

# Ottoman Perception in The Byzantine Short Chronicles

## Bizans Kısa Kroniklerinde Osmanlı Algisi

Şahin KILIÇ\*

### **Abstract**

*Anonymous chronicles, usually known as the Byzantine Short Chronicles, provide scholars of Ottoman history with rich and unique information about historical events having taken place until the 17th century. Majority of these chronicles, usually regarded as a part of “non-official historiography” due to their idiosyncratic features, were produced in rural monasteries of the Byzantine Empire. Even after the fall of Constantinople, these chronicles, which continued to emerge in the peripheries under the Ottoman domination or threat, provide an invaluable arena for examining Byzantine and post-Byzantine Orthodox Christian subjects’ visions of the Ottomans. The present study aims to explore the approaches of Byzantine authors toward Ottomans by focusing on the language and the vocabulary used for describing Ottomans.*

**Key Words:** *Byzantine Short Chronicles, Byzantine Historiography, Ottoman Perception*

### **Öz**

*Bizans Kısa Kronikleri olarak bilinen anonim kronikler, Osmanlı tarihçilerine 17.yy’a kadar uzanan olaylar hakkında zengin ve eşsiz bilgiler sunar. Bizans kaynakları içinde kendine özgü özellikleri nedeniyle daha çok Bizans’ın “gayriresmi tarihyazını” örnekleri sayılan kroniklerin büyük bölümü Bizans taşrasındaki manastırlarda yazılmıştır. İstanbul’un fethinden sonra da bir bölümü Osmanlı egemenliği veya tehdidi altındaki eski Bizans taşrasında yazılan kroniklerde, 14.yy’dan itibaren Yunanca konuşan Ortodoks Hristiyan toplumunun Osmanlılar hakkında kullandıkları terminoloji ve ifadelerle sıklıkla rastlıyoruz. Bu çalışma, kronik yazarlarının kullandığı terminoloji ve ifadeleri üzerinden söz konusu toplumun Osmanlılara yaklaşımını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Bizans Kısa Kronikleri, Bizans Tarihyazını, Osmanlı Algisi*

---

\* Arş. Gör. Dr., Uludağ University, Department of History. Görükle-Nilüfer/BURSA. E-mail: sahin kilic@yahoo.com

For historians, the study of place names (toponymy), ethnic group names (ethnonymy), personal names (anthroponymy) the ways how they are expressed and titles used for persons or places in sources are very important for understanding a community's identity and culture. These fields of study, principal branches of onomastic (the study of names), also help to understand how a culture perceives another culture, its value judgments, and the meanings they attribute to the related terms depending on a given period of history. The purpose of this paper is to understand how chroniclers perceived Ottomans by analyzing the personal names, titles and expressions used for describing Ottomans in the Byzantine Short Chronicles between the 14<sup>th</sup> century and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. At this point, the features of the Byzantine Short Chronicles as a genre of historiography, which are different from those of the other historical and chronicle genres, gain importance. Compared to the other historical and chronicle genres written by learned intellectuals, the Short Chronicles, the characteristics of which will be explained in detail below, could be considered as products of larger part of community. For this reason, we can say that the information gleaned from these chronicles also gives us an idea about the late Byzantine and the post-Byzantine Orthodox Christian communities' perceptions of the Ottomans. Moreover, we hope that the different orthographies of the Ottoman names in the chronicles and the meanings assigned to them will contribute to the Turkish onomastics in the Byzantine sources.<sup>1</sup>

The Byzantine histories and chronicles constituting the corpus of the Middle Age Greek literature provide invaluable information for understanding the terms used for neighbors of Byzantium throughout the history. Recent studies has shown that the use of certain terms changed according to contemporary historical and political context, i.<sup>2</sup> When it comes

---

<sup>1</sup> For all the Turkish names in the Byzantine sources and a list of terms used for Turks and the sources where they are mentioned, see Gy.Moravesik, *Byzantinoturcica*, v. I-II, Berlin 1958. (Especially v. II, pp. 359-360). On the publication date of this work, published in two volumes, very few of the Short Chronicles were known. For this reason, references are made only to those chronicles which were known at the time when it was published.

<sup>2</sup> For an article indicating clearly that the Byzantine authors used the terminology which they had borrowed from the Ancient Greek together with their new meanings consciously and very carefully without confusing the names of the ethnic and religious groups such as Turks, Persians and Arabs whom they encountered in various periods of the history and the places where these groups lived, see Koray Durak, "Defining the 'Turk': Mechanisms of Establishing Contemporary Meaning in the Archaizing Language of Byzantines, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 59. Band/2009, 65-78; Moreover, for thoughts on Perception of the Seljuk Turks from religious perspective, see Alexander Beihammer, "Orthodoxy and Religious Antagonism in Byzantine Perceptions of the Seljuk Turks (Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries)", *Al-Masaq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean*, 23:1 (2011), 15-36.

to Turks an ethnic group appearing first on the eastern borders in the 11<sup>th</sup> century and, the Byzantine community's the response to developed in two way regarding the ethnic and religious identities. One is that the collective memory of the Arab-Byzantine conflict in the 7<sup>th</sup> century revived and the other is that the image of Muslim Arabs came into being again in Muslim Turks.<sup>3</sup> With the reflex of the protection of Christianity against countless number of enemies, which is one of the most important duties of the Emperor "protected by God" according to the Byzantine Empire ideology, the terms which they were acquainted with such as *Agarenoi/Agarens* (Αγαρηνοί)<sup>4</sup>, *Ismaelitai/Ishmaeli* (Ισμαηλίται), *Mousoulmanoi/Muslims* (Μουσουλμάνοι) referring to the religious identities of the Turks were put into use again. However, the term of *Sarakenoi/Saracens* (Σαρακηνοί) is used with its ethnic meaning only for the Arabs in the Byzantine sources.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the terms such as *Persai/Persians* (Πέρσαι), *Skythai/Scythians* (Σκύθαι), *Ounnoi/Huns* (Οὔννοι), *Parthoi/Parthians* (Πάρθοι) borrowed from the Ancient Greek and the late Ancient Age terminology and also from the "barbaric" ethnic groups of the North, who are wild and fond of violence<sup>6</sup> are identified with the ethnic identity of the Turks.<sup>7</sup> For this reason,

<sup>3</sup> For changes in the Byzantine-Islamic cultural relationships and the perceptions in the Muslim Arabs in the 11th century, see Vassilios Christides, "Periplus of the Arab-Byzantine Cultural Relations", in *Cultural Relations between Byzantium and the Arabs*, ed. Yacoub Yousef al-Hijji and Vassilios Christides (Athens: Institute for Graeco-Oriental and African Studies, 2007), pp. 35-36; Nike C. Koutrakou, "Highlights in Arab-Byzantine Cultural Relations (IXth-XIth centuries AD): An Approach Through Diplomacy", in *Cultural Relations between Byzantium and the Arabs*, pp. 85-102.

<sup>4</sup> Agarens and Ishmaelitai descend from Ishmael, son of Agar of Egypt, slave of Abraham. Agar's son, Prophet Ishmael, forms the origin of Arabs. Later this term was used to refer to Arabs and Muslims, especially Crete Emirate and Muslims living in North Africa. From the 11th century on when Turks entered Anatolia, these terms were started to be used for Turks in the Byzantine sources as well. See Aleksios G. C. Savvides, "Some Notes on the Terms Agarenoi, Ismailitai and Sarakenoi in Byzantine Sources", *Byzantion* 67 (1997), 89-96.

<sup>5</sup> Durak, *ibid*, p. 73.

<sup>6</sup> Beihammer, *ibid*, pp. 17-18

<sup>7</sup> Leading works on the effects of Classic/Ancient Greek literature and the use of ancient period terminology in the Byzantine literature, their reasons and styles are these: H: Hunger, "On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 23/24 (1970), 19-20?; Gy. Moravcsik, "Klassizismus in der Byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung", *Polychronion, Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit D), Heidelberg 1966, 368-372; C. Mango, "Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror", in *C. Mango, Byzantium and Its Image: History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and Its Heritage*, London, 1984, 1-18; C. Mango, "Discontinuity with the Classical Past in Byzantium", in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, 1979, ed. M. Mullet-R. Scott, Birmingham 1981, 48-57.; M.C. Bartusis, "The Function of Archaizing in Byzantium", *Byzantinoslavica*, 56 (1995), 273?; Roger Scott, "The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography", *Byzantium*

when the Byzantine sources starting from the 11<sup>th</sup> century on are examined, we witness that the terminology used for the Great Seljuks, Anatolian Seljuks, Beyliks and Turcoman groups describes them with the terms related to religious and ethnic identity. Such tribes as Scythians and Parthians in Caucasia and the north of Black Sea, which Byzantines knew from the Ancient Greek literature, Persians, Sasanians in Iran, Huns of the Roman period, Muslim Arabs of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and Turks encountered in the Iranian-Caucasian geography in the 11<sup>th</sup> century become important reference sources for Byzantines. The relationship between the lands where Turks come and their ethnic origin was transformed into hybrid terms such as *Persoskython/Persian-Scythians* (Περσοκυθών) *Skythopersai-Scythians-Persian* (Σκυθοπέρσαι), *Tourkopersai/Turk-Persian* (Τουρκοπέρσαι) with the reflex in Byzantines' collective memory. However, when it is looked at the historiographers and chroniclers of the 11th and 12th century and other literature types carefully, it is observed that this confusion does not last long and Turks are carefully discriminated from the other ethnic groups and the term "*Tourkoi/Turks* (Τούρκοι)" is adopted quickly. However, it is understood that the use of the religious referenced terms such as *Agarenoi*, *İsmaelitai*, *Mosoulmanoi* is never abandoned even after the end of the Byzantine state and they are used plentifully in the Short Chronicles.

Here we will not make a detailed analysis of the terminology used in the Byzantine sources for Turks. However, as many studies indicate that from the 11th century on the term "Tourkoi/Turks" is commonly used in the famous Byzantine histories and chronicles such as Skylitzes, Zonaras, Attaliates, Michael Glykas, Eusthatios Thessaloniki, Kedrenos, Khoniates, Akropolites, and although the use of archaic terms continues, we understand that they pay attention to the style in which what they mean can be understood.<sup>8</sup> However, in texts other than chronicles and works of history, as an indication of a literary ability, they pay attention to the use of archaic terminology. For example, it is a known fact that in military, financial records, manuals, and most of the chronicles, archaic terms are used, and since chronicles traditionally use a simpler and more modest language, they avoid archaic terminology and prefer more contemporary understandable terminology.<sup>9</sup> On the contrary, in some kinds of the Byzantine sources such as letter, poem and speech and some historical works, the use of archaic terminology is intensive.<sup>10</sup>

---

*and the Classical Tradition*, University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, 1979, ed. M. Mullet-R. Scott, Birmingham 1981, 61-74.

<sup>8</sup> See Footnote 2.

<sup>9</sup> Timothy Gregory, *Bizans Tarihi*, trans. Esra Ermert, İstanbul 2008, p. 21;

<sup>10</sup> See Durak, *ibid*, p. 66.

When we come to the 14th century, we see that Ottomans starting to expand their lands against Byzantium naturally become a matter of discussion in the Byzantine sources of the period. It is observed that as the Ottoman expansion against Byzantium continued, Byzantine historiographers and chroniclers show more interest in Ottomans, gradually acquaint themselves with this new enemy and give more places to them in their writings. The most successful examples of these sources can be mentioned, starting from Georgios Pachymeres (b.1242- d. approximately 1310) on, the works of the Byzantine scholars of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, who are highly educated, intellectual, represent the elite parts of the society, and at the same time, hold active positions in the central administration of the Byzantine state. Works written by prominent Byzantine authors such as Byzantine Emperor Ioannes VI. Kantakouzenos (1292-1383), Nikephoros Gregoras (1295-1360), Georgios Sphrantzes (1401-1478), Michael Doukas (1400-after1462), Laonikos Chalkokondyles (1423-1490) with different motivation and in different kinds.can also be cited as such examples. In addition to, historical and chronicle genres, the works of many authors such as that of Demetrios Kydones (1324-1398) also shed light on the last fifty years of the Byzantine state and Turk-Byzantine relations. All these works are also important representatives of the Byzantine historiography and literature tradition.

The Byzantine historiography tradition continues after 1453 with the Byzantine historiographers writing their works in a more reconciliatory language and style together with the new political order. The writings of many "Byzantine" thinkers such as Michael Kritovoulos, Georgios Amiroutzis and Patriarch Gennadios, which we can also categorize as the post-Byzantine period, are a few of the examples falling into this category. In one sense, all this collection is considered to be an archaic historiography tradition's ideological reaction to the new political order.<sup>11</sup> The Ottomans' settling on the former Byzantine territory as a new empire is completed after the conquest of Istanbul, and then Trabzon causing the loss of hopes that the Byzantium would be revived. This process creates hopelessness in some of the contemporary period's thinkers regarding themselves as Byzantines and grown up in the Byzantine political ideology and culture. That Byzantines perceive the Ottoman victory in 1453 as a punishment sent by God due to their sins is observed in many contemporary sources. J. Koder attributes the

---

<sup>11</sup> Konstantinos Moustakas, "Byzantine 'Visions' of the Ottoman Empire: Theories of Ottoman Legitimacy by Byzantine Scholars after the Fall of Constantinople", *Images of the Byzantine World, Visions, Messages and Meanings Studies Presented to Leslie Brubaker*, ed. Angeliki Lymberopoulou, Ashgate, 2011, p. 215.

prevalence of the use of arguments praising the personal qualities of Mehmed II to the skies and supporting the legitimacy of the Ottoman administration by this period's Byzantine and western historians to this pessimism.<sup>12</sup> According to him, this attitude seen in the period's sources shows both Byzantines and westerners' seeing the impossibility of putting a state up against Mehmed II. However, Konstantinos Moustakas, in his recent study on the historiography of this period, divides the Byzantines' attitudes toward the Ottoman administration after 1453 into three separate categories. According to the first attitude, the Ottoman administration is not legitimate but tyranny. They believe that this tyranny created by foreign and barbaric heathen can be defeated and Byzantium can be liberated again through a 'Crusade' to be created in the West. The best representatives of these ideas are such Byzantine scholars as Doukas and Cardinal Bessarion (1395-1472) who created the core of the anti-ottoman league situated in Italy.<sup>13</sup>

The second attitude is best represented by Patriarch Gennadios appointed as the first to patriarchate in Istanbul . According to Gennadios, the salvation of Christians should be left to God as the misadventures I are a punishment sent by God due to sins they commit. Patriarch Gennadio, as the first patriarch under the Ottoman sovereignty between 1454 and 1456 , defends the idea that Christians have no choices but to submit to the will of God and faithful Christians should also stand the administration although it is a tyranny and illegitimate one and preserve their commitment to the church.<sup>14</sup> According to Moustakas, his belief that doomsday is imminent underlies this opinion due to his eschatological beliefs. The third attitude is more positive when compared to the first and the second attitudes toward the Ottoman administration and regards the new administration as legitimate from the point of Christians. Although this attitude observed in writings of Kritovoulos, Georgios Amiroutzes and partly Chalkokondyles is considered by Moustakas relatively marginal<sup>15</sup>, there are also opinions regarding the fact that the attitude of the Christians in the Balkans toward getting on well with

---

<sup>12</sup> Johannes Koder. "Romaioi and Teukroi, Hellenes and Barbaroi, Europe and Asia: Mehmed the Conqueror Kayser-i Rum and Sultan al-barrayn wa-l-bahrayn"-Summary. Athens Dialogues. 2010. Stories and Histories. Period Two. <http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=21>. (13.11.2012)

<sup>13</sup> Moustakas, *ibid*, p. 215.

<sup>14</sup> Gennadios having eschatological beliefs, which were common throughout the history of Byzantium, believed that the world would come to an end in 1493-4 according to the doomsday prophecies of the time. See Cyril Mango, *Bizans, Yeni Roma*, trans. Gül Çağalı Güven, YKY, İstanbul 2007, pp. 219-232.

<sup>15</sup> Moustakas, *ibid*, p. 216.

the Ottoman elites and adaptation very quickly is not an attitude adopted by only a few intellectuals but a more prevalent one.<sup>16</sup> The opinions of other authors, different from that of Chalkokondyles', occupy an important place since they have relationships with both Ottoman administrators and elites living in Istanbul and Patriarchate.<sup>17</sup> However, although Chalkokondyles seems a proponent of Ottomans, he implicitly legitimizes the Ottoman administration by setting his hopes on the "Hellenization" of the Ottomans in the future.<sup>18</sup> However, as a result of these attitudes are made a matter of discussion by researchers within the context of the personalities of the authors, their birthplaces' where was not under the control of Byzantium, the places where they live, political loyalty and cultural environment in which they are, the extent to which they are rated among Byzantines, individual ideological attitudes or relationships based on self-interest. All the works mentioned above can ultimately be considered in one sense as the official histories of the educated elite authors, who are from high culture level and main vein of the Byzantine historiography tradition. Although their personal characteristics make some differences, the education they take, their relations with the center of the state, their positions and their aims of writing determine their approaches to historical events. It is more difficult to get an idea about how Byzantium living under the administration of Ottomans or feeling closely the Ottoman threat perceives the new status of the Orthodox subjects and developments from the works of the mentioned authors looking at the events of the period from the center of the Empire and with the empire ideology shaped through a centuries of experience. However, due to their distinctive characteristics (genre), the Byzantine Short Chronicles provide researchers with more opportunities about this matter. For this reason, first of all, it will be useful to mention briefly about the genre characteristic of the Short Chronicles to understand the subject better.

---

<sup>16</sup> Famous Balkanist Maria Todorova indicates that this attitude which she calls "Kritovoulos Paradigm" is lived frequently especially in Balkans. The Ottoman Administration's achieving non-Muslims' participation in socio-economic life and administration (Christian cavalrymen, etc.) starting from the 15th century on indicates that this paradigm is not at least marginal. Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, Oxford University Press, New York 1997, pp. 167-168. We will see one of the important examples related to this matter in more detail in the article of Olga Todorova in which she examines the work of Synadinos, the metropolitan bishop of Serres in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when we get back to the subject below again. See Olga Todorova, "The Ottoman State and its Orthodox Christian Subjects: the legitimistic discourse in the seventeenth-century 'Chronicle of Serres' in a new perspective", *Turkish Historical Review*, I (2010), 86-110.

<sup>17</sup> Moustakas, *ibid*, p. 217 and others.

<sup>18</sup> Moustakas, *ibid*, pp. 224-226.

### Byzantine Short Chronicles (Brachea Chronika)

Byzantine Short Chronicles<sup>19</sup> consists of the chronological notes written on the margins or in an empty page of the Greek manuscripts. They give information about important events written in vernacular Greek, which is irregular in syntax, grammar and punctuation, in a short, clear and laconically manner, and even with pedantic narration. The most important characteristic of these notes is that they recorded the chronologies of events with details of day, month, year, diction and even sometimes hour details. They are mostly anonym and the pieces of information recorded extend from 312 to 1771 chronologically. Some of these pieces of information are those cited by an "annalist"<sup>20</sup> from an older source. An important part of them shows that the annalist records events of the period in which he lives. It is understood that these chroniclers, who are not professional historiographers, do not aim to make political or religious propaganda, use an opposing language and state their aims and targets clearly. Despite this, it is clearly observed that they have the most fundamental motivation of historians, which is to record historical events and transfer them to next generations. Most of the chronicles giving information especially about Ottomans are contemporary with the recorded events. The chronicles discovered relatively late in the Byzantine sources were published as a *corpus* in three volumes by P. Schreiner between the years of 1975-1979. The Short Chronicles dating back to the earliest times are the two chronicles belonging to the 11th century. After the chronicles, two written in the 12<sup>th</sup> and two in the 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, approximately 14 chronicles written in the 14<sup>th</sup> century reached today in this *Corpus*. Moreover, there are about 8 chronicles belonging to the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. A great majority of the Short Chronicles belongs to the period between mid-15<sup>th</sup> and mid-17<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>21</sup> However, it is necessary to state that the editor P. Schreiner argues that the chronicles written after 1453 are associated with older chronicles, old texts copied or compiled by interpolating. For this reason, t a chronicle written in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century includes reliable information taken from a different source about an event taking place in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>19</sup> Peter Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, I-III, [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 12/1-3], Wien, 1975-1979.

<sup>20</sup> Here we need to state that Peter Schreiner compiling Short Chronicles in *corpus* uses the term of chronicle "authors" with its inclusive meaning. The editor mentioned about all of those writing, compiling, copying or interlining chronicles with this term. For more detailed information, see Peter Schreiner, *Studien zu den Βραχέα Χρονικά*, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 6, München 1967, pp. 116-119. For his opinions about chronicle authorship, see P. Schreiner, *Kleinchroniken*, v. II, pp. 41-43.

<sup>21</sup> For detailed information about the manuscripts where Short Chronicles are included, see Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. II, pp. 32-40.



The geographical distribution of the events told in the chronicles includes such regions as predominantly Byzantium and its capital, then Anatolia within the Mediterranean basin, the Balkans, Cyprus, Aegean islands, North Africa and Italy. For this reason, the chronological records including a vast geography and a long period are rich in subject diversity as well. The Ottomans became the subject of the chronicles after the foundation years onwards. After 1453, the only subject of the chronicles is almost the Ottomans.<sup>22</sup> A great majority of the chronicles are written in Athos, Patmos, Thessaloniki, Istanbul and other great monastery centers and in congregations around them. There are also local chronicles such as Cyprus, the Morea (Peloponnesos), Mytilene (Lesbos), Argos, Nauplion and Crete or family chronicles written by monastery monks, religious functionaries or educated people from different social strata. For this reason, the chronicles do not only reflect the viewpoints of the church and monastery hierarchy and political and intellectual elites, but also the opinions of a large social strata of the Byzantine and the Post-Byzantine period Greek community. As the phrase goes, it will not be wrong to evaluate these chronicles as the examples of unofficial historiography<sup>23</sup> in which the “public opinion”<sup>24</sup> of the Orthodox subjects having entered into the Ottoman domination or feeling closely this threat is reflected. At the same time, the Short Chronicles, a rare historiographical activity in the provinces of Byzantium in the late Byzantine period, are also important in terms of showing the expansion of the Turkish domination did not affect the Greek-Orthodox community's interest in historical processes. These chronicles are the most concrete examples indicating the fact that the Byzantine chronicle writing tradition continues powerfully under the Ottoman domination, too. The chronicles by their very nature include expressions reflecting their authors' state of mind or aiming to affect the reader although their authors try to remain anonymous. Some emotions felt by anonymous chroniclers such as fear, horror, amazement and joy are sometimes clearly observed in affronting expressions as well. From this point of view, they would be more useful for understanding the state of mind and political and social context of the period much better than contemporary sources.<sup>25</sup> Especially, the statements related to Ottoman

<sup>22</sup> See Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. II, pp. 52-55.

<sup>23</sup> Apostolos Karpozilos, “Peter Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*. 2. Teil Historischer Commentar. 3. Teil Teilübersetzungen, Addenda et Corrigenda, Indices [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. 12,2-12,3. Series Vindobonensis. ed. H. Hunger]. Wien, Öster. Akad. d. Wiss. 1977, 644 S/1979/, 254 S.”, *Ελληνικά (Hellenika)* 34 (1982), p. 437.

<sup>24</sup> Dusan Koraç- Radivoj Radić, “Mehmed II, ‘the Conqueror’ in Byzantine Short Chronicles and Old Serbian Annals, Inscriptions, and Genealogies”, *Zbornik Radova Vizantoloshkog Instituta (ZRVI)* XLV (2008), pp. 289-300. Here p. 289.

<sup>25</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. II, p. 52.

administrators, the style of the use of their titles and names, the change of terminology enable us to watch the perceptions of the Orthodox Greek community related to the new political and cultural environment in the process of transition from the Byzantine Empire to the Ottoman Administration.

Moreover, to understand how Ottomans are perceived in the chronicles, first of all, it is necessary to look at the terminology. In the chronicles, Ottomans are described with six different terms: Agarens (Άγαρηνοί/Agarenoi), Ishmaeli (Ισμαηλίται/Ismaelitai), Muhammedans (Μωαμεθανοί/Moammethanoi), Muslims (Μουσουλμάνοι/Mousoulmanoï), Ottomans (Ότμανλίδες, Ότμανίδες, Ότμάνοι/Otmanlides, Otmanides, Otmanoï) and Turks (Τούρκοι/Tourkoï). As it is known, Byzantine authors used various terms for Turks after they had encountered Arabs and Muslim communities in the East from the 11th century on. During the Middle Age, together with the terms which we mentioned above, it is known that most of the other terms used in the Byzantine texts such as Saracens (Σαρακηνοί/Sarakenoi), Scythians (Σκύθαι/Skythai), Persians (Πέρσαι/Persai), Tatars (Τάταροι/Tataroï) are confused most of the time. It is not surprising that some of the terms describing Turks (Seljuks, Beyliks, Turcoman, etc.) and used popularly in a negative meaning in the Byzantine sources from the 11<sup>th</sup> century on are also seen in the Short Chronicles. However, when it is looked at the use of these terms in the Short Chronicles, it can be stated that it is the reflection of the traditional Byzantine historiography rather than being systematic. In the same chronicle, the use of the terms "Ishmaeli" and "Turks" or the terms "Agarens", "Ottomans" and "Turks" together are observed very frequently<sup>26</sup>. The terms like *Scythians* (Skythai), *Persians* (Persai) and *Tatars* (Tataroï) are very rarely used and not for Ottomans. The term "Muhammedans" is used only once for Ottomans because of the conquest of Kavala in 1390.<sup>27</sup>

In the chronicles, it is seen that the term "*Agarens* (Agarenoi)" is used in 11 notes in 7 different chronicles. In 1307, we see some notes informing the Turks' passing to the West, the conquest of Prousa (Bursa) and the conquest of Nicea (İznik), another 1403 dated note related to the fights among the sons of Bayezid I in the Interregnum and another used for Bayezid I. However, they are rarely used for non-Ottoman Turks and Mamluks.<sup>28</sup> We observe that this term is used for Ottomans generally in

<sup>26</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 55 and Chr.50B

<sup>27</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 114/1.

<sup>28</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 7/6, 7/7, 12/5,12/12, 26/11-12, 50B/15, 54 (In the Chronicle Title), 58/44, 58/48, 63/1.

early dated chronicles dating back to the 14<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, it is also encountered in the chronicles written in later dates, though rarely. In a chronicle giving the list of Turkish sultans, a chronicle note basing the origin of the Ottoman sultans on Agarens is very eye-catching.<sup>29</sup> However, the term "*Ishmaeli* (Ismaelitai)" is used for Ottomans in about 8 places in the Short Chronicles.<sup>30</sup> Two of these are used in the titles of the chronicles. The others are used in the chronicles mentioning important events such as the Battle of Ankara (1402), the Conquest of Thessaloniki (1430), the Conquest of Constantinople (1453), the Conquest of Otranto (1480) and the other two in the chronicles giving the chronological list of the Ottoman sultans. Moreover, the term "Muslims (Mousoulmanoï)" is used for Ottomans in about 10 chronicles.<sup>31</sup> However, it is observed that the term, which is most frequently used in the Short Chronicles to describe Ottomans, is "Turks (Tourkoi)". It is observed that this term, which is started to be used from the 11<sup>th</sup> century when Turks entered Anatolia on, is more frequently used in the chronicle related to the Conquest of Prousa (Bursa) . In the chronicles written between mid-16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries , the previous terminology such as *Skythai* (Scythians), *Persai* (Persians) and *Mousoulmanoï* (Muslims) are no l are rarely used.? Now the terms such as *Ottomans* (Otmanoï, Otmanides, Otmanlides) and *Turks* (Tourkoi) are more frequently used.<sup>32</sup>

When it is looked at the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century Byzantine histories and chronicles, especially in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, we see that term of "Barbarism" is used. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century in Akropolites and Pachymeres and in the 14<sup>th</sup> century in N. Gregoras and Kantakuzenos, a strong "barbaric" emphasis is observed although descriptions change. For example, in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the term "barbaroi" primarily carries a religious characteristic and describes more frequently non-Christians.<sup>33</sup> It is clear that Turks, too, fall in this category in both Kantakuzenos and Gregoras. However, when it is looked at the Short Chronicles, it is observed that the term "Βάρβαρος/Βάρβαροι (Barbaros/Barbaroi)" is never used for Ottomans or anyone of the Turks. This term is used only once for Tamerlane.<sup>34</sup> However,

<sup>29</sup> See Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 50B/15

<sup>30</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 58/9, 59/6, 59/1, 62/2, 71a/15, 72a (chronicle title), 72a/5 (chronicle title), 12/10

<sup>31</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 8/16-17-21-24, 9/50, 33/56-58-67, 42/2, 47/9, 49/6, 50B/15, 71a/40, 96/6, 101/3.

<sup>32</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 58/41, 50B/15, 53/1, 59/27,

<sup>33</sup> See Gill Page, *Being Byzantine, Greek Identity Before the Ottomans 1200-1420*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008, pp. 170-176.

<sup>34</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 12/11b

it is known that the term “barbaroi” is used very frequently both in the Byzantine period and the post-Byzantine by historians like Chalkokondyles, who employed archaic terminology<sup>35</sup> This situation suggests that the anonymous authors of the Short Chronicles were not acquainted with the Barbarism terminology. Of course, while making this judgment, such reasons as some of them were written under the Ottoman threat and the anonymous writers of the chronicles tried not to make their feelings understood should also be taken into consideration. Interestingly, the terms "*Persians* (Persai) and *Scythians* (Skythai) are never used in the Short Chronicles for Ottomans. Since the term "barbaros" is used only for Tamerlane, in the chronicle note where his entering Anatolia is mentioned, it is informed that he enters Anatolia against Turks (Tourkoi) as a *Great Persian Satrap* (.Τεμίρπεης ἐξ Ανατολῶν, Περσῶν σατράπης μέγας.).<sup>36</sup> From the notes understood to have taken out from another only hand and giving plenty of information about Timur's Anatolia campaign, it is observed that they describe Timur as the emperor of *Scythians and Persians* (...Ταμύρη τοῦ Περσῶν καὶ Σκυθῶν ἀρχηγού.).<sup>37</sup> The same chronicle uses the terms "*Ishmaeli* (Ismaelitai)" and "*Agarens* (Agarenoi)" for Ottomans. In another chronicle note, both terms are observed to be used together by mentioning that in 1068-1071 the emperor Romanos Diogenis sets a campaign against *Persians* (Seljuks) and is taken prisoner by the *Turks* (Tourkoi) in the battle (the Battle of Manzikert).<sup>38</sup> Similarly, in a chronicle informing Aydinoglu Umur Beg's (here Αρμόπακις/Armorakis) coming to Thessalonike with his army, the term "ο Πέρσης" (Persian)" is used.<sup>39</sup> In another chronicle dated 16<sup>th</sup> century, it is understood that the author mentioning Sultan Selim I's setting a campaign against Iran (Persians) in 1514 is aware of the ethnic and religious distinctions and uses the terms correctly like many chroniclers:

*The same Sultan Selēmēs [Selim I] sets a campaign against Persians [Iran] as soon as he takes the control of the empire. And after achieving a victory, he returns to Constantinople.*<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See Nicolaos Nicoloudis, *Laonikos Chalkokondyles, A Translations and Commentary of the 'Demonstrations of Histories (Books I-III)*, Athens, 1996, pp. 57-64.

<sup>36</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 7/25.

<sup>37</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 12/7 and 12/10.

<sup>38</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 14/74, moreover; see Chr. 15/19, 17/4.

<sup>39</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 49/4.

<sup>40</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 58/31

In the chronicles, the names of the Ottoman sultans, begs and pashas appear in different writing forms. We also see that the titles and nicknames of the sultans are used correctly. The chroniclers use various terms for Ottoman sultans. *Authentis* (αὐθέντης) meaning *ruler*, *great ruler* (μέγας αὐθέντης), *emir* (ἄμυρ(ᾶς)), *great emir* (μέγας ἄμυρ(ᾶς)) and most frequently used *sultan* (σουλτάν(ος)) are some of these. Most of the time, the Ottoman rulers appear with the title "bey" added to the end of their names as well (for example, Mouratpeis, Baiazitbeis). However, it is striking that the titles and nicknames employed for Ottoman rulers in their own times are not confused. Osman Ghazi is emphasized a few times in the chronicles as the founder of the Ottoman dynasty and in any of the chronicles the title "beg" or the like titles are not used for Osman Ghazi. In some chronicles, he appears with some titles such as *Atoumanis* (Ατουμάνης), *Osmancikis* (Οσουμαντζικης), *Otmanis* (Οτμάνης) and *Otmanoglis* (Οτμάνογλης).<sup>41</sup> About his son, Orhan Ghazi, his conquests of Prousa (Bursa), Nicea (İznik), Gallipoli (Gelibolu) and the events he is involved in, it is observed that more than 30 notes in 20 separate chronicles give information.<sup>42</sup> In the chronicles, for Orhan Ghazi, both the title "Beg" and the title "Sultan" are used. His name is written in different forms such as *Arkanis* (Ἀρκάνης), *Orchani(s)* (Ὀρχάνι(ς)), *Orhanis* (Ὀρχάνης), *Yorkas* (Γιώρκας) and Giol Kasimes (Il Ghazi)<sup>43 44</sup>.

Orhan Ghazi's son, Sultan Murad I is mentioned in the chronicles more frequently due to his conquest of Adrianople (Edirne) and death. In the Byzantine Short Chronicles, we also come across the name of Murad I in different writing forms. The name of the sultan is usually written in distorted Greek spellings of the titles "Hudâvendigâr", "Gazi Hünkâr". These titles, also used by the Ottoman sources, are encountered in different punctuations in almost any of the chronicles because chroniclers write them as they hear. On the other hand, in the chronicles, we do not come across any negative titles or expressions about Murad I as well. In the chronicles, when mentioning about Sultan Murad I, see the following terms are used: Καζιχονκύρις (Kazichonkyris-Gazi Hünkâr), Καζιχοντικέρ (Kazichondiker-Gazi Hudavendigâr), Χανιτζιάρης-Chanitziaris), καζή Χμικιάρης (Kazi Chimikiaris-Gazi Hünkâr), Χον(τ)ικιάρης (Chondikiaris-Hudâvendigâr),

<sup>41</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr.

<sup>42</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 7/6, 8/16, 37/4, 38/1, 70/5, 72/1, 73/10, 8/21, 10/2, 7/7, 8/24, 101/3, 8/17, 8/27, 7/13, 37/5, 53/3, 54/1, 55/3, 58/1, 58/2, 59/17, 60/5, 60/6, 69/2, 71a/4, 72/2, 72a/1, 87/3, 7/1, 72a/4.

<sup>43</sup> Chr. 64/1

<sup>44</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 7/13, 7/15, 8/21, 8/24, 8/27, 72a/1, 72a/2, 72a/4, 72/3, 72a/3.

καζή Αμουράτης (kazi Amouratis-Gazi Murat), καζις Μουράτμπεις (kazis Mouratmpreis-Gazi Muratbey), Αμουράτη μπείς (Amourati beis-Muratbey), Αμουράτης(τις) (Amouratis-Murat), Αμουράτμπεης(εις) (Amouratmpreis-Muratbey), Μουράτης (Mouratis), Μουράτ(μ)πεης (Mouratbeis), Μουράτ(μ)πεις (Mouratbeis), Μωράτης (Moratis) and σουλτάν Μουράτης (sultan Mouratis-Sultan Murat).<sup>45</sup>

Murad I's son, Bayezid I or Yıldırım Bayezid, is generally mentioned with the titles "emir", "sultan", "arhont" or by adding *beg* to the end of his name. However, he is sometimes mentioned only with his name or *Yıldırım*. As chroniclers write down how they hear, different forms of writing are seen such as Παγιαζίτπει (Pagiazitpei), Παγιαζήτ (Pagiazit), Μπαγιαζήτης (Bagiazitis), Μπαγιαζήτις (Bagiazitis), Παϊαζίτης (Paiazitis), Παζαήτης (Pazaitis), Παγιαζήτ (Pagiazit), Παγιαζήτ πεη (Pagiazit pei), Παγιαζίτης (Pagiazitis), Παϊαζήτης (Paiazitis), Παϊαζίτης (Paiazitis), Παγιαζήτης (Pagiazitis), Ήλταρίμ (İltarım), Ήλτιρίμ (İltirim), Ήλτηρήμ (İltirim), Γιλτηρίμ Παγιαζήτης (Yıldırım Bagiazitis), Ϊλντιρήμ Μπαγιαζίτης (İldirim Bagiazitis) Ϊλντιρίμ Μπαγιαζίτμπείς (İldirim Bagiazitbeis). We observe that the first negative statements used for the ottoman sultans in the chronicles are used for Bayezid I, too. For this reason, it is observed in the chronicles that the titles such as *faithless*, *abhorred* and *deceitful* are used for him and his being defeated by Tamerlane is mentioned and his death is met with joy.<sup>46</sup> No negative statements are used for the Ottoman rulers before Bayezid I. Important pieces of information are given about the civil war breaking out following the death of Bayezid I and the princes. Moreover, an important matter catching attention in the chronicles belonging to this period is that the titles such as emir, beg, çelebi, sultan are not used haphazardly for princes. For Musa Çelebi, different titles of Μοσίπης (*Mosipeis*), Μωσής (*Mosis*), Μουσή Τζελεπής (*Mousi Tzelepis*), Μουσιλτζεπίς (*Mousiltzepis*), and Μουσή Κελεπής (*Mousi Kelepis*) appear before us in every chronicle. Besides these, in the chronicles, sometimes persons are confused with one another or different nicknames are used for the same person. For example, it is catching attention that *Moursouman*, *Mousoulman*, used as his nickname, is used for Emir Süleyman Çelebi, and for (Çelebi) Mehmed I, only the nickname of Κυριτζής (Kyritzis)<sup>47</sup> is used in the chronicles belonging to the

<sup>45</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 53/4, 9/24, 9/30, 9/34, 70/6, 72a/6, 53/7, 54/7, 55/8, 60/10, 72a/8, 91/3, 107/15.

<sup>46</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 7/21, 7/25, 7/27, 12/5, 12/6, 12/10, 12/11, 12/12, 22/26, 29/4, 50B/15, 53/8, 53/9, 54/8, 54/9, 69/60, 69/67, 70/8, 71/1, 71a/8, 72a/9, 72a/10, 72a/11, 72a/12, 72a/13, 75/4, 91/5, 94A/2, 95/1, 95/3, 96/1, 97/1.

<sup>47</sup> In the Short Chronicles and the Byzantine sources, this name is always used for Çelebi Mehmed. It is controversial that this word written in Greek as Κυριτζής/Κυριτζης= Kyritzis is

15<sup>th</sup> century and the titles of *soultan tzalapis (sultan çebebi)*, *Mechmetis*, *Sultan Mechmetis* and *ruler (authentis) Mechemetis*<sup>48</sup> are used in later dated sultan lists and in some chronicles. On the other hand, it is observed that no negative statements are used for the princes in this period either. Murad II's conquest policies starting with the siege of Constantinople in 1422 and continuing in the Balkans leads him to be remembered in the chronicles as the second Ottoman ruler, after Bayezid I, with negative statements of faithless, godless. His name is frequently encountered in the chronicles with the spellings of *Amouratisbeis* (Ἀμουράτης(τις) μπεις), *Sultan Amouratis* (Σουλτάν Ἀμουράτης(τις)) and *Amouratis, σουλτάν Μωράτης* (sultan Moratis).<sup>49</sup>

From Mehmed II on, almost the only subject of the Byzantine Short Chronicles is the Ottoman conquests. Especially, the actual hero of the chronicles categorized as “Chronicles of Turkish Conquests” is the Ottoman sultans and conquests. Some of the chronicles are allocated only to Sultan Mehmed II's campaigns under the title “τὰ σεφέρια ὅποῦ ἔκαμεν ὁ σουλτάν Μεμετής (*Campaigns made by Sultan Mehmed*)”.<sup>50</sup> However, almost all of these recordings record and list briefly the sultans' military campaigns and conquests without any interpretation. In most of these chronicles, it is observed that chroniclers do not disclose their feelings toward sultans. Moreover, Mehmed II is the sultan mentioned as *βασιλεύς/basileus* for the

---

used to refer to Çelebi Mehmed. In his article where he discusses this subject, Wittek discusses the similarity of “kirişçi” in sound to *Çelebi* meaning “young shehzadah or bey” and its establishing in Turkish as “kirişçi”. See Paul Wittek, “Der ‘Beiname’ des osmanischen Sultans Mehmed I”, *Eretz-Israel* 7 (1964), pp. 144-153; p. 391. Zachariadou is also of the same mind: See Elizabeth Zachariadou, “Suleiman Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles” *Der Islam*, 60.2 (1983), p. 287. The word's closeness to the word “kirişçi” denoting the profession of making the string between the two ends of the bow used for throwing arrows is not just a paronomasis. According to Laonikos Chalkokondyles's expression, whose source is unknown, Çelebi Mehmed worked with a bowyer in Bursa to learn the profession: See Chalkokondyles, *Historiarum*, v. I, pp. 168, 8-9: “...χορδοποιοῦ τινός, ἐν Προύση παρεκατέθεντο, ὡς ἂν τὴν τέχνην ἐκμανθάνοι.” It was also used in Turkish sources mistakenly to denote “wrestler”. See Şerif Baştav, “Legends about the Youth of Çelebi Mehmed”, *Türkisch Historical Society Paper Summaries*, Ankara 2002, pp. 128–129.

<sup>48</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. III, Chr. 71a/12, 71a/14, 71a/39, Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 75/4.

<sup>49</sup> Schreiner, *Kleinchroniken*, v. I, 9/49, 9/53, 13/2, 13/11, 22/34, 22/36, 22/42, 22/47, 32/42, 33/39, 33/50, 33/51, 34/4, 34/5, 34/11, 34/12, 34/17, 35/7, 36/18, 38/10, 39/6, 40/3, 50B/15, 53/14, 53/16, 53/17, 53/20, 54/11, 54/12, 54/14, 54/15, 55/9, 55/11, 55/12, 55/13, 56/3, 60a/1, 63/4, 64/1, 69/4, 69/28, 69/29, 69/61, 69/69, 70/11, 71/1, 71/6, 71a/16, 71a/18, 71a/20, 71a/21, 71a/29, 71a/30, 72/6, 72a/22, 72a/23, 72a/26, 72a/27, 73/4, 76/3, 82/4, 94A/5, 97/10, 102/1.

<sup>50</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v.I, Chr. 69/41-50.

first time in the chronicles. Although this title is used for centuries for the Byzantine emperor, that it is used frequently for Mehmed II and his successor powerful rulers as we will see below can be an indication of the new *basileus*' becoming the Ottoman ruler now among the Orthodox Greeks. Of course, this assumption falls short of explaining when we consider that the Short Chronicles are not completely independent from the historiography tendencies of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. At this point, in what meaning the term "*basileus*" (βασιλεύς) is used gains importance within the context of achieving the legitimacy of the Ottoman administration among the above-mentioned Post-Byzantine authors. It is seen that while the Byzantine authors of the 15<sup>th</sup> century such as Doukas and Cardinal Bessarion use the term "*basileus*" and other ruler titles carefully, it is used consciously for the Ottoman ruler in most of the pro-Ottoman authors such as Kritovoulos, Amiroutzis.<sup>51</sup> While Doukas describes Mehmed II as a tyranny and anti-Christian, Amiroutzis fills his work with praises and recommendations for Mehmed II by declaring him as the "New Emperor of Romans." It is more commonly known that Kritovoulos mentions about Mehmed II's personality, courage, and policies regarding the protection of trade as his official historian.<sup>52</sup> For this reason, it is beneficial to evaluate the term "*basileus*" used for the Ottoman rulers in the Short Chronicles most of which are written in the 15<sup>th</sup> century or later within this context. Of course, it is impossible to prove that these chronicles were affected directly by the sources like Amiroutzis. However, we can state that the prevalence of this terminology and the appropriateness of the political condition facilitated the acceptance of this use among chroniclers.

Mehmed II conquered many Christian cities. Despite this, negative statements related to him are not common, as expected, in the chronicles except for a few chronicle notes. In one of these chronicle notes, Mehmed II is described as *Murat's faithless son*.<sup>53</sup> The Conquest of Constantinople (1453), Mehmed II's great military success, are recorded in 42 chronicles. These chronicles describe only the event itself without making any comments about the young sultan and sometimes without even telling his name. Another exceptional chronicle cites the statement of an annalist rejoicing at the death of Mehmed like "*Wild wolf and cruel monster Emir Mehmet died in 6989*".<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Moustakas, mentioned paper, p. 220.

<sup>52</sup> Steven W. Reinert, "Mehmed II" *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. Kazhdan, New York-Oxford 1991, p. 1331.

<sup>53</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 9/53.

<sup>54</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 101/7.



Not many negative statements are used while listing the conquests of all the Ottoman sultans coming after Mehmed II in the chronicles. While mentioning about the campaigns and conquests in the periods of Bayezid II, Sultan Selim I, Süleyman I, Selim II and Murad III, the chroniclers are rarely observed to reflect their feelings. Among these sultans, the use of the title "great ruler/megas authentis" for Bayezid II, the titles "basileus" and "megas basileus" for Süleyman I, and the title "basileus" for Murad III is eye-catching.<sup>55</sup> For the title "megas", which is not used haphazardly, even for the Byzantine emperors, is usually used to describe the rulers, who are old and famous for their achievements, or in case of a common empire, the bigger one.<sup>56</sup> Although such titles as *megas sultanos* (great sultan), *megas amiras* (great emir) are rarely used in the history for great Turkish rulers, we do not come across the use of the title "megas basileus" for a Turkish ruler. It is eye-catching that an chronicler recording the news of the death of Sultan Selim I (1520) praises him as a righteous ruler protecting Christians, repairing churches and building new churches:

*"In 7029, on September 26, following the 9 years of emperorship, a faithless, brave man, meticulous and righteous judge, Sultan Selēmēs [Yavuz Selim] died. He liked especially most of the Christians and the churches of Christ. In his period, many churches of a lot of Christians were repaired. He, in his period, made all the necessary help for the repairment of old churches again. He said this: "All the houses of God will be beautified". And together with the old churches, many new ones were built from the foundation."*<sup>57</sup>

Despite these positive statements, his use of the title 'faithless' (asevis) in the same chronicle makes us consider that such kinds of titles are traditionally used. But still, we can also think that this note describes the "good" emperor for a Christian annalist. What is important for an annalist is that an Ottoman emperor having a different belief protects his religion and it is enough for him to describe that emperor as a good, praiseworthy one. Moreover, by going further, chroniclers describe the Ottoman lands which Süleiman the Magnificent rule as βασιλεία/basileia (empire). In one of the Sultan lists (Chr. 59/27), after listing up to Süleiman the Magnificent, when his statement "Our rulers called Ottomans were these"<sup>58</sup> is considered together with the title "megas basileus", we can state that at least for this

<sup>55</sup>Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 41/5, 46/16, 53/51, 53/54

<sup>56</sup> See Peter Schreiner, "Zur Bezeichnung 'Megas' und 'Megas Basileus' in der byzantinischen Kaisertitulatur" *Byzantina* (3), 1971, p. 180 and others.

<sup>57</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 33/79.

<sup>58</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 59/27

annalist the holy titles of the Byzantine emperors are left behind. Moreover, in another chronicle, it is told that Suleiman the Magnificent decides to put Christians to the sword due to a Jewish magician's prophecies but Piri Pasha convinces the sultan and prevents this massacre. At the same time, from the statements in the following chronicle note, it is almost clearly anticipated that the increase in the Jewish people's ascendancy over the Ottomans' political and economic lives unsettles the Greek-Orthodox population:

*“Before Soulainanēs [Suleiman I] became the ruler, a Jewish magician had gone before him and said this: “Know that, you are going to become the ruler.” And in return for this, the Sultan asked “When?” And the Jewish said: “I learned this from three letters. I did not see anything about in what year or month it will be or [about this matter]”. And when he said this and other useful things, Sultan Suleiman said: “If I become the ruler, I will give you the reward you want”. And he gave him a written guarantee. And according to what that Jewish said, he became the ruler and when the Jewish's letters were counted, his words were seen to be true. The Jewish popped out and demanded his reward in accordance with the piece of writing which the Sultan had penned with his own handwriting and went before him with the esteemed people. He asked him how his rulership will be. Learning about the future thanks to his belief or with a bad intention, the Jewish said: “The Christians in the city will start a riot and declare a person who is in the City today the ruler and associated with this they will rise up against your state. For this reason, for your rulership, to prevent them from doing this, you should put them to the sword. But he called in his leading advisors to put the Christians to the sword. One of the leading persons called Pyrimpasias [Piri Pasha] prevented him from illegal and unfair anger and said: “Your Sultan, such great matters are from God and if these are from God, we can stand up against God; because we should not accept anything equal to God. If it results from people, then leave us, your subjects, the giving of necessary punishment.”<sup>59</sup>*

This chronicle note's being repeated in two different chronicles makes us consider that those mentioned above were commonly known among the Christians. Moreover, in another chronicle note, the same event is linked to mystical powers and it is told that on an Easter's Sunday Muslim dervishes

---

<sup>59</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 33/84. The same story is repeated in Chr. 58/35 as well.

worshipping in Hagia Sophia hear Christian hymns and see a divine light, then Suleyman I is called forth to Hagia Sophia and he comes there, and when he himself witnesses that event, he orders Christians be killed and again Piri Pasha calms him down:

*“In the same year God showed this sign of his in Constantinople: At the midnight of the Easter's Sunday, dervishes came together and went to the Hagia Sophia to say salavat as required by their tradition. And when they came to the courtyard of the church, they heard a hymn and saw a divine light inside the church. When they approached there, they found there with its doors open, the candles lit and the hymn “Christ resurrected” sung. And when they heard these, they immediately informed the ruler about these, and he himself came and listened to this. And after he [Suleiman I] witnessed these with his own eyes, he ordered his men to climb up the arches to learn if that was a human work. And at that moment the light and hymn ended. Although he was inclined to put the Christians to the sword, Piri Pasha [Piri Pasha] calmed his anger down.”<sup>60</sup>*

These chronicle notes can be interpreted from many different perspectives. Even, it can be stated that they reflect the tension among the elite administrator groups appearing in the Ottoman administration. For this reason, it can be stated that these chronicles watch closely the tendencies in the Ottoman administration, express their feelings according to the tendencies appearing in the administration with covert statements. The clearly seen thing is that for the Orthodox Greeks there are now good and bad people among the 16th century Ottomans. In the chronicles, there are also negative statements used for Turks frequently without specifying any ruler. When it is looked in general, we see that these statements are the terms used for sultans such as *ἀπιστος* (apistos), *ἄθεος* (atheos), *ἀσεβής* (asevis) meaning beliefless, faithless, atheist, godless. In a chronicle, the term *παράνομος* (paranomos)/bandit" is used.<sup>61</sup> However, it can be observed that these kinds of statements decrease as the Ottoman domination gets strong. How the Ottoman administration gained legitimacy among the Orthodox Christians living under the Ottoman domination and Christians' "mixed feelings" about Ottomans become clearer when the sources other than the

<sup>60</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 33/85.

<sup>61</sup> For example, Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr.7/25, 14/107, 65/19, 56 (in the title), 114/1 and others.

Short Chronicles are examined. Of various studies made on this matter,<sup>62</sup> the most striking one is the one made in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in which Olga Todorova discusses the legitimacy of the Ottoman administration among Christians over the "Chronicle of Serres" referred to Synadinos (Papasyadinos), the metropolitan bishop of the city of Serres. In his chronicle, Synadinos records and interprets the daily lives of Christians living in Serres and around, the conditions in which they live and their relationships with the Ottoman administration from his own perspective throughout his life; in this sense, it can be evaluated both as an autobiography and a "local chronicle" reflecting the mentality of Christians living in a middle-scale Balkan city. Here, without repeating a detailed analysis of the work, it will be enough to point out that it is a work reflecting the "homo Ottomanicus" mentality of Synadinos, with the expression of O. Todorova, and indicating how the Christian clergyman systematized the legitimacy of the Ottoman administration. According to O. Todorova, although Synadinos begins his work with a feeling of sorrow for the fall of Constantinople, he recognizes the Ottoman sultan as the legitimate ruler and mentions about his loyalty to him many times. As it is in the Short Chronicles, he mentions about the Ottoman sultan not as "Sultan" but as "Basileus", also not as a foreign ruler but his own ruler and defends the idea that the subjects are obliged to pay taxes and be loyal to the ruler by supporting the relationship between the ruler and his subjects via examples from the Bible. Narrating concrete events, Synadinos praises the justice of both the Ottoman emperor and some Ottoman administrators in Serres at every opportunity, but sometimes he criticizes some Sultans and pashas. He tells about the celebrations held after Murad IV's Bagdat victory and the victory boastfully and reveals clearly that he adopts the achievements of the state in foreign policies.<sup>63</sup> Moreover, O. Todorova's most important finding is Synadinos's having reasons for mentioning Murad IV, one of the most despotic sultans in the Ottoman history, as more righteous and better than any rulers which Christians can have. That the pashas assigned by Murad IV treat the Christian subjects in Serres fairly without making any discrimination against injustice made by local administrators and Muslim subjects takes away the worries of the Christians in Serres. For this reason,

---

<sup>62</sup> Johann Strauss, "Ottoman rule experienced and remembered: remarks on some local Greek chronicles of the Tourkokratia", *The Ottomans and the Balkans: A Discussion of Historiography*, eds. Fikret Adanır and Suraiya Faroqhi, Leiden, Brill 2002, p. 196-205; Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "Turkish Yoke Revisited: The Ottoman Empire in the Eyes of its non-Muslim Subjects", *Zones of Fracture in Modern Europe: The Baltic Countries, the Balkans, and Northern Italy*, ed. Almut Bues, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005, pp. 157-164.

<sup>63</sup> O. Todorova, *ibid*, pp. 89-93.

when we come to the 17th century, it can be easily stated that the policy applied to Christians and the church rather than rulers' religion gave shape to the Ottoman perception. When it is looked from this perspective, as it is in the above-mentioned Short Chronicle excerpt, although that it includes a series of praises about Sultan Selim I, one of the most pious sultans, as a protector of Christians might be surprising at first sight, it seems natural in terms of reflecting the personality of the author of the chronicle.

How chroniclers perceive Ottomans is closely related to how they describe themselves. Seen from this perspective, the result is not surprising. In general, in the early chronicles, the term “Romans (Ρωμαίοι/Romaioi)” refer to Byzantines, as opponents of Turks (Ottomans) and being attacked by them continuously. After 1453, however, the use of this term is not encountered except for two chronicle notes. One of these is the chronicle mentioning the capture of Morea from the hand of "Romans" in 1460 and Romans living in Navarino in 1501.<sup>64</sup> Although it is not possible to make a generalization from here, it can be stated that the term “Romaioi/Romans” is used to discriminate themselves from the others in places over which Ottomans have no control yet and in most of the local chronicles in the Greek geography under the pressure of Westerners.<sup>65</sup> However, in addition to the Short Chronicles showing that the “Roman” identity still continues to live in the Ottoman period, I need to add that this identity is often used by the Greek-speaking Orthodox Ottoman subjects until the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the texts written in Greek in the Ottoman period as well. One of the striking examples of this can be seen in the childhood recollections of the famous Greek Byzantinist Peter Charanis cited by A. Kaldellis. P. Charanis mentions about Greek soldiers' coming to Limnos, which is his birthplace, in 1912 and his conversation with them. Soldiers asks P. Charanis, looking at them wonderingly, why he is looking at them like that and the child says that he is looking at “Helens” (Greeks). The soldier asks him: “Aren't you Helens?” And the child P. Charanis answers: “No. We are Romans”.<sup>66</sup> In most of the chronicles, the identities such as Christians, Argosians (people of Argos city), Cretans are now used. The use of these local identities in local

---

<sup>64</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 37/8–20, 79/38–42.

<sup>65</sup> For detailed analysis on the change period of Hellenism and Greek identity in the Byzantine period, see Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2007, p. 351. Kaldellis puts forth that, in order to indicate the distinction between them and the Latins in the region, they described themselves as Romans and the others as “those speaking the language of Romans” in Tocco Chronicle in the 15th century, and again L. Machairas described himself as "Roman" to indicate the difference between him and the Westerners in Cyprus.

<sup>66</sup> Kaldellis, *ibid*, pp. 41-42.

chronicles is more frequently observed in regions where the Ottoman administration is not strong enough yet. Moreover, another subject catching attention at this point is that the terms of Hellen or Hellenes (ὁ Ἕλλην/ οἱ Ἕλληνες) are never used in the Short Chronicles. It is observed that the word "Hellas" (ἡ Ἑλλάς) is used a few times only in geographical sense. The term "Hellenism" is an important historical category which should be evaluated by taking linguistic, ethnic, cultural changes, identities and period characteristics into consideration and cannot be simplified. For this reason, without entering into the discussions of the concept of "Hellenism", it will be enough to state that this concept was used consciously in the 14<sup>th</sup> century in the works of Demetrios Kydones and Nikolaos Kabasilas and in the next century in the works of Gemistos Plethon, Bessarion, Patrik Gennadios and Chalkokondyles and its roots are based on the intellectual accumulation in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>67</sup> Although there are enthusiastic proponents of it among the above-mentioned great authors of Byzantium, it is not by accident not to come across it in the Short Chronicles. Due to not using of the concept of Hellen/Hellenes in the Short Chronicles, it might be an assertion to say that it is not adopted yet in large segments of the society. However, at least, we should accept the fact the authors of these chronicles are away from the agenda of the elite intellectuals of the period in terms of historiography. At this point, it is useful to remember Maria Todorova's "Kritovoulos Paradigm" thesis.<sup>68</sup> M. Todorova conceptualized more conformist and positive attitude preferring the adaptation to and the adoption of the Ottoman regime from the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century on especially in the Balkans in historiography through the attitude of Kritovoulos. When it is looked at the Short Chronicles, it is anticipated that this paradigm also affects the chroniclers especially after the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Of course, it is not possible to reach such kinds of precise generalizations from the untidy notes in the Short Chronicles. However, in the process of transition from the Byzantine period to the Ottoman domination, we can at least watch that ordinary people adopt their new political and cultural environments. Approximately, in 1500, it is observed that a person who is eager to record what is going on in his family and around like Manuel Gerakes living in Thessaloniki records his children's birth and death hours as *"At the time when Turkish morning azan is being recited or At the time when salâ is being recited on Friday*. He notes that when his other son is born, he is in Constantinople and when his another daughter is born, it is Christian feast. The ordinariness in his writings gives

<sup>67</sup> See Nicoloudis, *ibid*, p. 58; Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Ιστορία τοῦ Νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, v. I, Thessalonike 1974, pp. 290-291-303.

<sup>68</sup> Maria Todorova, *ibid*, pp.167-168.

us at least an idea about this person's perception related to his new cultural environment.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Schreiner, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, v. I, Chr. 107.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BEIHAMMER, Alexander, "Orthodoxy and Religious Antagonism in Byzantine Perceptions of the Seljuk Turks (Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries)", *Al-Masaq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean*, 23:1 (2011), 15-36.
- DURAK, Koray, "Defining the 'Turk': Mechanisms of Establishing Contemporary Meaning in the Archaizing Language of Byzantines", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 59. Band/2009, 65-78.
- GREGORY, Timothy, *Bizans Tarihi*, çev. Esra Ermert, İstanbul 2008, s. 21;
- KARPOZILOS, Apostolos, "Peter Schreiner, Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken. 2. Teil Historischer Commentar. 3. Teil Teilübersetzungen, Addenda et Corrigenda, Indices [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. 12,2-12,3. Series Vindobonensis. ed. H. Hunger]. Wien, Öster. Akad. d Wiss. 1977, 644 S/1979/, 254 S.", *Ελληνικά (Hellenika)* 34 (1982), p. 437.
- KALDELLIS, Anthony, *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2007
- KODER, Johannes, "Romaioi and Teukroi, Hellenes and Barbaroi, Europe and Asia: Mehmed the Conqueror Kayser-i Rum and Sultan al-barrayn wa-l-bahrayn"-Summary. Athens Dialogues. 2010. [http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=21.\(13.11.2012\)](http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=21.(13.11.2012)).
- KORAC, Dusan - Radič Radivoj, "Mehmed II, 'the Conqueror' in Byzantine Short Chronicles and Old Serbian Annals, Inscriptions, and Genealogies", *Zbornik Radova Vizantoloshkog Instituta (ZRVI)* XLV (2008), s. 289-300.
- MANGO, Cyril, *Bizans, Yeni Roma İmparatorluğu*, çev. Gül Çağalı Güven, YKY, İstanbul 2007
- MORAVCSIK, Gyula, *Byzantinoturcica*, c. I-II, Berlin 1958.
- MOUSTAKAS, Konstantinos, "Byzantine 'Visions' of the Ottoman Empire: Theories of Ottoman Legitimacy by Byzantine Scholars after the Fall of Constantinople", *Images of the Byzantine World, Visions, Messages and Meanings Studies Presented to Leslie Brubaker*, ed. Angeliki Lymberopoulou, Ashgate, 2011, s. 215-229.
- NICOLOUDIS Nicolaos, *Laonikos Chalkokondyles, A Translations and Commentary of the 'Demonstrations of Histories (Books I-III)*, Athens, 1996, s. 57-64.
- PAGE, Gill, *Being Byzantine, Greek Identity Before the Ottomans 1200-1420*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008, s. 170-176.



- REINERT, Steven W., "Mehmed II" *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. Kazhdan, New York-Oxford 1991.
- SAVVIDES, Aleksios G. C., "Some Notes on the Terms Agarenoi, İsmailitai and Sarakenoi in Byzantine Sources", *Byzantion* 67 (1997), 89-96.
- SCHREINER, Peter, "Zur Bezeichnung 'Megas' und 'Megas Basileus' in der byzantinischen Kaisertitulatur" *Byzantina* (3), 1971, s. 175-192.
- , Peter, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, I-III, [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 12/1-3], Wien, 1975-1979.
- , Peter, *Studien zu den Βραχέα Χρονικά*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 6, München 1967, s. 116-119.
- TODOROVA, Maria, *Imagining the Balkans*, Oxford University Press, New York 1997, p. 167-168.
- TODOROVA, Olga, "The Ottoman State and its Orthodox Christian subjects: the legitimistic discourse in the seventeenth-century 'Chronicle of Serres' in a new perspective", *Turkish Historical Review*, I (2010), 86-110.
- VAKALOPOULOS, Apostolos, *Ιστορία τοῦ Νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, c. I, Thessalonike 1974.
- WITTEK, Paul, "Der 'Beiname' des osmanischen Sultans Mehmed I", *Eretz-Israel* 7 (1964), s. 144-157.
- ZACHARIADOU, Elizabeth, "Suleiman Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles" *Der Islam*, 60.2 (1983), 268-290.

