The last two decades of the fourteenth century witnessed the consolidation of the Ottoman power in the Balkans and the reduction of the Byzantine Empire to a Turkish dependency.\(^2\) By then, following the collapse of the Selçuks a series of independent emirates had emerged in Asia Minor, one of the most well established being that of the Saruhan family, the Saruhanoğlu, founded by Saruhan son of Alpاغ (ca. 1313 – after 1348), the Emir of Manisa (Magnesia) on the Sipylos.\(^3\) Along with the emirate of Aydin, the Aydınıoğlu, it extended its power in the Aegean, collaborating and competing with both the Byzantines and the Genoese.\(^4\) According to the Moroccan traveler Ibn Battuta, who travelled around Asia Minor ca. 1331, the Genoese of Phokaia used to send an annual gift to the emir of Saruhan, one assumes to prevent him from his piratic raids.\(^5\) Together with external conflicts the emirates experienced internal succession struggles. Evidence in a short chronicle contained in a Greek manuscript housed in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, records such a hitherto unknown internal conflict that took place in 1383, which sheds further light on the Saruhanid succession in this period.

The deluxe Oxford MS. Auctarium T. 1. 2 (Misc. 180, Meerman 65, Clermont 99) has been twice described in detail by Annaclara Cataldi-Palau.\(^6\) It consists of 291 parchment leaves preserving twenty-four Orations by Gregory of Nazianzus (329-390) with scholia, and commentaries to Orations 38 and 39 by Maximus Confessor (ca. 580-662) and to Oration 39 by Pseudo-Nonnus (6th c.). The value of this codex in terms of the textual transmission of these Orations is enhanced by the decorative elements in the annotation. Copied by two different anonymous hands (A and B) the codex is mutilated in the beginning and end, and therefore no evidence of its precise date is recorded in a colophon, if indeed such one existed. However, on the basis of datable scholia and the style of Greek minuscule (bouletée élancée) employed by scribe B (ff. 224-269\(^v\), 294-297\(^v\)), the manuscript has been dated to the tenth century. A possible Southern Italian provenance has also been suggested.\(^7\)

\(^{1}\) The present joint article started its life in Spring 2012. Since then a number of reasons postponed its completion. Professor Elizabeth Zachariadou read and approved its pre-final version before she passed away on 26 December 2018. It is dedicated to her memory with deep love, respect and admiration. Profound thanks are offered to Dr Georgios Liakopoulos for his kind help and advice on Ottoman sources, and to Professor Stephen Reinert for his valuable comments, corrections and suggestions which substantially improved its final version. Warmest thanks are expressed to Ms Theodora Oikonomides and Mrs Katerina Oikonomides for their kind permission to publish this joint article in memory of their mother.


Together with a number of subscriptions in Greek by various thirteenth-fourteenth century hands (ff. 155v, 240\textsuperscript{r}, 89\textsuperscript{r}, 90\textsuperscript{r}, 202\textsuperscript{r}, 203\textsuperscript{r}, 242\textsuperscript{v}), a note by a different, crude and undisciplined hand, appears in the upper left-hand margin of f. 295\textsuperscript{v} (older no. 303v).\textsuperscript{8} The note was written in black ink which has now turned into grey green and has almost faded in certain points, making it difficult to read even with the help of ultraviolet light. This text, which contains a number of abbreviations and spelling errors (itacisms and isochronisms) as well as two lacunae, is a short chronicle recording events concerning members of the Saruhanoğulları that took place between May and June 1383 (fig. 1):
and the moon stated in the note. On the basis of the aforementioned Easter Sunday on 22 March we are able to calculate the day of the week on 24 May 1383 when the specific event took place, that is a Sunday. The last letter is still legible in the lacuna ([Կորուցե՛ր]).

Σαρχάνης is clearly identified with Saruhan son of Alpagı. He appears as Σαρχάνης in John Kantakouzenos11 and Nikephoros Gregorias.12 He is also mentioned as Σαρχάν by Ducas,13 Σαρχάνης by Laonikos Chalcocondyles14 and Pseudo-Sphrantzes,15 and Σαρχάνης in a short Chronicle.16 It is, therefore, quite acceptable that the short chronicle concerns Saruhan (r. ca. 1313 – after 1348) and his emirate, recording an event related to succession of power. As is well known, all Turkish emirates in the fourteenth century were ruled by their ulu beg (grand beg) who divided his ‘kingdom’ to his sons. For example, Mehmed Bey, father of the well-known Aydinoğlu Umur Bey, who was a friend of John Kantakouzenos, had divided his ‘kingdom’ to his sons, granting Smyrna and its area to Umur. Similarly, Alpagı granted the area of Magnesia to his son Saruhan and the area of Nif (Nymphaion) to his other son Ali, about whom hardly anything is known.17 Around 1333, three sons of Saruhan – Atmatz, Orhan, and Timur Han – took part in a naval raid organised by the Aydinoğulları, though nothing is known of what happened to them subsequently.18 It should also be noted that towards the end of the fourteenth century it seems that the titles of emirs become more official. In the treaty with the Venetians in 1375 the emir of Mençe Ahmed Bey has added beside his traditional title Çelebi (Zalapi) also the title of gazi, that is warrior of the faith. More specifically, in the introductory section of the treaty the emir appears as ‘Cassibegi Zalapi’, while in the closing paragraph he signs as ‘Casibegi Zalappi’ and can be considered certain that he is a gazi.19

Firm genealogical evidence on the Saruhanoğlu is provided by dated inscriptions in the funerary monument of the Ulu Cami (A.H. 778 = A.D. 1376) and the adjacent medrese (A.H. 780 = A.D. 1378) in their capital, Manisa. These inscriptions mention the ruler responsible for the building of the two monuments, who was alive in April 1378, namely Ishak Çelebi, son of İlyas, son of Saruhan.20 Actually,
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20 Rudolf Meyer Riefstahl and Paul Wittek, Turkish Architecture in southwestern Anatolia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931); Riefstahl, ‘The Ulu Djami of Ishak Bey’, pp. 7-15; Wittek ed. and trans., ‘Inscriptions from Southwestern Anatolia’: p. 109, no. 29 (fig. 225): ‘Inscription over the main portal of Ulu Djami’ (Central section) … “the overwheleming heresy, the fighter in the path of God, the victorious, the victor – (Left section) the confirmed by the aid of the pardoning king, the Sultan and son of Sultan Tshelebi Ishak b. Iljâs b. Şarukhan – God give eternity to his reign – in the year 778 [beg. 21st of May, 1376]”; p. 110, no. 30 (fig. 226): ‘Inscription over the portal of the medrese adjacent to Ulu Djami’ … “(Right) Has ordered the construction of this blessed medrese the most exalted Sultan, the prince of the Gâzîs and fighters for the Faith Ishak Tshelebi b. Iljâs b. Şarukhan – may God make their reign eternal! – in (left) the months of the year 780 [beg. 30th of April, 1378 A.D.]”; cf. p. 111, no. 31: ‘On the front of the member [of Ulu Djamî] ‘Has ordered the
this is the last mention of İshak (r. by 1357), who must have died in 1378, when he was succeeded by his son and successor Orhan,21 as the date (A.H. 780 = A.D. 1378) of the silver coin the latter issued in his own name attests.22

The illegible word or words in mid-sentence in our short chronicle (i.e., o[.e.] in: Σαχαντζή· o[.e.] ο ἐγγονός τοῦ Σαχαρχάνη ἐκείνου) do not help in identifying the possible circumstances of İshak’s death since whatever the author wrote cannot refer to this simply because the date of the recorded action (1383) in the text does not coincide with the plausible year of İshak’s death, as evidenced from the coin of his son and successor Orhan (1378–9). Similarly, the preceding word, Σαχαντζή, presents problems. It seemingly coordinates with a Turkish word ‘Sahancı’ or ‘Şahancı’, but what the latter signifies is unclear. It does not appear to designate a personal name or surname, and in any case a name in this form is not, to our knowledge, attested in any Greek source of the period.23 Likewise it is implausible to connect Σαχαντζή with ‘sakabaş’, the term for a janissary regimental ‘chief water carrier’.24 Might Σαχαντζή somehow echo the honorary title of ‘Şahzade’, reserved for the royal princes? If that is the case, then Σαχαντζή/Şahzade likely refers to the aforementioned İshak Celebi (known as Muzafferüreddin İshak Celebi), Sarkuhan’s grandson (ἐγγονός τοῦ Σαχαρχάνη ἐκείνου). If this interpretation is correct, then the word Σαχαντζή in our short chronicle simply reflects its author’s garbled understanding of the correct spelling and pronunciation of the title ‘Şahzade’.

Σαχαντζή ή Χαρτίρπετη (Χαρτίρ παίζει) in our short chronicle must refer to Hızurşah Bey 25 – İshak’s son and grandson of İlyas (Fahreddin İlyas) (r. after 1348 – ca. 1357) – accompanied by the honorary appellation ‘İsmâ’il’. Hızır appears as Χρησίμη in Ducas, who states that when the Emirate of Saruhan was conquered by Sultan Bayezid I, who gave it to his son Süleyman Celebi in 1390, Hızır surrendered himself to the Sultan and was sent to Bursa, where soon after he was poisoned on the Sultan’s order and died.26 According to Hoca Sâdeddin Efendi (1536/7-1599), after Bayezid I’s conquest of the Emirate, Hızır was arrested (in his bath); before he was executed he requested to be buried after his death in his ancestral mausoleum in Manisa.27 Whatever the case, prior to these events, an internal strife between Hızır and his brother Orhan broke out. Sometime before 1389 Hızır deposed Orhan, who was reinstated by Bayezid in 1390, while after the battle of Ankyra (28 July 1402), when Bayezid was captured by Timur, Orhan was restored to power by the Mongol leader.28 Soon after Orhan issued copper coins in construction of this blessed mimbir the most exalted the most exalted sultan, the master of the necks of the nations, Tshelebi İshâb b. Iljâs – exalted be his victory! – in the year 778 [beg. 21st of May, 1376 A.D.]”. See also HAKKI ACÜN, ‘Manisa’da Tübre Mimarisı’, Belleten 49 (1985), 479-501; idem, ‘Manisa İshak Celebi Külliyesi’, Yaktifar Dergisi 19 (1985), 127-146.
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his own right (dated A.H. 806 = A.D. 1403/4). The struggle for power between the two brothers resumed in summer 1404, in which Hızır prevailed. His victory was short-lived. In spring of the following year (1405) he was deposed and murdered by the Ottoman Mehmed Çelebi. Whether Hızır played a role during the first years of the war among the successors to the Ottoman Sultanate, allying with İsâ Çelebi against Mehmed Çelebi, is not clear. What is certain is that Hızırşhah Bey was the last of the Saruhanids.

The last person in our short chronicle that needs to be identified is Σουλαϊμάνης. This name cannot refer to Saruhan’s son Süleyman (d. 1345), who during the Byzantine civil war (1341-47) fought in Thrace on the side of John Kantakouzenos (r. 1347-54) being an ally of Aydınoğlu Umur Bey (r. 1334-48), who assisted John against the Palaeologi. It has been suggested that, apart from Orhan and Hızır, İshak Çelebi had also another son, who at some point ascended the throne of the emirate and whose name is unknown. It seems that the Σουλαϊμάνης in our short chronicle is no other than this third son of İshak and brother of Hızırşhah Bey (ὁ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ ὁ Χητήρπεη). So far this is the only source which refers to a son of İshak by the name of Süleyman, who ruled for eight days (καὶ ἔφεντευσεν ὁ γιος του ὁ Σουλαϊμάνης ἡμέρας ἡ’), before his brother Hızırşhah Bey defeated him and became ruler (ὁ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ ὁ Χητήρπεη καὶ ἐπολέμησεν καὶ ἐνίκησεν καὶ ἐγένετον αὐθέντης). The internal dynastic strife among Ishak’s sons recorded by the anonymous Greek hand in our MS. was brief, lasting only thirteen days, between 24 May and 6 June 1383. In the light of this evidence a translation of the short chronicle is offered below:

In <the year> 6891 (AM = 1383 AD), of the 6th indiction, 3rd solar cycle, 13th lunar cycle; Jewish Passover on March 21st, Christian Easter on March 22nd; on May 24th, the day of the Lord (Sunday), the Şahzade (?) [missing word/s] the grandson of that very Saruhan and his son Süleyman ruled for 8 days; his brother Ismael Hızır Bey fought and was victorious, and became ruler on June 6th.

Thus, the genealogy of the Sarihanoğulları should be as follows, the numbers in parentheses indicating order of succession:

---
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Our proposed sequence and chronology of Saruhanid rule is as follows, correcting and emending Bosworth in *The new Islamic dynasties*:³³

1. Saruhan, son of Alpagı (ca. 1313 – after 1348)
2. İlyas (Fahreddin İlyas) (after 1348 – ca. 1357)
3. İshak Çelebi (Muzafferüddin İshak Çelebi, Şahzade), son of İlyas (by 1357 – 1378)
4. Orhan, son of İshak Çelebi (1378 – 24 May 1383)
5. Süleyman, son of İshak (24 May – 6 June 1383)
6. Hızırşah, son of İshak (7 June 1383 – ?)
7. Orhan, son of İshak (? – before 1389)
8. Hızırşah, son of İshak (before 1389 – 1390)
9. Ottoman partial annexation (1390 – 28 July 1402)
10. Orhan, son of İshak (17 August 1402 – 1404)
11. Hızırşah, son of İshak (1404 – 1405)

Another important piece of evidence in the MS. concerns a certain Kalothetos, a family name not unknown to Saruhan. On f. 242v a later hand copied the same text found on f. 90v, the second part of which comes from Libanius, *Epistula* 608 to Philagrios (ed. Förster, *Libanius*, 10, no. 608), in a note which concludes with the phrase ‘+ Καλοθέτου γράμματα : –’ ³⁴ It is possible that this Kalothetos may be

---

related to the Chiot family with the same name. If so, it is likely that the short chronicle in our MS. is not coincidental but rather intentional.

The most famous of Kalothetois is undoubtedly Leo Kalothetos (fl.1315-63), a supporter of Andronikos III Palaiologos (1328-41), who appointed him governor of Chios after it was recaptured from the Genoese in 1329. During the civil war Leo fell from power and joined his old friend Kantakouzenos, who after he usurped the imperial throne he offered him the title of protosebastos. In 1345 Kalothetos acted as Kantakouzenos’ envoy to the megas stratopedarches John Vatatzes, and three years later he was appointed governor of Old Phokaea (1348-63). On 9 September 1349 he witnessed a treaty with Venice in Constantinople and in 1358 he took part in the episode with Orhan’s son Halil, who fell to the hands of Greek or Genoese pirates and was held captive in Old Phocaea. It was only after he received a ransom of no less than 100,000 hyperpyra that Kalothetos agreed to free Halil in response to the demand of Emperor John V (r. 1341-76, 1379-91). Kalothetos held the office of panhypersebastos at the time. What links the short chronicle mentioning Saruhan with the name of Kalothetos (though not specifically Leo) in the note in our MS. is a treaty signed by Giovani and Francesco Giustiniani with Saruhan and Leo Kalothetos, mentioned in a later document issued by the two Giustiniani on 8 October 1364.

It is not impossible, therefore, that this important theological MS. was owned at some stage by members of the Kalothetos family, who evidently shared political and financial interests with the Saruhanid dynasty, hence their concern for the succession of the emirate and the short chronicle recording the internal dynastic strife. Apart from its value as a new historical piece of evidence on the Saruhanogullari, this short chronicle, and similar ones, reflect the continuity of life of the Greek Orthodox communities under the Turcoman conquerors in a critical period marked by the increasing decline of Byzantine power and the rise of the Ottomans.
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