources undertaken in order to shed light on a relatively neglected aspect of the transformation of Anatolia and the Balkans between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries, has revealed that major changes occurred during this period in Byzantine identity as defined by the Constantinopolitan elites and by the Turco-Muslim groups who had been in close contact with the Byzantines since the eleventh century.

The analysis of the authors of the *martyria* and the authorial intentions has shown that in most of the cases the people living in the same society with the martyrs were not the authors. These texts were rather written by people belonging to the religious and the civilian members of the Constantinopolitan elite. In the eyes of these authors, what made a martyr a Byzantine and not a *zımmi* under Muslim rule or not the subject of Latin rule was the Byzantine universal ideology. First during the reign of the Byzantine emperor Andronikos II and then under the hesychasts patriarchs, through the creation of new martyrs and the use of their authority, a conscious effort was made to re-assert the Byzantine universal and ecumenical claim over all Orthodox Christians as the legitimacy of this claim had been damaged after 1204.

The *martyria* written by the members of the Constantinopolitan elite as well as those written by individual authors reflect the importance of Constantinople, the Byzantine emperor and the patriarch ruling from

Constantinople within the Byzantine universalist ideology. By contrast, in the *martyria* written by an author who was from an autonomous Byzantine city such as Philadelphia or dealing with a post-Byzantine martyrdom case, the importance attributed to Constantinople disappears. One can also observe certain ruptures and deviations from the major doctrines of the Byzantine Church in these "non-Constantinopolitan" *martyria*.

In terms of the transformation of Byzantine identity, the *martyria* of the period between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries reflect that the definition of Byzantine identity changed during this period. While during the years of "Byzantine exile in Nicaea", an emphasis had been placed on the Hellenic identity, which helped to differentiate the Byzantines from the Latins, in late Byzantine identity as it is reflected in the *martyria* as well as in other late Byzantine sources, the Christian component became more prominent.

The Byzantines are defined in the *martyria* as well as in some other late Byzantine sources mostly as Christians whose identity was thought to be hereditary and hence closely related with family/race (*genos*) and the native lands (*patris*). The term Christian, as we have seen, was utilized synonymously with the term Roman and it began to signify people who were the bearers of the territorial, cultural, political and religious coordinates of being Roman/Byzantine. Conversion to Orthodox Christianity and changing one's outlook were not enough to be considered a true Christian/Roman if one was from a different *ethnos*.

Again if one was not loyal to the Emperor ruling in Constantinople, he was not considered to be a Christian/Roman.

This exclusive identity formation was probably related with the diminishing of the group size due to constant raids, incursions and conquest, which threatened the physical boundaries of the Byzantine territories. Byzantine universalism was thus an exclusive universalism which aimed at not losing its group members on the former Byzantine lands. In the context of Byzantine cultural and religious expansion in eastern Europe, as we have seen in the case of the Lithuanian martyrs, this exclusive conception did not permit newly-converts to have full membership in the group.

The outsiders who occupied the physical and symbolic universe of the Byzantines were the Latins and Turco-Muslim groups of whom the later represented the perfect "other" for the Byzantines according to the *martyria.* The threats felt by the Byzantines against their groups were different under the Latin and Muslim rule. The major threat under Latin rule was felt in the monastic and religious circles due to the Catholic doctrines imposed on the clergy and on the monks by the Catholic religious authorities. Within these circles, the ones threatened the most were the hesychast monks. On the other hand, the major threats felt by the Byzantines under the Turco-Muslim groups were enslavement due to the incursions and raids, the siege of the cities and the pressure of the Muslims over the Christians in the cities, especially in the public areas where there was more interaction between the different groups. The

Byzantines who were mostly affected by these threats under Turco-Muslim rule were the common people.

The cause of the martyrdom under the Muslim rule was not always conversion and apostasy. Only two martyrdom cases were related with this issue and in both of the cases conversion was the outcome of enslavement which took place at a young age during raids and incursions. Other causes of martyrdom were the differences between Islamic and Christian thought on the nature of Christ and on fasting. Arguments between the martyrs and the Muslim commoners on such differences ended up with the martyrs insulting Islam and Mohammed which was in fact considered to be a breech of the contract between the Muslims and non-Muslims according to the Islamic law.

While under Latin rule Latin monks and clergy seemed to be responsible for imposing the Latin doctrines, under Turco-Muslim rule, one does not see Muslim religious authorities or dervishes or Sufi brotherhoods but rather the Muslim community as a group controlling the implementation of Islamic principles.

If the dervishes, whom modern historiography has considered to be the major actors in the conversion of the Christians, are not visible in the *martyria*, they are nonetheless visible in Turco-Muslim hagiographic and epic sources. The analysis of the *menakıbname*s and the heroic epics based on their categorization in terms of the settings in which the activities of the dervishes took place has shown that while in the frontier/*gaza* narratives and urban narratives there is plenty of interaction between the Muslims and non-Muslims, in the rural narratives the non-

Muslims are almost inexistent. Frontiers and the cities are also the settings for most of the conversion narratives. In the *menakıbnames* and of heroic epics, which are classified as conquest narratives, the authors' aim is to remind the central authorities of how *gazi*-dervish circles played the major role in turning the Abode of the infidels into the Abode of Islam. In the urban narrative, *Menakıbü'l Arifin*, the aim is to show the role of Mevlana and his descendants in calming down the possible tension between the different social groups in the society. In the rural narratives, the major concerns of the dervishes were to obtain the favor of the local authorities, to impose their own authority over the cults of the previously installed dervishes and/or to point out their superior position in the hierarchy of the *veli*s.

There is a certain pattern of conversion in all the frontier/*gaza* narratives and in the few rural narratives where the conversion always takes place in the *darü'l harb / darü'l küfr* (Abode of war / Abode of infidels). All conversion stories in these texts are related with the conquest of an area and with its transfer from *darü'l küfr* to *darü'l Islam* (Abode of Islam). This transfer can be considered as an entrance point, an act for the Islamization of space. *Menakıbü'l Arifin* is the only text where the conversion of people of the Book takes place within the Abode of Islam. According to the Islamic law, once under Muslim rule people of the Book are considered to have concluded a pact, a contract with the conquerors wherefore they cannot be forced to convert and their status must be respected. Thus Mevlana's method of gaining followers with or without converting was through persuasion and through protection and support of individuals in the lower strata of the society.

Both *martyria* and the *menakıbname*s point to the frontiers and cities as the major social spaces of interaction, conversion and conflict. The absence of martyrdom cases in the rural areas and the absence of Christians in the *menakıbname*s where the activities of the dervishes took place in rural areas may be due to the fact that the major social and cultural transformation was taking place in the frontier regions and in the cities between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. Thus these were the areas where the Byzantines felt most threatened.

Another point of intersection between the *martyria* and the *menakıbname*s is the significant role attributed to the city of Adrianople/Edirne. Out of six martyrdom cases under Muslim rule, three are related with this city. Theodore the Younger was captured from Adrianople. George, a soldier from Sofia was martyred in Adrianople and Michael Mauroeides fell into the plot of the ones who were jealous of his fame, prosperity and good relations with court circles in Edirne. Edirne also has a very significant place in the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources and in the heroic epics, especially in the ones related with the *gazi*-dervish circles, who played a major role in the conquest of the Balkans. Edirne comes out as an important center of opposition, authority and power in these narratives. Although the evidence is not very strong, it also seems to have been a city where "Orthodox" Muslims had certain power. In the *martyrion* on George of Adrianople, we saw that the *tasimanioi*, who came from the East, demanded the application of *şeriat* against the decision of the grand vizier. In the *Vilayetname* of Otman Baba, the administrators of the city as well as the religious authorities were against Otman Baba, refused to accept his *vilayet* and sent their complaints to the Sultan in Istanbul. Otman Baba himself called Edirne with certain contempt the "vile world".

The analysis of the religious identification of "self" and "other" reveals that for the authors of these *menakıbname*s and heroic epics change of faith was not perceived as the unique way of permitting the "other" into their group. The key term in defining the "other" in these texts is *kafir* (infidel). Political loyalty to a cause and submission to the superiority of a military or a spiritual leader without changing one's faith can allow one to be one of "us".

The analysis of cultural and ethnic identifications in these sources reveals the existence of two visible identities, that of Turk and that of Rum/*Rumi*. A certain kind of transformation in the meaning of Turkish identity can be perceived. While the term Turk is used mainly as an antonym of being urban in the fourteenth-century texts, in the fifteenth-century texts its meaning is mostly linguistic. In some texts it is used interchangeably for being Muslim. When the term is used by the "others" such as Franks it has an ethnic connotation.

The Rum/*Rumi* identification in the fourteenth-century texts is utilized for the Greek-speaking Christians. In some of the texts this Rum identification contains all the components of Roman/Byzantine identity; political, territorial, cultural and religious. In these texts, the Rum attribute is used for the Muslims living in former Byzantine lands reflecting the territorial aspect of their identity. In the fifteenth-century texts, Turkish-speaking Muslims are identified as *Rumi*s and this identification has cultural as well as territorial components. It is mainly used to differentiate the Turkish-speaking Muslims from other Muslims such as Persians and Arabs and from other Turkish groups such as Timurids. This *Rumi* identity however was not part of an official ideology or an operational category as in the case of the Byzantine Roman identity.

The *menakıbname*s and the heroic epics reflect an inclusive identity formation during which "self" as well as "other" was transformed. The impetus behind this attitude was the universalizing impulse. Contrary to the exclusive Byzantine universal ideology, which was dictated from a center whose values, doctrines and traditions were well- defined, this was an extremely inclusive universal ideology which was not dictated from any central authority. It emphasized the importance of loyalty to the cause and the belief in essence rather than the external demonstration of religion.

All these aspects found in the Turco-Muslim hagiographical sources and epics hint to a dialectic formation of identity where the new comers were themselves being transformed while transforming their environment. With the adaptive reuse of symbols, figures, monuments and terminology, the conquerors redefined their self-identity as well as the identity of the conquered.

ABBREVIATIONS

AS	*Acta Sanctorum*, 71 vols. (Paris, 1863-1940)
BF	*Byzantinische Forschungen*
BHG	*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*^{3}, ed. F. Halkin, 3 vols. in 1 pt. (Brussels, 1957)
BHG Auct	*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, ed. F. Halkin, vol. 4, *Auctarium* (Brussels, 1969)
BHG Nov. Auct	*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, ed. F. Halkin, vol. 5, *Novum Auctarium* (Brussels, 1984)
BMGS	*Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
EI^2	*The Encyclopedia of Islam*^{2}, vols.1- (Leiden, London, 1960-)
JÖB	*Jahrbuch des Österreichischen Byzantinistik* (before 1969, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*)
MM	F. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, 6 vols. (Vienna, 1860-90)
ODB	*The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols. (New York, Oxford, 1991)
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completes, Series graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 161 vols. in 166 pts. (Paris, 1857-66)
PLP	*Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, vol. 1- (Vienna, 1976-)
REB	*Revue des études Byzantines*
RegPatr	*Les régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, ed. V. Grumel, V. Laurent, J. Darrouzès, 2 vols. in 8 pts. (Paris, 1932-79)

Sathas, MB	K.N. Sathas, *Mesaionike Bibliotheke,* 7 vols. (Athens-Venice-Paris, 1872-94; rp. Hildesheim 1972)
SF	*Südost-Forschungen*
TIB	*Tabula Imperii Byzantini,* ed. H. Hunger (Vienna, 1976-)
TM	*Travaux et mémoires*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

" De B. Andrea Chio. Martyre Constantinopoli Sub Turcis, " *AS*, Mai VII (1738), pp.185-188.

Κύπρια Μηναία (Leukosia: np., 2000).

Νέον Λειμωνάριον (Venice, 1819).

Adel Th. Khoury (ed. & tr.). *De la vérité de la foi des chrétiens*, Corpus Islamo-Christianum (Altenberge: CIS Verlag, 1987).

Akalın, Şükrü H. (ed.). *Saltuk-name*, 3 vols. (Ankara : Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1988-90).

Atsız, Nihal (ed.). *Osmanlı Tarihleri* (Istanbul : Türkiye Yayınevi, 1949).

Büttner-Wobst, T. (ed.). *Ioannes Zonaras. Epitomae Historiarum* (Bonn, 1897).

Chionides, Georgios X. (ed.). *Ἀνέκδοτος ἀκολουθία τοῦ νεόμαρτυρος Ἀρσενίου μητροπολίτου Βεροίας (14ος ἢ 15ος αἰ.)* (Thessalonike : Ekdosis tes metropoleos Veroias, 1971), pp. 7-32.

Davidov, Angel Asev and Rusev, Peno (ed. & tr.). *Gregoire Camblak en Roumanie et dans l'ancienne littérature roumaine* (in Bulgarian) (Sofia : Izdvona Bulgarskata akademiiano naukite, 1966).

Darrouzes Jean (ed.). *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, (Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1981).

Dedes, Yorgos (tr.). *Battalname*, 2 vols (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1996).

Delehaye, Hippolyte (ed.). " Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le jeune, " in *Mélanges offerts à M.G. Schlumberger*, ed. Adrien Blanchet and Gabriel Millet, vol. 1 (Paris : P. Geuthner, 1924), pp. 208-211.

Doukakis, K. CH. (ed.). *Μέγας Συναξαριστὴς πάντων τῶν ἁγίων*, 12 vols. (Athens: np., 1889-96).

Dyobounites, K.I. (ed.). "*Ὁ Ἀθηνῶν Ἄνθιμος καὶ Πρόεδρος Κρήτης ὁ ὁμοληγητής*," *Epeteris Buzantion Spoudon* 9 (1932), pp. 47-79.

Erünsal, Ismail E. & Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar (eds.). *Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye fi Menasıbu'l Ünsiyye. Baba Ilyas-i Horasani ve Sülalesinin Menkabevi Tarihi* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995).

Eustratiades, Leontopoleos Sophroniou (ed.). " *῾Ο Νεομάρτυς Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ ᾽Αδριανουπολίτης,* " *Thrakika* 10 (1938), pp. 7-28.

________________________________. *῾Αγιολόγιον τῆς ὀρθόδοξου ἐκκλησίας,* (Athens: np., nd.).

Failler, Albert (tr.). *Relations historiques de Georges Pachymérès*, 7 vols, (Paris: Institut français d'études Byzantines, 1984-2004).

Fedalto, Giorgio (ed.). *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis 1. Patriarchatus Constantinopolitanus,* vol. 1 (Padova: Messaggero, 1988).

Gedeon, Manuel (ed.). "Εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ ἐνδόξους νεοφανεῖς μάρτυρας ᾽Αντώνιον, ᾽Ιωάννην καὶ Εὐστάθιον τοὺς Ρώσσους," in ᾽Αρχεῖον ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας, vol. 1 (Constantinople: np., 1911), pp. 152-174.

Gibb, H.A.R., Sanguinetti, B.R. and Defrémery, C. (tr.). *The Travels of Ibn Battuta : A.D. 1325-1354*, vol. 2 (Cambridge : CUP for the Hakluyt Society, 1962).

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik (ed.), *Dedem Korkudun Kitabı* (Istanbul: Kabalcı, 2007).

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki (ed.), *Manakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. Vilayetname* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1958).

____________________." Otman Baba Vilayet-namesi, " in *In Memoriam Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı Hatıra Sayısı*, ed. Ahmet T. Kut & Günay Kut (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1995), pp. LVII-CV.

_____________, Sungurbey, Ismet. *Simavna Kadısıoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Menakıbı* (Istanbul : Eti, 1967).

Gregoras, Nikephoros. *Byzantina Historia*, 2 vols (Bonn: Bonnae Weber, 1829-30).

Gross, Erich (ed. & tr.). *Das Vilajet-name des Haggi Bektasch. Ein Türkisches Derwischenvangelium* (Leipzig : Mayer & Müller, 1927).

Grumel, V. & Laurent, V. & Darrouzès, J. (eds.). *Les régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople,* ed., 2 vols. in 8 pts. (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1932-79).

Güzel, Abdurahman (ed.). *Abdal Musa Velayetnamesi* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999).

Halkin, François (ed.). " L'Éloge du néomartyr Nicétas par Théodore Mouzalon. BHG 2302," in *Hagiographica inedita decem*, Corpus Christianorum 21 (Turnhout : Brespols, 1989), pp. 127-154.

Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra (ed.). *The Synaxarion. The Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church* (Athens : np., 2008).

Huart, Clément (ed. and tr.). *Les Saints des derviches tourneurs* , 2 vols. (Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1918).

İz, Fahir and Tekin, Gönül Alpay (eds.). *Saltukname. Ebu'l Hayr Rumi'nin sözlü rivayetlerden topladığı Sarı Saltuk menakıbı*, 7 vols. (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1974-84).

Jeffreys, Elizabeth (tr.). *Digenis Akritis, the Grottaferrata and Escorial versions* (Cambridge : Cambridge University, 1998).

Jouanno, Corinne (tr.). *Digénis Akritas, le héros des frontières. Une épopée byzantine* (Turnhout : Brepols, 1998).

Kılıç, Filiz, Arslan, Mustafa and Bülbül, Tuncay (eds.). *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi (Tenkitli Metin)* (Ankara : np., 2007).

Koca, Şevki (ed.). *Odman Baba Vilayetnamesi. Vilayetname-i Sahi Göçek Abdal* (n.p., 2002).

Leib, Bernard (ed.). *Anne Comnène. Alexiade (Régne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène 1081-1118)*, 3 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1945-1967).

Lewis, Geoffrey (tr.). *Book of Dede Korkut* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972).

Macrides, Ruth (tr.). *George Akropolites: The History* (New York: Oxford University, 2007).

Magoulias, Harry J. (tr.). *Historia Turco-Byzantina. Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks* (Detroit : Wayne State University, 1975).

Mavrogordato, John (tr.). *Digenes Akrites, Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford : Clarendon, 1956).

Melikoff-Sayar, Irène (tr.). *Le destan d'Umur Pacha (Düsturname-i Enveri).Texte, traduction et notes* (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1954).
_______________. *La Geste de Melik Danişmend. Étude critique du Danişmendname*, 2 vols, (Paris : Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1960).
_______________. *Abu Muslim, le porte-hache du Khorasan, dans la tradition épique turco-iranienne* (Paris : Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962).

Metochites, Theodore ." Oratio de S. Michaele Martyre," *AS*, Nov. IV (1925), pp. 670-78.

Miklosich, F. and Müller, J. (ed.) *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, 6 vols. (Vienna,1860-90).

Nicoloudis, Nicolaos (ed.). *Laonikos Chalkokondyles. A Translation and Commentary of the "Demonstrations of Histories" (Books I-III)* (Athens: Historical publications St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996).

Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Neon Martyrologion* (Athens : Ekdotikos oikos Aster, 1961).

Noyan, Bedri (ed.). *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli Sultan) Vilayetnamesi* (Ankara : Ayyıldız Yayınları, 1995).

Oikonomides, Nicolas (ed.). " 'Ακολουθία τοῦ ῾Αγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Νέου," *Neon Athenaion* 1 (Athens, 1965), pp. 205-221.

Öztürk, Mürsel (tr.). *Kerimüddin Mahmud-i Aksarayi. Müsameretü'l-Ahbar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).
_______________. *El Evamirü'l-ala'iye fi'l-umuri'l-ala'iye* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996).

Özbayoğlu, Erendiz (tr.). *Bir keşişin anılarında Tatarlar ve Anadolu: 1245-1248* (Antalya: Doğu Akdeniz Kültür ve Tarih Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2006).

Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.), A. " Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ῾Ιστορίαν Τραπεζοῦντος, " *Vizvrem* 12 (1906), pp. 132-138.

Paschos, P. B. (ed.). *Νέον Μαρτυρολόγιον. ῏Ητοι Μαρτυρία τῶν Νεοφανῶν Μαρτύρων τῶν μετά τὴν ῞αλωσίν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατά διαφόρους καιροὺς καὶ τόπους μαρτυρησάντων* (Athens: np., 1961).

Patrinelis, Christos G. (ed.). " Μία ἀνέκδοτη διήγηση γιὰ τὸν ῞αγνωστο Νεομάρτυρα Γεώργιο (d.1437), " *Orthodoxos Parousia* 1 (1964), pp. 64-72.

Perantones, J.M. (ed.). *Λεξικὸν νεομαρτύρων* (Athens: np., 1972).

Richard, Jean. (ed.) *Simon de Saint Quentin. Historia Tartarorum*, tr. and ed. (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1965).

Sarou, Emilia (ed.). *Βίος Ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου Ἀργέντη τοῦ Χίου καὶ ἀκολουθία αὐτοῦ πονηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκονόμου Μάρκου Ἁγ. Βασιλάκη μετὰ προλόγου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀθηνῶν κ. Χρυσοστόμου* (Athens : Hestia, 1935).

Sathas K.N. (ed.). " *Διήγησις τῶν ἁγίων τριῶν καὶ δέκα ὁσίων πατέρων τῶν διὰ πυρὸς τελειωθέντων παρὰ τῶν Λατίνων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Κύπρῳ ἐν τῷ 6739*" in *Sathas MB*, vol. 2 (Venice, 1873).

Schmitt, J. (ed.), *The Chronicle of Morea* (London, 1904; rp. Groningen, 1967).

Sophianou, Demetriou Z. (ed.). *Ὁ νεομάρτυρας Μιχαήλ Μαυροειδὴς ὁ Ἀδριανουπολίτης χα.1490, Ἀδριανούπολη* (Athens : np., 1984).

Süreyya, Mehmed. *Sicill-i Osmani*, 6 vols., (Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı & Tarih Vakfı, 1996).

Tschudi, Rudolf (ed. & tr.). *Das Vilajet-name des Hadschim Sultan* (Berlin :Mayer & Müller, 1914).

Tulum, Mertol (ed.). *Tarihi Metin Çalışmalarında Usul. Menakıbu'l Kudsiyye Üzerinde Bir Deneme* (Istanbul : Deniz Kitabevi, 2000).

Wallis, Ernest A. (tr.). *The chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj, the son Aaron, the Hebrew physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus: being the first part of his political history of the world* (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2003).

Yazıcı, Tahsin (ed.). Şams al-Din Ahmed Al-Aflaki Al-Arifi, *Manakıb al-Arifin*, 2 vols. (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1976).

Yıldırım, Rıza (ed.). *Seyyid Ali Sultan ve Velayetnamesi* (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007).

Yınanç, Mükrimin Halil (ed.). *Düsturname-i Enveri* (Istanbul : Istanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1928).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ahrweiler, Hélène. " L'histoire et la géographie de la région de Symrne entre les deux occupations turques (1081-1317), particulièrement au XIIIe siècle, " *TM*1 (1965), pp. 1-204.
______________." La région de Philadelphie au XIV^e siècle (1290-1390), dernier bastion de l'hellénisme en Asie Mineure, " *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 127/1 (1983), pp. 175-197.
____________. "Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner: The Case of the Nomads," in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler & Angeliki Laiou (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998), pp. 1-15.

Aigrain, René. *L'hagiographie: Ses sources, ses methodes, son histoire* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 2000).

Artan, Tülay. "Questions of Ottoman Identity and Architectural History," in *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, ed. Dana Arnold, Elvan Altan Ergut, Belgin Turan Özkaya (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 85-109.

Akın, Himmet. *Aydınoğulları Tarihi hakkında bir Araştırma* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1968).

Angelov, Dimiter. " Theodore Metochites : statesman, intellectual, poet, and patron of the arts, " in *Restoring Byzantium : the Kariye Camii in Istanbul and the Byzantine Institute restoration*, ed. Holger A. Klein (New York : Colombia University, 2004), pp. 15-22.
_________________."Byzantine Ideological Reactions to the Latin Conquest of Constantinople," in *Urbs Capta: the Fourth Crusade and its consequences* (Paris: Éditions P. Lethielleux, 2005), pp.
_________________. *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330* (New York: Cambridge University, 2007).

Angold, Michael. "Byzantine Nationalism and the Nicaean Empire," *BMGS* 1 (1975), pp. 49-71.
____________." Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile, " in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton, David Jacoby (London: F. Cass, 1989), pp. 63-86.
____________. " Autobiography & Identity. The Case of the Later Byzantine Empire," *Byzantinoslavica* 60 (1999), pp.36-59.
_______________. *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni 1081-1261* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000).

Auzépy, Marie-France. *L'Hagiographie et l'Iconoclasme byzantin. Le cas de la Vie d'Étienne le Jeune* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1999).

Balivet, Michel. " Deux partisans de la fusion religiuese des Chrétiens et des Musulmans au XV^{e} siècle : Le Turc Bedreddin de Samavna et le Grec Georges de Trebizonde, "*Byzantina* 10 (1980), pp. 363-396.

___________. "Derviches turcs en Romanie latine. Quelques remarques sur la circulation des idées au XV^{e} Siècle, " *BF* 11 (1987), pp. 239-255.

___________. *Romanie Byzantine et pays de Rum Turc. Histoire d'un espace d'imbrication gréco-turque* (Istanbul: ISIS, 1994).

___________. " Le Saint turc chez les infidèles : Thème hagiographique ou péripétie historique de l'Islamisation du Sud-Est Européen ? " in *Saints Orientaux*, ed. Denis Aigle (Paris : De Boccard, 1995), pp. 211-223.

_______________. *Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans ottomans. Vie du Cheikh Bedreddin le Hallaj des Turcs (1358/9-1416)* (Istanbul : ISIS, 1995).

___________. *Pour une concorde Islamo-chrétienne. Démarches byzantines et latines à la fin du moyen-âge (de Nicolas de Cues à Georges de Trébizonde)* (Rome : Pontificio Istituto di studi arabi e d'islamistica, 1997).

Barkan, Ömer Lütfü. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir Iskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942), pp. 235-259.

Barker, Ernest. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957)

Barth, Fredrik. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries : The Social Organisation of Culture Difference* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969).

Baronas, Darius. " The Three Martyrs of Vilnius. A Fourteenth-Century Martyrdom and Its Documentary Sources, " *Analecta Bollandiana* 122 (2004), pp. 83-134.

Bazzani, Marina. " Theodore Metochites, a Byzantine humanist, " *Byzantion* 76 (2006), pp. 32-52.

Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène. "La conquête d'Andrinople par les Turcs: La pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomans," *TM* 1 (1965), pp. 439-461.

____________________." 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)*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon : University of Crete, 1996), pp. 45-63.

____________________." La " Révolte " des Baba'i en 1240, visait-elle vraiment le renversement du pouvoir seldjoukide ? " *Turcica* 30 (1998), pp. 99-117.

Birge, John Kingsley. *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London : Hartford Seminary Press, 1937).

Brand, Charles M. "The Turkish Element in Byzantium, 11th-12th centuries," *DOP* 43 (1989), pp. 1-25.

Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints.Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981).
__________. *Society and Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California, 1982).

Browning, Robert. *History, Language and Literacy in the Byzantine World* (Northampton: Variorum, 1989).

Brubaker, Leslie and Haldon John. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca.680-850). The Sources* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).

Bryer, Anthony. "A Byzantine Family: the Gabrades," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1970), pp. 164-87.
___________. "Greeks and Turkmens: The Pontic Exception," *DOP* 29 (1975), pp. 113-49.
____________.*The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*, (Aldershot: Variorum,1980).
___________ and Windfield, David. *The Byzantine Monuments and the Topography of Pontos,* 2 vols (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1985).
_____________."Rural Society in Matzouka," in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society. Papers Given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982,* ed. Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Center for Byzantine studies, 1986), pp. 23-35.
_______________."The Structure of the Late Byzantine Town: Diokismos and the Mesoi," in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society. Papers Given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982,* ed. Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Center for Byzantine studies, 1986), pp.263-279.
____________. *Peoples and Settlement in Anatolia and the Caucasus, 800-1900*, (Aldershot: Variorum, 1988).
____________. "The Late Byzantine Identity," in *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence. XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies. University of Copenhagen, 18-24 August, 1996. Major Papers*, ed. Karsten Fledelius & Peter Schreiner (Copenhagen: Eventus, 1996), pp. 49-50.
____________. Dunn, Archibald and Nesbitt, John W. "Theodore Gabras, Duke of Chaldia (1098) and the Gabrades: Portraits, Sites and Seals," in *Byzantium State and Society. In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, ed. Anna Avramea, Angeliki Laiou, Euangelos Chrysos (Athens: Ethniko Hidryma Ereunon, 2003), pp. 51-71.

Bulliet, Richard. "Conversion Stories in Early Islam," in *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. M. Gervers and R.J. Bikhazi (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1990), pp. 123-133.

Cahen, Claude. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey. A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History, c.1071-1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1968).

_____________. " Baba Ishaq, Baba Ilyas, Hadjdji Bektach et quelques autres," *Turcica* 1 (1970), pp. 53-64.

Canard, Marius. " Le Traité de 1281 entre Michael Paléologue et le Sultan Qala'un, " *Byzantion* 10 (1935), pp. 669-80.

Cazacu, Matei. " Saint Jean le Nouveau, son martyre, ses reliques et leur translation à Suceava (1415), " in *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, ed. Petre Guran (Bucarest : New Europe College, 2001), pp. 137-158.

Çelebi, Asaf Halet. *Mevlana ve Mevlevilik* (Istanbul : Turgut Atasoy ve Ortağı, 1957).

Charanis, Peter. "Ethnic Changes in Seventh Century Byzantium," *DOP* 13 (1959), pp. 28-36.

Cheynet, Jean-Claude. " Philadelphie, un quart de siècle de dissidence, 1182-1206, " in *Philadelphie et autres études* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1984), pp. 39-54.

____________________.“Du prénom au patronyme: les étrangers à Byzance (X^e et XII^e siècles)," in *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography*, ed. Nicolas Oikonomides (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1987), pp. 57-66.

__________________. *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963-1210)* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1990).

Cohen, Anthony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (London: Tavistock, 1985).

Constantelos, Demetrios J. " The Neomartyrs as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 23/3-4 (1978), pp. 231-234.

__________________. " Mysticism and Social Involvement in the Later Byzantine Church : Theoleptos of Philadelphia-A Case Study, " *Byzantine Studies-Études byzantines* 6 (1979), pp. 83-94.

Cornell, Vincent J. *Realm of the Saint. Power and Authority in Moroccan Sufism* (Austin: University of Texas, 1998).

Corrigan, Kathleen A. *Visual Polemics in the ninth-century Byzantine Psalters* (New York: Cambridge University 1992).

Coureas, Nikolaos. *The Latin Church in Cyprus 1195-1312* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997).

Çapa, Halil Erdem. " Contextualizing Şeyh Bedreddin : Notes on Halil b. Ismail's Menakıb-ı Şeyh Bedreddin b. Israil" in *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlardan Osmanlıya,* ed. Günay Kut and Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz (Istanbul : Simurg, 2005), pp.

Dalleggio d'Alesso, E. " Un néo-martyr catholique à Constantinople André de Chio (1465), " *Memorial Louis Petit* (1948), pp. 64-77.

Dagron, Gilbert. "Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du X^{e} et XI^{e} siècle: l'immigration syrienne," *TM* 6 (1976), pp. 177-216.
____________. "Lawful Society and Legitimate Power: " "Εννομος πολιτεία, "εννομος ἀρχή," in *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth-Twelfth Centuries*, ed. Angeliki Laiou & Dieter Simon (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1994), pp. 27-51.
____________. *Empereur et prêtre: Étude sur le "césaropapisme " byzantin* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996).
____________. *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, tr. J. Birrell(New York: Cambridge University, 2003).

Darrouzès, Jean. *Recherches sur les Offikia de l'Église byzantine* (Paris : Institut français d'études byzantines, 1970).
____________. *Le régistre synodal du patriarcat byzantin au XIVe siècle : étude paléographique et diplomatique* (Paris : Institut français d'études byzantines, 1971).

Decei, Aurel. " Le problème de la colonisation des Turcs seljoukides dans la Dobrogea au XIII^{e} siècle, " *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10-11 (1968), pp. 85-111.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1933)
______________. *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1934).
______________. *Les Légendes hagiographiques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1955).
______________. *Les Passions des Martyrs et les genres littéraires* (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1966).
______________. "Greek Neo-Martyrs," *Subsidia Hagiographica* 42 (1966), pp. 246-55.
______________. *Les Légendes grecques des saints militaires* (New York: Arno Press, 1975).
______________. *L'ancienne hagiographie Byzantine: les sources, les*

premiers modèles, la formation des genres (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1991).

Delilbaşı, Melek. "Selanik ve Yanya'da Osmanlı Egemenliğinin Kurulması," *Belleten* 51/199 (Ankara, 1987), pp. 75-106.

Delooz, Pierre. *Sociologie et Canonisation* (Liège: Faculté de Droit Liège, 1969).

Diehl, Charles. *Byzance: grandeur et décadence* (Paris: E. Flammarion, 1919).

Ducellier, Alain. "Mentalité historique et réalités politiques: L'Islam et les Musulmans vus par les Byzantins du XIII^{ème} siècle," *BF* 4 (1972), pp. 31-63.
____________."L'Islam et les Musulmans vus de Byzance au XIV^e siècle," *Byzantina* 12 (Thessalonica, 1983), pp. 95-134.

Eastmond, Antony. " Art and Regional Identity in the Orthodox World after the Fourth Crusade, " *Speculum* 78/3 (2003), pp. 707-49.
______________. *Art and Identity in the Thirteenth-Century Byzantium. Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2004).

Edbury, Peter W. *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991).

Ehrenkreutz, Andrew. " Strategic Implications of the Slave Trade between Genoa and Mamluk Egypt in the Second Half of the Thirteenth century, " in *The Islamic Middle East. Studies in economic and social history,* ed. Abraham L. Udovitch (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1981), pp. 336-37.

Eyice, Semavi. " Çorum'un Mecidözü'nde Aşık Paşa oğlu Elvan Çelebi Zaviyesi, " *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 15 (1969), pp. 211-46.

Failler, Albert. " Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère, " *REB* 39 (1981), pp. 150-55.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. " Agricultural Activities in a Bektashi Center : The Tekke of Kizil Deli, 1750-1830, " *SF* 35 (1976), pp. 69-96.

Featherstone, Jeffrey M. *Theodore Metochites's poems "To himself"* (Vienna : Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000).

Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire. The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1986).

Flusin, Bernard. " Martyrs," in *Late Antiquity. A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G.W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, Oleg Grabar (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2000), pp. 567-8.

Galatariotou, Catia. " Structural Oppositions in the Grottaferrata Digenes Akrites, " *BMGS* 11 (1987), pp. 29-68.

______________. *The Making of a Saint. The Life, Times and Sanctification of Neophytos the Recluse* (New York: Cambridge University, 2004).

Gibbons, Herbert Adams. *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1916).

Gill, Joseph. *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1961).

_________." The tribulations of the Greek Church in Cyprus, " *BF* 5 (1977), pp. 73-93.

__________. " Eleven Emperors of Byzantium seek Union with the Church of Rome, " *Eastern Churches Review 9* (1977), pp. 65-74.

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. " Şeyh Bedreddin'in Babası Kadı mı idi ? " *Tarih ve Toplum* 2 (1984), pp. 96-8.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Mevlana Celaleddin. Mektuplar* (Istanbul: Inkilap ve Aka, 1963)

________________. *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1983).

________________. *Mevlana Celaleddin : hayatı, felsefesi, eserleri eserlerinden seçmeler* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1985).

________________. *Türkiye'de Mezhepler ve Tarikatler* (Istanbul : Inkilap, 1997).

Görkay, Zeynep Yürekli. *Legend and Architecture in the Ottoman Empire: The Shrines of Seyyid Gazi and Hacı Bektaş* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2005).

__________________." Şeyh Bedreddin ve Ecinniler : Alışılmışın ve Çalışılmışın Dışında bir Menakıbname, " in *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlardan Osmanlıya,* ed. Günay Kut and Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz (Istanbul : Simurg, 2005), pp. 721-729.

Gradeva, Rozitsa. *Rumeli under the Ottomans, 15th-18th Centuries: Institutions and Communities* (Istanbul: ISIS, 2004).

Guilland, Rodolphe. *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1967).

_____________. " Les Logothètes. Etudes sur l'histoire administrative de l'Empire byzantin," *REB* 29 (1971), pp. 100-110.

Haldon, John. *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World (565-1204)* (London: UCL Press, 1999).

Halkin, François. *Martyrs grecs II^e-VIII^e siècle* (London: Variorum, 1974).

Harris, Jonathan. "Common Language and the Common Good: Aspects of Identity among Byzantine émigrés in Renaissance Italy," in *Crossing Boundaries. Issues of Cultural and Individual Identity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Sally McKee (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), pp. 189-202.

Hasluck, Frederick William. *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, ed. Margaret M. Hasluck, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929).

Hendy, Michael F. *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 1081-1261* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1969).

______________. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection IV : Alexius I to Michael VIII (1081-1261)*, 2 vols. (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1999).

Heppell, Muriel. *The Ecclesiastical Career of Gregory Camblak* (London : np., 1979).

Hero, Angela C. *The Life and Letters of Theoleptos of Philadelphia* (Massachusetts: Hellenic College Press, 1994).

Herzfeld, Michael. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece* (New York: Pella, 1986).

Heyd, Uriel. *Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).

Hopwood, Keith. "Nomads or Bandits? The Pastoralist/Sedentarist Interface in Anatolia," in *Manzikert to Lepanto. The Byzantine World and the Turks 1071-1571. Papers given at the Nineteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1985*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Michael Ursinus (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1991), pp. 179-193.

İnalcık, Halil. "Timariotes chrétiens en Albanie au XV^e siècle d'après un registre de timars ottoman," *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchives* 4 (1952), pp. 118-138.

______________."Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954), pp.104-29.

______________. *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954, rp. 1995), pp. 137-184.

_______________. and Robert Anhegger, *Kanunname-i Sultani ber* *muceni Örf-i Osmani: II.Mehmed ve II.Beyazıd devirlerine ait Yasakname ve Kanunnameler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1956).

____________.“ Edirne’nin Fethi (1361), ” in *Edirne. Edirne’nin 600. Fethi Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965), pp. 137-59.

____________.“The Policy of Mehmed II towards the Greek population of Istanbul and the Byzantine buildings of the city,” *DOP* 23-24 (1969-1970), pp. 231-41.

____________. *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1987).

____________. “Greeks in the Ottoman Economy and Finances 1453-1500,” in *To Hellenikon. Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis*, vol.2, ed. Jelisaveta S. Allen, Christos P. Ioannides, John Springer Langdon and Stephen W. Reinert (New Rochelle: Artistide D. Caratzas, 1993), pp. 307-319.

____________. “ Dervish and Sultan: an Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilayetnamesi,” in idem *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1993), pp. 19-36.

____________. *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600* (London: Phoenix, 1995).

Iorga, Nicolae. *Byzance après Byzance: continuation de l’histoire de la vie Byzantine* (Bucharest: L’Institut des études Byzantines, 1935).

Jacoby, David. “ The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Collapse of the Hohenstaufen Power in the Levant, ” *DOP* 40 (1986), pp. 83-101.

______________.“ Byzantine Traders in Mamluk Egypt, ” in *Byzantium State and Society in Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, ed. Anna Avramea, Angeliki Laiou, E. Chrysos (Athens: Ethniko Idryma Ereunon, 2003), pp. 249-267.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth. “ Akritis and Outsiders, ” in *Strangers to Themselves : The Byzantine Outsider. Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998*, ed. Dion C. Smythe (Aldershot : Ashgate, 2000), pp. 189-202.

Kafadar, Cemal. “ A Death in Venice (1575) : Anatolian Muslim Merchants Trading in the Serenissima, ” in *Raiyyet Rüsumu. Essays presented to Halil Inalcik*, in *Journal of Turkish Studies* 10 (1986), pp. 191-217.

____________. *Between Two Worlds. The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California, 1995).

____________.“A Rome of One’s own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum,” *Muqarnas* 24 (2007), pp. 7-25.

Kafescioğlu, Çiğdem. "In the Image of Rum: Ottoman Architectural Patronage in Sixteenth- Century Aleppo and Damascus," *Muqarnas* 16 (1999), pp. 70-95.

_______________. "Osmanlı Şehirciliğinde Dönüşüm ve Devamlılık: On beşinci Yüzyıl Istanbul'unda Külliye ve Mahalleler," in *550. Yılında Fetih ve Istanbul. The Conquest and Istanbul in 550th Anniversary. Istanbul, 14-15 Haziran 2003* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007), pp. 177-188.

__________________. "Rumi Kimliğin Görsel Tanımları: Osmanlı Seyahat Anlatılarında Kültürel Sınırlar ve Mimari Tarz," in *In Memoriam Şinasi Tekin. Journal of Turkish Studies* 31 (2007), ed. Y. Dağlı, Y. Dedes, S.S. Kuru, vol. 2, pp. 57-65.

Kaplan, Michel. "Les normes de la sainteté à Byzance: VI^e-XI^e siècles," *Mentalités* 4 (1990), pp. 15-34.

___________. *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VI^e au XI^e siècle: propriété et exploitation du sol* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1992).

___________. "L'hinterland religieux de Constantinople: moines et saints de banlieu d'après l'hagiographie," in *Constantinople and its hinterland*, ed. Cyril Mango & Gilbert Dagron (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995), pp. 191-205.

___________. "Le saint, l'évêque et l'empereur: l'image et le pouvoir à l'époque du second iconoclasme d'après les sources hagiographiques," in *Les images dans les sociétés médiévales: pour une histoire compareée*, ed. Jean Marie Sansterre, Jean Claude Schmitt (Rome: Institut historique belge de Rome, 1999), pp. 185-201.

__________. "L'ensevelissement des saints: rituel de création des reliques et sanctification à Byzance à travers les sources hagiographiques (V^e-XII^e siècles), *TM* 14 (2002), pp. 319-332.

__________. "Hagiographie et l'histoire de la société," in *Les Vies des saints à Byzance: Genre littéraire ou biographie historique?*, ed. Paolo Odorico & Panagiotis A. Agapitis (Paris: Centre d'études Byzantines, néo-helléniques et sud-est européennes, 2004), pp. 25-47.

__________. "Espace et le sacré à Byzance d'après les sources hagiographiques," *Spoleto* 51 (2004), pp. 1053-1115.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends. Dervish groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period* (Salt Lake City : University of Utah Press, 1994).

_______________." Yesevilik, Melâmetilik, Kalenderîlik, Vefâ'îlik ve Anadolu Tasavvufunun Kökenleri Sorunu, " in *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler. Kaynaklar-doktrin-ayin ve erkân-tarikatlar edebiyat-mimari-güzel sanatlar-modernizm*. ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2005), pp. 61-88.

Kastritsis, Dimitris J. *The Sons of Bayezid. Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402-13* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Kazhdan, Alexandre. "Byzantine Hagiography and Sex in the Fifth to Twelfth Centuries," *DOP* 44 (1990), pp. 131-143.

Kılıç, Rüya. *Osmanlıda Seyyidler ve Şerifler* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005).

Kiel, Machiel. *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1985).

__________." Sarı Saltuk : Pionier des Islam auf dem Balkan im 13. Jahrhundert, " in *Aleviler Kimlik ve Tarih = Alewiten : Identität und Geschichte*, ed. Ismail Engin and Erhard Franz (Hamburg : Deutches Orient-Institut, 2000), pp. 262-4.

Klein, Holger A. & Ousterhout, Robert G. & Pitarakis, Brigitte (eds.). *Kariye : from Theodore Metochites to Thomas Whittemore : one monument, two monumental personalities*, ed. (Istanbul : Pera Müzesi, 2007).

Koder, Johannes. "Latinoi-The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources," in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo)*, ed. Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 2002), pp. 26-39.

Kolbaba, Tia. " Fighting for Christianity. Holy War in the Byzantine Empire, " *Byzantion* 68 (1998), pp. 194-221.

Konnare, Angel-Nicolaou and Schabel, Chris. *Cyprus Society and Culture 1191-1374* (Leiden : Brill, 2005).

Kouroupou, Matoula. " Le siège de Philadelphie par Umur Pacha d'après le manuscrit de la Bibl.Patriarcale d'Istanbul, Panaghias 58, " in *Geographica Byzantina*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1981), pp. 67-77.

Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad."Anadolu'da Islamiyet: Türk istilasından sonar Anadolu tarih-i dinisine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menba'ları," *Darü'l-fünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmu'ası* 2 (1922-23), pp. 281-311; 385-420; 457-86.

_______________." Les origines du Bektachisme, essai sur le développement historique de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Asie Mineure, " *Actes du congres international d'histoire des religions, Paris octobre 1923* (n.p., 1926).

_______________. *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993).

__________________. *Some Observations on the Influence of Byzantine Institutions on Ottoman Institutions*, tr. Gary Leiser (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999).

__________________." Epic of the Deeds of Saints (Evliya Menkabeleri), " in *The Seljuks of Anatolia : their history and culture according to local Muslim sources*, tr. G. Leiser (Salt Lake city : University of Utah Press, 1992), pp. 38-52.

__________________. *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (Ankara : Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, 1993).

__________________." Anadolu Selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları, " *Belleten* 7/1 (1943), pp. 379-599.

Krstic, Tijana. *Narrating Conversions to Islam: The Dialogue of Texts and Practices in Early Modern Balkans* (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2004)

Laiou, Angeliki. " Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks : The Backgroud of Anti-Turkish League of 1332-1334, " *Speculum* 46 (1970), pp. 374-392.

______________. *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronikos II 1282-1328* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1972).

______________. "The Byzantine Aristocracy in the Palaeologan Period: A Story of Arrested Development," *Viator* 4 (1973), pp. 131-151.

______________. "Saints and Society in the Late Byzantine Empire," in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou (News Brunswick: Rutgers, 1980), pp. 84-114.

______________."The Foreigner and the Stranger in 12th century Byzantium: Means of Propitiation and Acculturation," in *Fremde der Gesellschaft. Historische und sozialwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Differenzierung von Normalität und Fremdheit*, ed. Marie Theres Fögen (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1991), pp. 71-97.

______________. " On Just War in Byzantium, " in *To Hellenikon Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis*, vol. 1, ed. Jelisaveta S. Allen, Christos P. Ioannides, John Springer Langdon and Stephen W. Reinert (New Rochelle: Artistide D. Caratzas, 1993), pp. 153-74.

______________ and Cecile Morrison. " Byzantine Trade with Christians and Muslims and the Crusades, " in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. Angeliki Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), pp. 157-196.

Lammens, Henri. " Correspondances diplomatiques entre les sultans mamelouks d'Égypte et les puissances chrétiens, " *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 9 (1904), pp. 151-87, 359-92.

Laurent, Vitalien. " La liste épiscopale du synodicon de la métropole d'Andrinople, " *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939), pp. 1-34.

______________." Encore le néomartyr Michel Mauroeides, " *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939), pp. 371-79.

______________.“ L’idée de guerre sainte et la tradition byzantine,” *Revue historique du sud-est Européen* 23 (1946), pp. 71-98.

______________.“ La succession épiscopale des derniers archevêques grecs de Chypre. De Jean le Crétois (1152) à Germain Pèsimandros (1260), ” *REB* 7 (1949), pp. 33-41.

______________.“ La Vita Retractata et les Miracles posthumes de Saint Pierre d’Atroa, ” *Subsidia Hagiographica* 31 (1958), pp. 10-74.

Legrand, Emile. *Bibliographie Hellénique ou Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs aux XVe et XVIe siècles*, vol.1 (Paris : G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose, 1885).

Lemerle, Paul. *L’émirat d’Aydin, Byzance et l’Occident : recherche sur “La geste d’Umur pacha* ” (Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1957).

_____________. *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977).

___________.“ Philadephie et l’Émirat d’Aydin, ” in *Philadelphie et autres études* (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1984), pp. 55-69.

Lowry, Heath W. *Trabzon Şehrinin Islamlaşması ve Türkleşmesi, 1461-1583: Trabzon örneğinde Osmanlı Tahrir Defterinin şehirleşme demografik tarihi için kaynak olarak kullanılması* (Istanbul: Boğaziçi Universitesi, 1998).

_____________.“Changes in the Fifteenth-Century Ottoman Peasant Taxation: The Case Study of Radilofo,” in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society. Papers Given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982,* ed. Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Center for Byzantine studies, 1986), pp. 23-35.

_____________.“The Island of Limnos: A Case Study on the Continuity of Byzantine Forms under Ottoman Rule,” in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society. Papers Given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982,* ed. Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Center for Byzantine studies, 1986), pp. 235-59.

_____________. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: University of New York, 2003).

Lloyd, Setton and Rice, D. Storm. *Alanya (Alaiyya)*, tr. N. Sinemoğlu (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1964).

Macrides, Ruth.“ Saints and Sainthood in the Early Palaiologan Period,” in *The Byzantine Saint,* ed. Sergei Hackel (London : The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1981), pp. 67-87.

___________, and Magdalino, Paul. “The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism,” in *The Perception of the Past in the 12th Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino, (London: Continuum

International, 1992), pp. 117-56.

___________. " Nomos and Kanon on Paper and in Court," in *Church and People in Byzantium*, ed. Rosemary Morris (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1990), pp. 61-86, reprinted in *Kingship and Justice in Byzantium, 11th-15th Centuries*, study VI, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

Magdalino, Paul."Honour among Romaioi: the framework of social values in the world of Digenes Akrites and Kekaumenos," *BMGS* 13 (1989), pp. 183-218.

___________."Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium," in *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium*, study XIV (Aldershot: Variorum, 1991).

___________. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (New York: Cambridge University 1993).

___________ & Ricks, David (eds.). *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).

Magoulias, Harry J. "The Lives of the Saints as Sources of Data for the History of Byzantine Medicine in the VIth and VIIth Centuries," *BZ* 57 (1964), pp. 127-150.

Maguire, Henri. "Byzantine Hagiographical Texts as Sources on Art," *DOP* 45 (1991), pp. 1-22.

Mango, Cyril. "Review of A.Vacalopoulos, The Origins of the Greek Nation 1204-1261," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 88, pp. 256-8.

Mansouri, Mohamed T. " Byzantins, Mamluks et Mongols aux alentours de 1265. La politique étrangere de Michel VIII Paléologue au début de son régne, " *Byzantiakon* 12 (1992), pp. 317-24.

Masai, François. *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956).

Matschke, Klaus-Peter. "The Notaras Family and Its Italian Connections," *DOB* 49 (1995), pp. 59-72.

Mercati, Silvio G. "Macaire Calorités et Constantin Anagnostès," *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, vol. 2 (1920-21), pp. 162-193.

Mercati, Angelo " Lettres à Mehmed II, " La due lettere di Giorgio da Trebisonda a Maometto II, " *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 9 (1943), pp. 65-99.

Meyendorff, John. *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1959).

___________. *Grégoire Palamas : Défense des saints hésychastes*, 2 vols. (Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, 1973).

___________. *Byzantine Hesychasm : Historical, Theological and*

Social Problems (London: Variorum reprints, 1974).

______________.“The Three Lithuanian Martyrs : Byzantium and Lithuania in the Fourteenth Century,” in *Eikon und Logos: Beiträge zur Erforschung byzantinischer Kulturtraditionen*, ed. H. Goltz (Wittenberg : Martin Luther-Universitat Halle, 1981), pp. 179-197.

______________.“ Is Hesychasm the Right Word? Remarks on Religious Ideology in the Fourteenth Century,” in *Okeanos. Essays presented to Ihor Sevcenko*, ed. Cyril Mango and Omeljan Pritsak, vol. 7 (Cambridge : Harvard University, 1983), pp. 447-457.

______________.“Mount Athos in the 14th Century: Spiritual and Intellectual Legacy, ” *DOP* 42 (1988), pp. 157-165.

___________. “Balsamon, the Empire and the Barbarians,” in *Byzantium in the 12th Century. Canon Law, State and Society*, ed. Nicolas Oikonomides (Athens: Society of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1991), pp. 533-542.

Monfasani, John. *George of Trebizond. A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden : Brill, 1976).

Moravcsik, Gyula, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958).

Morrison, Cécile. “La dévaluation de la monnaie Byzantine au XI^{e} siècle,” *TM* 6 (1976), pp.3-47.

Musurillo, Herbert. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

Nasturel, Petre S. “Une prétendue œuvre de Grégoire Tsamblak: Le martyre de Saint Jean de Nouveau,” *Actes du Premier Congrès international des etudes balkaniques et sud-est européens, Sofia, 1966*, vol. 7 (Sofia: Bibliothèque centrale, 1971), pp.122-136.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. “The Life of an Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia after Byzantium,” in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present*, ed. Robert Mark, Ahmet Şefik Çakmak (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992), pp.195-223.

______________. “Challenging the Past: Sinan and the Competitive Discourse of Early Modern Islamic Architecture,” *Muqarnas* 10 (1993), pp. 169-180.

Necipoğlu, Nevra. “Ottoman Merchants in Constantinople During the First Half of the Fifteenth Century,” *BMGS* 16 (1992), pp. 158-169.

______________.“Economic Conditions in Constantinople During the Siege of Bayezid I (1394-1402),” in *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, ed. Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995), pp. 157-67.

________________. “Byzantine monasteries and monastic property in Thessalonike and Constantinople during the period of Ottoman conquests (late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries)," *The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 15 (1995), pp. 123-35.

____________. "The Aristocracy in Late Byzantine Thessalonike: a case study of the of the city's *archontes* (late 14th and early 15th centuries)," *DOP* 27 (2003), pp. 133-51.

____________. "The Byzantine Aristocracy during the Period of Ottoman Conquests," in *The Halil Inalcik Festchrift*, ed. Nejat Göyünç, Jacques Bacqué Grammont, Özer Ergenç, forthcoming.

____________. *Byzantium Between the Ottomans and the Latins. Politics and Society in the Late Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge ` University, 2009).

Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicoson, 1971).

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Bazı Menakıbnamelere göre XIII. ve XV. Yüzyıllardaki Ihtidalarda Heterodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü," *Journal of Ottoman Studies* 2 (1981), pp. 31-42.

_____________. *Bektaşi menakıbnamelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri* (Istanbul: Enderun, 1983).

_____________. *La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIII^e^ siècle* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989).

____________. *Osmanlı Imparatorluğunda Marjinal Sufilik: Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII; Yüzyıllar)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992).

____________."Alevilik ve Bektaşilik hakkındaki son yayınlar üzerinde (1990) genel bir bakış ve bazı gerçekler," *Tarih ve Toplum* 8 (1991), pp. 20-25 and 7 (1992), pp. 115-120.

____________. *Kültür Tarihi Kaynakları Olarak Menakıbnameler. Metodolojik bir Yaklaşım* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997).

____________. *Osmanlı Toplumda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler, 15.-17. Yüzyıllar* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998).

____________. *Sarı Saltık. Popüler Islam'ın Balkanlar'daki Destani Öncüsü (XIII. Yüzyıl)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).

____________."Kutb ve İsyan: Osmanlı Mehdici Hareketlerinin İdeolojik Arkaplanı," *Toplum ve Bilim* 83 (1999/2000), pp. 52-54.

Oikonomides, Nicolas. " Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane, " *SF* 35 (1976), pp.1-10.

_______________. *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople, XIIIe-XVe siècles* (Montreal: Institut d'études médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1979).

_______________. "La decomposition de l'Empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: A propos de la Partitio Romanie," *15^e^ Congrès international d'études Byzantines. Athènes-Septembre 1976. Rapports et co-rapports* (Athens: np., 1980), reprinted in *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*, study XX (Aldershot; Ashgate, 1992).

_______________."Les Danishmendids entre Byzance, Bagdad et le

Sultanat d'Iconium," *Revue Numismatique* 25 (1983), pp. 189-207.

________________. "Ottoman Influence on Late Byzantine Fiscal Practices," *SF* 45 (1986), pp. 1-24.

________________."La brébis égarée et retrouvée: l'apostat et son retour," *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Simon (Frankfurt: V. Klostermann, 1990), reprinted in *Social and Economic Life in Byzantium*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, study II, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

________________."Pour une typologie des villes "séparées" sous les Paléologues," *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. W. Seibt (Vienna, 1996), pp. 171-75, reprinted in *Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, study XXI, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

Ousterhout, Robert. "Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995), pp. 48-62.

Özbaran, Salih. *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği. 14.-17. Yüzyıllarda Rum/Rumi aidiyet ve Imgeleri* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2004).

Page, Gill. *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity Before the Ottomans, 1200-1420* (New York: Cambridge University, 2008).

Pancaroğlu, Oya. "Architecture, Landscape and Patronage in Bursa: The Making of an Ottoman Capital City," *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 20/1 (1995) pp. 40-55.

____________."The Itinerant Dragon-Slayer: Forging Paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia," *Gesta* 43/2 (2004), pp. 151-164.

Papadakis, Aristeides and Meyendorff, John. *The Christian East and the Rise of Papacy* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994).

Patlagean, Evelyne. "Ancienne hagiographie Byzantine et histoire sociale," *Annales* 23 (1968), pp. 106-126, rp. in *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance (IV-XIe siècle), study* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1981).

Pétridès, Sophrone. "Le néo-martyr Michel Mauroeides et son office," *Echos d'Orient* 14 (1911), pp. 333-4.

Popovic, Alexandre & Veinstein, Gilles (eds.). *Bektachiyya : Etudes sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach* (Paris : Paul Geuthner, 1995).

Redford, Scott. *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia. Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya, Turkey* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2000).
__________. "A grammar of Rum Seljuk ornament," *Mésogeios* 25-26 (2005), pp. 283-310.

Runciman, Steven. *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970).

Sariyannis, Marinos. " Aspects of Neomartyrdom : Religious Contacts, Blasphemy and Calumny in the 17th century Istanbul," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005/6), pp. 249-62.

Schimmel, Annemarie. *The Triumphal Sun : A Study of the Works of Jalaloddin Rumi* (London : East-West Publ., 1980).

Schreiner, Peter. " Zur Geschichte Philadelpheias im 14. Jahrhundert (1293-1390), " *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 35 (1969), pp. 375-431.

Sevcenko, Ihor. *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussel: Byzantion, 1962).
___________.“Theodore Metochites, the Chora and the the Intellectual Trends of His Time," in *The Kariye Djami*, ed. Paul A. Underwood, vol. 4 (Princeton: Princeton University, 1975), pp. 17-91.

Shukurov, Rhustem M. "Turkoman and Byzantine self-identity. Some reflections on the logic of the title-making in twelfth and thirteenth-century Anatolia," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999*, ed. Antony Eastmond (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2001), pp. 259-276.
______________. "Christian Elements in the Identity of the Anatolian Turkmens (12th-13th Centuries), in *Spoleto. Cristianita D'Occidente e Christianita D'Oriente*, vol.1 (2004), pp. 707-59.

Smythe, Dion C. "Byzantine Identity and Labelling Theory," *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence. XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies. University of Copenhagen, 18-24 August, 1996. Major Papers*, ed. Karsten Fledelius & Peter Schreiner (Copenhagen: Eventus, 1996), pp. 26-29.

Stavrides, Theoharis. *The Sultan of Vezirs. The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelovic (1453-1474)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

Stolte, B.H. "Civil Law in Canon Law: A Note on the Method of Interpreting the Canons in the Twelfth Century, " in *Byzantium in the 12th Century. Canon Law, State and Society*, ed. Nicolas

Oikonomides (Athens: Society of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1991), pp. 543-554.

Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Old Wine in New Bottles: The Rewriting of Saints' Lives in the Palaiologan Period," in *The Twilight of Byzantium: Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire*, ed. Slobodan Curcic, Doula Mouriki (Princeton: Princeton University, 1991), pp. 15-26, rp. in *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*, Study X (Aldershot: Variorum, 2001).

________. "Byzantine Women, Saint's Lives and Social Welfare," in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, ed. Emily A. Hanawalt, Carter Lindberg (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University, 1994), pp. 105-122.

Terzioğlu, Derin "The Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyazi-i Mısri (1618-94)," *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002), p. 139-165.

Thomson, Francis J. *Gregory Tsamblak. The Man and the Myths* (Ghent: Gent University, 1998).

Turan, Osman. "L'Islamisation dans la Turquie du moyen âge," *Studia Islamica* 10 (1959), pp. 137-52.

________. *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmi Vesikalar. Metin, Tercüme ve Araştırmalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988).

Togan, Ahmed Zeki Velidi. " Haberler : a) Şifahi Haberler, " in *Tarihte Usul* (Istanbul: Enderun, 1981), pp. 48-50.

Trépanier, Nicholas. *Food as a Window into Daily Life in Fourteenth Century Central Anatolia* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2008).

Turki, Abdelmagid. "Situation du "Tributaire" qui insulte l'Islam, au regard de la doctrine et de la jurisprudence musulmanes," *Studia Islamica* 30 (1969), pp. 39-72.

Tzedopoulos, Giorgos. "᾽Εθνικὴ ῾Ομολογία καὶ Συμβολικὴ στὴν ᾽Ελλάδα τοῦ 19ου Αἰώνα. Οἱ ᾽Εθνομάρτυρες" *Mnemon* 24 (2002), pp. 107-143.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Çandarlı Vezir Ailesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1974).

________. *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2003).

Vaporis, Nomikos Michael. *Witness for Christ. Orthodox Christian Neomartyrs of the Ottoman Period (1437-1860)* (Crestwood: Saint Vladimir's Seminary, 2000).

Verpeaux, Jean. “Contribution à l’étude de l’administration byzantine,” *Byzantinoslavica* 16 (1955), pp. 272-281.

____________. “Le cursus honorum de Théodore Métochite,” *REB* 18 (1960), pp. 195-98.

Vryonis, Speros. “The Byzantine Legacy and Ottoman Forms,” *DOP* 23/24 (1969-70), pp. 253-308.

____________. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California, 1971).

____________. “Religious Changes and Patterns in the Balkans, 14th-16th Centuries,” in *Byzantina kai Metabyzantina. Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks and Ottomans* (Malibu: Undena, 1981).

______________. “The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430,” in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society. Papers Given at a Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1982,* ed. Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Center for Byzantine studies, 1986), pp.281-321.

____________. “Byzantine cultural self-consciousness in the fifteenth century,” in *The Twilight of Byzantium: Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire*, ed. Slobodan Curcic, Doula Mouriki (Princeton: Princeton University, 1991), pp. 5-14.

____________. “The Family in 13th-14th Century Anatolia as Reflected in the Writings of the Mawlawi Dervis Eflaki,” in *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389)*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (Rethymnon: Crete University, 1993), pp. 213-223.

____________. “The Political World of the Mevlevi Dervish Order in Asia Minor (13th-14th Century) as Reflected in the Mystical Writings of Eflaki,” in *Philhellen: Studies in Honour of Robert Browning* (Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e post-bizantini di Venezia, 1996), pp. 411-419.

____________. “ The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamisation from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century: The Book in the Light of Subsequent Scholarship, 1971-98,” in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999*, ed. Antony Eastmond (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2001), pp.1-15.

____________, “The Economic and Social Worlds of Anatolia in the Writings of the Mawlawi (Mevlevi) Dervish Eflaki, ” in *Cultural Horizons. A Festschrift in Honor of Talat S. Halman*, ed. Jayne L. Warner (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 2001), pp. 188-197.

Walsh, E. M. “The Women Martyrs of Nikodemos Hagiorites’ Neon Martyrologion,” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 36/1 (1991), pp. 71-91.

Walter, Christopher. *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Werner, Ernest. *Ketzer und Weltverbesserer* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1974).

Wittek, Paul. *Das Fürstentum Menteshe. Studien zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15.Jh* (Amsterdam : Oriental Press, 1967).
_________. *Menteşe Beyliği. 13-15inci Asırda Garbi Küçük Asya Tarihine Ait Tetkik*, tr. Orhan Ş. Gökyay (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1944).
_________."Yazijioghli Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobrudja," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14/2 (1952), pp. 639-68.

Woodhouse, Christopher M. *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986).

Yaltkaya, Şerefeddin M. *Simavne Kadısıoğlu Bedreddin* (Istanbul: Cağaloğlu Kitabevi, 1994).

Yıldırım, Rıza. "History Beneath Clouds of Legend: Seyyid Ali Sultan and His Place in Early Ottoman History According to Legends, Narratives, and Archival Evidence," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 15/1-2 (2009), pp. 21-57.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Türk Metinlerinde Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri* (Istanbul: İletişim yayınları, 1993).
______________. "Byzance dans les chroniques ottomans (XIV^e-XVI^e siècle), in *Byzance en Europe*, ed. Marie-France Auzepy (Saint-Denis: Presses universitaires de Vincennes, 2003), pp. 19-29.

Yüce, Kemal. *Saltukname'de Tarihi, Dini ve Efsanevi Unsurlar* (Ankara : Kültür Bakanlığı, 1987).

Zachariadou, Elizabeth A. "Early Ottoman documents of the Prodromos Monastery,"*SF* 28 (1969), pp. 1-12.
___________________."Ottoman Documents from the Archives of Dionysios (Mount Athos)," *SF* 30 (1971), pp. 1-35.
___________________." Sept traités inédits entre Venise et les émirats d'Aydın et de Menteşe (1331-1407), " in *Studi preottomani e ottomani, Atti del convegno di Napoli (24-26 settembre 1974)*, ed. Aldo Gallotta (Napoli : Istituto Universitario Orientale , 1976), pp. 229-40.
___________________. "Pachymeres on the Amourioi of Kastamonu," *BMGS* 3 (1977), pp. 57-70, reprinted in *Romania and the Turks (c. 1300-c. 1500)*, Study II (Aldershot: Ashgate,1985).
___________________. "Note sur l'article de Matoula Couroupou," in *Geographica Byzantina,* ed. Hélène Ahrweiler (Paris : Publications de la Sorbonne, 1981), pp. 78-80.

———. *Trade and Crusade. Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300-1405)* (Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1983).

———."Lauro Quirini and the Turkish Sandjaks (ca.1430)," in *Raiyyet Rüsumu. Essays presented to Halil Inalcik*, Journal of Turkish Studies 11 (1987), pp. 239-247.

———." The Neomartyr's Message, " *Bulletin of the Center for Asia Minor Studies*, Vol. 8 (Athens, 1990-91), pp. 51-63.

———."Les notables laïques et le patriarcat œcuménique après la chute de Constantinople," *Turcica* 30 (1998), pp. 119-133.

———."Mount Athos and the Ottomans c.1350-1550," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Eastern Christianity*, ed. Michael Angold, vol. 5, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2006), pp. 154-168.