

# Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II in Byzantium (1262-1264/1265)

The vicissitudes in the life of the exiled Seljuk sultan Kaykāwus II (ruled 1245-1262) in Byzantium and his subsequent flight to the Crimea are widely known from mentions in all of the general histories of Byzantium and the Saljuq sultanate<sup>1</sup>. Briefly, the story of Kaykāwus II is as follows. Beginning in the late 1240s, two co-rulers and brothers 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus and Rukn al-Dīn Qilich Arslan contested the supreme power of the sultanate. The Mongols of Iran, who subjugated Anatolia as early as 1243, resolutely supported Rukn al-Dīn. As a result of a series of conflicts, 'Izz al-Dīn left the sultanate and fled to Byzantium and stayed there until the winter of 1264/1265. At first, his relations with the emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos were friendly; however, later for a reason there appeared tension between the sultan and the emperor. Kaykāwus hatched a plot and planned to depose Michael Palaiologos. The sultan appealed for help to the Bulgarians and the Mongols of the Golden Horde. Finally, there occurred the joint attack of the Bulgarians and the Tatars against the Empire who liberated Kaykāwus II from Ainos in Thrace and brought him to the Golden Horde. This is the generally known story of the sultan's exile in Byzantium. The case of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus is symptomatic of the two most significant paradigms of Byzantine attitudes towards the Turks: first, relations with those Turks who were outside Byzantium, and second, relations with the Turks as Byzantine subjects inside the empire. However, the case of Kaykāwus II has never been researched specifically, the chronology of his life in Byzantium still remains doubtful in some parts, and many details of the story are still obscure.

Kaykāwus' adventures profoundly impressed both Greek and Oriental authors. Greek, Persian, Arab, Syriac, and Ottoman historians kept retelling the story for many decades after the event. In the primary sources, one may distinguish at least four independent accounts of Kaykāwus' adventures. The Greek side is represented by the connected versions of Georgios Pachymeres (ca. 1308) and Nikephoros Gregoras (ca. 1359) who was dependent on the former<sup>2</sup>. The Oriental tradition is more complex. The Persian chronicles of Ibn Bibī (ca. 1281) and Aqṣarāyī (1323) gave two independent, albeit intersecting, versions<sup>3</sup>. Yazıcızâde 'Alī's Turkish paraphrase of Ibn Bibī's story (1423) entitled »Tawāriḫ-i Āl-i Saljūq« mainly follows its source adding important new details; however, the validity of some of his additions may be questioned<sup>4</sup>. The Mamluk historian Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir (1223-1293), who was a contemporary of the events, provides unique information on the diplomatic activity of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus before his emigration to Byzantium<sup>5</sup>. The Mamluk high official Baybars al-Manṣūrī (d. 1325) was a younger contemporary of the events and gave in his writings one more independent version of the story<sup>6</sup>. Finally, some minor details can be found in the Syriac History of Bar Hebraeus (Abū al-Faraj) (before 1286) and the Persian anonymous Ta'riḫ-i Āl-i Saljūq (ca. 1300)<sup>7</sup>.

I would like to focus on a few key episodes, which may allow, as I hope, to reevaluate the importance of the whole story. First, it is necessary to establish the chronology of Kaykāwus' arrival in Byzantium; second, the circle of Kaykāwus' courtiers and subjects will be discussed; finally, I will focus on the fate of Kaykāwus' men after his flight from Byzantium.

1 My special thanks are due to Dr. Oya Pancaroğlu for her generous help during the preparation of this piece.

2 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler). – Gregoras, Historia I (Schopen)

3 Ibn Bibi (Erzi), an incomplete German translation: Ibn Bibi (Duda). – Aqṣarāyī (Turan).

4 We still do not have a fully reliable critical edition of Yazıcızâde 'Alī's »Tawāriḫ«, the source containing essential information for the history of Anatolia and the Balkans. For the subjects under discussion I have used three versions of Yazıcızâde 'Alī's »Tawāriḫ«: 1) a Berlin manuscript – Yazıcızâde 'Alī (Berlin), 2) a recent critical edition of A. Bakır who transcribed the original Arabic text into modern Turkish script and whose readings are not unquestionable. – Yazıcızâde Ali (Bakır), 3) extensive quotations from one of the Istanbul manuscripts (Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Revan Bölümü R.1390) transcribed into modern Turkish script. – Decei, Le problème 87-90. Decei's study also contains comprehensive analyses of the later Ottoman tradition based upon Yazıcızâde 'Alī's account.

5 See: Muḥī al-Dīn. In the 1260s, Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir was a secretary in the chancellery of the Egyptian sultan 'Abd al-Zāhir Baybars (1260-1277) and prepared drafts of official correspondence of the sultan. It is possible that he himself drafted the letters going from the Mamluk court to 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus. Thus, he is the only contemporary high standing eyewitness for Kaykāwus' affairs with a direct access to first-hand information unlike other Oriental and Greek authors. On Muḥī al-Dīn's biography and writings see: Khawaiter, Baibars 144-166.

6 See: Baybars al-Manṣūrī. Baybars al-Manṣūrī, a high-ranked military commander and secretary of the Mamluk court, made use of Muḥī al-Dīn's accounts but also added important new information using the archives of the Mamluk state chancellery and information coming from the Mamluk diplomats and informers. The information of Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir and Baybars al-Manṣūrī was extensively utilized by later Mamluk historiographers such as al-Maqrīzī (1364-1442), al-'Aynī (1360-1453) and many others (see for instance: Tizengauzen, Sbornik).

7 Abu al-Faraj (Budge). – Tarix-e al-e Saljuq (Jalali).

## Flight to Byzantium (summer 1262)

There is still no consensus in the scholarly literature about when Kaykāwus went to Byzantium and where in Byzantium he arrived. Most scholars date the sultan's arrival to the time before the conquest of Constantinople by the Greeks on 25 July 1261, while others simply avoid giving an exact date implying that Kaykāwus arrived in Byzantium sometime in 1261<sup>8</sup>. The problem lies in the discrepancy between the evidences of the Byzantine and Oriental sources and the lack of an exact date in the available sources. However, a careful comparison of sources allows us to come to a more precise date.

The most plausible date of Kaykāwus' arrival in Byzantium may be derived from Oriental sources, which have been hitherto underutilized. Sometime before his journey to Byzantium, 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus fled from Konya to Antalya under the pressure of the forces of his brother Rukn al-Dīn and the Mongol army led by 'Alijāq. According to the anonymous »Ta'rikh-i Āl-i Saljūq«, sultan Rukn al-Dīn conquered Konya on 12 August 1261 (14 Ramaḍān 659)<sup>9</sup>, just two days after Kaykāwus left the city for Antalya, as Ibn Bībī maintains<sup>10</sup>. This chronology is supported by the well-informed Syriac historian Bar Hebraeus who reports that the civil war in the Saljuq Sultanate and the flight of Kaykāwus from Konya happened »at the end of the summer« of 1261<sup>11</sup>. Kaykāwus, after his escape from Konya, spent a rather long time in Antalya where he waited for the outcomes of the counter-offensive of his troops under the command of 'Alī Bahādūr and pleaded for support from his allies abroad. 'Alī Bahādūr gathered a large army at Sivrihisar and tried to besiege the enemy in Konya. In the meantime, the sultan sent envoys to Michael VIII Palaiologos to receive the emperor's consent to host him<sup>12</sup>. Finally, 'Alī Bahādūr was routed by Rukn al-Dīn and the Mongols at Sivrihisar and fled to *uc* areas. After the final defeat of his troops the sultan was headed to Byzantium<sup>13</sup>. However, the question arises as to how long the sultan stayed in Antalya. A clear answer to this question can be found only in Mamluk sources of the time.

During his stay in Antalya the sultan, in particular, communicated with the Egyptian court hoping to get military aid from the Mamluks. Osman Turan in his seminal book

»Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye« refers to the important testimonies of the Mamluk historian Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir which are the most chronologically reliable of the surviving sources<sup>14</sup>. Muḥī al-Dīn's evidence allows us to define precise dates for 'Izz al-Dīn's stay in Antalya. It seems pertinent to return to Turan's arguments with some emendations and additions. Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir refers to diplomatic contacts between the Mamluk court and 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus. The earliest reference belongs to the Muslim year 660 (25 November 1261-14 November 1262) with no indication of the month: two envoys arrived from 'Izz al-Dīn at the Mamluk court with his letter in which »he displayed great humility to him (that is to the Mamluk sultan Baybars – *Author*) and [said] that he lost power over half of his country«. 'Izz al-Dīn asked for support and, by the way of reciprocation, offered to grant *iqṭā'* in his lands to the Mamluk emirs chosen by Baybars. Baybars »ordered to prepare troops for helping the ruler of Rum« and appointed one of his emirs to be sent to Rum with 300 cavalymen<sup>15</sup>. As subsequent passages show, this happened in the interval November 1261-April 1262. In Jumādā II 660 (22 April-20 May 1262), an Egyptian ambassador was sent by sea to 'Izz al-Dīn in Antalya to inform that Baybars »responded to his request and answered his call for help« by his decision to send an army<sup>16</sup>. Next month, in Rajab (21 May-19 June 1262), 'Izz al-Dīn informed the Mamluk court that »his enemies, having heard about his alliance with the sultan [Baybars], were in fear of the power [of the sultan] and fled, and that he went to Konya and was besieging it in order to seize his brother's partisans inside it«<sup>17</sup>. Obviously, in the message of May-June 1262, 'Izz al-Dīn implied the attack of 'Alī Bahādūr against Konya which finally ended with his severe defeat at Sivrihisar. As Ibn Bībī put it, »having despaired of a good outcome« 'Izz al-Dīn soon left for Byzantium. As to the planned Mamluk military aid, al-Manṣūrī remarked that while the military expedition was under preparation news came of 'Izz al-Dīn's flight from the sultanate, and so there was no longer need for it<sup>18</sup>.

Based on these testimonies one may suggest that Kaykāwus arrived in Byzantium as late as the summer of 1262 and not earlier than June 1262<sup>19</sup>. In addition to narrative data, Seljuk numismatics provides confirmation for this

8 See, for instance, the most detailed and important studies: Mutafčiev, Die angebliche Einwanderung 10. – Wittek, Yazijioğlu 254. – Geanakoplos, Michael Palaeologus 81. – Failler, Chronologie I 53-55. – Cahen, La Turquie 249. – Cahen, Kaykā'ūs II 813-814. – PLP no. 328. – Bees, Inschriftenaufzeichnung 44. 46. – Žavoronkov, Tjurki 168. – Vásáry, Cumans and Tatars 72-77. See also more recent general studies: CHT 63. 72. – CHBE 722. In my earlier works, I followed the traditional date 1261 as well.

9 Tarix-e al-e Saljuq (Jalali) 99.

10 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 636. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 283.

11 Abu al-Faraj (Budge) 442.

12 The possibility of 'Izz al-Dīn taking refuge in Byzantium had been already negotiated between his envoys and Michael VIII Palaiologos as early as the spring of 1259 in Nymphaion: Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 10 (1, 149, 15-21).

13 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 636-637. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 283. 342 note 371.

14 Turan, Selçuklular 496-497.

15 Muhi al-Din (Hüwaytîr) 125:

وذلك الأمير شرف الدين الجاكي، والشريف عماد الدين الهاشمي وصلا من عند صاحب الروم عزالدين كيكافوس بن كيكسرو، و صحبتهم الأمير ناصر الدين نصرالله بن کوچ رسلان، أمير حاجب، والصدر صدرالدين الأخطاطي، رسلان منه، و معهما كتابه إلى السلطان ينتزل فيه ترلاً عظيماً، وأنه نزل للسلطان عن نصف بلاده؛ وسيز دروجاً فيها علامت بما يقطع من البلاد لمن يختاره

السلطان، و يؤمره، و يكتب له من جهته منشراً قرين منشور صاحب الروم. فلما وصل الرسل أكرمهم السلطان، و سكن جأهم، و شرع في تجهيز جيش نجدة لصاحب الروم، و أمر بكتب المناشير، و عين الأمير ناصر الدين أغلمش، السلاح دار الصالح، لتقدمة العسكر و عين له نلنمته فارس، و أقطعه في الروم.

However, Muhi al-Din (Hüwaytîr) wrongly placed this passage after his account of later events in Sha'bān 660 (20 June - 18 July 1262). This led to a misunderstanding in later Mamluk historiography which used Muhi al-Din's text as the main source for the biography of the sultan Baybars: al-Maqrizî and al-'Ayni reproduce this passage under Sha'bān 660 (al-Maqrizî (Atā), 1, 542. – al-'Ayni (Amin) 1, 334).

16 Muhi al-Din (Hüwaytîr) 127:

و أن يتوجه صدر الدين، الرسول الآخر، صبية رسل السلطان في البحر، إلى السلطان عزالدين، واعلمه بأن اسطان قد أجاب داعيه، و لبى مناديه، و وقع الاهتمام في كتب المناشير، و تجريد الأمراء من حلب و الشام.

17 Muhi al-Din (Hüwaytîr) 128:

و في هذا التاريخ وصل كتاب صاحب الروم، يذكر فيه أن العدو لما بلغهم التفاق مع السلطان خافوا من هيبتة، فوَلوا هارين، وأنه سير إلى قونية يهاصرها ليأخذ من بها من أصحاب أخيه.

18 Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 75:

و لما وقع الاهتمام بذلك جاءت الأخبار بالهزائم...  
19 1262 as the date of 'Izz al-Dīn's arrival to Byzantium has been accepted in: Leiser, Şarı Şaltük Dede 61.

date. Coins under the name of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus were still minted in 660 (November 1261-November 1262) and, probably, his latest mint of 1262 originated from Antalya<sup>20</sup>. Thus, the summer of 1262 as the date of 'Izz al-Dīn's arrival in Byzantium perfectly fits the information found in Oriental narrative and numismatic sources.

In fact, the proposed chronology does not contradict our main Greek authority Georgios Pachymeres who gives no direct indication of the exact date of the event, albeit placing it (Il. 24) before his account of the conquest of Constantinople by the Byzantine troops of Alexios Strategopoulos in July 1261 (Il. 26)<sup>21</sup>. Pachymeres was about 19 at the time and wrote about the events many decades later. Pachymeres did not observe a strictly chronological order in his narration often jumping to the past or the future and returning to the chronological point he abandoned many pages above. It is my conviction that, chronologically, the whole story of the sultan's arrival should be read after Michael Palaiologos' return to the City (15 August 1261). In addition, an *ex silentio* argument is probably not out of place here: neither Georgios Akropolites nor Theodoros Skoutariotes say anything about the arrival of the sultan. Akropolites and Skoutariotes<sup>22</sup> were the most reliable historians of the early reign of Michael VIII and demonstrated a profound interest in the relations between Byzantium and the Seljuk sultanate. Both narrations end approximately with Michael VIII's solemn return to Constantinople in 15 August 1261, and, one can suggest, they did not mention Kaykāwus' arrival simply because the latter appeared in Byzantium approximately a year after that date.

Finally, in all probability, 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus went directly to Constantinople and not to any of Anatolian harbours of the Empire. Oriental authors are unanimous in stating this<sup>23</sup>. Scholars who argue that the sultan came to some Anatolian harbour base themselves on the wrong dating of the event and assume that at the time of the sultan's arrival Michael VIII and his court were still in the Anatolian provinces of the Empire. However, Byzantine authors never stated explicitly that the sultan arrived in a place somewhere in Byzantine Anatolia. If we accept the proposed date for the event (summer 1262), my suggestion that Constantinople was in fact the destination point of the sultan would not contradict any available data.

## Kaykāwus' people in Byzantium

In his exile in Byzantium 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus was accompanied by his immediate relatives including his mother, wife, four sons (Mas'ūd, Kayūmarth, Konstantinos Melik and one unnamed), a daughter, his sister (who, apparently, was unmarried), and, finally, his two maternal uncles Kīr Khāya and Kīr Kadīd/Kattidios. These are the ones who were directly mentioned in the primary sources; it is not impossible that at least the sultan's eldest son (Mas'ūd) and uncles brought along members of their families. At first, Michael VIII Palaiologos sent the sultan's family (probably, women and underage children) to Nicaea in order to keep 'Izz al-Dīn under control<sup>24</sup>. However, later, by the time of the sultan's flight from Ainos, we find most of his family in Constantinople<sup>25</sup>. One of Kaykāwus' sons, Konstantinos Melik, was left by his father in Byzantium and later held high ranks in the Byzantine hierarchy, founding the Byzantine aristocratic family of the Melikai<sup>26</sup>. The subsequent history of the sultan's family in Byzantium has been described in a number of studies<sup>27</sup>.

Besides family members, there were numerous courtiers of the sultan who followed him in his exile. Obviously, in close, even familial relations with the sultan's family was Makarios, the metropolitan of Pisidia since 1250 who came along with 'Izz al-Dīn from the Seljuk Sultanate, in the words of Pachymeres, as a guide (προαγωγῶντος) for the sultan and his family<sup>28</sup>.

Some members of the Seljuk elite who followed the sultan are known by their names. These are 'Alī Bahādur with his attendants, the *amīr-ākhur* (the chief of the horses) Muẓaffar al-Dīn Uğurlu with his retainers (خوایص)<sup>29</sup>, Ḥusām al-Dīn Tashtī, Ḥājī Bābā<sup>30</sup>, Nūr al-Dīn Arzinjānī<sup>31</sup>, and, finally, Malik (Μελίκ ← «Prince», «King») and Sālik (Σαλικ ← «Wayfarer», «Dervish») <sup>32</sup>. Ḥājī Bābā and Nūr al-Dīn Arzinjānī are not known from other sources. Judging by his name, Ḥājī Bābā might have belonged to the spiritual elite of the Sultanate and possibly to Sufi circles. Ḥusām al-Dīn Tashtī is probably identical to *sharāb-salār* (the cupbearer, probably, a sinecure) Ḥusām al-Dīn Aq-Taṣ who is mentioned by Ibn Bibī and in a Seljuk official document<sup>33</sup>. The *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu and, especially, 'Alī Bahādur are well-known from Oriental sources: they

20 See for instance: Erkiletlioglu/Güler, Türkiye 184 no. 422. – Album, Checklist 63 no. A1231. – Hennequin, Catalogue 769 note 1.

21 As it seems, in his account of the same events, Gregoras uncritically follows the relative chronology of Pachymeres: Gregoras, Historia I (Schopen) IV, 2 (1, 82, 4-83, 2). On other inconsistencies in Gregoras' narration concerning the family of 'Izz al-Dīn in Byzantium see: Šukurov, Family 111-113.

22 See the concluding chapters of Akropolites, Historia (Heisenberg/Wirth) 1, 188-189 and Skoutariotes 554-556.

23 Ibn Bibi (Erzi), 637-638. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 283-284. – Aqsarayi (Turan) 70. – Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93. – Abu al-Faraj (Budge) 442. – al-'Ayni (Amin), 1, 321.

24 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 24 (1, 185, 12-17).

25 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) III, 25 (1, 303, 15-19).

26 Laurent, Une famille.

27 Wittek, Yazijioğlu. – Wittek, La descendance. – Laurent, Une famille. – Zachariadou, Oi christianoi. – Šukurov, Oriental Margins 180-190. – Šukurov, Family 89-116.

28 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 24 (1, 185, 3). – On the metropolitan Makarios see: PLP no. 16271.

29 On 'Alī Bahādur and Muẓaffar al-Dīn Uğurlu see: Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 614. 627. 637-639. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 268. 276. 283-286. – Aqsarayi (Turan) 42. 70. 74. 75. – Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93. – Turan, Selçuklular 480. 486-488. 495-496. 499. 521.

30 These two names are mentioned in: Aqsarayi (Turan) 70. – Earlier, Aqsarāyī refers to them as the sultan's companions during his first exile in Byzantium in 1256-57 (Aqsarayi (Turan) 42).

31 Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93-94 (see also below).

32 The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt) 4553-4554. 5171. 5181. 5206-5255. 5315. 5672. 5676. 5661-5738. – Libro de los fechos (Morel-Fatio) 75 § 335; 77 § 344; 79-82 § 359-372; 80 § 360. – Bon, La Morée, 1, 131-135, 337. – PLP no. 17785.

33 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 623. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 273. 341. – Turan, Resmī Vesikalar 87 (Persian text). – Turan, Selçuklular 480. 484. – Cf.: Cahen, La Turquie 249 (according to Cahen, the sobriquet Tashtī might have indicated that its owner held also the court title of *tashtdār* that is the keeper of the royal washing basin).

were famous commanders who fought much in Anatolia, trying to withstand the Mongols and their Anatolian allies. The two military officers (emirs?) Malik and Sâlik are referred to in »The Chronicle of Morea« as commanders in the Turkish division of the Byzantine army that invaded Morea in 1263. There is no reason to believe that Malik and Sâlik belonged to the Seljuk ruling dynasty and were relatives of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykâwus as some scholars believed<sup>34</sup>; in all probability, they were middle-ranking emirs in charge of a part of the Turkish contingent. The following year (1263) Malik and Sâlik with their Turks defected to the Achaian prince Guillaume de Villehardouin, because the Byzantines refused to pay them their salary. The prince married Malik to a noble lady, the widow of a certain Aimon de Simico. Later, some of Malik's Turks settled in Morea in Vounarvi and Renta, while Malik went home to »Vlachia« (see below).

It is very likely that the sultan's *Constable the Greek* (کندصطبل رومی *kundaṣṭabil-i rūmī*) took refuge in Constantinople. He was a Greek Christian and had a brother holding the title *amīr-maydān*. The *constable* appeared in the Seljuk sources in 1256. In 1258, the *constable* was granted the title of *beglerbeg* and after that time his influence upon the sultan became exceptionally strong. The titles of *constable* and *beglerbeg* were among the highest military ranks at the Seljuk court; *amīr-maydān* was responsible for organizing the game of polo (*chawgān*) at the royal court<sup>35</sup>. The *constable's* role in the political life of the sultanate was appraised extremely negatively by Muslim historians of the time. Soon after mid-August 1261, the *constable* was sent by the sultan to Michael Palaiologos in order to arrange 'Izz al-Dīn's move to Byzantium and to obtain the emperor's consent for this. The careers of the Christian *constable* and his brother at 'Izz al-Dīn's court have been comprehensively studied by Olga Apanovich, who, however, hesitates to identify the *kundaṣṭabil* with any known personage of the time<sup>36</sup>.

Parallel reading of Pachymeres and the Oriental authors leaves little doubt about the identity of the Christian *constable* and his brother as the brothers Βασιλικοί. If one takes into account the chronological inconsistency of Pachymeres' narration for the period in question, the chronological obstacle (which is the only serious one) for such an identification vanishes. According to Pachymeres, the brothers Basilikoi (one of them was Basil by name) originated from Rhodes and, at first starting as »theatre actors« at the Seljuk court and becoming close to the sultan, soon gained supreme positions at the court and gathered enormous riches. Shortly before the sultan's arrival in Constantinople, both brothers appeared in

Byzantium and were well accepted by Michael Palaiologos due to the friendship he had established with them during his exile in the Seljuk sultanate a few years earlier. Basileios Basilikos was granted the court title of παρακοιμώμενος τοῦ κοιτῶνος, while his brother that of πρωτοϊερακάρης<sup>37</sup>. Probably, it was Basileios Basilikos, as the most prominent of the two brothers, who held the positions of the *constable* and *beglerbeg* as at the Seljuk court. Pachymeres' account and the evidence of the Oriental authors coincide in all key points: 1) *kundaṣṭabil* had a brother, and the Basilikoi were two brothers; 2) *kundaṣṭabil* and his brother were Christian Greeks, and the Basilikoi were Christian Greeks; 3) *kundaṣṭabil* held an extremely prominent position at the Seljuk court, and the Basilikoi's position at the Seljuk court was high; 4) *kundaṣṭabil* arrived in Byzantium before the sultan, and the Basilikoi did the same. If Basileios Basilikos was the former sultan's *constable* and *beglerbeg* while his brother the *amīr-maydān*, it explains well why two immigrants from abroad enjoyed such an outstanding reception in Constantinople and were so quickly and easily incorporated into the aristocratic elite of the empire. If so, the arrival of the Basilikoi to Byzantium took place soon after mid-August 1261.

One court functionary is mentioned by his official title only: an unnamed *amīr-majlis* whose duty was to organize receptions and audiences<sup>38</sup>. Finally, in Constantinople the sultan was surrounded by his closest retainers (οἰκεῖοι)<sup>39</sup> and »menacing bodyguards« (φοβερούς σωματοφύλακας)<sup>40</sup> who came with him from the Sultanate; however, we have no indications of the numbers of these οἰκεῖοι or of the bodyguard detachment.

We know also about one individual of possibly lower social standing identified by name: Sarı Saltık (Şārū Şaltūq), a semi-legendary Sūfī saint who in the subsequent centuries became a rather famous figure in the Ottoman tradition and overshadowed sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykâwus<sup>41</sup>. Sarı Saltık was, possibly, associated with Turkic nomads rather than Anatolian townfolk. The figure of Sarı Saltık brings us to the question of the Turkish nomadic groups who followed sultan 'Izz al-Dīn in his exile.

## Kaykâwus' nomadic supporters

The narrations of Pachymeres, Ibn Bibī and Yazıcızâde 'Alī suggest that the sultan was also followed by a significant number of the Anatolian nomads who did not recognize the power of the Mongols in Anatolia and their protégé, the

34 Žavoronkov, Tjurki 171.

35 Cahen, La Turquie 189.

36 Apanovič, Kundastabl 171-192. – Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 623. 637. – Aqсарayı (Turan) 49-50. 65-66. As Apanovich has shown, the identification of the Seljuk *constable* with Michael Palaiologos prevailing in the scholarly literature is essentially wrong.

37 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 24 (1, 181-183); VI, 12 (2, 575); VI, 24 (2, 615, 12). – PPL nos 2458. 2452.

38 Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93.

39 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) III, 25 (1, 303, 18).

40 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 24 (1, 185, 8).

41 On Sarı Saltık and relevant bibliography see: Leiser, Şarı Şaltūk Dede. – Ocak, Sarı Saltık. Additional information on the links between Sarı Saltık and the Crimea: DeWeese, Islamization 251-256.

sultan Rukn al-Dīn. The testimonies of Pachymeres and Ibn Bibī are plausible but rather vague, while that of Yazıcızâde 'Alī is more explicit and detailed although somewhat tinted with epic overtones. One can derive from Pachymeres' account that a considerable number of Anatolian nomadic Turks (σκηνίτας) refused to acknowledge the Mongol power and moved on to Byzantine territory recognizing the authority of the emperor. However, relations between the nomadic newcomers and the local population were far from harmonious: nomads plundered the locals and the latter paid them back in kind. Nonetheless, Michael Palaiologos »tried hard to win to his side borderline Persians« wishing to use them as a barrier in case of Mongol attack<sup>42</sup>. One may conclude from this account that some nomadic Turks, as the result of internal conflict in the sultanate, crossed the border and recognized the power of Michael Palaiologos.

The data provided by the Oriental sources confirms this in many ways, and adds further details. After the flight of 'Izz al-Dīn from the sultanate, a war of many months erupted in borderland regions (*uc*) throughout the country's west, north and south margins between the government forces and the nomadic Turks<sup>43</sup>. In the 1230s-1260s, many nomadic Turks came to Anatolia from Turkistan, Central Asia and Iran as refugees from the Mongol conquests. They probably considered 'Izz al-Dīn as a symbol of resistance against the hated Mongols and viewed the sultan's defeat as their own. During Turkmen revolts in the western borderland regions, the Byzantines were occasionally involved in the clashes: a certain Pisar-i Khurmā revolted in the Danishmandiyya region in the South-West Pontus and excited disorders in the province of Kastamonu where »on his advice the Roman army launched an attack« (بتدبیر او لشکر روم هجوم کردند)<sup>44</sup>. The Seljuk general 'Alī Bahādur together with *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu tried to besiege Rukn al-Dīn in Konya but was routed again at the caravanse-*rai* Altunba<sup>45</sup>. 'Alī Bahādur fled to the *uc* area and for some time fought in the regions of Çankırı (کنگری, Byz. Gangra) and Ankara, which were located not far from the north-eastern Byzantine border, however he was defeated again by government forces<sup>46</sup>. These events occurred between autumn 1261 and autumn 1262. Ibn Bibī continues of 'Alī Bahādur's story

reporting that he »found refuge in *uc* but failed to gain a foothold there, and being all the time in fear of the rudeness of Turkic gangs there, went to Istanbul together with a group of his retainers to serve the sultan«<sup>47</sup>.

The most detailed account of the migration of nomadic Turks to Byzantium can be found in a few controversial passages from Yazıcızâde 'Alī's »Tawārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq«. In summary, the accounts of Yazıcızâde 'Alī can be understood in the sense that Michael Palaiologos authorized a fairly large-scale emigration of nomadic Turks, partisans of 'Izz al-Dīn, from Anatolia to the European part of the Byzantine empire. It seems plausible that the main bulk of the Turkish nomads was settled by the Byzantine authorities in Southern Dobruja. The spiritual leader of the Turks of Dobruja was Sarı Saltık. The warriors of these nomadic groups participated in some victorious wars on the side of the emperor, in particular, one may think, during the re-conquest of Dobruja in the name of Michael VIII Palaiologos<sup>48</sup>. The later Ottoman historian Lokmân adds that the nomadic resettlement in Dobruja happened in 662 H. (4 November 1263-23 October 1264) a date which perfectly fits the information available from other sources<sup>49</sup>. The relevant passages from Yazıcızâde 'Alī and later Ottoman tradition have been comprehensively discussed more than once by specialists in Oriental, Byzantine, Romanian and Bulgarian studies; despite energetic attempts to question the reliability of the Ottoman tradition, it is now considered to be generally trustworthy<sup>50</sup>. One further addition can be made: it is possible that the leading administrative role among the Dobrujan Turks belonged to the sultan's maternal uncle Kyr Khāya and not to the mystic saint Sarı Saltık<sup>51</sup>.

Kaykāwus' Turks, being incorporated into the Byzantine army, took part in the wars of the Empire. Ibn Bibī makes 'Alī Bahādur the real hero of these wars. He asserts that every time an enemy appeared, the emperor asked 'Alī Bahādur for help because of the latter's courage. 'Alī Bahādur fought with and defeated the emperor's adversaries. Because of this, his position in the Byzantine service grew in importance and honour and he was bestowed with honorary clothing and other rewards by the emperor<sup>52</sup>. The Greek references to Turkish detachments in the Byzantine army within one generation

42 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) II, 24 (1, 187, 6-7): τοὺς μὲν κατὰ τὰ ὀχυρώματα Πέσσας καὶ λίαν ὑπεποιεῖτο, ὡς θρηγγοῖς ἐπιτίζων χρᾶσθαι. My translation differs from that of Failler. See also commentaries to this passage: Zachariadou, Histoire et légendes 84.

43 Aqsarayi (Turan) 71-74. – On the Turkish revolts in the upper Meander valley see also: Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 76.14-22. – Lippard, The Mongols and Byzantium 24-25.

44 Aqsarayi (Turan) 74. – I have corrected Turan's reading which is grammatically impossible and should be re-checked in the original manuscripts. This is unique evidence for the Byzantine involvement in the Seljuk internal strife in the region of Kastamonu at that time. The name of the Turkmen rebel Pisar-i Khurmā (Son of Date-Plum) is very plausibly originally Central Asian.

45 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 637. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 342 note 373.

46 Aqsarayi (Turan) 74. – On Turkic revolts in the beginning of the 1260s see: Cahen, Notes 336-337. – Cahen, Quelques textes 136. – Lippard, The Mongols and Byzantium 24-25.

47 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638:

و در اوج پناه جست و آنجا مستقری نداشت و همه از جهالت طوائف اتراک خایف می بود با شرمه از حواشی خویش باسنتبول روی بخدمت سلطان نهاد.

Cf.: Ibn Bibi (Duda) 284.

48 Yazıcızâde 'Alī (Berlin) 367b. – Decei, Le problème 87-90. – Yazıcızâde Ali (Bakır) 772-774. – Wittek, Yazıcioghlu 648-649. I follow mostly Bakır's reading which, however, is not unquestionable. Cf. Duda's less convincing reading and German translation: Duda, Quellen 143-144, original Ottoman text transcribed 144 note 1.

49 Lokmân 3 (Latin translation 2).

50 See, for instance, the most significant studies with further bibliographical references: Mutafčiev, Die angebliche Einwanderung (excellent survey of Byzantine and Bulgarian material and helpful critical discussion of previous studies). – Wittek, Yazıcioghlu (brilliant defence of Yazıcızâde 'Alī's reliability). – Decei, Le problème (comprehensive discussion of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman tradition). – Decei, Dobruca 632. – Inalcık, Dobrudja 610. – Vryonis, Manpower 131. 134. – Vásáry, Cumans and Tatars 77-79.

51 Šukurov, Oriental Margins 188-189.

52 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638:

باری چند فاسیلیوس را معادیان و منازغان ظاهر شدند علی بیبادررا بدفع ایشان فرمان داد دران باب جواب خصوم ملک ارمو چنانک از کمال حماست او اقتضا کرد واجب دید ویاقامت رسانید و بنعم کفار آثار صرامت ظاهر کردانید بدانواسطه پایه او در خدمت ملک ارمو در وقار و حشمت بیفزود و هر بار سحاب خلعت و صلت ازخزانة ملک ارمو در باره او داز و فایض بود و پیوسته بانعام و اکرام او اختصاص می یافت.

Cf.: Ibn Bibi (Duda) 284.

of the sultan's arrival (1262-1280s) are very scant and never mention 'Ali Bahādur. For that time, it seems, Pachymeres refers to Kaykāwus' warriors in the Byzantine army solely as Πέρσαι and τὸ Περσικόν. He maintains that, τὸ Περσικόν detachment participated in the Byzantine campaign in Morea in 1263<sup>53</sup>. According to »The Chronicle of Morea«, those Turks were partly under the command of the aforementioned Malik and Sālik. »The Chronicle of Morea« seems to indicate Dobruja as the homeland of these Turks. Around 1265, Malik asked his lord Guillaume de Villehardouin to let him go to his »patrimones« (εἰς τὰ ἰγονικά); receiving the prince's assent he went to »Vlachia« (ἐδιάβη τῆς Βλαχίας). Given the imprecise sense and polysemantic meaning of Βλαχία and Βλάχοι at the time, could it have been an indication of Dobruja? Or could Βλαχία have been any other location in the Balkans (like Macedonia or Thrace) which had been granted to the Turks by the Byzantine authorities? In any case, Malik's ἰγονικά was located in Europe, but not in Anatolia, which confirms that his soldiers came from Kaykāwus' Turks<sup>54</sup>.

In 1271, Πέρσαι took part in the siege of Neai Patrai in Thessaly under the command of Rhimpsas<sup>55</sup>. Rhimpsas was a baptized Turk having been in Byzantine service since the late 1250s. It was common Byzantine practice to place non-Greeks under the command of officials of the same race.

In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the descendants of Kaykāwus' Turks were normally known as Τουρκόπουλοι and the denomination τὸ Περσικόν was becoming less common. This is clear from Pachymeres' account of the battle of Apros in July 1305: he refers to them as a detachment which »[had been labeled] formerly τὸ Περσικόν and was also called Τουρκόπουλοι«<sup>56</sup>. Consequently, it would be reasonable to suggest that initially the detachments of Kaykāwus' Turks

were technically called Πέρσαι and τὸ Περσικόν and that only their descendants acquired the synonymic denomination of Τουρκόπουλοι.

There is no solid evidence about the total number of the Turks who moved from Anatolia to the Balkans. The only reference to the size of a Turkish detachment is found in »The Chronicle of Morea«. In 1263, 3000-3500 Turks took part in the Byzantine campaign against Morea, while the aforementioned Malik and Sālik were in charge of 1500 Turks<sup>57</sup>. The men of Malik and Sālik seem to have come to Morea without their families, because later the Achaean prince »gave them wives and they begot children«<sup>58</sup>. Only Yazıçizāde 'Alī gives estimates allowing to derive total numbers: »in the land of Dobruja, there were two or three Muslim cities and thirty to forty divisions (bölük, بولی) of nomadic Turkic families«<sup>59</sup>. In another passage he implies that, in Byzantium, the sultan could count on »ten or twelve thousand« of his supporters, probably implying just soldiers among the sultan's other attendants and compatriots in Byzantium<sup>60</sup>. If, in reality, 10,000-12,000 of Kaykāwus' Turks were able to bear arms it might imply a minimum total of 35,000-42,000 immigrant Turks including men, women and children (with minimal ratio 1 adult man × 3.5)<sup>61</sup>. Interestingly, the other numerical indication of Yazıçizāde 'Alī mentioning about 30 or 40 »divisions of Turkish families« seems to match these figures well: given every »camp« consisted of about 100 families the total would average 35,000 individuals<sup>62</sup>. The numbers provided by Yazıçizāde 'Alī are surprisingly highly plausible, and so provide one more indirect argument in favour of the reliability of this account. If so, the 1500 Turks who defected to William de Villehardouin were a relatively large force constituting at least 15 % of the total number of Turkish immigrant soldiers.

53 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) III, 16 (1, 273, 3).

54 The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt) 5729-5732. In the Greek version of the Chronicle, the description of the origin of Byzantine Turkish troops is rather confusing. On the first reference they are described as: Ἐνταῦτα ἦλθεν στήν Τουρκίαν κ' ἐρρόγεψε τοὺς Τούρκους. ἢ χιλίους ἐρρόγεψε ἐκλεχτοὺς κὶ ἄλλους πεντεκοσίους, ἢ καὶ ἦλθαν <κὶ ἀνατολικοὶ κἂν ἄλλες δύο χιλιάδες>. Translation: »Thereupon, he [that is Michael VIII Palaiologos] went to Τουρκία and hired the Turks; he hired 1000 select troops and 500 others, and around another 2000 Anatolians went with them« (The Chronicle of Morea [Schmitt] 4553-4555). First, the problem is that Τουρκία at that time terminologically might well have meant the Golden Horde, however, sometimes Τουρκία in a non-terminological usage could also have signified Anatolia (see online TLG). It is unclear whether a Mongol or Couman detachment is implied here or just two different groups of Anatolian Turks. I suggest that it is more likely that Tourkia denotes here Anatolia. Second, if Tourkia is identical to Anatolia, probably the Chronicle intends to draw up a distinction between (1) 1500 mercenaries hired in Anatolia/Tourkia, and (2) 2000 Anatolian Turks living in the Balkans, that is Kaykāwus' Turks. Obviously, Malik belonged to the latter group of the Balkan Turks since he regarded as his home some location in the Balkans.

Probably, more reliable numbers are given by the Aragonese version of the Chronicle: 3000 for the total number of the Turks and 1500 for those defected with Malik [Libro de los fechos (Morel-Fatio) 75 § 335; 80 § 360].

55 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) IV, 31 (2, 425, 18).

56 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) XII, 23 (4, 573, 6): τὸ ἐκ παλαιῶν Περσικόν, οὗς καὶ Τουρκόπουλους ὀνόμαζον. Cf. with Failler's French translation of

the passage, which seems less precise. For the same events Gregoras speaks of a thousand Tourkopouloi »who followed the sultan 'Izz al-Din when he defected to the Romans«: Gregoras, Historia I (Schopen) VII, 4 (1, 229, 11-12). However, it is evident that it could have been only the next generation after the initial Turkish immigrants, and that Gregoras again inaccurately reproduced Pachymeres' statement. Gregoras uses the same anachronism when he calls the »Persian« detachments Τουρκόπουλοι in his account of the Thessalian war in 1271: Gregoras, Historia I (Schopen) IV, 9 (1, 111).

57 Libro de los fechos (Morel-Fatio) 80 § 360. – In the Greek version, the references to the strength of the Turkish troops are as follows: The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt) 4553-4554 (1500 or 2000 men). 5095 (1000 men).

58 The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt) 5737.

59 Yazıçizāde 'Alī (Berlin) 367b line 8-9: یکی اوج پاره مسلمان شهری اوتوز و فرق بولوک اوباری ترک واری. See also: Decei, Le problème 88. – Yazıçizāde 'Alī (Bakır) 772. – Wittek, Yazıçizāde 648.

60 Yazıçizāde 'Alī (Berlin) 367b line 13: اون اون ایکی بیک ار واروز. See also: Yazıçizāde 'Alī (Bakır) 772-773. – Decei has omitted this passage.

61 For calculation patterns for the evaluation of medieval populations see: Ponomarev, Population 386-395. Similar ratio (× 3.5 and × 4) for 18<sup>th</sup>-century nomadic and semi-nomadic societies see: Di Cosmo, Ancient City-States 397-398.

62 However, it is hardly possible to define the numerical value of »bölük« as it was used by Yazıçizāde 'Alī. »Bülük/bulük/bölük« could have been, in particular, a unit consisting of an indefinite group of families who make the seasonal migrations together and jointly use particular grazing grounds (see: Towfiq, 'Ašāyer). See also entry بلیو as an administrative district in late medieval Iran in: Dehkhodā, Loghatnāme.

## The testimony of Byzantine prosopography

Byzantine prosopography is one more instrument that may help to identify 'Izz al-Dīn's Turks in Byzantine service. To start with, in Greek sources, apart from the members of the sultan's family, the metropolitan Makarios and general references to the retainers and bodyguards, no other individual is directly referred to as a person coming to Byzantium together with 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus. However, there are a number of individuals of Oriental descent who might well have been the sultan's subjects coming with him or soon afterwards along with 'Alī Bahādur or the groups of nomadic settlers. Below I would like to discuss the possible candidates for the virtual status of a Turk following Kaykāwus. However, one has to bear in mind that the influx of Anatolian Turks in Byzantium as mercenaries and slaves did not cease in the course of the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. This puts certain limitations on the discussion that follows below: having no direct indications in the sources, we can only speculate about a given individual belonging to Kaykāwus' Turks. There are two major criteria for selection: 1) the chronological criteria (1260s to the late 1280s, the generation of initial Anatolian settlers) and 2) linguistic criteria; that is, the origin of a name in the Turkish Anatolian milieu. For the period under discussion one may refer to the following persons and families bearing presumably Anatolian Turkish names.

1. A certain soldier Γαζής, who died before September 1286 and was a former owner of lands in Lozikion (Macedonia, south of the lake Bolbe), might well have been one of Kaykāwus' warriors<sup>63</sup>. The name Γαζής comes from the well-known Arabic term *ghāzī* (غازي), which in Turkish and Persian of the time meant »warrior, conqueror, raider, soldier of fortune«<sup>64</sup>. The Byzantines had known the word γαζής as deriving from the Oriental »Ghāzī warrior« since the 12<sup>th</sup> century. For the events of 1116, Anna Comnena refers to some Ghāzī (Γαζής), one of the noble Turks in the service of the Seljuks, the son of the emir Ἀσὸν Κατοῦχ<sup>65</sup>. In the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the honorary title Ghāzī was extensively used by the Danishmandid rulers in its both Arabic and Greek forms. The Greek legend of Gümüştegin Ghāzī (1104-1134) gives the Greek form of his Muslim title as ὁ μέγας ἀμῆρᾱ(ς) Ἀμῆρ Γαζή(ς)<sup>66</sup>. Ghāzī sometimes could have been used as a first name as well<sup>67</sup>. Having first appeared in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the word γαζής continued circulating in the Greek-speaking world throughout the Late Byzantine period and beyond<sup>68</sup>. Therefore, it is unlikely that Greek γαζής could have been

confused with something other than *ghāzī* in Byzantine linguistic space of the 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The aforementioned Thessalonian soldier Γαζής is referred to as belonging to the thematic cavalry troop of Thessalonike (ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Θησσαλονικαίου ἀλλαγίου)<sup>69</sup>. Here Γαζής was a nickname which probably later became a family name. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, two more soldiers had the same second name: Συργιάννης Γαζής and another Γαζής is referred to without his baptismal name. The Slavic Chilandar *praktikon* referred to **проник Газиа Фирιанова** that is the *pronoia* of Συργιάννης Γαζής in Rousaiou, Chalkidike in 1300 who very likely was a soldier and officer<sup>70</sup>. In September 1344, a certain *protallagator* Γαζής, a high-ranked military officer from Thessalonike, was a witness in the investigation concerning the dispute between the monastery of Docheiariou and a fiscal officer<sup>71</sup>. Given that all three were soldiers, bore the same family name and lived in the same area, it would be reasonable to suggest that they belong to a prominent family of hereditary soldiers living in the region of Thessalonike:

### I Generation (1260s-1280s)

Γαζής, ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Θησσαλονικαίου ἀλλαγίου, d. before 1286

### II Generation (1280s-1300s)

Συργιάννης Γαζής, *pronoiar*, 1300

### III Generation (1300s-1320s)

–

### IV Generation (1320s-1340s)

Γαζής, πρωταλλαγάτωρ, 1344

Thus, one may suggest that the *megalallagites* Γαζής was the great-grandfather of the *protallagator* Γαζής. As I have noted, Γαζής was rather popular name and we find ten more individuals bearing this name from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, however, it is too risky to claim that all or even some of them were related to those discussed above<sup>72</sup>.

2. A certain *pronoiar* Πέτρος was called Φαχρατίνης by Persians before he was baptized; he died before 1283-1289. It seems that Πέτρος Φαχρατίνης himself or his two sons (one of whom was Andronikos by name) had a *pronoia* in Constantinople or its neighbourhoods. However, after the death of Πέτρος Φαχρατίνης the authorities attempted to deprive his two sons of their *pronoia* and to transfer them

63 AZog no. X, 15-19; 27 (27-28). – PLP no. 3444.

64 Strictly speaking, the meaning »warrior for the Faith« was secondary and appeared later. *Ghāzī* soldiers in Central Asia in the Samanid time constituted gangs of soldiers of fortune who lived on the booty taken in their raids. Similar bands of *ghāzī* mercenaries are found on the Byzantine-Arab borderlands in the 'Umayyad era. In Anatolia and Syria, in the 11<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> centuries, *ghāzī*-warriors (mostly nomadic Turkmens) acquired even greater importance than ever before (Mélékoff, *Ghāzī* 1043-1044).

65 Alexias (Leib) XV, 6, 9.

66 The name Ἀμῆρ Γαζή(ς) is found also on some subsequent Danishmandid coins. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Mengujekid ruler Bahrām-Shāh in Erzincan (1168-

1225), the Ayyūbids of Syria and the Saljuqs bore the honorary title of Ghāzī. Later the Ottoman emirs and sultans called themselves *ghāzī*. See more details: Šukurov, *Turkmen*.

67 See for instance: Ibn al-Athir (Tornberg) 11, 329; 12, 278-279.

68 Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturğica* 2, 108. 109. – Dēmétrakos 2, 1534.

69 On *megala allagia* see: Bartusis, *Army* 192-196.

70 Mošin, *Akti* 208, 171-172. – Possibly the same individual was referred to in: ADoCh no. 18, 13 and p. 140; not listed in PLP.

71 ADoCh no. 23, 10 (170). – PLP no. 91580.

72 PLP nos 3443. 3445-3451. 93299.

forcibly to Thrace or Macedonia where they could be enrolled, if they wished, in the »Persian military lists« (Περσικοὶ στρατηγικοὶ κατάλογοι) and would be given necessary provisions (σιτηρέσιον) and arable land. The young men appealed to the patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus to avoid this. The patriarch was surprised by the eloquence of the youngest brother so unusual for a barbarian. Gregory II of Cyprus told this story in his letter to the *megas logothetes* Theodore Mouzalon some time between 1283 and 1289<sup>73</sup>.

The story is symptomatic and of primary importance for my discussion. The name Φαχρατίνης is identical to the Muslim name Fakhr al-Dīn (Ar. فخرالدین »Glory of the Faith«) which, obviously, was a personal name but not an honorary title (*laqab*)<sup>74</sup>. In all probability, he was a high-standing Muslim emir of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus who, at some point, converted to Christianity. Judging by the case of Φαχρατίνης and the previous example of the *megaloallagites* Γαζής, some of Kaykāwus' Turks, especially military commanders had been granted *pronoia* by the emperor. This assumption would help to explain numerous references in Oriental sources to the emperor's generosity toward Kaykāwus' retainers and attendants, which is formulated by Aqsarāyī in the most precise way: the Byzantines »gave each of his retainers, to the extent of his proximity [to the sultan] and rank, a fair place to live, and some allowance for provisions and daily expenses was provided to each of them in accordance with his position«<sup>75</sup>. As is clear from the discussed case of the sons of Fakhr al-Dīn, Kaykāwus' men could have been bestowed with *pronoia*, arable land to be farmed, and also σιτηρέσιον. Curiously, the data of the Greek and Persian sources coincide fully and are similarly worded. Last but not least, the information on the fate of the second generation of Kaykāwus' soldiers is equally noteworthy. The second generation pursued the military careers of their fathers in the »Persian« regiments which, as we saw above, were later commonly called »Tourkopouloi«. At the same time, the second generation was completely Hellenized, and its members could even surprise a highbrow Byzantine intellectual with the eloquence of their language. The assimilating ability of the Byzantine culture was still strong and operative.

3. The unknown father of Βασίλειος Γιαγούπης, who was referred to in the famous inscription of the Church of St. George of Belısırma between 1282 and 1304, may well have been one of Kaykāwus' Turks. I have discussed in greater

details the inscription and its historical context elsewhere<sup>76</sup>. Βασίλειος Γιαγούπης most likely was a second generation Turk fully assimilated with the Byzantines: his name was shaped according to the standard Byzantine paradigm.

4. The *protohierakarios* Ἀβράμπαξ (← Ar.-Tk. ابراهيم بيك Ibrāhīm-Bek or Ar.-Pers. ابراهيم پاشا Ibrāhīm-Pāshā), judging by the barely Hellenized appearance of his name, might well have belonged to the first generation of Kaykāwus' Turks<sup>77</sup>. Some time in the 1280s or 1290s, the *protohierakarios* Ἀβράμπαξ was a guide and simultaneously a watchman escorting the Seljuk sultan Mas'ūd II (Μελήκ of Pachymeres) who went from Constantinople to Adrammytion to meet Andronikos II<sup>78</sup>. This is the only reference to Ἀβράμπαξ in the sources. *Protohierakarios* was a Byzantine court title, apparently a sinecure which was not connected with any specific obligation. It is not impossible that, at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the title *protohierakarios* was somehow associated with immigrants from the East<sup>79</sup>.

5. A certain Ἀραβαντηνὸς Μασγιδᾶς was a landowner in Kotzakion, Strymon in 1273, and, possibly, an ancestor of the aristocratic family of Masgidades which flourished in the 14<sup>th</sup> and, probably, the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century<sup>80</sup>. Judging by the date, he might have been one of Kaykāwus' men. At first sight, the etymology of Μασγιδᾶς represents no problem: ← μασγίδιον »mosque« ← Ar. *masjid* (مسجد)<sup>81</sup>. The problem is in the semantics of the name. It is clear that the name unmistakably associates its owner with Muslim world. However, the problem is that Μασγιδᾶς, unlike other personal names discussed here, had no Oriental equivalent. Unlike the Christian tradition in which personal names with the meaning »church« were normal (Italian: Chiesa, Tempio; French: Temple; English: Church; German: Kirche and the like), traditional Muslim anthroponymy never used *masjid* as a personal first name or sobriquet. One may adduce two possible explanations. First, Μασγιδᾶς might well have denoted a person coming from the Islamic lands, that is generally »Asian«, »of Muslim breed«, possibly with a pejorative tint. It might have been synonymous with more generalizing sobriquets such as Ἀγαρηνός (cf. Γεώργιος ὁ Ἀγαρηνός<sup>82</sup>) and Σαρακηνός (see below). The second, less probable option: Μασγιδᾶς might have been a Hellenized Arabic name Majīd مجيد »Glorified«, misunderstood by the Byzantines.

73 Eustratiades 119 no. 159. Comprehensive analysis of the case is provided in: Bartusis, Army 374-375. See also: Bibikov, Svedenia 95. – Laurent, Les registes no. 1536 (326). – Cf.: PLP no. 29669 (numerous factual mistakes in the entry).

74 Laurent's suggestion for the Asian prototype of the name is unlikely: Ferhadeddin. For honorary titles at the Seljuk court see: Khuyi, Ghuniyat al-Katib and Khuyi, Rusum al-Rasa'il.

75 Aqsarāyī (Turan) 70: و خواص اورا هريكی را بر قدر قربت و منزلت مسكنی لائق مهيا كردانيدند و اسباب نزل و ما يحتاج ايشان بر وفق حال هريكی علی حده مهيا و مرتب داشتند.

See similar statements in: Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 637. – Ibn Bibi (Duda) 284. – al-Maqrizi (Atā) 2, 14.

76 Šukurov, Giagoupai 210-217 with further bibliographical references.

77 Pachymeres, Relations (Failler) X, 25 (4, 361, 10-11). – PLP no. 61. – Zachariadou, Observations 267.

78 Šukurov, Giagoupai 215-216.

79 Ibidem 224-225: one Giagoup and one of the brothers Basilikoi who »repatriated« from Muslim Anatolia to Byzantium, hold the title of *protohierakarios*.

80 Alv 3, no. 61, 21 (112) and 110: referred to as a neighbour. – PLP no. 94097. On the family of the Masgidades see: APhK 305-306. – APantél 99. – Mercati, Sull'epitafio 239-244. A Venetian document of 1425 refers to two more Μασγιδᾶς: Mertzios, Mnēmeia 51 and fig. 3a (facsimile of original document). – For other bearers of the family name Μασγιδᾶς see: PLP nos 17216-17223. 94096 and not listed in PLP a landowner from Zichna Ιωάννης Μασγιδᾶς in APantél no. 11, 17-18 (99). – Some or all of them could have been relatives. Thus, we know 15 Masgidades and one Μασγιδιώτης (PLP no. 17224).

81 Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica 2, 182-183.

82 MM 4, 76-77. – Ἀγαρηνός as a sobriquet was surprisingly uncommon in the Byzantine world, probably because of its negative connotations in a Byzantine context.

6. One may also suggest that the groups of the Vardariotai Turks, who presumably lived in north-western Macedonia and served as palace guards at the Byzantine court, were reinforced by Kaykāwus' Turks in the 1260s or later. As Pseudo-Kodinos maintains, they were »Persians« and pronounced in »Persian« their acclamations during the Christmas celebrations at the Byzantine court<sup>83</sup>.

7. Finally, some of the numerous Byzantine aristocrats, who bore the patronymic Σουλτάνος in the late 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, were very likely descendants of one of the relatives of Kaykāwus accompanying him in his exile. Although the genealogy of the Σουλτάνοι has been discussed more than once it still deserves further study<sup>84</sup>.

The emergence in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century or a little later of some new Macedonian place-names could have been in connection with Kaykāwus' Turks. These are Γαζής (near Rousaiou in Kalamaria), Μελίκι (east of Berroia), Τουρκοχώριον (5 km north-northwest of Berroia) and, finally, another Τουρκοχώριον (near Gabriele in Kalamaria), which I have already discussed elsewhere<sup>85</sup>. As we have seen in the story of Fakhr al-Dīn above, it was normal practice to grant Turkish newcomers *pronoia* and arable land. Probably, these place-names indicate the localities of concentration of Turkish military *pronoia*s and farmers in the area that lasted as such for decades<sup>86</sup>.

Those listed above are the most likely candidates for being Kaykāwus' men, however, as it has been already stated, we have no direct indications in the sources for this. The influx of the Turks into Byzantine society in the 13<sup>th</sup> century was enormous, and without unambiguous evidence one cannot be sure about the true background of this or that Anatolian Turkish newcomer.

Zhavoronkov described a few more persons as those who arrived in Byzantium with 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus<sup>87</sup>. However, as a more focused appraisal shows, not all of his attributions are completely convincing. First, I exclude all the persons from Zhavoronkov's list who do not meet the chronological limits of the first generation (1260s-1280s). Second, the *sebastos* Μιχαήλ Ἀπελμενέ (1268), who was possibly the founder of a noble family, could hardly be included in Kaykāwus' list<sup>88</sup>. The reason for my doubts is linguistic. Ἀπελμενέ most probably derived from the Arabic Abū al-Ma'ānī (ابوالمعاني), »Rhetorician« or from the less probable Arabic Abū al-Ma'ālī (ابوالمعالي), »Sublime«, »Great«<sup>89</sup>; both options for the Muslim original sound stylistically too Arabic to be the name of an Anatolian

Turk; such names were not in use in Seljuk Anatolia, but prevailed in the Arab world: Egypt, the Maghrib, Syria<sup>90</sup>. Probably, Ἀπελμενέ should be grouped with Βεοβέριος (Kephallenia, 1264, landowner), Βαοβαρηνός (Serrhai, ca. 1317-1321, paroikos) and Βαοβαρηνοί (Chalkidike, 1327-1340s, a soldier company)<sup>91</sup>. Possibly, some or all of numerous Σαρακηνοί have to be added to the same group<sup>92</sup>. All these names seem to have belonged to newcomers from the Arabic speaking world, most likely, from North Africa (in particular, the *Berbers*) who served in the Byzantine army as light cavalry<sup>93</sup>. Third, we have no sufficient grounds to associate with Kaykāwus' men the group of individuals bearing Oriental names who were the residents of Western Anatolia. These are Ιωάννης Προσούχ (Smyrna, 1272-1283), Γεώργιος Χαλούφης (Ephesos, 1273), and Κουτλάς (Smyrna, 1280)<sup>94</sup>. Of course, one cannot completely exclude the connection of these individuals or at least some of them with Kaykāwus, especially taking into account Pachymeres' statement that Michael Palaiologos settled some Turkish nomads in the borderline areas. However, it seems that they might have been initially defectors, prisoners of war or slaves who came to the Byzantine Anatolian provinces for different reasons and by different ways.

## Those who were left in Byzantium

In winter 1264/1265, Kaykāwus' conspiracy against Michael Palaiologos failed, the sultan joined the Mongol and Bulgarian troop, which invaded Thrace, and left Byzantium for the Crimea. Ibn Bibī argues that the details of the conspiracy were finally exposed to Michael Palaiologos by the sultan's uncle Kyr Kattidios<sup>95</sup>. On the flight of the sultan with two of his sons, the emperor's rage descended upon his emirs most of whom remained in Byzantium. Both Greek and Oriental sources describe the fury of Michael Palaiologos in a similar way. He arrested all the high-ranking officers of the sultan including 'Alī Bahādur. 'Alī Bahādur was executed as well as probably some others as Aqсарayī argues<sup>96</sup>. According to Oriental sources, 'Alī Bahādur, *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu, the unnamed *amīr-majlis* and some other unnamed emirs were the key figures in the conspiracy being those who inspired the sultan with the idea to attack and depose Michael Palaiologos<sup>97</sup>. Evidently, 'Alī Bahādur and probably some others were charged with treason and an attempt on the emperor's

83 Pseudo-Kodinos (Verpeaux) 210, 7-8. – Šukurov, Byzantine Turks 101-102.

84 Zachariadou, Oi christianoi. – Žavoronkov, Tjurki 171-174. – Šukurov, Family 113-116.

85 Šukurov, Byzantine Turks 88-90.

86 See also: Zachariadou, Oi christianoi 73-74.

87 Žavoronkov, Tjurki 173-176.

88 PLP no. 1158, and his possible descendants: PLP nos 151-157. 91262.

89 Cf. with the similar Hellenizing modification of an Arabic name: Ἀπελμουζέ – Abū al-Mu'izz (De administrando imperio [Moravcsik] ch. 44).

90 See for instance: al-Maqrizi (Atā) 8: Indices.

91 PLP nos 2625. 2166. 2165.

92 PLP nos 24860-24866; see also PLP nos 24855-24859: Σαρακηνόπουλος.

93 Oikonomidēs, À propos 360 ff. – Bartusis, Army 201-202.

94 PLP nos 23844. 30532. 13643. 24866.

95 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638 and Yazıcızāde 'Alī (Berlin) 367b. – Aqсарayī (Turan) 75 does not specify the names of the traitors; Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93 gives a rather improbable version relating that both uncles Kyr Kattidios and Kyr Khāya were sent to the emperor by the sultan himself to inform him about the conspiracy of Turkish emirs. However, as I suggest, Kir Khāya was not with the sultan at that time. For the role of the two uncles see: Šukurov, Oriental Margins 186-190 and more detailed Šukurov, Family 96-105.

96 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638. – Aqсарayī (Turan) 75. – al-Maqrizi (Atā) 2, 14.

97 Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93 ('Alī Bahādur, *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu, the *amīr-majlis*). – Aqсарayī (Turan) 75 (*amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu). – Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638: ascribes the very idea of the plot to a group of unnamed emirs and, probably, wants to pose 'Alī Bahādur as a chance witness to the conspirators' conversation.

life. However, *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu managed to avoid the death penalty. Aqṣarāyī relates that *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu »found refuge in the Monastery of Aya Sofia, for every offender looking for asylum in this monastery received protection from the death penalty. However, although they did not execute him, his two world-seeing eyes were blinded by a red-hot [iron] rod«<sup>98</sup>. The whole story of Uğurlu sounds plausible for it was normal Byzantine practice for those accused of crime to look for asylum in a church and, especially, in St. Sophia<sup>99</sup>. In summer 1264, just few months earlier, the *chartophylax* Bekkos and *megas oikonomos* Xiphilinos along with their wives and children rushed to St. Sophia to take asylum there from the wrath of the emperor<sup>100</sup>. Probably, this resounding affair was taken as a model by *amīr-ākhur* Uğurlu.

Many of Kaykāwus' Turks were arrested by the authorities. Baybars relates the continuation of the story as follows: »However, with regard to the emirs, he [i. e. Michael Palaiologos – *Author*] blinded all of them, and then ordered to gather all those who have dealt with them, their soldiers, slaves, commoners, and servants. All of them were brought together in the Great Church [i. e. St. Sophia – *Author*], where higher clergy and officials were present and they demanded from them to adopt the Christian faith. Those who accepted baptism remained unscathed, but those who at all cost wanted to remain Muslim were blinded. Among them was a man from Erzincan Nūr al-Dīn by name; when they brought him and asked him to adopt Christianity, he exclaimed: »Paradise is prepared for Islam, and fire is prepared for you!« His words were passed to the emperor. The emperor said: »This man is firm in his faith, provide him with a written travel permission and let him go«. They did this and released him«<sup>101</sup>. This interesting story sounds convincing as it has close parallels in Byzantine practices. In the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, some Hagarenes (that is Anatolian Turks) were summoned to the Synod and were required to be baptized. This is a well-known case concerning the re-baptizing of Christian Hagarenes which was tried during the patriarchate of Loukas Chrysoberges (1157-1169/1170) and was referred to by the subsequent canonical tradition<sup>102</sup>. One may think that it was normal practice to bring infidels to the Church authorities in order to force them to adopt Christianity. Gregoras explicitly

confirms the forcible conversion of the Kaykāwus' men: »His people, who were men of a great multitude and extremely warlike, having been brought to new birth by the Christian baptism, were incorporated in the Roman army«<sup>103</sup>.

Baybars argues in the cited passage that those who rejected baptism were blinded. Aqṣarāyī reports that those who escaped death were imprisoned<sup>104</sup>. Ibn Bibī and Yazıcızāde 'Alī maintain that those who rejected baptism »were punished, detained by the emperor and remain forever in prison«<sup>105</sup>. The versions of Ibn Bibī and Aqṣarāyī seem more plausible: the stubborn Muslims could have been punished by imprisonment but not the death penalty, which Byzantines normally applied with caution and only in extreme cases. Pachymeres partly confirms this saying that all the servants of the sultan's family were imprisoned<sup>106</sup>. Pachymeres refers elsewhere to the detainment of prisoners of war (seemingly those who rejected the option of naturalization in Byzantium) in the Nicaean prison in February 1265<sup>107</sup>. Were they or some of them the Turks of Kaykāwus? The punishment of blinding, obviously, was more appropriate for those who were charged with rebellion as happened in the case of Uğurlu. The conversion of Kaykāwus' Muslims took place in Constantinople and, probably, in Thrace and Macedonia only, and did not involve Dobruja. In the second quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa passing through Dobruja, refers to the city of Bābā Salṭūq the name of which was undoubtedly linked with the Muslim saint Sarı Saltıq; the evidence of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa can be understood as an indirect indication of the continuous presence here of a Muslim population<sup>108</sup>. As I have mentioned above, the 15<sup>th</sup>-century Ottoman tradition implied that the Kaykāwus' Turks (or some of them) continued to confess Islam in Dobruja up to the time of the Ottoman conquest. It may be added that, according to Ottoman tradition, some Turks of Dobruja (including Sarı Saltık) followed the sultan in his move to the Crimea<sup>109</sup>.

In summary, in the discussed episodes we have an instance of forcible conversion of Muslims, which had a distinct juridical meaning. During the sojourn of Kaykāwus in Byzantium, the Anatolian Muslims who came with him to the empire, both noble persons and commoners continued to profess their religion. It is also confirmed by the case of Malik and

98 Aqṣarāyī (Turan) 75: دست بقتل خواص دراز کردند، اغرلو امیر آخر بدیر ایا صوفیه پناه برد بسبب آنکه هر کتاه کاری که بدان دیر پناه برد ایمن می دارند از قتل، اما چون از قتل امان دادند در دو چشم جهان بینش میل کشیدند و باقی اصحابرا محبوس کردندیندند

99 Macrides, *Killing* 514-516.

100 Pachymeres, *Relations* (Failler) III, 24 (1, 299, 4-6).

101 Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards) 93-94: و اما امرأته فانه كحلهم جميعاً ثم رسم بأن يُجمع كل من يلوذ بهم من الجند و العلمان و العائمة و الحاشية فُجمعو في الكنيسة الكبرى جميعاً و حضر البطارقة و البطارقة و عرضوا عليهم الدخول في دين النصرانية فمنهم من تنصر فسلم و من ابى الآ البقاء على اسلامه فُكحل و كان فيهم رجل من ارزنكان يسمى نورالدين فلما أحضرناه و عرضوا عليه التنصر صاح و قال الجنة معدة للاسلام و النار معدة || لكم فطالعو الملك بأمره فقال هذا رجل ثابت على دينه فأعطوه كتاب الطريق و لا تعرضوا له فاطفوه

102 PG 119, 785 (Synod's decree). – Rhalles/Potles, *Syntagma* 2, 497-498 (Balsamon); 6, 120 (Blastares).

103 Gregoras, *Historia I* (Schopen) IV, 6 (1, 101): ὁ δὲ περὶ ἐκεῖνον ὄχλος, ἄνδρες δ' οὗτοι μάλᾳ τοι πλείστοι καὶ κράτιστοι τὰ πολέμια, τῷ Χριστιανῶν ἀναγεννηθέντες βαπτίσματι, τῇ Ῥωμαίων συγκατελέγοντο

στρατιῶν, and see also a similar statement: Gregoras, *Historia I* (Schopen) VII, 4 (1, 229.11-16).

104 Aqṣarāyī (Turan) 75.

105 Ibn Bibi (Erzi) 638: و امیر آخر را مکحول و مسمول و علی بهادر را مقتول کردانید هرکه از اتباع و اشماخ و خدم و حشم سلطان ارتداد می نمود و در ملت مسیح مخالفت می کرد نان و امان می یافت و هرکه بپروژه و تفتی اسلام دست اعتصام قوی می داشت و نقش این الدین عندالله الاسلام بزورق جان و صفحه اعتقاد می نکاشت بنکال و عقال فاسلیوس مبتلای گشت و در زندان اید محبوس می ماند

Cf.: Ibn Bibi (Duda) 284. – Yazıcızāde 'Alī (Berlin) 368.

106 Pachymeres, *Relations* (Failler) III, 25 (1, 313, 14-15): σὺν τοῖς περὶ ἐκεῖνους ἄπασιν, εἰρκατὰς ἀσφαλέσιν ἐδίδου.

107 Pachymeres, *Relations* (Failler) III, 28 (1, 321, 20-21).

108 Ibn Battouta (Defrémery) 2, 416.

109 Yazıcızāde 'Alī (Berlin) 368b: کوجرب اول ترک اولری و صارملنوق بله آلب دشته ایلندی و صلغاد و صدقانی اگا تیمار و خلقته بیروبرت ویردی

Decei, *Le problème* 88. – Yazıcızāde Ali (Bakır) 774 inexplicably omits this passage and the subsequent phrase.

Sālik's Turks: they remained Muslims while serving first in the Byzantine and then in the Latin army, and only later, as the war ended, did some of them adopt Christianity (presumably, the Latin rite) and were settled in Morea<sup>110</sup>. Consequently, Kaykāwus' Muslims in the Byzantine territories were juridically considered as the subjects of a foreign sovereign and in that capacity could legally have kept their Muslim faith. However, after the failure of Kaykāwus' conspiracy and his escape from Byzantium, the juridical status of his people changed: they were treated as prisoners of war or new settlers and as expropriated individuals fell under the jurisdiction of the emperor and Roman law. Insofar as Islam was classified as paganism by the Byzantine church tradition, while according to the civil law practicing of any sort of paganism was illegal throughout the Empire<sup>111</sup>, Kaykāwus' Muslims had no other option than baptism. This is why those who refused baptism and tried to retain their »pagan« faith were put in jail. Consequently, here we have the only credible evidence of forcible mass conversion of Muslims in Byzantium. To my knowledge, in the entire Byzantine history either before or after that time Muslims were never forced to adopt Christianity in such great numbers and within such a short period.

And, finally, it is also remarkable that Michael Palaiologos did not punish the sultan's women and children, although he put them under custody for some time immediately after the sultan's escape. The sultan's wife, mother, sister, daughter and two sons remained in Byzantium, were probably finally settled in Berroia in Western Macedonia (at least some of them) and enjoyed the high status of the noblest aristocratic families of the empire. It conformed to the Byzantine tradition of not harming underage children and women of even the bitterest enemy.

Evidently, the overall number of Kaykāwus' followers was large and included not only high military and civil officers but also their families, servants, slaves and soldiers. Most of his people had kept their Muslim faith in Byzantium as foreign subjects until the escape of their lord, and immediately afterwards they had to choose between baptism and punishment. Evidently, after the sultan's escape in winter 1264/1265 extensive disturbances ensued in Constantinople and probably throughout some other provinces of the empire resulting in mass arrests and persecutions of the Turks and their forcible conversion into Christianity. We can only guess about the real extent of the crises which Muslim authors reflected in more vivid ways than Greek historiography of the time. However, most of Kaykāwus' men were finally incorporated in Byzantine society and soon each found his niche in the new life.

110 The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt) 5735: και ὤρισεν ὁ πρίγκιπας κ' ἐβάφτισάν τους ὄλους.

111 See for more details about the status of Islam: Vryonis, *Manpower* 129-132. – Reinert, *Muslim Presence* 125-150. – Šukurov, *Crypto-Muslims* 135-158.

## Bibliography

### Sources

- Abu al-Faraj (Budge): *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj the son of Aaron* 1-2. Ed. by E. A. W. Budge (London 1932, reprint Amsterdam 1976).
- ADoch: *Actes de Docheiariou*. Texte. Ed. by N. Oikonomidès (Paris 1984).
- Alv: *Actes d'Iviron* 1-4. Ed. by J. Lefort / N. Oikonomidès / D. Papachrysanthou / H. Métrévéli (Paris 1985-1995).
- Akropolites, *Historia* (Heisenberg/Wirth): *Georgii Acropolitae opera I, continens historiam, breviarium historiae, Theodori Scutariotae additamenta*. Ed. by A. Heisenberg / P. Wirth (Stuttgart 1978).
- Alexias (Leib): *Anna Comnène, Alexiade* 1-3. Ed. by B. Leib (Paris 1937-1945).
- al-Maqrizi (Atā): *Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī, Kitāb al-sulūk li-ma'rifat duwal al-mulūk* 1-8. Ed. by M. 'Abd al-Qādir 'Atā (Beirut 1997).
- APantél: *Actes de Saint-Pantéléémôn*. Ed. by P. Lemerle / G. Dagron / S. Çirković (Paris 1982).
- APhilK: *Nouveaux documents du monastère de Philothéou*. Ed. by V. Kravari. TM 10, 1987, 261-356.
- al-'Ayni (Amīn): *Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad al-'Ayni, 'Iqd al-jumān fī ta'rīkh ahl al-zamān* 1: 648-664 H/1250-1265 M. Ed. by M. M. Amīn (Cairo 1987).
- Aqsarayi (Turan): *Kerimüddin Mahmud Aksarayī, Mūsameretü'l-ahbār ve Mūsāyeretü'l-ahyār. Moğollar zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi*. Ed. by O. Turan (Ankara 1944).
- AZog: *Actes de l'Athos IV. Actes de Zographou*. Ed. by W. Regel / E. Kurtz / B. Korabiev. VV Priloženie k XIII t. No. 1 (S.-Peterburg 1907).
- Baybars al-Mansuri (Richards): *Baybars al-Mansuri al-Dawadar. Zubdat al-fikra fi ta'rīkh al-Hijra. History of the Early Mamluk Period*. Ed. by D. S. Richards (Beirut, Berlin 1998).
- De administrando imperio (Moravcsik): *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio*. Ed. by Gy. Moravcsik, transl. by R. J. H. Jenkins (Washington, D. C. 1967).
- Gregoras, *Historia I* (Schopen): *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina historia* 1. Ed. by L. Schopen. CSHB [4] (Bonnae 1829).
- Ibn al-Athīr (Tornberg): *Ibn al-Athīr, Al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh. Chronicon quod perfectissimum inscribitur* 1-13. Ed. by C. J. Tornberg (Lugduni Bavorum 1851-1876, reprint Bairūt 1966).
- Ibn Battouta (Defrémery): *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah. Texte arabe, traduction* 1-4. Ed. by C. Defrémery, transl. by B. R. Sanguinetti (Paris 1853-1858).
- Ibn Bibi (Duda): *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi*. Transl. by H. W. Duda (Kopenhagen 1959).
- Ibn Bibi (Erzi): *Ibn Bibi. El-Evamirü'l-Ala'iyye fī'l-umuri'l-Ala'iyye. Önsöz ve Fihristi Hazırlıyan*. Ed. by A. S. Erzi (Ankara 1956).
- Laurent, *Les registes: Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople* 1, fasc. 4: *Les registes de 1208 à 1309*. Ed. by V. Laurent (Paris 1971).
- Libro de los fechos (Morel-Fatio): *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea compilado por comandamiento de Don Fray Johan Ferrandez de Heredia, maestro del Hospital de S. Johan*

de Jerusalem. Chronique de Morée au XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles publiée et traduite pour la première fois pour la Société de l'Orient Latin. Ed. by A. Morel-Fatio. Publications de la Société de l'Orient Latin Série Historique 4 (Genève 1885).

MM: Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana 1-6. Ed. by F. Miklosich / J. Müller (Vindobonae 1825-1895).

Muhi al-Din (Huwaytîr): Muḥī al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Zāhir. Al-Rawḍ al-zāhir fī sirāt al-Malik al-Zāhir. Ed. by 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Huwaytîr r (Al-Riyāḍ 1976).

Pachymeres (Failler): Georges Pachymères, Relations Historiques 1-5. Ed. by A. Failler (Paris 1984-2000).

Pseudo-Kodinos (Verpeaux): Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des offices. Ed. by J. Verpeaux (Paris 1966).

Rhalls/Potles, Syntagma: K. Rhallēs / M. Potlēs, Syntagma tōn theiōn kai ierōn kanonōn 1-6 (Athēnē 1852-1859).

Skoutariotes: Skoutariotes, Anōnymou Synopsis Chronikē. In: K. Sathas, Mesaiōnikē Bibliothēkē 7 (Venetia 1914) 1-556.

Tarix-e al-e Saljuq (Jalali): Tarix-e al-e Saljuq dar Anatoli compiled by Unknown Author. Ed. by N. Jalali (Tehran 1999).

The Chronicle of Morea (Schmitt): The Chronicle of Morea. Ed. by J. Schmitt (London 1904).

Yazıcızâde 'Ali (Berlin): Jazıgıyoğlu 'Ali, Oğuzname. Handschrift der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. Ms. or. quart. 1823.

Yazıcızâde Ali (Bakır): Yazıcızâde Ali, Tevâriḥ-i Âl-i Selçuk. Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Târihi. Ed. by A. Bakır (İstanbul 2009).

## References

Album, Checklist: St. Album, A Checklist of Islamic Coins (Santa Rosa, CA 1998).

Apanovič, Kundastabl: O. S. Apanovič, K voprosu o dolžnosti kundastabla u Seldžukidov Ruma v XIII v.: kundastabl rumi i Michail Paleolog. VV 66 (91), 2007, 171-192.

Bartusis, Army: M. Bartusis, The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204-1453 (Philadelphia 1992).

Bees, Inschriftenaufzeichnung: N. Bees, Die Inschriftenaufzeichnung des Codex Sinaiticus Graecus, 508 (976) und die Maria Spiläotissa Klosterkirche bei Sille (Lykaonien), mit Exkursen zur Geschichte der Seldschuken-Türken (Berlin 1922).

Bibikov, Svedenia: M. V. Bibikov, Svedenija o pronii v pis'mah Grigorija Kiprskogo i »Istorii« Georgija Pahimera. ZRVI 17, 1976, 93-99.

Bon, La Morée: A. Bon, La Morée Franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205-1430) 1-2 (Paris 1969).

Bosworth, Laḳab: EI<sup>2</sup> 5 (2004) 621-622 s. v. Laḳab (C. A. Bosworth).

Dehkhodâ, Loghatnâme: 'Aliakbar Dehkhodâ, Loghatnâme, CD-Version (Tehran 2000).

DeWeese, Islamization: D. DeWeese, Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition (University Park, PA 1994).

Cahen, La Turquie: C. Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane (Istanbul 1988).

Kaykā'ūs II: EI<sup>2</sup> 4 (1978) 813b-814a s. v. Kaykā'ūs II, 'Izz al-Dīn (C. Cahen).

Notes: C. Cahen, Notes pour l'histoire des Turcomanes d'Asie Mineure au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Journal asiatique 239, 1951, 335-354.

Quelques textes: C. Cahen, Quelques textes négligés concernant les Turcomans de Roum au moment de l'invasion mongole. Byzantion 14, 1939, 131-139.

CHT: K. Fleet (ed.), The Cambridge History of Turkey 1: Byzantium to Turkey, 1071-1453 (Cambridge 2009).

CHBE: J. Shepard (ed.), The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500-1492 (Cambridge 2008).

Decei, Le problème: A. Decei, Le problème de la colonisation des Turcs seldjoukides dans la Dobrogea au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih- Coğrafya Fakültesi. Tarih Bölümü 10, 1968, 85-111.

Dobruca: İslâm Ansiklopedisi. İslâm Âlemi Tarih, Coğrafya, Etnografya ve Biyografya. Beşinci Baskı 1-13 (Ankara 1978-1987) 3, 628-643 s. v. Dobruca (A. Decei).

Dēmētrakos: D. Dēmētrakos, Mega lexikon tēs ellēnikēs glōssēs 1-9 (Athēnai 1949).

Di Cosmo, Ancient City-States: N. Di Cosmo, Ancient City-States of the Tarim Basin. In: M. H. Hansen (ed.), A comparative study of thirty city-state cultures: an investigation (Copenhagen 2000) 393-408.

Duda, Quellen: H. W. Duda, Zeitgenössische islamische Quellen und das Oğuznâme des Jazygıyoğlu 'Alī zur angeblichen türkischen Besiedlung der Dobrudscha im 13. Jhd. n. Chr. Spisanie na B"lgarskata Akademija na Naukite i Izkustvata 66. Klon" istoriko-filologičen" 32, 1943, 131-145.

Erkiletioğlu/Güler, Türkiye: H. Erkiletioğlu / O. Güler, Türkiye Selçuklu Sultanları ve Sikkeleri (Kayseri 1996).

Eustratiades: S. Eustratiades (ed.), Grēgoriou tou Kyrpriou Epistolai. Ekklēsiastikos Faros 4, 1909, Parastēma.

Failler, Chronologie I: A. Failler, Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de George Pachymères, partie I. REB 38, 1980, 5-103.

Chronologie II: A. Failler, Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de George Pachymères, partie II. REB 39, 1981, 145-149.

Geanakoplos, Michael Palaeologus: D. J. Geanakoplos, Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West (1258-1282). A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations (Cambridge, MA 1959).

Hennequin, Catalogue: G. Hennequin, Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes. Asie pré-Mongole (Paris 1985).

Huart, Kaykā'ūs: EI<sup>1</sup> 2 (1927) 637-638 s. v. Kaykā'ūs (C. Huart).

İnalçık, Dobrudja: EI<sup>2</sup> 2 (1991) 610-616 s. v. Dobrudja (H. İnalçık).

Khowaiter, Baibars: A. Khowaiter, Baibars the First: His Endeavours and Achievements (London 1978).

Khuyi, Ghuniyat al-Katib: Hasan b. 'Abdi'l-Mu'min el-Hoyi, Gunyetu'l-Katib ve Munyetu't-Talib. In: A. S. Erzi (ed.), Selçukiler Devrine âid İnşâ Eserleri (Ankara 1963) 1-15.

Rusum al-Rasa'il: Hasan b. 'Abdi'l-Mu'min el-Hoyi, Rusumu'r-Resa'il ve Nucumu'l-Faza'il. In: A. S. Erzi (ed.), Selçukiler Devrine âid İnşâ Eserleri (Ankara 1963) 1-46.

- Laurent, Une famille: V. Laurent, Une famille turque au service de Byzance. Les Mélikès. BZ 49, 1956, 349-368.
- Leiser, Şarı Şaltūk Dede: El<sup>2</sup> 9 (1997) 61-62 s.v. Şarı Şaltūk Dede (G. Leiser).
- Lippard, The Mongols and Byzantium: B. G. Lippard, The Mongols and Byzantium, 1243-1341 [unpubl. PhD Thesis Indiana Univ.1984].
- Lokmân: J. J. W. Lagus, Seid Locmani ex libro Turcico qui Oghuzname inscribitur excerpta (Helsingfors 1854).
- Macrides, Killing: R. Macrides, Killing, Asylum, and the Law in Byzantium. Speculum 63, 1988, 509-538.
- Mansouri: M. T. Mansouri, Recherches sur les relations entre Byzance et l'Égypte (1259-1453) (d'après les sources arabes) (Manouba 1992).
- Mélikoff, Ghāzī: El<sup>2</sup> 2 (1991) 1043-1044 s.v. Ghāzī (I. Mélikoff).
- Mercati, Sull'epitafio: S. G. Mercati, Sull'epitafio di Atanasio Masgidas nel monastero del Prodromo presso Serres. OCP 13, 1947, 239-244.
- Mertzios, Mnēmeia K. Mertzios, Mnēmeia makedonikēs istorias (Thesalonikē 1947).
- Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica: Gy. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica 1-2 (Leiden 1983).
- Mošin, Akti: V. Mošin, Akti iz svetogorskih archiva. In: Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije 91, 1939, 155-260.
- Mutafčiev, Die angebliche Einwanderung: P. Mutafčiev, Die angebliche Einwanderung von Seldschuk-Türken in die Dobrudscha im XIII. Jahrhundert. Spisanie na B'lgarskata Akademiâ na Naukite i Izkustvata 66. Klon" istoriko-filologičen" 32, 1943, 1-128.
- Ocak, Sarı Saltık: A.Y. Ocak, Sarı Saltık. Popüler İslâm'ın Balkanlar'daki Destânî Öncüsü (XIII. Yüzyıl) (Ankara 2002).
- Oikonomidès, À propos: N. Oikonomidès, À propos des armées des premiers Paléologues et des compagnies de soldats. TM 8 (Hommage à Monsieur Paul Lemerle) 1981, 353-371.
- Ponomarev, Population: A. L. Ponomarev, Territorija i naselenie genuézskoj Kafy po dannym buchgalterskoj knigi – massarii kaznačejstva za 1381-1382 gg. In: S. P. Karpov (ed.), Pričernomor'e v srednie veka 4 (S.-Peterburg 2000) 317-443.
- Reinert, Muslim Presence: S. W. Reinert, The Muslim Presence in Constantinople, 9<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Some Preliminary Observations. In: H. Ahrweiler / A. E. Laiou (eds), Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire (Washington, D. C. 1998) 125-150.
- Šukurov, Byzantine Turks: R. Shukurov, The Byzantine Turks: An Approach to the Study of Late Byzantine Demography. In: L'Europa dopo la caduta di Costantinopoli: 29 maggio 1453: atti del XLIV Convegno Storico Internazionale, Todi, 7-9 ottobre 2007. Atti dei Convegni del Centro Italiano di Studi sul Basso Medioevo, Accademia Tudertina e del Centro di Studi sulla Spiritualità Medievale NS 21 (Spoleto 2008) 73-108. Russian corrected version: R. M. Šukurov, Vizantijskie tjurki: k voprosu ob ètničeskom sostave Vizantijskoj imperii v èpochu Paleologov. VV 68 (93), 2009, 108-134.
- Crypto-Muslims: R. Shukurov, The Crypto-Muslims of Anatolia. In: D. Shankland (ed.), Anthropology, Archeology and Heritage in the Balkans and Anatolia or the Life and Times of F. W. Hasluck (1878-1920) 2 (Istanbul 2004) 135-158.
- Family: R. M. Šukurov, Semejstvo 'Izz al-Dina Kaj-Kavusa II v Vizantii. VV 67 (92), 2008, 89-116.
- Giagoupai: R. M. Šukurov, Iagupy: tjurkskaja familija na vizantijskoj službe. Vizantijskie Očerki (S.-Peterburg 2006) 205-229.
- Oriental Margins: R. Shukurov, The Oriental Margins of the Byzantine World: a Prosopographical Perspective. In: J. Herrin / G. Saint-Guillain (eds), Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204 (Aldershot 2011) 167-196.
- Turkmen: R. Shukurov, Turkmen and Byzantine self-identity. Some Reflections on the Logic of the Title-Making in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Anatolia. In: A. Eastmond (ed.), Eastern Approaches to Byzantium (Aldershot 2001) 255-272.
- Tizengauzen, Sbornik: V. G. Tizengauzen, Sbornik materialov, otnosjaščichsja k istorii Zolotoj Ordy 1: Izvlečeniâ iz arabskich sočinenij (S.-Peterburg 1884).
- Towfiq, 'Ašāyer: F. Towfiq, 'Ašāyer. In: Encyclopaedia Iranica, online version [www.iranicaonline.org/articles/asayer-tribes](http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/asayer-tribes) (14.2.2014).
- Turan, Resmî Vesikalar: O. Turan, Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmî Vesikalar. Metin, Tercüme ve Araştırmalar (Ankara 1958).
- Selçuklular: O. Turan, Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye. Siyâsi Tarih Alp Arslan'dan Osman Gazi'ye (1071-1318) (Istanbul 1971).
- Vásáry, Cumans and Tatars: István Vásáry, Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185-1365 (Cambridge 2005).
- Vryonis, Manpower: Sp. Vryonis, Byzantine and Turkish Societies and Their Sources of Manpower. In: Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks, and Ottomans: Reprinted Studies (Malibu, CA 1981) No. III, 125-40.
- Wittek, La descendance: P. Wittek, La descendance chrétienne de la dynastie Seldjouk en Macédoine. Echos d'Orient 176, 1934, 409-412.
- Wittek, Yazijioghlu: P. Wittek, Yazijioghlu 'Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja. BSOAS 14, 1952, 639-668.
- Zachariadou, Histoire et légendes: E. Zachariadou, Histoire et légendes des premiers Ottomans. Turcica 26, 1995, 45-89.
- Observations: E. Zachariadou, Observations on some Turcica of Pachymeres. REB 36, 1978, 261-267.
- Oi christianoi: E. Zachariadou, Oi christianoi apogonoi tou Izzeddin Ka'kaous. Makedonika 6, 1964-1965, 62-74.
- Žavoronkov, Tjurki: P. I. Žavoronkov, Tjurki v Vizantii (XIII-seredina XIV v.). Čast' pervaja: tjurkskaja aristokratija. VV 65, 2006, 163-177.

## Zusammenfassung / Abstract / Résumé

### Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II. in Byzanz (1262-1264/1265)

Dieser Artikel befasst sich mit dem Schicksal des Seldschukensultans Kaykāwus II. (1245-1262) und mit dem Los derer, die ihm nach Byzanz gefolgt sind. Der Autor diskutiert anhand von griechischen, persischen, arabischen etc. Quellen den inneren Kreis der Höflinge des Kaykāwus II., nämlich seldschukische Kommandeure und gewöhnliche Türken, die ihm ins Exil gefolgt sind. Der Autor revidiert das bisher allgemein akzeptierte Datum und den Ort der Ankunft des Kaykāwus II. in Byzanz. Die meisten der Untertanen Kaykāwus' II. blieben nach dessen Flucht auf die Krim in Byzanz. Der Autor diskutiert detailliert das Los der ehemaligen Untertanen des Sultans und vertritt die Auffassung, dass die meisten von ihnen gewaltsam zum Christentum bekehrt worden seien. Der diskutierte Fall der Konversion stellt das detaillierteste und best dokumentierte Beispiel einer gewaltsamen Christianisierung von Muslimen in der gesamten Geschichte der byzantinisch-muslimischen Beziehungen dar.

### Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II in Byzantium (1262-1264/1265)

The article deals with the fate of the Seljuk sultan Kaykāwus II (ruled 1245-1262) and the lot of those who followed him in Byzantium. The author discusses the closest circle of Kaykāwus II's courtiers, Seljuk military commanders and ordinary Turks who accompanied him in his exile, on the basis of Greek, Persian, Arabic etc. sources. The author revises the commonly accepted date and place of arrival of Kaykāwus in Byzantium. Most of Kaykāwus's subjects remained in Byzantium after the sultan's escape to the Crimea. The author discusses in detail the fate of Kaykāwus's former subjects and argues that most of them underwent forcible conversion to Christianity. The case of conversion discussed represents the most detailed and best-documented example of forcible Christianisation of Muslims in the entire history of Byzantine-Muslim relations.

### Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II à Byzance (1262-1264/1265)

Cet article traite du destin du sultan seldjoukide Kaykāwus II (1245-1262) et du sort encouru par ceux qui l'avaient accompagné. L'auteur, basé sur des sources grecques, perses et arabes, discute le cercle interne des courtisans de Kaykāwus II, à savoir des commandants seldjoukides et de simples Turcs qui l'avaient suivi dans son exil. L'auteur révisé la date acceptée jusqu'ici et le lieu d'arrivée de Kaykāwus II à Byzance. La plupart des sujets de Kaykāwus II restèrent à Byzance après sa fuite en Crimée. L'auteur discute aussi de manière approfondie le sort des ex-sujets du sultan et soutient que la plupart d'entre eux furent convertis au christianisme par la force. Ce cas de conversion est l'exemple le plus détaillé et le mieux documenté d'une christianisation de Musulmans par la force dans toute l'histoire des rapports entre Byzantins et Musulmans.