

THE LEGEND OF KÖSE MIHAL

ADDITIONAL NOTES

Historical narratives require a proper, reserved and careful study, and researchers are expected to carefully judge their historical accuracy. This approach also applies to the analysis of the earliest Ottoman chronicles from the last half of the fifteenth century, written during the reigns of Mehmed II (1451-1481) and Bayezid II (1481-1512), and whose aim was to bolster the sultan's imperial authority with a superlative introduction to the dynastic origin of the Ottomans. At the same time, these chronicles describe events and personalities of early Ottoman history almost two centuries of hindsight. This fact in itself is sufficient a reason for maintaining certain reservations towards the unconditional acceptance of these chronicles as an accurate historical source. Nevertheless, they are the only surviving sources containing accounts of the principal actors in the genesis of the Ottoman state and the foundation of its earliest institutions¹. That is the reason why these texts are widely used by historians. It is obvious that chronicles dating from the second half of the fifteenth century were based on earlier written accounts, now lost. The "Chronicle of Yahşi Fakih" included in Aşıkpaşazade's *History* is a case in point. These texts were also based on Ottoman oral traditions,

Orlin SABEV is Research Fellow, Institute for Balkan Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 45 Moskovska Street, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria.

¹ For a more detailed discussion on the earliest Ottoman chroniclers and the emergence of Ottoman historiography see Halil İNALCIK, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography" and Victor MÉNAGE, "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography," in B. LEWIS and P. M. HOLTS (eds.), *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962; V. L. MÉNAGE, "The Menâqib of Yakshî Faqih," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXVI, 1963; Colin IMBER, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481*, Istanbul, Isis Press, 1990, p. 1-5.

which were ‘corrected’ according to the contemporary interpretations of the earliest Ottoman chroniclers.

These limitations were noted by Colin Imber in his comparative analysis of Ottoman chronicles². His general conclusion is as follows:

“Clearly none of the theories of the Ottoman origins, ancient or modern, is tenable. Equally, almost all the traditional tales of Osman Gazi are fictitious. The best thing that a modern historian can do is to admit frankly the earliest history of the Ottomans is a black hole. Any attempt to fill this hole will result simply in the creation of more fables.”

I have chosen to quote Imber’s thesis since its metaphorical conclusion presents a rather radical position, a position which requires very careful consideration. This thesis, namely the author’s opinion that the figure of Köse Mihal is “entirely fictitious” have prompted me to write the following historiographical notes.

According to Imber, the figures of Hasan Alp, Turgud Alp, Konur Alp, Akça Koca and Kara Mürsel, depicted in the earliest Ottoman chronicles, were created by folk-etymology, based on some place-names in Anatolia. Moreover, he insists that some of the more central figures of early Ottoman history, such as Ali (Alaeddin) Paşa and Köse Mihal were simply created by Ottoman chroniclers. I intend to restrict myself to Köse Mihal, and try to adduce other sources in filling in this imaginary or real portrait.

When Imber declares Köse Mihal to be an “entirely fictitious” figure, he suggests that this invention was inspired by the example of “Christian lords who, like Köse Mihal, fought alongside the Muslims and eventually accepted Islam.” How has he come to this conclusion? He compares the chronicles of Oruç Bey and Aşıkpaşazade (of 1484) and the “*erweiterte Oruç*” (of 1493), stressing the differences between these texts in describing the activities of Köse Mihal. Finally, he compares these narratives with a date derived from an early-sixteenth-century land survey of the *sancak* of Hüdavendigâr³. According to this register, Mihaloğlu Ali had purchased the village of Harmankaya as a freeholding. Pointing out that the date of the purchase is not mentioned in the

² C. IMBER, “The Legend of Osman Gazi,” in Elisabeth ZACHARIADOU (ed.), *Halcyon Days on Crete. A Symposium held in Rethymnon 11-13 January, 1991*, Rethymnon, 1993, p. 67-76; see also its Turkish translation: C. IMBER, “Osman Gazi Efsanesi,” in E.A. ZACHARIADOU, *Osmanlı Beyliği, (1300-1489)*, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997, p. 68-77.

³ Published by Ö. L. BARKAN and E. MERİÇLİ, *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defteri*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988, notes 540 and 556.

register, Imber supposes that Aşıkpaşazade and his younger contemporary Mihaloğlu Ali knew each other personally. Therefore, the chronicler has merely celebrated his friend's new acquisition by making up a fictitious ancestor, Köse Mihal, lord of Harmankaya.

Yet, the differences in the character of Köse Mihal, as he was described by the earliest Ottoman chroniclers, do not constitute sufficient grounds to assert that Köse Mihal was not a real historical figure. These differences could simply express a process of attribution of qualities and activities to Köse Mihal; they certainly do not prove that the person himself is a "fable". In fact, his character contains elements of fiction and interpretation, based on the chroniclers' contemporary historical circumstances. For example, it is clear that the prediction made by the Prophet in Köse Mihal's dream that his successors would spread the faith of Islam as far as Hungary (according to Oruç Bey's narrative)⁴, in contrast to Aşıkpaşazade, who gives no such details⁵, was a reflection of the historical reality of the second half of the fifteenth century. At that time, the *akıncı* campaigns, led by members of the Mihaloğlu family, had reached the Hungarian territories⁶. However, the fact that the chronicler presented contemporary historical realities as events foreseen approximately a century and a half earlier is not sufficient a reason for asserting that Köse Mihal is a fictitious character.

The chronicles of Aşıkpaşazade and Oruç Bey are not, in fact, the only sources mentioning Köse Mihal. Indeed, as we pointed out above, Imber also used a land survey. However, the data contained in it do not support his conclusion. This survey reflects landownership at the time of its collection, or a bit earlier. If it is used in isolation from other documents, it is of little value to solve our problem. Imber points out that the date of purchase of Harmankaya by Mihaloğlu Ali Bey is not mentioned in the text. Neither is the name of the person who sold Harmankaya to Mihaloğlu Ali Bey. The answer, however, can be found in the copy of the *vakfiye* of Boyalı Mehmed Paşa (d.1593), quoted by the Turkish his-

⁴ [Nihal] ATŞIZ (ed.), *Oruç Beğ Tarihi*, İstanbul, Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, [1972], p. 26. See also FRANZ BABINGER, *Die früh-osmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch nach der Handschriften zu Oxford und Cambridge erstmals herausgegeben und eingeleitet von F. Babinger*, Hannover, 1925.

⁵ N. ATŞIZ (ed.), *Aşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Basımevi, 1992, p. 29. See also FR. GIESE, *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Aşıkpaşazâde*, Leipzig, 1929.

⁶ On the *Akıncı* campaigns of the Mihaloğlu family see Agâh Sırrı LEVEND, *Gazavat-nameler ve Mihaloğlu Ali Bey'in Gazavat-namesi*, Ankara, TTK, 1956.

torian Mahmud R. Gazimihal⁷. The villages, endowed in his will to a pious foundation, were located in the *kazas* of Gölbazarı, Göynük, and Bilecik of the *sancak* of Hüdavendigâr. Harmankaya was among these villages. These villages were, according to the *vakfiye*, initially a freeholding (*mülk*) of Bali Bey, son of Mahmud Bey. The latter is presented as “one of the sons of Gazi Mihal Bey”. Later, Mihaloğlu Ali Bey purchased these villages from the offspring of Bali Bey (that is, from one of his own relatives) and they became his *mülk*. Mihaloğlu Ali Bey then handed them over to his son Mehmed Bey. Finally, Boyalı Mehmed Paşa purchased this *mülk* from the heirs of Mehmed Bey. A *hüccet* of 1573, quoted by Mahmud Gazimihal, points out that these villages were handed over from generation to generation as *mülks* in the possession of Gazi Mihal’s successors from “ancient times”. Hence, Mihaloğlu Ali Bey was not the first member of this famous family to possess Harmankaya as a freehold. Yet, the copy of Boyalı Mehmed Paşa’s *vakfiye* and the *hüccet* of 1573 are not the final proof that Köse Mihal was the pre-Ottoman lord of Harmankaya. Likewise there is no direct mention in the two sources that Gazi Mihal, supposed to be the grandson of Köse Mihal, owned Harmankaya⁸.

In the yard of the Gazi Mihal Mosque in Edirne, completed in 1422, the gravestone of the founder and of a number of his relatives and descendants are still preserved to this day. The stone of the founder, bearing the name of “Mihal bin Aziz bin Frenk bin Cünd” is dated 839 (1435/36). The same name and patronym (but not the mention of “Frenk bin Cünd”) also appear on the building inscription of the mosque. This does not appear to connect this Mihal to our Köse Mihal, as one might have expected. Unless, of course, we assume that behind “Frank, son of a warrior” [Frenk bin Cünd] hides our Köse Mihal, who would then have been one of the Catalan mercenaries of Roger de Flor’s expedition of 1308, who entered the service of the recently established emirate of Karasi, and from there moved on to serve the Ottomans. We have, however, no way of ascertaining this hypothesis⁹. Similarly, a tombstone in

⁷ Mahmud R. GAZİMİHAL, “İstanbul Muhasaralarında Mihaloğulları ve Fatih Devrine ait bir Vakıf Defterine göre Harmankaya Malikânesi,” *Vakıflar Dergisi*, IV, 1958, p. 125-137.

⁸ See M. Tayyib GÖKBİLGİN, “Mihal-Oğulları,” *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, v. 8, İstanbul, 1960, p. 285-292; Yaşar GÖKÇEK, “Köse Mihal Oğulları,” İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Mezuniyet Tezi, 1950, p. 19-20; A. S. LEVEND, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁹ On the gravestone and the inscription of the mosque, see Ekrem Hakkı AYVERDİ, *Osmanlı Mi'mârisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri (1403-1451)*, second edition,

Harmankaya, which oral tradition considers to be the grave of Köse Mihal, does not provide us with any real information, since no epigraph is engraved on it¹⁰. Yet, there are other sources mentioning Mihal Bey, some narrative, others styled as official documents. The first is the *Düsturnâme* of Enveri, a chronicle in verse written in 1464/1465, considerably earlier than Aşıkpaşazade. Enveri gives the genealogy of Mahmud Bey, the founder of an important group of early-Ottoman buildings in the central-Bulgarian town of Ihtiman. Ihtiman was traditionally one of the seats of a branch of the Mihaloğlu family, the leaders of the *akıncıs* of Rumelia. According to Enveri, Mahmud Bey was the son of İlyas Bey and fell in the Battle of Ankara, in 1402, while defending sultan Bayezid I. This İlyas Bey was, again according to Enveri, a son of Balta Bey¹¹. The text tells us that :

“The hero Mihal Bey came from Şam (Damascus) together with the son of Balta Bey, that young man; İlyas Bey was the son of Balta Bey.” (*Şam’dan gelmiş idi Mihal Bey pehlivan / Balta Bey oğlu ile ol nevcivan / Baltabey’in oğlu dürür İlyas Bey*).

Yaşar Gökçek, who first interpreted this text, drew the following genealogy: Köse Mihal—Balta Bey—İlyas Bey—Mahmud Bey (of

İstanbul, 1989, p. 390. See also T. GÖKBILGIN, *Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı, Vakıflar—Mülkler – Mukataaalar*, İstanbul, 1952, p. 57, note 108, and p. 244-246. On the mosque inscription see also F. Th. DIKEMA, *The Ottoman Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne*, Leiden, Brill, 1977, p. 17-18 and plate I. One should add that the builder of the mosque is the well-known early Ottoman commander Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, who was *beylerbey* of Rumelia under Emir Süleyman and Musa Çelebi. After Mehmed I’s victory over Musa (July 1413), he fell from favour and was imprisoned in the Bedevi Çardak prison in Tokat, only to be liberated by Murad II during the crisis caused by the “impostor Mustafa,” (end of 1421-beginning of 1422). The mosque was completed in the year 825, which runs between 26 December, 1421 and 14 December, 1422. As it is absolutely impossible to construct such an elaborate building (including a separate kitchen building and a large double bath) in less than a year, we have to assume that the works were actually begun under Süleyman and Musa (1411-1413), when Mihaloğlu Mehmed was *beylerbey*, and that they remained unfinished and were completed after the founder had been set free again. This would mean that we have to push at least ten years the date that this Mihaloğlu is mentioned as a son of Aziz Bey and grandson of “Frenk”.

On the Catalan expedition, the first years of Karasi and the early Ottomans, see the excellent study by Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, “The Turks in Europe (1305-13) and the Serbs in Asia Minor (1313)” in E. ZACHARIADOU (ed.), *The Ottoman Emirate (1300-1389)*, Rethymnon, 1993, p. 159-168.

¹⁰ E. H. AYVERDI, *Osmanlı Mi'mârisinin İlk Devri 630-805 (1230-1402)*, İstanbul, 1966, p. 152.

¹¹ ENVERİ, *Düsturname-i Enveri*, (ed. by M. H. Yinanç), İstanbul, 1928, p. 90-91 (quoted from Gökçek, *art. cit.*, p. 33).

Ihtiman)¹². He considered Mihal Bey to be our Köse Mihal, although there is no way to establish this link with any certainty. In spite of this, M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, in his article “Mihaloğulları,” in *İ.A.*² followed the suggestion made by Gökçek¹³. Nevertheless, the Mihal Bey mentioned by Enveri is more likely identical with the builder of the Edirne mosque, who was buried in its graveyard in 1435/1436, Mihaloğlu Mehmed Bey, *beylerbey* of Rumelia under Süleyman and Musa Çelebi, and rising again to prominence during the reign of Murad II. The Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey mentioned by Enveri appears in a number of administrative records concerning the *vakf* of his *zaviye* and mosque in Ihtiman, where he is alternatively called “Mahmud Bey *bin* Mihal Bey,” “Mahmud Bey *veled-i* Gazi Mihal Bey,” “Gazi Mihal Bey-*zade* Mahmud Bey,” etc¹⁴. According to Semavi Eyice, this Mahmud Bey must have lived during the first half of the fifteenth century¹⁵. If we compare the sources just mentioned with Enveri’s account, the conclusion can be drawn that Mahmud Bey was a descendant of a certain Mihal Bey, who must have lived in the fourteenth century and could be identified with Köse Mihal Bey. However, this conclusion should be regarded as no more than a free supposition.

We should also point to two other narratives presenting Köse Mihal as the lord of Harmankaya. One is a fifteenth-century manuscript copy of the *Vilâyetnâme* of Hacı Bektaş, used in the work of M. R. Gazimihal, which tells us about the relations between Mihal, “the lord of Göl” (Harmankaya was in the district of Göl-Gölbazarı), and Osman (Atman Bey)¹⁶. The second account is the *Gazavâtname* of Suzi Çelebi (d.1524/5), dedicated to the *akıncı* campaigns of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey, lord of Plewna/Pleven. It presents Köse Mihal as: “the chief lord among the Christian kings,” and mentions that he was in the service of

¹² GÖKÇEK, *art. cit.*, p. 19-20, 32-33, 40.

¹³ GÖKBILGIN, “Mihal-Oğulları”, *İ.A.*², *op. cit.*

¹⁴ See the following registers, preserved in the *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi*, Istanbul, *Tapu Tahrir Defterleri* 236, 370, 409, 566 (all the sixteenth century) and *Mevkûfat Kalemî* 2559 (from 1023 (1614/1615)). See also the *fermans* and *berats* from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and an order of appointment from 1324/1916, presented in Latin transcription by Yaşar Gökçek, *art.cit.*, p. 57-67.

¹⁵ Semavi EYİCE, “Sofya Yakınında İhtiman’da Gazi Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey İmâret-Camii,” *Kubbealtı Akademi Mecmuası*, 2, 1975, p. 49-61.

¹⁶ M. R. GAZİMİHAL, *art. cit.* The author has not pointed out which of the many surviving manuscripts of the *Vilayetname* he used. The passage is not included in the edition by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, “Manakıb-ı Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî “Vilâyet-Nâme”, Istanbul, 1958 (and other editions).

Osman¹⁷. In both cases, it is still possible to assume that the authors of these two works used information of older, or almost contemporary sources, such as Aşıkpaşazade and Oruç. Thus, in spite of all the information above, there still are grounds to suspect that Aşıkpaşazade really was the person who ‘created’ the character of Köse Mihal Bey.

Historians consider Köse Mihal to have had three sons: Aziz Bey (the father of the builder of the *zaviye*-mosque in Edirne, Gazi Mihal Bey), Balta Bey (the father of İlyas Bey) and Ali Bey¹⁸. The sources at hand do not clearly indicate a direct relation between Köse Mihal Bey on the one hand and Aziz and Balta Beys on the other, as has already been said. That Köse Mihal was the father of Ali Bey is supported by a text which, to the best of my knowledge, is preserved in two different copies and one extract in Bulgarian translation. The oldest copy was published by Nüzhet Paşa in his *Ahvâl-i Gazi Mihal*¹⁹. The second copy is included in the work of Yaşar Gökçek, who presented it as a Latin transcription of a *berat* copied by the mufti of Kırklareli from a *sicill* of the Sharia court of Bursa dated 1304/1886²⁰. Thirdly, the Bulgarian historian Yordan Trifonov reports that one of the heirs of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey, living in Pleven, had, among his family papers, a *berat*, whose contents he describes in an abbreviated form²¹. The document is, or at least purports to be, a decree issued by Sultan Bayezid I (1389-1402) in the first decade of *Muharrem*, 793, *i.e.* December, 1390. According to its contents the sultan granted the sons of “Mihal Beg oğlu Ali Beg” a *sancakbeylik* as a reward for his bravery and his companionship to the sultan’s father, Hüdavendigâr (Murad I), obviously during the battle of Kosovo in 1389.

The document is the earliest to mention the name of Mihal Bey. Trifonov even declared him to be Köse Mihal himself (*Gazi Ali Bey Köse Mihal oğlu*). Indeed, from a chronological point of view, the Mihal mentioned in this document could be identical with Köse Mihal, as Yaşar

¹⁷ A. S. LEVEND, *op. cit.*, p. 250-260. For details on Ottoman Pleven see the article of M. KIEL, “Plewna” in *E.I.*², VIII, Leiden, 1995, p. 317-320.

¹⁸ See the genealogies of the Mihaloğlu family presented by Gökçek, *art. cit.*, and Gökbilgin, *art. cit.*

¹⁹ Nüzhet PAŞA, *Ahvâl-i Gazi Mihal*, Dersaadet, 1315 (1896/97)), p. 45-47.

²⁰ Gökçek, *art. cit.*, p. 74.

²¹ Yordan TRIFONOV, “Mihal-beyovtsi v predaniето i istoria,” Bălgarska Istoricheska Biblioteka, v.3, Sofia, 1929, p. 212-229. See also the Turkish translation by Türker ACAROĞLU, “Tarih ve Rivayetlerde Mihal Beyoğulları”, *Ülkü-Halkevleri Dergisi*, XVI, 95-96, 1941, p. 390-398, 533-541. See the new impression of this translation in *Belleten*, LX/229, 1996, p. 801-818. See also Yordan Trifonov’s rich monography: *Istoria na grada Pleven do Osvoboditelnata vojna*, Sofia, 1933, especially p. 36, note 1.

Gökçek and the well-known historian Tayyib Gökbilgin have asserted. We must keep in mind, however, that we have no original text but only nineteenth-century copies. In fact, by using the term document here, we mean only the formal character of the source as issued by the sultan, that it is a document from the point of view of diplomatics alone. Since we have no reference to the original text, we can only judge the document's historical accuracy from its textual structure. One may thus suggest that it is a falsification from the time of Bayezid II, a period to which modern research (Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr) has linked many "early Ottoman" documents. Our text is rather similar to the text of a *berat*, given to Gazi Evrenos Bey by sultan Murad I. This text is included in the great late-sixteenth century collection of government papers of Feridun Ahmed Bey printed in the nineteenth century²². As I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr has shown, some formulae in the *berat* for Gazi Evrenos (as for example: "*tevki'-i ref'i-i hümâyûnum hükmü oldur ki*") are simply anachronisms, coming in use only in the time of Mehmed II, whereas quotations from the Koran or from the hadiths are not typical of *berats* or *fermans* but of trust deeds²³. In our text, we have the same introductory formula, together with a quotation of verse 181 of the second *surah* of the Koran, *al-Baqarah*, which is often used in the final part of trust deeds. So, the *berat* of 1390 could be a hoax, made in the early years of Bayezid II to retrieve a lost *vakf* property, confiscated during the last years of Mehmed II. Yet, not all is fiction. One of the persons mentioned in the text as witness, Timurtaş Bey, is a well known historical character. He was appointed *beylerbey* of Rumelia around 1387 and died, according to his well-preserved gravestone in the yard of his *imaret*/mosque in Bursa, in March, 1404. Lala Şahmelek Pasha, the other easily-identified witness was, according to the (not always trustworthy) Hüsamüddin (in his *Amasya Tarihi*), active under Bayezid I, during the interregnum and well into the reign of Murad II. He died, according to his gravestone next to his mosque, on the banks of the Tundja river in Edirne in the year 1441. If we assume that he might have been 85 years old at his death, he must have been born around 1356, and therefore, in 1390, was probably old enough to occupy the important post of tutor to the princes. According to Hüsamüddin, he had been the *lala* (tutor) of prince Musa Çelebi. As there is some uncertainty about

²² Feridun BEY, *Münşeatü's-Selâtin*, v. I, Istanbul, 1857, p. 87-89.

²³ Irène BELDICEANU-STEINHERR, *Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I*, München, Societatea Academica Romana, 1967, p. 228-236.

the year in which Musa was born, it cannot be ascertained if Şahmelek Bey could have been his *lala* in 1390, but this is certainly not to be excluded. Nor should one exclude the possibility that Şahmelek had been Lala of another prince, before he became the teacher of Prince Musa. Thus, in the case of this second identifiable witness on our document, there remains some ground for doubt. One should also note that Nüzhet Paşa was himself among the descendants (*ahfād*) of Gazi Mihal, as he states in his book. He probably had in his possession the original of this document or, more likely, a copy of it. However, the text of the same document, in Latin transcription, as given by Yaşar Gökçek, is not derived from the work of Nüzhet Paşa, but from a *suret* (copy) of the ferman, preserved in a *sicill* of Bursa. Gökçek himself used the copy of this *suret*, made by the mufti of Kırklareli in 1304 (1886), when Edhem (İbrahim Edhem Efendi) was the *naib-üş-şer'* of Bursa. In any case, it is too early to confirm, or to reject this source as a genuine historical document, but we do have to take it into account.

Finally, one should not discard the assumption made by M. R. Gazimihal that the name *Kuximpaxis*, as mentioned by the Byzantine chronicler Georgios Pachymeres (d.1310), in fact denotes Köse Mihal²⁴. M. R. Gazimihal made a detailed analysis of the phonetic structure of this personal name and concluded that *Kuximpaxis* stands for *Köse Bey*, *i.e.* Köse Mihal. If one adopts Gazimihal's suggestion, the thesis of Köse Mihal's historical reality could be confirmed by a non-Ottoman chronicler who was a contemporary of the events he described, in contrast to the Ottoman chroniclers a century later. However, this too remains a supposition.

The additional data provided here concerning the legend of Köse Mihal do not provide necessary grounds for reaching a conclusion on whether Köse Mihal was a real historical figure or simply a fiction. However, they do show that Colin Imber's inferences about the fictitious nature of Köse Mihal are a little hasty. No less, perhaps, than his assertion that the earliest Ottoman chronicles are "black holes" which deserve no serious consideration. The legend of Köse Mihal, lord of Harmankaya, at least, is not entirely fictitious.

²⁴ M.R. GAZIMIHAL, *art. cit.*

APPENDIX I

Text of the document attributed to Bayezid I as quoted by Nüzhet Paşa, Ahvâl-i Gazi Mihal. Der Saḫadet, 1315. Suret-i hatt-ı Hümayun, 45-47.

احوال غازى ميخال
نزهت پاشا
در سعادت
۱۳۱۵
۴۷-۴۵

«صورت خط همایون»

توقيع رفيع همایون حکمی اولدرکه:

مرحوم و مغفور له بابام خداوندکاريک شهيد واقع اولديغی جنک عظيمده اشبو امير الکبير مفتخر الامراء العظام ملك الغزات و المجاهدين قاهر الکفرة و المشركين ميخال بك او غلی علی بك دام علوه خدمتارينک کلی ارلکي و يولداشغلی ظهوره کلمکين امر ايلدم که او لادلرين او لادلرينه بطناً بعد بطن و قرناً بعد قرن سنجاق و يربلوب من بعد معزول اولماق ايچون بو بيتی يی ويردم و بيوردم که بنم او لادمدن و انتسامدن هرکيمه حق جانبندن دولت ميسر اولور ايسه بو بيتی يی مقبول طوتوب غازى علی بك او لادمک او لادلرينه سنجاق بکلکی ويروب و من بعد معزول ايلميوب رعايت و حمايت ايده لر هرکيم بو بيتی يی مقبول طوتيمه «کما قال اه سبحانه تعالى فمن بدله بعد ما سمعه فانما اثمه على الذين يبدلونه ان اه سميع عليم و لعنة اه و الملائكة و الناس اجمعين» (1) اوزرينه او لسون بو بيتی يی مقرر و محقق بيلوب اعتماد و اعتقاد قله لر تحريراً في او ائل محرم الحرام من سنه ثلاثين (2) و تسعين و سبعمائه بمقام ادرنه المحروسه

(1) A quotation of verse 181 of the second sura of the Koran *al-Baqarah*.

(2) Incorrectly printed for ثلاثه.

شاهد بذلك حسن الكتان في خدمت السلطان	شاهد بذلك قاسم بك
شاهد بذلك منلا جلال الدين بن محمد افندى الحاكم	شاهد بذلك حمزه بك المناوى
شاهد بذلك سلو بك بن اغزار شاهين	شاهد بذلك منلا حافظ الدين بن محمد
شاهد بذلك الشهير غظر قال متولى	شاهد شاه ملك پاشا لاله پاشا
شاهد بذلك مفضل الفضلات الحاكم باشه	شاهد بذلك منلا محمود الشهرت قوجه افندى
شاهد بذلك ديكر قاسم بك	شاهد بذلك امور بك بن افندى
شاهد بذلك محمود بك بن حرخسار	شاهد بذلك قره مقبل لاله
شاهد بذلك الياس بك بن الحيدر انى	شاهد بذلك تيمور طاش بك
شاهد بذلك مولحو لو	شاهد بذلك منلا شمش الدين بن محمد

APPENDIX II

Transcription of the same document as given by Yaşar Gökçek in 1950 on the basis of a copy made in 1886 by the mufti of Kırk Kilise (Kırklareli):

Suret-i Berât-ı Ali

Bu tevki^c-i ref^c-i hümayun hükmü oldur ki, merhûm ve mağfûrunlah babam Hüdavendigâr şehid vaki^c olduğu ceng-i aziminde işbu emir-ül kebir mefhar-ül ümera-il nizam melik-ül ğuzat ve-l mücahidîn kahir-ül kefere-ti ve-l müşrikîn Mihâl beğ oğlu Gazi Ali beğ lalam dame ʿulüvvühü hizmetlerinin mülki erliği zuhura gelmeğün emreyledim ki evlâdlarının evlâdlarına batnen ba^cde batnın ve karnen ba^cde karnin sancak virilüp min bâd mazul olmamak için bu beyti verdim ve buyurdum ki benim evlâdımdan ve ensabımdan her kime hak canibinden devlet müyesser olur ise bu beyti makbûl tutup Gazi Ali beğ lalamın evlâdlarına sancak beyliği verüp min bâd ma'zul eylemeyüp riaye ve himaye edeler. Ve her kim bu beyti makbûl tutmıya kemâ kalallah-u süphânehu ve tealâ ve men beddelehu adema semiahu ve innema ismihu alellezine yübeddilnehû innallahe semiuñ âlim ve lânetullahi mel melâiket-i ve-n-nâsi aleyhim ecmain üzerine olsun mukarrer ve mütehakkık bilüp i^ctimad ve i^ctikad kılalar Tahriren fi eva-ili muharrem-ül haram min şühur li sene-ti selâse ve tis'iyn ve seb^camie.

Be makam-ı Edirne
Muharrem/793 (M.1390)

Şahit İmzaları

Not: İşbu suret 1304 senesinde Mahruse-i Bursa'da naib-ü şer' bulunan merhum İbrahim Edhem efendinin mahkeme-i şer'iyesinde mahfuz sicilden bi aynihi ihraç ve mukabele olunmuştur.

Kırklareli Müftisi.

Orlin SABEV, *The Legend of Köse Mihal – Additional Notes*

The present article is inspired by an article of Colin Imber entitled “The Legend of Osman Gazi” and claiming that the popular figure of Köse Mihal, appearing in the earliest preserved Ottoman chronicles of the late 15th century, is “entirely fictitious”.

The current additional notes attempt to question Colin Imber’s assertion by drawing attention to other kind of sources dealing in particular with the eventual descendants of Köse Mihal. A special consideration deserves a *berat* of 1390 issued by sultan Bayezid (1389-1402) and mentioning the name of a certain “Mihal Beyoğlu Ali Bey”. The *berat*, however, could be hardly used as an evidence for the historical reality of Köse Mihal himself because, firstly, we have at hand only rather later copies of that source dating from the late 19th century, and, secondly, the “document” itself could be a later version.

In conclusion, the article suggests the earliest preserved Ottoman chronicles of the late 15th century could reflect real historical persons although being featured with fictitious elements.

Orlin SABEV, *La légende de Köse Mihal—Notes supplémentaires*

Ce texte est inspiré par l’article de Colin Imber, «The Legend of Osman Gazi», dans lequel l’auteur affirme que la figure populaire de Köse Mihal, présente dans les premières chroniques ottomanes conservées de la fin du xv^e siècle, a été inventée.

Ces «notes supplémentaires» ont pour but d’éclairer l’assertion de Colin Imber. Elles utilisent d’autres sources, liées aux héritiers éventuels de Köse Mihal. Une attention spéciale est portée au *berat* de l’année 1390, où «Mihal Beyoğlu Ali Bey» est mentionné. Le *berat*, cependant, ne peut être utilisé comme preuve de la réalité historique de Köse Mihal; en effet, d’une part nous n’en avons qu’une copie datant de la fin du xix^e siècle, d’autre part le «document» lui-même peut être une version plus tardive.

L’article suggère enfin que les premières chroniques ottomanes conservées de la fin du xv^e siècle pourraient évoquer des personnages historiquement authentiques, bien que marqués par des éléments imaginaires.