

S P E R O S V R Y O N I S, J R.

Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey. Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne, 1976).**

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

*Reasons for Interest in, and Controversy over, the Book**

It is impossible to comprehend the various issues and consequences which have arisen as a result of the publication of Prof. Shaw's book without an introduction and general background to the complex events and circumstances surrounding its appearance. I can only allude to these briefly at this point. It is a book whose consequences have cut across every major aspect of our community life as scholars and students in the University of California, Los Angeles: scholarly excellence, academic freedom of faculty and students, the very integrity of the evaluative process or system by which the university assures scholarly standards among the faculty through their university promotions. All these aspects of our university life have been subjected to great stress and in my opinion have been seriously damaged by the events surrounding the book's appearance, though to many the details remain unknown. The book brought demonstrations by the Association of Armenian Students at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), charges by the local American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the UCLA Senate Committee on Academic Freedom of the purported violations of Prof. Shaw's academic freedom by these students, and implicated and cast aspersions (by the local AAUP) on Prof. Richard Hovanissian in written public documents (but without due democratic process) that he 'may have violated Professor Shaw's academic freedom'. In 1978 a panel of UCLA

* This article is an expanded version of the seminar which I gave at the GE von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies, UCLA, May 25, 1983, and was also the subject of the Marshall Hodgson Memorial Lecture on Islam delivered at the University of Chicago May 27, 1983. This paper is, in turn, based on a much more exhaustive study to be published as a book in the Balkan Bibliography series of the Institute for Balkan Studies.

Since this article went to press a devastating review has appeared in Turkish by Aychoĝan Demir, in *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, I (İzmir, 1983), Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayını, pp, 157-207.

specialists had planned a seminar to discuss the book, but as a result of the large demonstration of Armenian and other students the seminar was cancelled.

During my tenure as Director of the GE von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies I did not feel free to discuss the book in a formal public seminar, and had declined to participate in the seminar that finally aborted following the student demonstrations. Having resigned from the directorship in the spring of 1982, I no longer felt constrained. I requested, and received, permission to discuss the book within the format of the Student-Faculty Seminar of the Center. It seemed to be the appropriate forum because it is a well established seminar of high scholarly standards, open to all: faculty, students, interested public. Further, it has been intellectually open to all points of view and every idea, and finally it focusses on the Near East. I am informed that the Director, Prof. Richard Hovanissian, notified Prof. Shaw of the scheduling of my presentation, and offered to provide him with the commensurate time and opportunity to respond, but that Prof. Shaw declined to avail himself of this opportunity.

Since the book and author have become important issues in our university life, the discussion of either often raises strong reactions, as did the announcement of my pending discussion of the book. On at least three occasions a high administrative authority expressed strong displeasure, within formal meetings wherein this authority sat as official representative of the university, at the fact that I would speak on such a subject and that the presentation would be sponsored by the Near Eastern Center. This authority requested the appropriate dean to put a halt to the seminar. Fortunately, the dean responded by defending academic freedom and open scholarly discussion. The actions of this high administrative authority were occasioned by Prof. Shaw in a letter addressed to this authority in which he strongly urged that I be stopped from carrying on what was essentially a scholarly and academic function and that thus my academic freedom be curtailed within the university. In this respect I would call attention to the fact that on numerous occasions and in response to the protests of the Association of Armenian Students at UCLA as to the contents of Prof. Shaw's book and teaching, these students were told by university authorities that the appropriate avenue for the veracity of the materials in question would be a scholarly forum of specialists. This was most recently expressed by the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, but was also expressed by Prof. James Wilkie, former pres-

ident of the UCLA chapter of the AAUP, to me in an informal meeting of that organization in early 1982. The contents of this letter of Prof. Shaw, in the hands of the dean, were communicated to me by the dean, but I was not allowed to see the letter, despite my request and that of the university ombudsman. Shortly thereafter and just prior to my arrival at the University of Chicago, where I had been invited to deliver the Annual Marshal Hodgson Memorial Lecture on Islam, the director of the Center for Near Eastern Studies at the University of Chicago informed me that already pressure had begun to mount on him and his Center as a result of my pending lecture. Specifically, he informed me that Prof. Kemal Karpat of the University of Wisconsin, a member of the governing board of the newly founded (by the Turkish government) Institute for Turkish Studies in Washington (founded by a grant of \$ 3,000,000), had telephoned the director and put strong pressure on him to halt the lecture. The director told me of his fears of further pressure from the Turkish government, a strange development inasmuch as my lecture had to do with Prof. Shaw's historical methods and constituted no attempt to defame either the Turks or their history. It should be noted, however, that not only is Professor Karpat the newly elected president of the Middle East Studies Association, the central organization of American scholars in the field of Near Eastern Studies, but he was in the forefront of those who persuaded the membership of MESA to vote an issue which involved the protection of Prof. Shaw's academic freedom. Thus this man, now holding a responsible position in a major academic professional organization willfully proceeded in such a coarse attempt to pressure the University of Chicago to violate the principles of academic freedom.

Thus the strains which ensued from the issues raised by the book, and which impinged directly on the most fundamental questions of our university life, i.e. questions of scholarly excellence, academic freedom, and the university evaluative process vis-a-vis its faculty would have been sufficient in and of themselves to justify a lengthy discussion of the book. The issues it has raised in terms of academic freedom and the integrity of the university evaluative process will not be discussed here but will be treated at the end of this study. Suffice it to say that I have been dismayed at the lack of appropriate procedure in the proceedings and promulgations of the Academic Senate Freedom Committee and the local chapter of the AAUP, and incredulous over the close secrecy and complete disregard of scholarly standards

in the specific university evaluative process.

But aside from these reasons, which I consider fundamental, there are other reasons, and these too, important, for a detailed examination of the book. If, as has been charged by the Association of Armenian Students, the book was conceived within a political context and upon birth immediately entered the currents of political life, and since such distorted and erroneous books are common in Near Eastern Studies, would it not have made sense simply to ignore this work as yet one more book to be consigned to oblivion? In the first instance the answer would be 'no', as the book has a wide circulation, is forming the ideas on a substantial part of Near Eastern History of a new generation that will become in turn professors, State Department and CIA employees, and most importantly will influence the ideas and notions of what is just in the minds of the educated American laity in matters dealing with the Near East. Further, the work enjoys the imprimatur of one of the most prestigious university presses in the world, the Cambridge University Press. In addition, I am informed, the book is to be translated into other European languages. Thus the Latin maxim is valid, which states: *Scripta manent, verba volant*.

In a more immediate scholarly framework, however, the work merits analysis because of the centrality of the subject, the inherent importance of the history of the Ottoman Empire, and it is a very great history. First, there is its importance as an imperial structure and as the continuator of the Empires of Byzantium and the Caliphate. Second, it played a crucial role, for 500 years, in the large, adjacent geo-political areas of East Europe, Central Europe, the Mediterranean, Near East and North Africa. At the same time it directed the fates of a bewildering variety of peoples: Arabs, Turks, Armenians, Kurds, Greeks, Albanians, Serbs, Bulgarians, and the modern states of that part of the world arose from the ruins of this great empire. Finally, the very richness of Ottoman archival and literary remnants alone make of the Ottoman phenomenon a very important object of historical study.

It is an obvious fact that the study of Ottoman history and culture is of extreme importance and deserves a historical treatment according to the highest scholarly standards. My task here is to examine the question of whether it has received such a treatment 'according to the highest scholarly standards', at the hands of Prof. Shaw.

Part II

*Reception of the Book (volume I) among the Scholarly Public:
Book Reviews*

What is the current scholarly opinion on the quality of Prof. Shaw's book (hereafter we shall be discussing, primarily, volume I)? Perhaps the best way to approach an answer to this question is to examine the scholarly journals. Approximately seven years have elapsed since the Cambridge University Press published volume I and I have found 20 reviews, written by Ottomanists, Arabists, general historians, political scientists, one classicist. Elsewhere I have analyzed these reviews according to five categories:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A. Completely critical | D. More favorable than critical |
| B. More critical than favorable | E. Completely favorable |
| C. Neutral | |

To non-specialist readers it would seem that Groups A and E are reviewing two different books by two different authors as there is an astonishing variety and contrariety of opinions. Because of the paucity of space, I shall present, very briefly, the opinions of only two of these five groups: Groups A (completely unfavorable) and E (completely favorable).

The first review in Group A (completely unfavorable) is that of Rifaat Abou el-Haj, in the *American Historical Review*, 82 (1977), p. 1029.

«In the only part of the text which appears, through footnote citations, to rely directly on the Ottoman archives, I found the effort to be, at best, a duplication of a similar though more detailed and earlier study by a modern Turkish historian (These sections are covered by the first sixty-six footnotes of chapter 7... The latter part of the same chapter and the period of time it covers are in the main based on Shaw's monograph detailing the reign of Selim III. The aforementioned Turkish work is I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, IV: I (1956), 8, 10, 70-1, 93, 99, 132, 133, 135, 177, 180, 181, and 193».

«The overall orientation of the book lacks any conscious theoretical framework... is written from a legitimist point of view, and therefore focusses on the decisions, policies, and personal histories of members of the Ottoman dynasty as the proper problems for historical study. The sovereignty of the dynasty is, as a consequence, considered

immutable; and historically evolved movements... which threaten to abridge that sovereignty are considered ill-founded... As a system of explanations... it is not only rigid, narrowly based, and ahistorical but also tends to equate change with chaos.... Social forces which challenge...the dynasty are portrayed as nuisances to be destroyed with impunity. When successful...these challenges are seen as symptoms of decay. Sultans, other individuals, and groups are swayed (and motivated) not by *raison d'état* or self-interest, but in the main by such ahistorical drives as religious affiliation».

«The major difficulty with Shaw's approach is its incapacity to accomodate different and new scholarship».

Literally eviscerative is the review of V.L. Menage in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 41 (1978), pp. 160-162. Without attempting a catalogue of errors the reviewer lists 73 by way of illustrating the types of mistakes: in well established dates, on topography, in historical methodology, on Ottoman institutions, in the use of technical terminology, on Ottoman literature and learning, in English style and grammar. He writes: «The remarks on learning and literature can only be called comic, especially after 'European observers' are castigated (p. 139) for a 'lack of linguistic as well as aesthetic qualifications needed to discern and appreciate cultural developments.» As for the book's objectivity the reviewer continues:

«As to its general presentation of the Ottoman 'power structure', the book seems to reflect a less than critical acceptance of the simplistic prejudices displayed by the more chauvinistic popular writers of modern Turkey,»

He concludes:

«According to the dust-cover, this book 'sweeps away the accumulated prejudices of centuries'. One prejudice that has vanished in the process is respect for accuracy, clarity, and reasoned judgement».

A. Fisher, in a very carefully worded review that appeared in *The Historian*, Feb. 1978, vol. 11. pp. 342-343, pronounces the following:

«Second, Shaw makes very clear that for centuries the Ottoman Empire belonged politically and economically both to Eastern Europe and Southwest Asia. Yet it is also clear that political, social, and economic development in both large areas have not been understood by the Ottomanists from whose work Shaw draws much of his findings».

«This criticism of Ottoman historiography aside, Shaw's book will become an important reference for Ottoman history and should make the contribution of Turkish, European and American Ottomanists available to the wider historical community».

This is an oblique reference to the derivative character of Prof. Shaw's book, at least in the eyes of A. Fisher.

The review of C. Imber in the *English Historical Review*, 93, 1978, pp. 393-395, is unequivocal.

«With so much basic work still to be done, a general Ottoman history will at best be patchy. It might however, serve a useful purpose if it is stimulating, provocative or, at the very least, accurate. The present two volumes are none of these. They are so full of errors, half truths, oversimplifications and inexactitudes that a non-specialist will find them positively misleading. At the same time, they rely so heavily on secondary material and second-hand ideas that they are valueless to an Ottoman specialist. When almost every page is a minefield of misinformation, a detailed review is impossible. The most one can do is to give a few random examples from the first hundred or so pages».

It is clear that Group A of the reviewers condemned volume one in the very harshest terms because they assert that: (1) It is (in parts) at best a duplication of the history of Uzunçarşılı, though not as detailed; (2) it relies heavily on secondary works, second-hand ideas; (3) Prof. Shaw took much from Ottomanists who do not understand the political, economic, and social developments in eastern Europe and southwest Asia; (4) there is a lack of a theoretical structure, and it is narrowly based, and ahistorical; (5) the author is incapable of integrating newer, different scholarship; (6) at a more rudimentary level there are many errors in dates, geography, historical method, Ottoman institutions, *termini technici*, Ottoman literature and learning, structure...«almost every page (is) a minefield of misinformation;» (7) there is a lack of accuracy, clarity, reasoned judgement and has incorporated ideas from the more chauvinistically oriented Turkish historiography.

For Group A, then, the volume is essentially a work based on secondary materials, lacking a clear structure of its own, and riddled with errors of all kinds.

Let us turn momentarily to Group E, the reviewers who are completely favorable to the book.

S. Kili in the *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 6 (1978), pp. 93-95, is encomiastic.

«Publication of this major new study marks an important step forward in knowledge of Ottoman and Turkish history in the western world».

In particular she praises the work for asserting that the Ottomans treated the Christians and Jews well, and that contrary to western beliefs Ottoman greatness was not due solely to the services of Christian converts, for the empire's institutions were manned by both Muslims and converts to Islam. She hopes that his book will stimulate further research to

«dismiss once and for all, the myth that Ottoman rule, at all times, constituted suppression for the non-Muslin subjects».

She praises the section on literature and culture, extolls the work for its reliance on Turkish primary sources and ends the volume's praise with the sentiment: «This work will stand for years as a very significant treatment of Ottoman history as well as a stimulus for further research in the field. It is to be hoped that it soon will be made available in Turkish».

A. Turgay continues much in the same vein in his review in *Muslim World*, 68 (1978), pp. 223-235.

«The publication of the two volumes...marks an 'auspicious event' in Ottoman historiography...these works clearly represent products of many years of exacting and thorough research...based on the author's research in archives in Turkey and Europe and...in the United States».

He particularly praises the section on Ottoman culture and literature and concludes that

«these splendid volumes are works of lasting merit and will undoubtedly stand as excellent examples of scholarship in the field of Ottoman-Turkish historiography».

E. Toledano in a pro-forma review in *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, 12, 1, Feb. 1978 that merely lists contents and gives no real analysis concludes:

«This work draws heavily on both Western and Ottoman sources, including the author's extensive research in European and Turkish archives...»

S. Fisher in the *Asian Student*, Feb. 1977, is eulogistic.

«On the other hand, Professor Shaw's volume, the first of his long awaited Ottoman history, is a completely original, thorough study and

synthesis by the widely acknowledged master of the field of the sources and most of the monographs in every language. Although the text is relatively short for such a comprehensive work, each of the 300 pages is so studded with facts, interpretations and ideas that it is not something for Sunday afternoon reading».

D. Little, *Religious Studies Review*, 4 (April, 1978), p. 120, is in general agreement:

«These two volumes provide the fullest, most authoritative general history of the Ottoman Empire presently available. Based on extensive research in Turkish archives and in Turkish and Western scholarship, they provide a cogent culmination of the main features of Ottoman history from the beginning to the present».

Finally, I wish to refer to a French review, anonymous, that appeared in the *Revue Française de Science Politique* of December 1979:

«La parution de cette histoire de l'Empire ottoman, fruit d'une vingtaine d'années de recherche de la part de S.J.S...est donc particulièrement bien venue: elle procure au politiste un instrument de travail incomparable, dont la manipulation est rendue particulièrement aisée par l'importance de l'index».

For this reviewer the work presents the non-specialist social scientist with a data bank from which to take building materials for the construction of theoretical structures that have a historical dimension.

These six reviews from Group E are united by two features: (1) They are all highly favorable, asserting that the work is the result of twenty years of research in Ottoman, European, American, archives; that it is the fullest (sic), most authoritative work on Ottoman-Turkish history; that it is completely original, highly accurate, balanced, rich on literature and culture, and balances the anti-Turkish bias in most other writings; (2) The reviewers of Group E do not analyze the volume in any depth whatever. They by and large accept at face value the claims of the author and of the Cambridge University Press as to the originality of the research, and that it was carried out over a period of 20 years in the archives and primary sources.

The reviewers of Group A have gone into considerable detail and depth in their analysis whereas Group E has done neither. Group A consists of a more homogeneous group of specialists in that all are Ottomanists. This is not true of Group E: Kili is a political scientist, Little is a medieval Arabist, Fisher is a generalist.

Given the contrariety of opinions in the reviews between Groups A and E, the basic problem which we set at the beginning, remains. This is the problem of analyzing in detail the methodology, the structure, and to a certain degree the contents and accuracy of the first volume. Only thus can one decide as to the relative value of the conflicting opinions of the reviewers in Groups A and E, and more importantly, as to the nature of the book itself.

In the analysis which follows the attempt will be made to ascertain the claims which the author makes for his volume: how is it that he himself sees his efforts, how does he present them to the scholarly world. Second, does his finished product correspond to the claims which he makes on its behalf, claims on the basis of which he presents the volume to the scholarly and lay communities? This will entail a very close look at his methodology and at the structure of the work.

Part III

Scope of the Work and Claims Set Forth on its Behalf by the Author

If, as we have just seen there is no unanimity as to the nature of this volume among the twenty reviewers, the author himself is very clear as to what he considers its goals to be and what its essential features are. Prof. Shaw, in pages vii-viii of the Preface, sets forth the goals and scope of his work. He wastes no time in informing the reader as to what differentiates his own work from all other scholarship that has preceded the publication of the first volume of his new enterprise.

«Of course, Ottoman history has been discussed many times before, and in considerable detail, but always from the European perspective, through the light of European prejudice, and largely on the basis of European sources. Based on both Ottoman and European sources, this work attempts to balance the picture without introducing the distortions that have previously characterized much of the West's view of the Ottomans».

Prof. Shaw goes on to reiterate this claim on behalf of his book by a very specific statement to the reader:

«This work is the product of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States».

This judgement is repeated by the Cambridge University Press on the back jacket of the volume:

«Based largely on Ottoman archival sources, the volume sweeps away the accumulated prejudice of centuries and describes the empire of the sultans as a living, changing society....»

The author pays «tribute to my teachers, colleagues, and friends who have contributed to this volume in one way or another», and he lists Barkan, Gibb, Halasi-Kun, Inalcik, Lewis, von Grunebaum, Young and Wittek. He ends with the final acknowledgement to his wife.

«I would like to express particular gratitude to my wife Ezel Kural Shaw, who has critically revized many sections of this work, particularly those dealing with Ottoman institutions, society, and culture, and whose analytic mind and knowledge of Ottoman history have made significant contributions in its preparation».

The Preface thus leads the reader to expect a completely new work, based on decades of original research in primary sources, with new ideas, results and data, a work that will objectively redress the erroneous and prejudiced research preceding his work. What has gone before, in terms of scholarship, is thus vastly inferior, since this earlier work has been discussed «...always from the European perspective, through the light of European prejudice, and largely on the basis of European sources». Prof. Shaw, according to his own claims, is the first scholar who has added the other necessary scholarly dimensions. Thus the claims and pretensions of the author are clear, unequivocal; he is presenting the scholarly and lay worlds with an objective book which has a solid foundation in a scientific and original exploitation and evaluation of the primary sources. Further, it departs from the old historical prejudices of all those who have written before him, authors who have written either enslaved to prejudice or unhealed by the miraculous waters of primary sources.

It would be well to comment briefly on the substantial claims of Prof. Shaw's preface so as to orient the detailed discussion that is to follow.

1. Has writing on and discussion of Ottoman history been carried out «...always from the European perspective, through the light of European prejudice, and largely on the basis of European sources?»

a) *The Last Century of Turkish Scholarship*. What of the last century of modern Turkish scholarship? Has it too been written «... always from the European perspective, through the light of European

prejudice, and largely on the basis of European sources?» One need not go into great detail to prove the untenability of Prof. Shaw's statement vis-a-vis a modern Turkish historiographical tradition that goes back to the activities and publications of the Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni and which includes such distinguished names as Ahmet Refik, Uzunçarşılı, Köprülü, Barkan, İnalcık and many others. None of these was ever guilty of having written Ottoman history «...always from the European perspective etc.» By his own admission in his bibliography M. Cezar and Sertoğlu et al. have written a multi-volume work which «makes judicious use of Ottoman and Western sources».

b) *Western Scholarship*. In addition there is a very substantial body of western scholars that has written on Ottoman history with a firm knowledge of varying portions of both Ottoman and European sources and without the perspective of coarse European prejudice. Such include Lewis, Mantran, Deny, Bazin, Eckmann, Gibb, Halasi-Kun, Bayerle, Eberhard, Raymond, Babinger, Cook, Wittek, Bombaci, etc.

What then are we to say of Prof. Shaw's statement as to the uniqueness of his work in this respect? In effect we saw that none of this is true. The author has set up a straw man in order to establish the priority and uniqueness of his work. For as we saw, there is a strong, rich historiographical tradition in modern Turkey that is already one century old, and certainly it never had this western orientation and prejudice. Second, there is an equally strong tradition of Ottoman studies in western Europe that utilizes both Western and Ottoman sources but which is not enslaved to those Western prejudices which would transmogrify Ottoman history.

2. *Bosnian, Serbian, Slav-Macedonian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Greek, Albanian, Hungarian, Armenian, Arab, and Russian scholarship*. Second, there is a substantial tradition, now, of Ottoman studies among these Balkan, Near Eastern and other peoples, and it is based on simultaneous examination not only of European primary sources, but on those of the Ottomans as well. Further, they control a vast third body of primary sources in Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Armenian, Arabic etc. which is of the first order of importance for Ottoman history. The secondary publications of these scholars cannot be ignored as they are of great importance not only for the relevant national histories, but for that of the Ottomans as well. Prof. Shaw completely ignores these sources (it would seem that he does not control these source languages), and the vast bibliography emanating from

these groups of scholars is by and large unknown to Prof. Shaw. He implicitly assumes that the body of these sources and secondary works has little of validity to say about Ottoman history. Thus if there is a prejudice, as he says, emanating from the reliance on only European sources among western scholars, and even if he has lived up to his claim that his work is based on both European and Ottoman sources (which is as of this point still at issue in our discussion), his very neglect of this third body of sources-scholarship subjects his work to a prejudice and deficiency of serious proportions. This is seriously damaging to his work. In any case he is not the only one to attempt to write on the history of the Ottomans without prejudice of a western type and on the basis of both European and Ottoman sources. Whether his work is imbued with other types of prejudices remains to be seen.

3. *Is the work based on years of original archival research?* What of Professor Shaw's claim that «this work is the product of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States?» His formal acknowledgement of debts for his research includes not only leading archival collections and libraries in Turkey and in other countries, but also some of the most distinguished names in scholarship: Gibb, etc.

This claim that the work is based on 20 years of archival research is, of course, a fundamental claim, for through this assertion the author assures his reader and the scholarly community that he has gone through the primary sources and so we are to take his work and text as fundamental historical truth. Inasmuch as this question will be the central focus of the majority of this analysis of his work, which I am here undertaking, I shall now foreshorten the narrative momentarily to give some of the results of this research into and analysis of the first volume. I do this, as already noted, because the process of analytical examination will be very long and detailed. Thus it is important to keep in mind the totality.

In fact the great majority of this volume would appear to be closely derived from a limited number of secondary works and not from research in archives (either European or Ottoman) or from research in any primary sources. Indeed, most of what is included in this volume is to be found in other secondary works of modern scholars, published considerably before the appearance of Prof. Shaw's time, and most of what is included in the author's work appears in these other

secondary works in much greater detail and with complete references to the primary sources. The single most important of these modern secondary works-authors is the late Turkish historian İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 volumes in 6, published in Ankara, 1947-59 (with a subsequent reprinting that included a new and much expanded volume I). Chapters two through seven of Prof. Shaw's book are very heavily indebted to this modern Turkish work (which as Prof. Shaw admits on p. 302 of the bibliography, is «...based almost completely on Ottoman chronicle and archival sources.») Chapters six and seven of Prof. Shaw's volume rely excessively on this work but are supplemented by other secondary works. Most important as a source from which Prof. Shaw seems to have quarried his materials, and second in importance only to Uzunçarşılı in this respect, is the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, the Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam, which had been completed down to the letter «T» by 1970 and through most of «T» by 1974, in other words substantially before the completion of Prof. Shaw's first volume. On literature the majority of entries and contents seems to be based on, or is closely parallel, to, yet another secondary work which is in fact an old, outdated encyclopedic survey, N. S. Banarlı, *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (An Illustrated History of Turkish literature, c. 1949-50, Ankara), supplemented by A. Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim* (Istanbul, 1943). In chapter V on Ottoman institutions he seems to rely very heavily on Gibb and Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, vol. I pts 1 § 2 (London, 1950, 1957), and the works again of Uzunçarşılı:

Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilatı (Organization of the Central Administration and Navy) (Ankara, 1948).

Osmanlı devletinin saray teşkilatı (Organization of the Ottoman Palace) (Ankara, 1945).

Osmanlı devletinin ilmiye teşkilatı (Organization of the Ottoman Learned Institution) (Ankara, 1965).

In chapter seven, after seemingly relying mostly on Uzunçarşılı's *Osmanlı Tarihi* for the great majority of this chapter he then turns for the last few pages to his own monograph, *Between Old and New, The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III, 1789-1807* (Cambridge, 1971).

In this very detailed analysis of the method, structure, and sources of his volume that follows these comments, the analysis will compare the contents and structure of Prof. Shaw's work with those of

the other limited number of secondary works. The parallels of contents, order of arrangement, and even the correspondence of subtitles in the case of Prof. Shaw's volume and the secondary works are striking. There is very little evidence of any substantial and direct reliance on primary archival and primary narrative and other sources. Particularly striking is the correspondence of the contents of his work with the contents of Uzunçarşılı and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi* entries.

Thus it will be obvious that Prof. Shaw's claims, that this work is the product of 20 years of archival research does not appear to be substantiated by the following analysis. One would have expected him to acknowledge this preponderant reliance on or at least the close similarity to Uzunçarşılı, Gibb-Bowen, and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, where in the Preface he acknowledges his personal debt to eight distinguished scholars (Gibb is mentioned separately without, however, any further detail). He did not do so, and he failed to do so in the majority of the footnotes. If one were to excise the substance in this first volume which appears to be taken from this restricted number of secondary works, or which closely parallels them, there would be little left for the reader to read. How and at what points he seems to have taken over contents, structure, and often ideas from these works will become apparent in the discussion that follows.

Since this volume does not seem to represent, substantially, the «work of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States», and since it presents little that is new in Ottoman history, it will be important to ascertain how accurately and critically Prof. Shaw has seemingly reproduced the materials which he has taken from other modern authors, and whether he really gives any substantially new interpretation of the Ottoman phenomenon. In fact there is little that is completely new in the volume and much that is old. Finally, an examination of his printed lecture notes, printed in the early 1970's, shows that much of the structure and of the details are similar to those in the present volume.

Part IV

An Introductory Survey of Chapters I-IV

An Introductory survey of chapters I-IV will serve as an appropriate point of departure for a detailed analysis of chapters V-VI. Though these first four chapters will not be subjected here to such an exhausting probe, their consideration will point the way for the sentence by sentence analysis which will be undertaken subsequently as it will indicate the general form which Prof. Shaw's research and volume have taken.

Chapter one (Turks in History, Sixth Century to c. 1280, pp. 1-11) has only four footnotes with no reference to primary sources or secondary works, and these footnotes are replete with factual error. The chapter does not utilize any of the primary sources, i.e. the Orhon inscriptions, the translations of Chinese chronicles by Chavannes and Julien, dealing with this early history of the Turks; there is no utilization of Ibn Fadlan, al-Kashgari, the Houtsma collection of Arab-Persian-Turkish texts on the Seljuks; the chronicle and other literature of the Rum Seljuks is completely ignored, as are also the important Christian chroniclers for Seljuk and early Ottoman Anatolia. The author seems to rely primarily on Grousset, Cahen, Vryonis. There is nothing new in terms of data, theses, ideas. It is thus based on a few secondary works, not always the most important, and sets a pattern which is constant throughout volume one.

Chapter two is also not based on original research in primary sources (The First Ottoman Empire 1280-1413, pp. 12-40), but heavily relies on or is very closely parallel to two secondary works, Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. I, and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, and there are only six footnotes with no references to primary sources. Thus this chapter too is not based on any original archival or primary source research. It is a careless compilation from a few secondary works with errors of various types. There is nothing new or original in chapter two.

Chapter three (Restoration of the Ottoman Empire 1413-81, pp. 41-54) has no footnotes whatever (there is an exhortation to the reader who has managed to get to page 308 of the bibliography, urging him to read the Greek chronicler Ducas, which he himself is unable to read either in its Greek text or in the Rumanian translation which accompanies the Grecu edition). Most of chapter three follows the

structure, contents of Uzunçarşılı and articles in the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*. In this chapter Prof. Shaw begins, significantly, to insert substantial numbers of subtitles in his work, and there are fifteen of them here. Eleven have their exact or closely approximate equivalents in Uzunçarşılı, and their sequence and contents are the same. This insertion of numerous subtitles becomes characteristic of the remainder of the book. Therefore, the basic structure of this chapter would seem to come from Uzunçarşılı and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*. There is nothing new or original, no evidence of primary research, only testimony to the well established reliance on a limited number of secondary works.

Chapter four (*Apogee of Ottoman Power 1451-1566*, pp. 55-111) is one of the longest and most important chapters in terms of length and period covered. Yet, it has only nine footnotes of which only two pretend to utilize primary sources. No. 4, TKS D9524 on the population of Istanbul in 1477, and no. 8, TKS E4312 (29) to the supposed establishment of the Armenian millet in 1516. In effect this chapter seems to be very heavily based on Uzunçarşılı, II, and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi* articles, «Mehmed II», «Selim I», «Suleyman». This is evident from the subtitles as well as the contents and sequence of materials. In this chapter there are 26 subtitles, 19 are in Uzunçarşılı with the same sequence. A brief look at the subtitles in Prof. Shaw's book and in that of Uzunçarşılı will give us an idea of the strong similarity of structure.

Thus there is nothing new or original in this chapter, no evidence of primary research in archives and sources, and all the developments and events in this chapter are well established and well known from other earlier secondary works.

Conclusions

Thus the introductory consideration of the first four chapters of Prof. Shaw's book indicates strongly that this is not an original piece of research. It gives no evidence whatever of having been based on research in archival materials or in primary sources. Further, and startlingly, it gives every indication of being derivative of very few secondary works, most prominent of which are Uzunçarşılı's *Osmanlı Tarihi* and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Finally, there is confusion in the coherence of many facts and developments which suggests that in addition Prof. Shaw has not reconciled contradictory materials coming from two or more secondary works. I shall return to this specific problem later in the discussion. With these general indications let us now turn to a detailed analysis of chapters five and six.

Chapte 4. *The Apogee of Ottoman Power, 1451-1566. pp. 55-111*

<i>Shaw's Caption</i>	<i>Shaw's Pagination</i>	<i>Others' paginations</i>	<i>Others' Captions</i>
<i>Reign of Mehmet II</i>		Inalcik, «Mehmed II» IA	
	55-79	507-535	
Conquest of Constantinople	56-57	510-511	
Organization of Empire	57-58	511-514	
Reconstruction of Istanbul	59-60	El ³ «Istanbul»	
Economic Development	60		
Mehmet's Aims of World Domination	60-62	511-517	
Conquest of Mehmet II	62-66	521-525	
Internal Developments	66-67	531-534	
New Wars in Europe	67-69	527-531	
Mehmet's Final Campaigns	69-70	Uzunçarşili, OT, II	
<i>Reign of Bayazid II 1481-1512</i>	70-79	157-239	
Reaction & Civil War	70-71		
Revolt of Cem Sultan	71-72	157-170	Bayezid-le Cem arasındaki mucadele (Strife between Cem and Bayazid)
Balkan Problems	72-73	173-178	Kili ve Akkırman' In alınarak Bogdan' In osmanlı hakimiyetine girmesine Lehistan Seferi (taking of Kiki and Akkerman; Moldavia comes under Ottoman domination. Polish expedition)
War with Mamluks	73	178-187	II Bayazid Zamanına kadar osmanlı-memluk devleti münasebetleri (Ottoman-Mamluk relations up to the period of Bayazid II)
Problems in Europe	73-75		
War with Venice	75-76	207-218, 192	Osmanlı-Venedik savaşı (Ottoman-Venitians on War)

<i>Shaw's Caption</i>	<i>Shaw's pagination</i>	<i>Others' paginations</i>		<i>Others' Captions</i>	
<i>Reign of Selim I 1512-1520</i>		<i>Uzunçarşılı, OT, II</i>	<i>Uzun. Captions</i>	<i>Tekindag, «Selim I» IA</i>	
Internal Reforms	76-77	229-242, 194			
Safavi Danger in the East	77-78	221-227		Safavi devletinin zuhuru ve faaliyeti (Appearances of Safavi state)	
Struggle for Succession	78-79	230-239		Osmanlı şehzadeleri (the Ottoman princes)	
Challenges to Throne	79-86			424-31	
	80	243-246		425	
Preparations for Conquest	80	246		Şehzadelerin bertaraf edilmeleri (Removal of the princes)	
				Şah İsmail üzerine hazırlık ve İran seferi (Preparations against Shah İsmail and the Iranian Expedition)	
War with Safavids	80-82	246-258		425-427	
Conquest of Eastern Anatolia	82-83	258-261		427	
				(As in above)	
Internal Reforms	83			Kemah'ın alınması (Conquest of Kemah) (in east Anatolia)	
Conquest of Arab World	83-85	267-280		428	
				Memluklerle son münasebet ve Misir seferi (Final relations with the Memluklerle and the Egyptian expedition)	
Internal Reforms	85-86	284-285		Kızılbaş Celal (The Kızılbaş Calalis)	
<i>Reign of Sulayman I 1520-1566</i>				431	
Internal Reforms	87-111			<i>Gökbülgin, «Sulayman I»</i>	
Alternating Campaigns and Internal Problems	87-88			96-155 IA	
1st Hungarian Campaign	88-90				
	91-92	307-308		Macaristan seferi ve Mohac meydan muharebesi (Hungarian expedition and battle of Mohac)	
		311-314		101-105	
				105-109	

<i>Shaw's Caption</i>	<i>Shaw's pagination</i>	<i>Others' paginations</i> <i>Uzuncarslı, OT, II</i>	<i>Captions</i> <i>Uzun.</i>	<i>Others' Captions</i> <i>Tekindag, «Selim I» IA</i>
<i>Reign of Selim I 1512-1520</i>				
Revolts in Anatolia 1526-28	92		İkinci Macaristan seferi (Second Hungarian expedition)	110-113
2nd Hungarian expedition	92-93	316-319		
3rd Hungarian expedition	93-94	319-323	Üçüncü Macaristan veya Alman seferi (Third Hungarian expedition)	114-115
Conquest of Mesopotamia	95-96	333-340	İrakeyn seferi ve Baghdad'ın alınması (Expedition of Iraq and conquest of Baghdad)	116-118
Naval Conflict, Hapsburgs, Barbarossa	96-98	351-360	Kanuni devrinde Türk denizcilerinin faaliyetler	118-119 (Turkish naval activities in the period of Kanuni)
Execution of Ibrahim Pasa	98	343-347	İbrahim Paşa'nın katli (execution of 119 Ibrahim Pasa)	123
War in the Mediterranean	98-99	361-367	Venedik ve müttefikleriyle harp (War with Venice and its allies)	123-124 122-123 121-122
War in the Eastern Seas	99-100	379-389		125-129
Moldavian campaign	100			131
Internal Changes	100-101			149 Barkan
Struggles with Hapsburgs	101-102			131-133
Mediterranean Campaign 1543	102			
Internal Developments	103-104			
Sulayman's 2nd Iranian expedition	104-105			
Transylvanian Campaign & Rise of Mehmet Sokullu	105			133-134

<i>Shaw's Caption</i>	<i>Shaw's pagination</i>	<i>Others' paginations</i>	<i>Others' Captions</i>
<i>Reign of Sulayman I 1520-1566</i>		<i>Uzunçarşılı OT, II Uzun. Captions</i>	<i>Gökbiliğin, «Sulayman I»</i>
Mediterranean War, 1551-62	105-106		144-144
Peace with Hapsburgs	106		144
Eastern Seas	106-107		146
Economic & Financial Problems	107-108		148-152 Inalcik
Pol. Degeneration in			
Sulayman's Later Years	108-110		134-143
Sulayman's last years	110-111		146-148

Part V

A Detailed Examination of Chapters Five and Six

Though the work has been examined elsewhere in very great detail, chapter by chapter, here we shall only examine in this detailed manner two chapters. Inasmuch as the method, structure and content of the volume have been shown to have a strong homogeneity in this earlier, detailed examination, it will not be necessary here to examine it point by point, chapter by chapter. The selection of what will be examined for the purpose of this discussion is thus dictated by the space allotted here (the detailed and lengthy examination will be published in a separate volume in the Balkan Institute's Balkan Bibliography), and by the fact that the method, structure, and content of the first volume have been determined to be largely consistent and the same throughout. For the purposes of this present analysis I have chosen chapters five and six, entitled, "The Dynamics of Ottoman Society and Administration," which deals with political, military, social legal, and educational institutions, literature and the sciences during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; chapter six, entitled, "Decentralization and Traditional Reform 1566-1683," is basically a political narrative of the internal events and wars of the empire for over a century. Thus these two chapters enable us to see how their author deals with the many facets of history, and at the same time they span about 300 years of the empire's life. Finally, although they constitute only two of eight chapters, they take up 103 of the text's 299 pages; therefore, they constitute 35% of the narrative and footnotes. From these few facts it emerges that a detailed examination of chapters five and six, coupled with a more fleeting glance at the other six chapters, will give us a sufficient base for forming our idea of the method, structure and contents of the volume.

The analysis of chapters five and six will proceed in the following manner. First, we shall examine their structure, then their content, and, finally, the author's method.

A. Structure (Subtitles)

Externally every chapter is characterized by the inclusion of a smaller or larger number of subtitles, often for each paragraph of ma-

terial, at other times for two or more paragraphs of material. Some-time the subtitles preside over paragraphs as short as two to six lines. Thus:

Ch. I	has	7	subtitles
Ch. II	has	17	
Ch. III	has	14	
Ch. IV	has	55	
Ch. V	has	49	
Ch. VI	has	70	
Ch. VII	has	64	
Ch. VIII	has	4	
Total		280	subtitles

The volume is subdivided into 280 distinct subtitles and it is these subtitles which constitute the building blocks of the tome's structure. Let us now examine these subtitles or building blocks in chapters five and six and see what they tell us about the origin and nature of the book's structure.

1. Chapter Five-Subtitles-Structure

a) As we saw, chapter five has 49 subtitles, of which 8 seem to be subtitles of larger sections, and the remaining 41 are subtitles of much shorter sections ranging in length from a few lines to a page or slightly more.

Of the author's 8 major subtitles, 6 correspond to subtitles in Gibb-Bowen, (and in a few cases also to Uzunçarşılı's work).

Shaw:

The Ruling Class	112-50	Gibb, I ₁ , The Ruling Institution	39-199
The Palace Institution	115-18	Gibb, I ₁ , Imperial Household	71-87
The Scribal Ins. (Kalemiye)	118-22	Gibb, I ₁ , Central Administration	107-36
The Military Institution	122-32	Gibb, I ₁ , Army, Navy etc.	45-70, 88-106
The Learned Ins. (Ilmiye)	132-49	Gibb, I ₁ , Religious Institution	70-138
The Legal System	132-37	Gibb, I ₁ ,	114-38
Culture under the Otto.	150-163	(Corresponds to Banarlı, Adivar etc.)	
The Subject Class	150-63	No subtitle in Gibb, but covered amply, I ₁ , 235-313; I ₂ ,	165-262

Thus the basic structuring of material and ideas is either that of Gibb-Bowen or else it is essentially the same as that which we find in Gibb-Bowen (which in turn is the same as that of the older work of Lybyer, with of course some newer adaptations and adjustments). The only basic difference in overall structure of Prof. Shaw's chapter five and corresponding portions of Gibb-Bowen is that the former includes a section on Ottoman literature and science, but that part of Prof. Shaw's work is a meagre reproduction of, or else closely parallel to other secondary materials.

Therefore, one concludes at this initial step that there is nothing new or original in the structure of this chapter, that in fact it follows or is very similar to older and well known models, for Prof. Shaw follows more or less the same general arrangements of subjects as does Gibb-Bowen, and his conceptualization at this level of structure is basically the same.

Let us look at the 41 smaller subtitles which the author has included in Chapter five.

<i>Shaw</i>		<i>Gibb-Bowen</i>	
Recruitment and Training	113	Imperial Household	I ₁ , 71-87, 329-62
A. The Palace Institution	115	The Harem	I ₁ , 73-77
The Harem	115	The Inside Service,	I ₁ , 331-46
The Inner Service	115-17	The Outside Service	I ₁ , 82-88, 346-362
The Outer Service	117-18	Central Administration	I ₁ , 107-36
B. The Scribal Institution	118		I ₁ , 116-28
The Imperial Council	118-19		I ₁ , 128-37, 325-337
The Financial Institution	119-20	Taxation and Finance	I ₁ , 1-49
The Tax System	120-21	Govt. of Provinces	I ₁ , 137-73
The Provincial Structure	120-21	The Army	I ₁ , 45-70, 88-106
C. Military Institution (Seyfiye)	122		
The Land Army	122		
Kapikulu Army	122-23		
Janissary Corps	123	The Janissaries	I ₁ , 56-66
Artillery Corps	123-24	Artillery and Armourers	I ₁ , 66-69
Kapikulu Cavalry	124-25	The Cavalry	I ₁ , 69
2. Provincial Forces	125	I ₁ , 46-53, The Feudal Forces	
a) Timarli Spahis	125-7		
b) Special Provincial Guards	127-9		
Ottoman Campaign Organization and Strategy	129-31		
Naval Forces		I ₁ , 88-107, The Ottoman Navy	
<i>The Learned Institution</i>		I ₂ , 70-138, passim. Religious Institutions	
(İlmiye)	132		
The Educational System	132-4	I ₂ , 139-164 Education	

<i>The Legal System,</i>			
1. The Law	134		I ₁ , 114-38, The Administration of Law
2. The Kadis	134-5		I ₂ , 114-20, Nature of Islamic Law
3. The Muftis	135-7		I ₁ , 121-132, The Kadis
Lesser Ulema	137-8		I ₂ , 84, 133-38, The Muftis
Leadership of the Ilmiye Institution	138		I ₁ , 95-97,
	138-9		I ₂ , 84-87,
<i>Culture Under the Ottomans</i>	139		
Ottoman Literature of the Classical Period	139-49		
<i>The Subject Class</i>	150		
Divisions by Residence	150		
1. City Dwellers and Cultivators	150		I ₁ , 235-80, City, Industry, Commerce. Peasantry. Land
2. The Nomads	150-1		Tenure and Agriculture
Divisions by Religion	151		I ₁ , 250-2
The Millets	151-3		I ₂ , 207-62, The Dhimmis
The Popular Religious Organizations	153-5		I ₁ , 149-216, The Dervishes
Divisions by Occupation	155		I ₁ , 235-58, Peasantry, Land Tenure and Agricult.
The Cultivators	155-6		
The Craftsmen	156-8		I ₁ , 281-98, Industry
The Merchants	158-9		I ₁ , 299-313, Commerce
Women	159		
Urban Organization	159-61		I ₁ , 276-81, The City
Role of Endowments	161-2		I ₁ , 165-78, Religious Endowments
The structure of the Ottoman City	162-3		I ₁ , 276-81,
Foreign Subjects in the Empire	163-4		
The Sultan as the Center of the Ottoman System	164-5		I ₁ , 26-38, Caliphate and Sultanate
The Bases of Personal Relations and Behaviour in Ottoman Society	166		

A cursory examination of the parallel series of subtitles in Prof. Shaw on the one hand and in Gibb-Bowen on the other reveals that 25 of the lesser subtitles of Prof. Shaw appear in one form or another in Gibb-Bowen, thus about 61% of the subtitles are closely similar to corresponding subtitles in Gibb-Bowen. Let us look briefly at the sixteen larger and smaller subtitles which do not appear in Gibb-Bowen.

Shaw:

Recruitment & Training 113-15	Though this is covered in Gibb I ¹ , 42-4, there is no subtitle. But Uzunçarşılı, Kap. Ocak. I, covers it, gives a similar title, 150-4: «Ocağa nasıl geçilirdi ve kimler alınırdı?»
Imperial Council 118-19	Covered in Gibb, I ¹ , 38. Uzunçarşılı, Merkez ver Bahriye, 1-7, covers and gives sub-title, «Divan-i humayun».
Financial Institutions (Maliye) 119-20	Covered in Gibb, I ¹ , 128-37; Uzunçarşılı, Merkez ve Bahriye, 319-37, covers it, gives subtitle «Merkez maliye teşkilatı.»
The Kapikulu Army 122	Gibb I ¹ , 45-70; 88-106, covers it. Uzunçarşılı, Kap. Ocak, II covers it in an entire volume, Osmanlı devleti teşkilatından Kapukulu Ocakları
Special Guards 127-9	Covered in Gibb I ¹ , 53-6, and by others
Raiding Forces 129	Covered in Gibb I ¹ , 55-6, and elsewhere
Ottoman Campaign Organization and Strategy 129-31	Not covered in Gibb, only partially in Uzunçarşılı, Kap. Ocak., II 255-64, «Osmanlı ordusunun harp nizamı».
Lesser Ulema 138	Covered in Gibb, I ² , 84-87; Uzunçarşılı, İlmiye.

Literature	134	Not in Gibb; is in Banarlı, Adıvar, et al.
Nomads	150	Gibb, I ¹ , has different material 250- 52
Divisions by Occupation	155	Gibb, I ¹ , covers it 235-313
Women	159	Jennings, «Women» JESHO, XVIII, 53-114
Structure of City	162-63	Gibb, I ¹ , 276-81; Inalcik, EI, «Istanbul».
Foreign Subjects in Empire	163-64	Inalcik, EI, «İmtiyazat»=«Capitulations»,
Bases of Personal Relations	166	Not covered in these works.

Of these 16 subtitles not in Gibb-Bowen, 15 are identifiably covered in Gibb-Bowen and in other secondary works wholly or in part. At least six of these subtitles in Prof. Shaw's work have their correspondent subtitles in other secondary works.

Conclusions as to the subtitles in Chapter V

There are 49 subtitles in Prof. Shaw's chapter five. Of the eight major subtitles, 6 correspond closely to major subtitles in Gibb-Bowen which deal with the appropriate contents. A seventh major subtitle, Ottoman Culture is not to be found in Gibb-Bowen inasmuch as the subject is not treated in this latter work. An eighth major subtitle, in Shaw, finds no corresponding major subtitle in Gibb-Bowen (The Subject Class), but is treated in this latter work in far greater detail. Gibb-Bowen simply chose not to give such a subtitle. As for Prof. Shaw's remaining, smaller 41 subtitles, 25 closely parallel subtitles to be found in Gibb-Bowen. Of the remaining 16 lesser subtitles which are to be found in Shaw but not in Gibb-Bowen, 6 are to be found in other appropriate secondary works, and the contents of 15 of these 16 subtitles are covered in greater detail in either Gibb-Bowen, Uzunçarşılı, Banarlı, Adıvar, Inalcik, or Jennings.

Correspondingly, the structure and conceptualization of this chapter present us with nothing new. It is all well known and already established by the works of other scholars, particularly Gibb-Bowen, Uzunçarşılı, Adıvar, Banarlı.

Further, the sequence of many of the subtitles, indeed the majority is quite similar to the sequence of subtitles and materials in Gibb-Bowen though here and there Prof. Shaw has rearranged these subtitles-building blocks in a slightly different order. Obviously, there is nothing original or new as to structure and overall conceptualization.

2. Chapter Six-Subtitles-Structure

Having demonstrated in some detail the method I have applied in analyzing the structure of chapter five I shall proceed to give the results, alone, of the same method and analysis of the structure and subtitles of chapter six.

This chapter has 70 subtitles. Indeed, a rapid survey of the subtitles in Prof. Shaw's chapter six together with a glance at the subtitles in Uzunçarşılı, reveals an astonishing correspondence between 53 subtitles in the works of the two authors.

Thus a close examination of the two series of subtitles in these two authors (Shaw and Uzunçarşılı) reveals that Prof. Shaw's subtitles are, in over 75% of the cases, either identical or closely parallel to those in Uzunçarşılı III¹.

There are 17 subtitles in Prof. Shaw's chapter which do not appear, specifically, as subtitles in Uzunçarşılı. But their contents are, for the most part, covered in Uzunçarşılı and in the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

What is further striking, aside from the coincidence of the majority of Prof. Shaw's subtitles with those of Uzunçarşılı, is the coincidence of the structure of sequencing of subtitles between Prof. Shaw and Uzunçarşılı. In pages 170-189 of Prof. Shaw's chapter six, the sequencing of the subtitles is more or less that also of Uzunçarşılı, though Prof. Shaw shifts around some of his subtitles. But from page 190 to the end of the chapter on page 214, Prof. Shaw's sequence of subtitles and events follows faithfully, or is almost exactly parallel to that of the subtitles-categories in Uzunçarşılı.

Chapter VI

Subtitles

- 170 The Political & Military
 171 Factors of Decline
 171 Social & Economic Factors of Decline
 171 Population Increases
 172 Economic Disruptions
 174 Uprisings & Revolts
 175 Traditionalistic Reform Efforts
 175 Manifestations of Decline 1566-1623
 175 The Reign of Selim the Sot
- 176 Reconquest of the Yemen
 176 Northern Policies & the Don-Volga
 Canal Expedition
- 177 The French Capitulations Agreement
 177 Naval Affairs & The Conquest of Cyprus
 178 The Battle of Lepanto
 179 The Death of Selim II
 179 Murad III, 1574-1595
 180 Ottoman Intervention in Poland
 180 Advances in North Africa
 180 Conquest of the Caucasus
- 181 New Relations with England
- 182 The Execution of Sokullu Mehmet Pasa
 182 War with Iran 1579-1590
 183 Problems with the Crimea
 183 Conclusion of the Iranian War
- 1 İkinci Selim' in hukumdarlığı ve Yeniçerileri serkeşlikler
 (The reign of Selim II and Janissary Rebellions)
 26 Yemen meselesi (The Yemen Question)
 33 Don - Volga kanalının açılmasına teşebbüs (Effort to open a
 Don-Volga canal)
 9 Kıbrıs adasının zaptı (Conquest of the isle of Cyprus)
 15 Lepanto-Inebahti muharebesi (Battle of Lepanto)
 42 Üçüncü Murad' in hukumdarlığı (Rule of Murad III)
 166 Osmanlı-Lehistan münasebetleri (Ottoman-Polish Relations)
 45 Kuzey Afrika Olaylar (Events in North Africa)
 60 Cildir muharebesi ve Gırcistan'ın istilası (Battle of Childir and
 the invasion of Georgia)
 224-5 (III*) Osmanlı-İngiltere münasebetlere (Ottoman-English Re-
 lations)
 54 Sokullu' nün ölümü (Death of Sokullu)
 59 İran' a harp ilanı (Declaration of war with Iran)
 64 İstanbul muahedesi (The treaty of Istanbul)

- 184 Beginnings of the Hapsburg War
- 194 Mehmet III 1595-1603
- 184 Continuation of the Austrian War
- 185 The Celali Revolts
- 186 Ahmet I, 1603-1617
- 186 Conclusion of the Hapsburg War
- 187 Military and Financial
- 187 The Treaty of Sitva Torok
- 188 Resumption of the Iranian Wars and Suppression of the Celalis
- 188 Truce with the Persians
- 189 Peace Agreements in Europe
- 190 Political Degeneration
- 191 Osman II, 1618-1622
- 191 The Polish War
- 192 The Reform Efforts of Osman II
- 193 Mustafa I, 1622-1623
- 194 Rejuvenation under Murad IV, 1623-1640
- 194 Internal Politics
- 194 The Fall of Baghdad
- 195 Difficulties in the Crimea
- 196 Uprisings of the Soldiers
- 197 Sultan Murad Gains Control
- 197 The Reforms of Murad IV
- 198 Problems with Poland
- 199 The Erivan Expedition
- 71 Yeni bir haclı ittifaki ve Nemce muharebesi (New crusade and the German war)
- 120 Üçüncü Mehmed'in şahsiyat (1595-1603) (Person of Mehmed III)
- 102 Celaliler (The Celalis)
- 120 Birinci Ahmed'in şahsiyeti (1603-1617) (Personality of Ahmed I)
- 97 Zidvatorok muahedesi (Treaty of Sitva Torok)
- 65 İran seferinin ikinci aşfası (Second Phase of Iranian Expedition)
- 132 İkinci Osman II
- 133 Lehistan seferi (The Polish expedition)
- 138 II Osman ve Kapukulu Ocakları (Osman II and the slave troops)
- 142 Sultan Mustafa'nın çıkarılması (Removal of sultan Mustafa)
- 182 Padişahlığın ilk on senesi (The first 10 years of his reign)
- 158 Baghdad olaylar ve İran muharebesi (Events at Baghdad and Iranian War)
- 175 Kırım Hanlığı ihtilafı (Difficulties in the Crimean Hanate)
- 183 Sipah zorbalarının faaliyetleri (Spahi Revolts)
- 191 Sultan Murad'ın eline alması (Sultan Murad Gains Control)
- 194 Temizleme hareketi (Cleaning-up Operations)
- 166-80 Osmanlı-Lehistan münasebetleri (Ottoman-Polish Relations)
- 200 Sultan Murad'ın Revan seferi (Murad's Erivan Expedition)

- 199 The Reconquest of Baghdad and the Treaty of Kasr-i Sirin
- 200 Resumption of Decline, 1640-1656
- 200 Sultan Ibrahim 1640-1648
- 201 The Expedition to Crete
- 202 Further Internal Decline
- 203 The Accession of Mehmet IV 1648-1687
- 203 Sultanate of the Agas, 1648-1651
- 204 The Rise of Suleyman Aga
- 205 The Regime of Tarhoncu Ahmet Pasa, June 20, 1652-March 31, 1653
- 206 Resumed Political Chaos, 1653-1656
- 207 The Kadizadeler
- 207 The Koprulu Years, 1656-1683
- 208 The Grand Vizirate of Mehmet Koprulu
- 209 Breaking the Blockade of the Dardanelles
- 210 Suppression of Revolts in Transylvania
- 210 Suppression of the Abaza Hazan Revolt
- 211 The Rise of Fazil Ahmet Pasa
- 212 War with Austria
- 212 The Conquest of Crete
- 213 The Polish Campaigns, 1672-1677
- 214 The First Russian War
- 214 War with the Hapsburgs
- 205 Dördüncü Murad' In Baghdad seferi (Murad III's Baghdad Expedition)
- 211 Iran'la sulh (Peace with Iran)
- 212 Sultan Ibrahim' in hükümdarlığı (Rule of Sultan Ibrahim)
- 221 Girit harbinin birinci safhası (First Phase of the Cretan War)
- 228 İç durumun bozulması (Internal Decline)
- 242 Mehmed'in tahtı (Mehmet's Accession)
- 249 Vezir-i azam ile ocak ağaları (The Grand Vizir & the Janissary Agas)
- 264-5 Gürcü Mehmet Pasa'nın sadareti (Vizirate of Gurcu Mehmet Pasa)
- 266 Tarhoncu Ahmed Pasa'nın vezir-i azamlığı (Vizirate of Tarhoncu Ahmed Pasa)
- 363 Kadi-zadeler veya Fakılar (Kadizadeler and Jurists)
- 375 Köprülüler devri (Koprulu Period)
- 375 Köprülü Mehmet Paşa'nın ise başlamış (Mehmed Koprulu Pasa begins his work)
- 383 Vezir-i azam Bogaz'a hareketi (Vizir moves to the Dardanelles)
- 393 Köprülü'nün Erdel'e hareketi ve avdeti (Koprulu advances to and returns from Transylvania)
- 394 Abaza Hasan Pasa isyanı (Rebellion of Abaza Hasan Pasa)
- 410 Fazil Ahmed Pasa'nın sadareti zamanı (Time of Vizirate of Fazil Ahmed Pasa)
- 411 Avusturya seferi (Austrian Expedition)
- 423 Vezir-i azam Girit'e hareketi (The Vizir's Cretan Expedition)
- 431 Lehistan seferi (Polish Expedition)
- 439 İlk Moskof seferi (First Russian Expedition)
- 444 Avusturya seferinin mukaddimatı (Beginning of the Austrian Expedition)

Conclusions as to the subtitles in Chapter Six

The arrangement of materials is very close to that which one finds in Uzunçarşılı, III¹, 1-465, as is evidenced by the clear similarity between the subtitles of the two authors. Thus the structure and conceptualization of the chapter are certainly not original with Prof. Shaw. The contents, as we shall see, are fundamentally the same as those to be found in Uzunçarşılı, in the articles of the Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam, and in a few other odd secondary works. None of the material which Prof. Shaw gives indicates independent conceptualization, or as we shall see, independent research in archival materials or primary sources. This amazing correspondence of facts and narrative in Prof. Shaw with the facts and narrative of the body of secondary materials, even where there is reference to a few primary sources in the notes, cannot be mere coincidence. But we shall look at this presently.

As for the structure and subtitles of chapter six, one is struck as in the case of chapter five, with the lack of originality of the structure and of the ideas, most all of which are to be found in the above mentioned secondary materials.

B. Contents and Sequence of Materials within Prof. Shaw's Subtitles in Chapters Five and Six

Having examined the structures of these two chapters (five and six) and drawn conclusions as to the nature of the structure and conceptualizations which they demonstrate, it is now time to look at the contents of these two chapters and the sequencing of the materials within them.

This called for a lengthy and extremely detailed examination of 104 pages of text and notes. Inasmuch as the analysis was carried out line by line, it called for the minute analysis of approximately 5,200 lines of text. The methodology applied was that of the philologist who is attempting to establish the matrix of an original text, from which the text that he is analyzing derived. The execution of this analytical method resulted in the production of 104 typed pages of text, single spaced, in which the contents of the text of Prof. Shaw were placed in the left hand column and their correspondent in other works were placed opposite them in the right hand column. The basic units of comparison and analysis were the subtitles in Prof. Shaw's work, a total of 119 subtitles in these two chapters. Thus in effect I had to deal with 119 individual, mini-texts in an effort to isolate and identify their putative sources.

1. Contents and Sequence of Materials within the Subtitles of Chapter Six

Of the materials which Prof. Shaw includes under subtitles in chapter six an initial examination of Uzunçarşılı, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, and very few other secondary works reveals the following.

The materials of 63 of Prof. Shaw's subtitles correspond almost completely with materials in the above mentioned secondary works, where the themes are treated in much greater detail. In other words over 90% of the materials in Prof. Shaw's chapter is to be found in a very limited number of well-known secondary works.

The majority of the contents of three of the remaining seven subtitles has been identified with the contents of the relevant secondary works. The identification of the remainder of three other subtitles has been made in the same manner. The identification of the remainder of the contents of these three subtitles, as well as the identification of the contents of a seventh subtitle were not pursued further. Even in the case of these seven subtitles, three-fourths, or 75% of their contents have been identified with corresponding materials in the limited number of secondary works. One concludes, accordingly, that 95 to 97% of the contents of chapter six are already established in the secondary literature all of which secondary literature is based on primary sources and original research, and all of which substantially predates the appearance of Prof. Shaw's work. Further, they present the same materials in much greater and richer detail. Therefore, Prof. Shaw has not, in chapter six, presented anything that is either original or new.

It is important to consider next the questions of the materials themselves and their sequencing within each of the subtitles of chapter six. These were analyzed in sixty-six pages of single spaced typed material. Obviously, even the tersest of stylists could not present all these within the present spatial constraints. I shall choose one section and present it here so as to offer a concrete and illustrative example of the preceding.

On pages 210-211 Prof. Shaw presents the events of 1658-9 under the subtitle «Suppression of Abaza Hasan Revolt» and includes in his account ten basic facts or events. The corresponding subtitle is to be found in Uzunçarşılı, III¹, page 349, «Abaza Hasan Paşa isyanı» (Rebellion of Abaza Hasan Pasa). I shall now set forth the ten major facts-events described by Prof. Shaw and will show antiphonically the corresponding fact-event in Uzunçarşılı.

Shaw: 210-211 Suppression of Abaza Hazan Revolt

Shaw 210-211

1. (210) Conquest of Crete, restoration of control in Transylvania delayed by rebellion in Anatolia
2. (211) Leader of revolt was Abaza, was not satisfied to be a sancak bey

3. Conditions of earlier Celali revolts provided conditions for Janissaries, spahis, who suffered from new regime in Istanbul, fled to Anatolia, joined robber bands, urged peasants to revolt against Istanbul

- a) Prof. Shaw refers to note 43 Naima, VI, 342, as though this refers to stages of Abaza revolt. It does not do so, rather refers to Erdel, affairs of Boockay Akos, etc. It has no reference to Abaza rebellion.

4. Mid-May, Abaza arrives in Konya

- a) Koprulu invites rebels to join expedition against Erdel
- b) Rebels hold back until most of army is in Erdel.
- c) Gives as footnote #44, Naima, VI, 345; this again has nothing to do with Abaza-Anatolia. It refers to Bockay, Transylvania.

Uzunçarsili, III, 1, 390-407

1. (390-4) describes these events in Transylvania preventing Koprulu from dealing with Abaza
2. (395) was successively voyvod of Yeni-il, 1655; Vali of Diyarbekir 1656; vezirlik of valiilik of Aleppo (not a sanjak bey)

3. (395) People fled, due to sale of offices. Also due to weakness of central government, rebellions of valis. Levents et al. raid towns, cities, villages. Villagers do not want to pay for sale of offices, flee to towns or join levents (so in effect these rebels did not cause people to rebel, rather they pillaged them). Naima, VI, 328, says this movement of people arose from sale of offices and sacking of provinces

4. (395) Abaza arrives in Konya

- a) (395) Koprulu invites them to join expedition to Erdel
- b) They put him off to gain time. Their intents become clear, they pass to action after Koprulu goes on expedition to Erdel.

5. July 8, Abaza openly rebels

a) Footnote 45, Naima, VI, 347-9, has nothing to do with Abaza, rather with articles of treaty with Bockay of Erdel.

6. Abaza army grows, thousands of Celalis, levants, peasants join.

a) Abaza claims rule of Anatolia, leaves Balkans to sultan.

b) Koprulu's effort to suppress revolt subverted by sultan's entourage, to cause his fall, restore their property, footnote #46, refers to Naima, VI, 339. But here Naima refers to rumors in Istanbul that say some of sultan's court were for Abaza. Rest of page of Naima is Koprulu's conquest of Yanova in Erdel.

7. Abaza's hordes reach Bosphorus, capital panics, 100's flee; Koprulu recalled from Erdel to Edirne, Oct. 12. 1658.

a) Many court figures advise sultan to compromise; Koprulu advises him to attack.

b) Army crosses Bosphorus to Uskudar, soldiers given 6 months wages, agents sent to bribe followers of Abaza (Shaw takes this from Uzunçarsili, 400, who gives equivalents- for is not in Naima VI, 378, to which Shaw refers in note 49, to cover this material. Naima 378 covers end of Abaza revolt, stuffing of heads of rebels).

5. (396-7) open rebellion of Abaza, demands removal of Koprulu

6. (395) They gather at Konya; 30.000 segban, levend, sarica, are assisted by Topal Sarı Kenan Pasha (396-7)

a) (398) Uzun, quotes text on split of rule of Anatolia and Balkans, Naima, VI, 339

7. (399) Sultan recalls Koprulu from Erdel; quickly arrives, 14 Muharrem 1658 at Edirne (no mention that 100's fled from Istanbul). Gives detailed text of sultan's summons

a) İslam Ansik. «Koprulüler», (896) Koprulu insists on attacking rebels

b) (400) Army moves to Uskudar, given «2 kists maaslar» (Naima, VI, 360, who though he gives these figures, does not transport them into 6 months equivalent. In par. two Uzunçarsili, p. 400, repeats 2 kists salary, and then later on same page he makes the conversion from 2 kists to 6 months salary; «altı aylık maas»).

- c) Abaza withdraws from Bursa to Eskishehir.
 - d) Attempt of Abaza's soldiers to collect salaries, join imperialists, to assassinate Koprulu.
 - e) Muhammad executed those soldiers of Abaza. Shaw's reference is to Naima, VI, 378, but Naima does not say this at this point.
8. Abaza constantly retreats, losing followers, suffering shortage of food supplies.
- c) (396) has Abaza in Bursa; (400) he moves from Bursa to Eskishehir
 - d) (400) Uzuncarsili has all of Shaw's details and more.
 - e) (400) says that Koprulu removed 7,000 spahis of Abaza from defters, sent lists to Murtaza with orders to kill them. He killed 1,000 that went to Istanbul to collect salaries (also in Islam. Ansik. «Köprülüler», 896.
8. (402) Abaza retreats to Ayntab, provisions are cut, suffers straits, his troops desert him.
9. (402-403). Was not grand vizir Koprulu who murdered them at banquet in Aleppo, but Serdar Murtaza Pasha. How could Koprulu be in Aleppo and on Bosphorus at same time; Naima, VI, 377, gives story of this final fate at hands of Murtaza.
10. (403), (406-7) on stuffing of heads of rebels in Aleppo, sending of them to Istanbul. But he did not send 12,000 (Naima, VI, 378, says 20 to 31). Naima reports sending of further, occasional heads, one or two at a time. Uzuncarsili reports the order to kill Janissaries, spahis, etc. (407) (Naima, VI, 404) Ismail Pasha sends to Istanbul 80,000 tufenks, to cebhane. Naima VI, 381, heads of more illustrious were sent, piled up in front of divan gate. Naima, VI, 382, says 1,000 of Abaza's people killed. Silahdar, I, 157 says 10,000 killed.
10. Koprulu sends agents into Anatolia to suppress Janissaries, spahis, ulema etc. Sends 12,000 heads back to Istanbul, (Shaw's reference 50, is to Naima, VI, 402-05. Actually pp. 402ff. are not the pages on which Naima refers to these events. They are pages in Uzuncarsili where this latter author deals with these matters. The appropriate pages in Naima on the 'heads' is 378 and not 402-405).

This example, characteristic of practically the entirety of the chapter, shows the identity of the contents and of the sequencing of these contents within each subtitle. The general coincidence of the sequencing of events and data within Prof. Shaw's subtitles and in the secondary literature is striking. The virtual identity of contents is even more striking.

2. Contents and Sequencing of Materials within the Subtitles of ch. V

Of the materials which Prof. Shaw includes under the 49 subtitles of chapter V an examination of the works of Uzunçarşılı, Gibb-Bowen and a few other secondary works brings the following results.

As in the case of the contents of Prof. Shaw's chapter VI, the materials of the vast majority of this chapter's 49 subtitles correspond almost exactly with materials in the secondary works where again the topics are treated in much greater detail than they are by Prof. Shaw. Of the contents of the 49 subtitles the contents of 45 subtitles have been identifiably covered in other older secondary works. Thus at first glance some 92% of the materials in chapter V is already well known or established through other secondary works written through fundamental research and based on archival materials and primary sources. These latter works, for the most part, cover the subjects and themes in a much more detailed and profound manner. Thus in these 45 subtitles Prof. Shaw merely reproduces in a much more abbreviated form, often in a single sentence, material and narratives already well known. But even in the remaining 5 subtitles where the present analysis has not proceeded to a complete identification of contents in chapter V with corresponding contents in the secondary works practically all the contents of these 5 subtitles consist of well known facts. One sees, then, that of the content of chapter V at least 95% consists of well known materials. This material exists in a limited number of secondary works which appeared well before Prof. Shaw's book, a limited number of secondary works the most important of which are:

Institutions: Gibb-Bowen, Uzunçarşılı, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

Literature-Culture: Banarlı, Adıvar, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Babinger.

Consequently, there is nothing fundamentally new or original as 95%, at least, of chapter V of Prof. Shaw's book, and the materials there presented, are in effect the equivalent of sketches of the materials in the secondary works.

Having ascertained the lack of anything original or new in terms of the contents of Chapter V, one must proceed to look at the materials themselves as well as the sequence the author has followed in the arrangement of the materials within the subtitles as this will shed some light on his methodology.

Let us take, by way of example, Prof. Shaw's discussion of the «Outer Service (Birun)» in the sultan's palace, which he discusses on pages 117-118, and does so with 8 facts. The title exists in Gibb-Bowen, but also in Uzunçarşılı Osmanlı devleti saray teşkilatı, as «Sarayın biyrun halı ve vazifeleri».

Shaw

The Outer Service (Birun), 117-18; Gibb, I¹, 82-8, 346-62; Uzunçarşılı, «Saray», 359-512, who entitled it Sarayın biyrun halı ve vazifeleri

Prof. Shaw's entire section on the «Outer Service» is either lifted from or very close to both Gibb-Bowen and Uzunçarşılı, the latter of whom is far more detailed and based entirely on primary sources.

I Shaw's first five groups:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Members of ulema: hoca, hekim başı, cerrah başı, kehlal başı, muneccim başı, hunkiar imamı | 1. Uzun. «Saray», 359-374, lists them all, and in much greater detail, in same order, with the same titles! |
| 2. Şehremini | 2. Uzun. 375-8, şehremini |
| 3. Matbah-i amire emini | 3. Uzun, 379-84, matbah-i amire emini |
| 4. Commissioners of mint | 4. Uzun. 384-6, mint |
| 5. Arpa emini
İstabl-i amire
Emir-i ahor | 5. Uzun. 387., arpa emini
Uzun. 488-9, istabl-i amire
Emir-i ahor |

II 3 Groups of Outer Service (Next paragraph in Shaw)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Rikab agaları
emir-i alem | 1. Uzun. 388 has all the corresponding offices
Uzun. 388-92 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|

kapıcı başı	Uzun. 404-07
cavuşlar	Uzun 408-18
2. Bostancı Ocağı	2. Uzun. 465-87
3. Tailors, curriers, cobblers, archers, peyks, mutferrika	3. Uzun. 439-44 et passim.

Comment: Everything in Prof. Shaw's section is in Uzunçarşılı, Saray Teşkilatı where it exists in much richer detail. It would seem that Prof. Shaw has taken everything in this section, both contents and sequence, from the work of Uzunçarşılı. It is also all in Gibb-Bowen, save for the beginning.

We see that there is an identical content in the works of Prof. Shaw and Uzunçarşılı, and, further, the sequence of the appearance-inclusion of the 8 facts-data is exactly identical with that of Uzunçarşılı. There is, however, this difference. Prof. Shaw satisfies himself with the mere inclusion of the names of the various offices and very sparse identification, all in one page. Uzunçarşılı gives a detailed and rich discussion that covers pages 359-512, over 150 pages. It should also be added that practically the entirety of the material which Prof. Shaw gives under this subtitle is to be found in Gibb-Bowen, I¹, pages 82-88, 346-362.

This example is characteristic and representative of the entirety of chapter V, and had we more space at our disposal for this I could simply read off the parallel columns which would run true to the form observed in the case of the Outer Service. As in chapter VI, there has been some slight shifting of order and sequence, but here, as also in chapter VI, we observe the same striking correspondence of the sequencing of events and data within Prof. Shaw's subtitles and in the secondary works. The frequency of the near identity of contents is even more perceptible.

C. The Footnotes in Chapters V & VI

Scholarly works in this field are most often characterized by, among other externals, footnotes. Thus there remains the task of saying something about the footnotes attached to these two chapters. But by way of introduction it would be well to note the general distribution of footnotes at the end of each of the book's eight chapters. In the first four chapters of the book, which cover 111 pages, or one third of the book, there are only four footnotes-references to primary

sources: Notes no. 1, 2 in chapter four to Rosenthal's English translation of Ibn Khaldun; Notes no. 4, 8, to materials in Top Kapı Saray (Census of Istanbul in 1477, supposed foundation of Armenian millet in 1514-1516). The footnotes, therefore, so sparse in regard to primary sources, are strongly indicative of the fact that these four chapters represent no original research of any kind by the author.

Let us turn, now, to the first of the two chapters under close consideration, Chapt. V. Though this is one of the longest and most important chapters, in terms of subject, in the book (112-167), 56 pages, it has but 9 footnotes, and only one of these is to a «primary source», note no. 2, to the historian Ata, I, 154. But it should be noted that Prof. Shaw quotes him indirectly, explicitly referring his reader to the reference to him in Gibb-Bown, I¹, 337. Further, it should be noted that Ata was not a contemporary source, but wrote his works in the mid-nineteenth century. Of the other footnotes six are to secondary works, and the seventh (no. 5) gives no reference to any work. In this latter note Prof. Shaw describes for his reader more than 12 types of ships in the Ottoman fleet, their structure, numbers of rowers, weight and length. He gives all this in an 18 line footnote without any indication where he might have come by this very specialized and unusual information. A quick glance at Uzunçarşılı's *Osmanlı devletin merkez ve bahriye teşkilatı*, reveals all the specialized information, arranged in the same order, over pages 455-479. The only difference is that Prof. Shaw has converted the Ottoman standards of measurement into meters and tons. There is no clue in the footnotes as to his massive dependence in this chapter on the restricted number of secondary works mentioned above in the present analysis.

Thus chapter five's footnotes, so few in number, furnish no evidence that there has been any substantial research into archival and primary sources.

Footnotes of Chapter VI

Chapter VI, one of the longest chapters of the book and consisting of 46 pages of text, begins very much as the preceding five chapters, with little in the way of footnote documentation. From page 169 through 202, for 33 pages (which constitute 75% of this chapter) our author has only 9 footnotes. Then in the remaining 13 pages (203-216) he suddenly appends 52 notes to the text, almost twice as many notes

as are to be found in the totality of the first five chapters (28). Thus one expects, at last, evidence of primary research, as the author had promised in the preface to his book. A close analysis, unfortunately, would seem to reveal that this sudden profusion of footnotes in the last quarter of Chapter VI, is not based on any fundamental, original research, and the results which he presents are in no way new, but are results already known in the other secondary works he has used, where the same sources are utilized and referred to specifically and very largely with the same paginations. His footnotes break down into four categories:

(1) Footnotes referring specifically and exclusively to secondary works are only four, no. 1, 2, 3, 39.

(2) Footnotes referring to primary sources, which primary sources are also utilized by and referred to specifically in secondary works (which secondary works Prof. Shaw does not mention in his footnotes). This includes the vast majority of footnotes in chapter VI and they number 49. They are:

4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61.

3) Footnotes which seem to be irrelevant to the theme under discussion in Prof. Shaw's text, no. 44, 58.

(4) Footnotes which were not correlated to corresponding footnotes in secondary works: no. 11, 12, 13, 15, 47, 48.

Conclusions as to the footnotes in chapter VI.

1. The material in the sources to which Prof. Shaw refers is already almost all in *Uzunçarşılı* and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, and the two latter works, further, give the exact same references to the sources as Prof. Shaw does in well over 90% of the cases. The author has brought to bear, in addition, no new sources, sources not already referred to in these two major secondary works.

2. Prof. Shaw's footnotes for a given subject have the same sequence of references to primary sources as do *Uzunçarşılı* and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

3. The identity of source references and their similar sequencing in Prof. Shaw on the one hand and in the *İslam Ansiklopedisi* and *Uzunçarşılı* on the other are, once more, striking. Let us take but one

example, his footnotes no. 22-31, which cover the materials he gives on pages 207 no. 209 on the events of the vezirate of Mehmet Köprülü.

22. Silihdar, I, 225; Naima, IV, 243.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses both these texts and gives the specific references.

23. Evliya Celebi, II, 452.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses this text and gives the specific reference.

24. Naima, IV, 459.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses this text and gives the specific reference.

25. Naima, V, 178.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses this text and gives the specific reference.

26. Naima, VI, 22, 125, 142.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses these texts and gives the references.

27. Naima, VI, 220-221; Silahdar, I, 57.

I.A., Köprülü, 893, uses these texts and gives the specific references.

28. Mehmet Halife, Tarih-i Gilman, 44.

I.A., Köprülü, 894, uses this text and gives the specific reference.

29. Naima, VI, 221; Silahdar, I, 58; Thomas, Naima, 108.

I.A., Köprülü, 894, uses both the Naima and Silahdar references, and gives the specific references.

30. Naima, VI, 249; Silahdar, I, 23.

I.A., Köprülü, 894 gives Naima, VI, 246 ff, and Silahdar 12 ff.

31. Naima, VI, 247-54; Silahdar, I, 64; Mehmed Halife, Tarih-i Gilmani, 44.

In I.A., Köprülü, 894, are Mehmed Halife 44 ff; Naima VI, 279 ff.

In I.A., Köprülü, 895, there is reference to Silahdar I, 69 ff. Uzunçarsili, III¹.

380 #1, refers to Naima, VI, 248.

Prof. Shaw's series of footnotes no. 22-31 follows the page numbers and sequence of sources references in the Islam Ansiklopedisi article «Köprülüler», where they are identical. Shifting momentarily from the footnotes themselves to the contents of this particular subtitle in chapter VI, we see that the entire content of the subtitle in Prof. Shaw has the exact same materials (though much less detailed) and exactly the same order of sequencing of the materials as does the article «Köprülüler» in the Islam Ansiklopedisi. The circumstances of (1) the identity of events given in his and the Islam Ansiklopedisi account, (2) the complete and perfect coincidence of the exact and precise sequence in the presentations of both authors, and (3) the fact that there are the exact same footnotes references to primary sources in both works is, we must all agree, a most striking confluence of facts.

This coincidence of and correspondence in source references, paginations of source references, and sequence of source references are

something much more than mere coincidence. These secondary works, whose source references and sequences are largely in Prof. Shaw's book, were written well before Prof. Shaw's book.

The contents and structure of the footnotes in the two remaining chapters, VII & VIII, fit closely into the pattern established in detail for chapters V & VI, as well as into the pattern observed for chapters I-IV. Chapter VII on the one hand has a large apparatus of 116 notes with a large proportion of these referring to primary sources and a total of 31 referring exclusively to secondary works. The vast majority of the footnotes, however, is contained in *Uzunçarşılı*, the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, and a few other secondary works. Also for the first time Prof. Shaw makes more than fleeting reference in the footnotes to *Uzunçarşılı's Osmanlı Tarihi* (his only previous reference to him in footnotes was in footnote no. 20 chapter VI). Thus the footnotes and contents of chapter VII give no indication of new and original research and findings. In chapter VIII Prof. Shaw has abandoned all attempts to cite primary sources and returning to the format of the first five chapters cites only 12 footnotes and all to secondary works.

Conclusions as to Footnotes in Chapters Five and Six

In chapter five the author makes no attempt to base his research on primary sources and this is reflected in the footnote apparatus consisting of a very small number of footnotes (nine) none of which refers to a primary or archival source. The footnote structure confirms what we saw in the examination of the structure, contents, and sequencing of materials in chapter five: There is nothing original or new; the structure and sequencing in this chapter exist also in the secondary works, and the contents are to be found there in greater and richer detail than in Prof. Shaw's volume.

In chapter six over 90 % of the footnotes referring to primary sources are to be found in the footnote and scholarly apparatus of *Uzunçarşılı* and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi* with the same references and sequence. Thus here too the contents, sequence, and structure of the footnotes confirm what an examination of the structure, contents, and sequence of the chapter itself showed: Prof. Shaw presents nothing original or new.

The footnotes of chapters one, two (three has no footnotes), four, five, and eight, are insignificant and contain a sum total of only 40 footnotes, only four of which purport to be references to primary

sources. These six chapters represent a total of 187 pages or close to 63% of the book. A scant four references to primary sources in this major portion of the book give no evidence that the book is based on original research in primary sources or Ottoman archives.

In chapters six and seven where there is a substantial reference to primary sources an examination has shown that the results are not new, but rather old and well established, primarily in *Uzunçarşılı* and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, where the facts and events are established in much greater detail and more richly. Further, these few secondary sources, which present the materials to be found in Prof. Shaw's book, give the great majority of specific references to the same primary sources which we find in Prof. Shaw's work, and they present these also in the same sequence.

Conclusions on Prof. Shaw's Chapters Five and Six

From the structure and subtitles of chapters five and six we see that there is nothing new or original in the structure, conceptualization and ideas of this substantial part of Shaw's work. For the structure and subtitles correspond very closely to those of *Uzunçarşılı*, *Gibb-Bowen*, and for literature to those of *Banarlı* and *Adıvar*.

As for the contents and structure of the contents within the 119 smaller subtitles of these two chapters at least 95% of the material in Prof. Shaw's work had already been set forth in these few basic secondary works. So there is nothing basically new or original in the contents of chapters five and six. The author's sequencing of these materials within the separate subtitles follows, substantially, that of the secondary works, and thus there is a close correspondence of contents and sequence in Prof. Shaw with contents and sequence in these secondary works. In fact at least 95% of Prof. Shaw's two chapters constitute the equivalents of sketches of materials in secondary works.

Finally, the footnotes in chapter five are numerically and substantially insignificant and do not testify to any original research in primary sources or archives. In chapter six, though the number of footnotes is substantial, the vast majority refers to texts that are utilized and specifically cited in the relevant sections of *Uzunçarşılı* and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, and in Prof. Shaw's book these citations have a sequence which is strikingly similar to the sequence in *Uzunçarşılı* and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*. Basically, Prof. Shaw cites no new set of sources.

These considerations bring one to the question of the methodology which Prof. Shaw applied in the conceptualization, structure, research and composition of these two chapters, and what is true for these two chapters will be, as we saw earlier, true for the entire book. In this respect we are faced with two possible conclusions as to which methodology Prof. Shaw utilized in the researching and writing of the book:

EITHER: (1) The work is, as Prof. Shaw and the Cambridge University Press state in this volume, «the product of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States». Thus the substantial identity of structure, subtitles, contents and sequence of Prof. Shaw's text (in chapters five and six, but also in the whole work) with the texts and footnotes of the aforementioned, limited number of secondary texts is purely and entirely coincidental;

OR: (2) Prof. Shaw in effect has based his structure, subtitles, contents, and sequence of text and footnotes on a limited number of secondary works, and not on any substantial original research based on primary sources and archival materials. He has culled and quarried these limited secondary works and has, in effect, reproduced them in a curtailed version. This process of culling, quarrying, and foreshortening of these materials is further evident from the author's actual writing and composition which often constitute abrupt splicing and recollating of materials in an awkward manner.

If, in fact, it is this second methodology which Prof. Shaw has employed, and it seems that it is, then he has produced what Collingwood described as «scissors and paste» history. The similarity of Prof. Shaw's work with the identified secondary works is overpowering in both degree and number. Basically, he would seem to have followed the political narrative of Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, adding here and there things from other secondary works, especially from the *Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam* (*Islam Ansiklopedisi*). In the chapter (five) on institutions and culture he would seem to have followed Gibb-Bowen, the works of Uzunçarşılı, and for Ottoman culture the following: On the basic structure of literature Banarlı's obsolete, superficial one-volume encyclopedia; on science and medicine A. Adıvar, and on the legal sciences largely Uzunçarşılı's book on the subject. The section on literature and culture would also, as in the case of Prof. Shaw's political narrative, appear to be further fleshed out by materials from the *Islam Ansiklopedisi* and a few other secondary works.

Prof. Shaw apparently quarried his materials from a limited number of secondary works (most often he does not identify these secondary works in his footnotes, though some appear in his bibliography at the end of the book). The results, therefore, are nothing new but rather a stale reproduction of well established data and history already set forth by his predecessors which he seems to have employed. The methodology of quarrying from a restricted number of secondary works is attested not only by the often crude process of splicing and recollating, but it is also betrayed by the fact that Prof. Shaw frequently repeats the errors of his secondary works as we shall see later. Thus this detailed examination of volume I does not substantiate Prof. Shaw's statement in the Preface that «this work is the product of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States». If anything, it would seem to be the product of «research» in these well-known secondary works and for whatever period of time it may have taken the author. The statement of the Cambridge University Press, on the back side of the volume, is sweeping. «Based largely on Ottoman archival sources, the volume sweeps away the accumulated prejudices of centuries...» It is deceiving to the non-specialist reader as to both of these purported characteristics of the volume, for neither does it seem to be abased largely on Ottoman archival sources...» nor to «sweep away the accumulated prejudices of centuries...» The book is as prejudiced as the most virulent Balkanite or Arab anti-Ottoman histories ever written in the past. The prejudices in Prof. Shaw simply come from the other side. It is difficult, in any case, to comprehend how such a respected press as the Cambridge University Press could have failed to detect the highly derivative and unoriginal character of the work and it is regrettable that it should have placed a statement on the cover which is blatantly untrue. It is of further interest to read in the Preface, on page viii, Prof. Shaw's acknowledgement of debt «to my teachers, colleagues, and friends who have contributed to this volume in one way or another: Ömer L. Barkan, Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Tibor Halasi-Kun, Halil Inalcik, Bernard Lewis, Gustave E. von Grunebaum, T. Cuyler Young, and Paul Wittek». No tribute is given and no debt acknowledged to what would seem to be the single most important author and source, for Prof. Shaw's volume I, that is I. H. Uzunçarşılı, and similarly no open acknowledgement to the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Without these two sources Prof. Shaw's volume one as it was published would have been, it would seem, impossible.

I shall not proceed to any survey of chapters seven and eight here for reasons of space. But it emerges from an already completed and detailed examination (to be published in the longer study already mentioned) that they follow the general structure, content and method of the chapters we have just analyzed.

Part VI

Conclusions as to the Originality of the Book and as to its Being Based on Research in Archives and on Primary Sources

It is obvious from the preceding, detailed analysis that this volume presents nothing new or original, would seem to be derivative of a limited number of secondary works, and gives no evidence whatever of any significant research in archives and primary sources. What is one to say then in response to Prof. Shaw who tells his scholarly public in the Preface that this «is the product of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman Archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States». Indeed, the resulting volume would seem to represent, for the most part, a very unsophisticated quarrying of materials from this restricted number of secondary works. Not only is this not acknowledged in the Preface, but the author even fails to acknowledge his two primary 'sources', Uzunçarşılı and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (though he does refer to them in the bibliography at the end and very occasionally in sporadic footnotes).

We return to the conflicting views of the reviewers of the volume: Group A, which was completely unfavorable, and Group E, which was completely laudatory.

It is apparent that this detailed analysis, and it is the most detailed which has been made of Prof. Shaw's work to date, supports the assertions of Group A of the reviewers when they criticized the book for its highly derivative character and when, as Imber said of both volumes, «they rely so heavily on secondary material and second-hand ideas that they are valueless to an Ottoman specialist». The claims of the reviewers in Group E, that the work represents decades of original research in archives and primary sources, reveal their own inability to perceive the essence of the work. Given the fact that most of

the first volume seems to come from Turkish secondary literature, in the Turkish language, the hopes of S. Kili are unintelligible:

«This work will stand for years as a very significant treatment of Ottoman history as well as a stimulus for further research in the field. It is to be hoped that it soon will be made available in Turkish». Her hope is revealing of her own unfamiliarity with the field of Ottoman studies as she is asking for a retranslation into Turkish of materials (Prof. Shaw's first volume) and ideas that already exist in Turkish but in a much more detailed, richer, and more accurate version*.

Given the fact that the majority of the reviews were highly favorable to the book, one concludes that once again the diminution in the quality of scholarly reviews being churned out in scholarly journals constitutes a serious and growing problem. Inasmuch as the majority of both the scholarly and lay reading public depends on the opinions of reviews in order to evaluate sources of knowledge the breakdown of the quality and integrity of reviews constitutes a process which poisons the stream of knowledge. The scholarly journals have, increasingly, lost the ability to maintain a high level of scholarly criticism in their reviews. But then, in this case, this failing has been matched by the striking failure of the Cambridge University Press itself.

Part VII

Error and Unreliability

Since the volume does not seem to represent the «work of almost 20 years of research in the Ottoman archives as well as other collections in Europe and the United States», and since it represents very little that is new in Ottoman history and a great deal that is very old, it is important to ascertain how accurately Prof. Shaw has reproduced these materials which, it would seem, he has taken from other modern authors. Here too the work was found seriously marred. It is so stricken with errors of every kind that no attempt was made at a systematic listing of errors. This has also been noted by other reviewers: Menage, Prof. of Turkish at the University of London lists some 73 errors

* The work has now been translated into Turkish as *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Modern Türkiye, Türkçeye aktaran: Mehmet Harmanlı*. 2 cilt (İstanbul, 1982).

by way of illustration, and without any attempt at an exhaustive listing of these errors in the first volume. He ends his review with the statement: «One 'prejudice' that has vanished in the process is respect for accuracy, clarity, and reasoned judgement». C. Imber, another of the reviewers, also refers to the fact that the volume is so full of errors as to be useless.

«The present two volumes...are so full of errors, half truths, oversimplifications and inexactitudes that a non-specialist will find them positively misleading... every page is a minefield of misinformation...»

Following my analysis of the volume in question, I was struck by the quantity, quality, and variety of errors which Prof. Shaw has made and so abandoned the effort to catalogue each and every one. In place of tabulating such a quantitative catalogue, I made an effort to assay, qualitatively, the errors which he has committed and they include the following types of errors. Since space is short I shall only give a detailed account of very few.

1. He effects confusion and commits errors in reproducing the data of his secondary sources. This involves, often, misattribution, misunderstanding, or distortion of data and theses which he finds in his secondary sources.

a) On p. 44, under the subtitle entitled «Mehmed I's Final Conquests», Prof. Shaw is discussing the foreign policies and conquests of a sultan who according to Uzunçarşılı, Prof. Shaw's immediate secondary source, died in 1421.

«Only after the revolts were suppressed could Mehmed achieve his final conquests. He annexed Aydın (1425) and Menteşe (1426), thus gaining control of western Anatolia, and then moved to the south, taking Teke and Antalya and bringing the entire western coast of Anatolia under Ottoman control. Since Germiyan had helped him during the Interregnum, he left it alone for a time, taking only its major communication centers of Kutahya and Afyon Karahisar. But its ruler finally bequeathed the principality to the Ottomans, completing Ottoman control of southwestern Anatolia (1428). When Mehmet died suddenly in 1421, his son Murat II succeeded to the throne».

Unless we accept some supernatural explanation of history, all these 'facts' and deeds are inconsistent. In effect Prof. Shaw has hastily conflated the account of Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, I, 195-7, which speaks of the death of Mehmed I in 1421, with pages 206-8 which speak of later Ottoman conquests after the death of Mehmed I. Unless

we accept the improbability that Mehmet I was indeed resurrected, we must assume that Prof. Shaw has not reproduced his secondary source accurately. As we shall see later, Prof. Shaw has resurrected several other medieval rulers and trotted them onto the pages of history where they are active in a second life which he has generously bestowed upon them.

b) A second example wherein we see illustrated the fact that Prof. Shaw frequently effects confusion and errors in reproducing the data of his secondary sources has to do with the role of the Turkish guilds in late Ottoman societies, pages 282-4. This section in Prof. Shaw's book relies directly on the article of the late Israeli historian G. Baer, «The Administrative, Economic, and Social Functions of Turkish Guilds», *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, I (1970), 28-50. On pages 283-4 Prof. Shaw writes:

«Now the guilds acted as administrative links between the government and the urban population, enforcing government regulations, assessing and collecting taxes, cooperating with government efforts to enforce price and wage regulations in vain efforts to control inflation, and providing the government with necessary services». This section in the author's book is a paraphrase of parts, and conflation of Baer, pp. 33-4, 35-38 (He refers to Baer in note no. 3). Baer 33-4, writes: «(1) The Guilds as an Administrative Link» (subtitle)

«The most important functions of the guilds throughout the centuries was their service as an administrative link between the government and the urban population».

Thus Prof. Shaw's idea and his very statement are almost identical to those in Baer, to whose work he here refers in a footnote. Baer continues, p. 35: «(2) Guilds and Taxation» (2nd subtitle). P. 38: «(4) Fixing of prices (narh) and wages», is another subtitle in Baer.

These two subtitles in Baer are indications of the fact that Baer intends to discuss the guilds in relation to these two items in the succeeding paragraphs.

Prof. Shaw, pp. 284-5, has assumed, simply from the listing of these two categories, in subtitles no. 2 and no. 4 by Baer, that the latter is stating that the guilds (Shaw pp. 283-4) «acted as administrative links... enforcing government regulations, assessing and collecting taxes, cooperating with government efforts to enforce price and wage regulations». Thus, Prof. Shaw on pp. 283-4.

Comment: Here Prof. Shaw has read the two captions or subtitles

of Baer, but has ignored, or not read carefully, what Baer has to say in the paragraphs following subtitles no. 2 and no. 4. He has assumed, from the subtitles, that Baer is proposing that the guilds shared with the government directly in these functions. But if one is to rely on secondary works (as Prof. Shaw has done), then one should pay careful attention to what the author of the work in question is in fact saying.

What did Baer actually say in regard to these two subtitles? Baer, on p. 35, writes under subtitle no. 2, «Guilds and Taxation:»

«One of the striking differences between the activities of the Turkish and Egyptian guilds was the absence of fiscal functions among the former. In Istanbul most urban taxes were collected by the ihtisab agası (muhtesib) through agents called kologlanlar».

Baer p. 38, on subtitle no. 4, «Fixing of prices (narh) and wages,» relates:

«As we have seen, instructions concerning the quality of goods were issued by the authorities, and the authorities punished makers or sellers of goods of inferior quality. The guild only controlled implementation of the official instructions and denounced the offenders. The actual prices of goods also were fixed by the government, and those who sold at higher prices were punished by the authorities. In addition, most of the implementation of these orders was in the hands of the official market inspector and was not a function of the guilds, whose concern with preventing overcharging was extremely small and rather limited».

Prof. Shaw in this instance (as in so many others) has not read his secondary material carefully, has not understood it, and has therefore passed his own errors on to the unsuspecting reader. In effect he attributes to Baer almost the exact opposite of what Baer is saying. I shall not go on to give other illustrations of this category of errors, but they abound in the text (p. 24, supposed Byz. influence on Ott. court ceremonial; Ottoman influence on specific aspects of Balkan culture; p. 114, supposed reasons why devshirme was not levied on Armenians; pp. 139-40, frequent misunderstanding of his main secondary sources on Ottoman and Turkish poetry; pp. 145-6 plethora of errors on Ottoman historians because he has either misunderstood or erroneously reproduced his secondary material; p. 287, errors on the itinerary of Evliya Celebi).

2. Prof. Shaw occasionally commits a second type of error when he fails to reconcile two contradictory secondary works on one and the

same subject with the consequent incorporation of contradictory data, theories, and ideas into his book. Let us take three examples from the history of some crucial Ottoman institutions.

Perhaps the most important of these was the Ottoman timar or fief. Thus on p. 23 he derives it from Byzantine fiefs and taxes, whereas on page 26, only three pages later, we read that it is derived from the «old Seljuk ikta system».

A second example wherein we see the careless incorporation of contradictory data has to do with the Armenian «millet» and its institutional creation under Ottoman rule. In page 152 he credits Mehmed with the foundation of the «Armenian patriarchate and millet in 1461». But on page 84 we read an entirely different and completely unrelated version: After Selim I defeated the Mamelukes in 1516 «...the Armenian Gregorians were given their separate status only now in return for loyalty and obedience to the sultan...» Thus he moves the date of creation of patriarchate and millet of the Armenians half a century forward to 1516, only to place it back again, on page 152, to 1461.

A third example of the same process of indiscriminate introduction of contradictory data into his narrative occurs in connection with the institution of the devshirme. On page 27 he tells us that this central Ottoman institution was the creation of the sultan Murad I. As the reader thumbs ahead to pages 113-4 he is informed of something quite different: «The development of the devshirme into an institution for the periodic levy of Christian children to fill positions in the palace and administration took place most likely early in the reign of Bayezit I, with its general application coming later under Murat II and Mehmet II».

This kind of error, that is to say the incorporation of mutually contradictory material points to a poor digestion of the author's secondary materials and to a hastily written text.

3. A much graver type of error is the one by which Prof. Shaw fabricates historical data because he ignores the primary sources. A few examples of the many which emerge on the first reading of the volume will suffice to show the ease with which the author carries out this process.

a) The first example to which we shall turn here occurs on page 57 where the author remarks that the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and the subsequent entry into the city were very orderly

and restrained by virtue of the very orders of the sultan himself.

«Once within the city the Ottomans advanced slowly and methodically, clearing the streets of the remaining defenders. While Islamic law would have justified a fullscale sack and massacre of the city, in view of its resistance, Mehmet kept his troops under firm control, killing only those Byzantines who actively resisted and doing all he could to keep the city intact so that it could be the center of his world empire».

Prof. Shaw has disregarded here all the contemporary sources, and for this event we have a plethora of eyewitness accounts that give us great detail as to the events of the siege and capture of the Byzantine capital. It is obvious that Prof. Shaw either has not read any of these contemporary sources, or else he has forgotten what they say, or else intentionally passes them over in silence. This large number of contemporary, for the most part eyewitness, sources is unanimous on three things: (1) The sultan Mehmed II agreed to allow his troops to sack the city and actually gave the order for the sack; (2) many of the sources describe how the Ottoman forces finally broke ranks, lost all discipline, abandoned their ships in the Golden Horn allowing some Greeks and Latins to escape by sea (the Turkish troops from the ships in some cases even abandoned their weapons so that they would be free to plunder), and looted for three days. The frenzy of looting was such that many Turks actually fell to killing one another over the loot itself; (3) Mehmed repented his decision to allow the plundering of the city for at the end of the third day it was 'devoid of man, beast and fowl', a wrecked ghost town. The Greek, Ottoman, and Italian sources confirm one another as to the above three points.

Let us examine first what the Ottoman sources have to say for they are both numerous (we shall look at nine such sources) and important for the event.

1. Ashikpashazade (ed. Giese, 132) is short inasmuch as it is an event too well known to warrant details from him. Nevertheless, he includes all the essentials:

اللی برنجی کون خونکار۔

یغہ ددی یورش اندلر سدشہ کون حصار فتح اولندی ابو یغیالر۔ وطوبیقلر
دخی اولندی التون وکش وچوہرلر و انواع قماشلر اورد۔ بازارہ کلوب دؤکلدی صانعا
شلدلر وخلقنی اسیر اندلر تکورنی۔ اولدر دیلر و محبوبہ لرنی غازیلر بغرلرینہ بصدلر

«On the fifty-first day the Conqueror ordered (that the city) be plundered.. And there were good plunder and goods: gold, silver, jewels arrived at the bazaar and began to be sold there. They enslaved the inhabitants, slew the emperor, and the gazis took the beautiful girls into their embrace».

2. The *tevarih-i al-i Osman* (ed. Giese I, 74) repeats Ashikpasha-zade:

عاقبت سلطان محمد حق یولنه فی سبیل الله یغما بیوردی جیڑا و قهرا قازلر
حصاره قیولوب کاغزلرین قروب مورتلرین اوغلنلرین قزلرین ایسابلریر. یغما قلدر

«Finally the sultan Mehmed ordered its plundering... the gazis broke into the city, slew the infidels and robbed and pillaged the women, boys, girls, and the property».

3. Tursun Beg (ed. & tr. H. Inalcik and R. Murphey 36-37), repeats much the same thing:

«The sultan proclaimed a general assault and gave the troops permission to take booty in the city».

«After having completely overcome the enemy, the soldiers began to plunder the city. They enslaved boys and girls and took silver and gold vessels, precious stones, and all sorts of valuable goods and fabrics from the imperial palace and the houses of the rich. In this fashion many people were delivered from poverty and made rich. Every tent was filled with handsome boys and beautiful girls».

4. Urudj (ed. Babinger 124) is in agreement with these sources:

سلطان محمد دخی
غیرت دوشب حق یوله یغما بیورب جبرا و قهرا هر طرفدن
لشکر اوشب حصارک ایچه کیروب کفاری قلجدن کچورب
شهرک ایچه کروب یغما و تالان قلوب قزلرنی و اوغلنلرنی
اسیر ایدب ماللرین و متاعلرین هر نه کم وار ایسه الدیلر

«Sultan Mehmed (in order to) arouse greater zeal for the way of God issued an order (that the city was to be) plundered. And from all

directions they (gazis) came forcefully and violently (to join) the army. They entered the city, they passed the infidels over the sword (i.e. slew them) and having entered the city they pillaged and looted, they took captive the youths and maidens, and they took their goods and valuables whatever there was of them».

The version edited by Atsiz, p. 109, adds a section missing in the Babinger edition:

«Üç gün yağma ettiler. Üç günden sonra yağmayı yasakladılar».

«They plundered for three days. After three days plundering was forbidden».

5. Neshri (ed. Unat and Koymen, II, 703) reports the same details:

زیرا او کوردوسی کون خونکار استنبوله یغما امر ایدوب

«...on the previous day the Conqueror gave the order that Istanbul be sacked».

Neshri, II, pp. 705-707:

غازیلر شهره کبرک تکورک باشن کیدیلر و وزیر کرلوقه دخی تعلقاتیلر اسیر اتدیر

او خرنهاد خوریادلرینی با سرهم . .

نلیچن کچوردیلر اهل و عیالدرین اسیر سلاسل و اغلال ایدب آیاصوفیهده
و سائر کلیسالرده التون و کومش پتلی غازیلر نجاق اوشورب کیمی قولن
کیمی بودین کیمی باشن کتورب و کافرلرک متاعلرندن هر نه کیم بولدیلر ایسه
یغما ایدب مبالغه طویلقلر اولدی

حتى غازیلر فلوری اچقه اولچک ایله بخش
ایندیلر اول وقتدن برو ضرب مثل اولشدرکه بر کشی بی غنایه
نبت اتلر | استانبول یغما می طوش اولدک دیرلر

«The gazis entered the city, cut off the head of the emperor, captured Kyr Loukas and his family... and they slew the miserable common people... They placed people and families in chains and placed me-

tal rings on their necks. They smashed the idols of gold and silver in Saint Sophia and the other churches. Some they took away by the arm, others by the body and others by the head. Whatever they found of the infidels' property they plundered until they became satiated from its superabundance...until the gazis spoke of florins (gold coins) in terms used to measure akches (silver coins). Since that time was the proverb that they say to one who is wealthy:

'Did you participate in the pillaging of Istanbul'?)»

6. The later source, Muneccimbashī (tr. I. Erünsal, p. 261) relying on earlier sources recapitulates them:

«The heralds announced the sultan's order granting permission to the army to sack (the city) for three days. In three days' time the booty that the Islamic army took has never been seen or experienced since the beginning of Islam».

7. Finally, there are the letters which Sultan Mehmed himself sent to various Islamic potentates of the Near East in which he himself announced the victory and the specific details of the conquest. Published in Feridun's Munsheat-i selatin in the nineteenth century, they were re-edited by virtue of a translation prepared by A. Ateş in 1953 («İstanbul'un fethine dair Fatih Sultan Mehmed tarafından gönderilen mektublar ve bunlara gelen cevablar», *Tarih Dergisi*, IV, sayı 7 (1953), 11-50).

a) In his letter to the sultan of Egypt (p. 19) Mehmed writes that his army killed many of the inhabitants, enslaved many others (those that remained), plundered the treasures of the city, 'cleaned out' the priests and took over the churches.

b) To the Sherif of Mecca (p. 25) he writes that they killed the ruler of Constantinople, they killed the 'pagan' inhabitants and destroyed their houses. The soldiers smashed the crosses, looted the wealth and properties and enslaved their children and youths. «They cleared these places of their monkish filth and Christian impurity».

c) In yet another letter (p. 42) he informs Cihan Shah Mirza of Iran that the inhabitants of the city had become food for the swords and arrows of the Muslim gazis; that they plundered their children, possessions and houses; that those men and women who survived the massacre were thrown into chains.

The Byzantine sources are full of information in regard to the capture of Constantinople, even more so than the Ottoman sources.

1. Ducas, who not only had access to eyewitness accounts but

visited the city immediately after the conquest, is the single most detailed account of the events (Ducas, ed. Grecu).

P. 363 The Turks sacked the monastery of the Chora near the walls, cut the icon of the Virgin into four parts and divided the treasures encrusting it. They sacked the house of the protostrator. In the meantime many of the inhabitants had sought refuge in the great church of St. Sophia:

P. 365, .. Τότε οἱ Τοῦρκοι κουρσεύοντες, σφάττοντες, αἰχμαλωτίζοντες ἔφθασαν ἐν τῷ ναῷ

P. 365: «Then the Turks arrived at the church, pillaging, slaughtering and enslaving». They enslaved all those that survived. They smashed the icons in the church, took their adornments as well as all that was moveable in the church.

P. 371.

Καὶ γὰρ ἦσαν ἅπαντες διασκεδασθέντες καὶ οἱ μὲν πρὸ τοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν καταλαβεῖν, αἰχμαλωτίζοντο, οἱ δὲ τὰς αὐτῶν οἰκίας καταλαβόντες, ἐρήμους παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶς καὶ πραγμάτων εὗρισκον καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸ τοῦ στοναχῆσαι καὶ κλαῦσαι ἐδεσμοῦντο τὰς χεῖρας ὀπισθεν. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἐρχόμενοι εἰς τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν καὶ εὐρόντες τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα ἤδη ἀπαγόμενα, καὶ συνεδέδεντο καὶ ἐδεσμοῦντο σὺν τοῖς φιλτάτοις καὶ τῇ συζύγῳ. Τοὺς δὲ γέροντας τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ, τοὺς μὴ δυναμένους ἐξελεῖν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ἢ διὰ νόσου ἢ διὰ γήρους, πάντας καὶ πάσας ἀνήλεως ἔσφαττον. Τὰ βρέφη τὰ ἀρτιγέννητα ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἐρρίπτον.

P. 371: «Those (of the Greeks) who went off to their houses were captured before arriving there. Others upon reaching their houses found them empty of children, wives and possessions and before (they began) wailing and weeping were themselves bound with their hands behind them. Others coming to their houses and having found their wife and children were being led off, were tied and bound with their most beloved and their wife. They (the Turks) slew mercilessly all the elderly, both men and women, in (their) homes, who were not able to leave their homes because of illness or old age. The new born infants were thrown into the streets».

P. 371. 27. Οἱ δὲ Τοῦρκοι ἅπαντες εἰσελθόντες ἐν τῇ Πόλει καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ βόσκοντες τὰς ἡμιόνους καὶ οἱ μάγειροι, πάντες ἐξαντλοῦντες ἔφερον.

P. 371: «All the Turks, even pasturers of the mules and all the cooks, having entered the city plundered and carried off (booty)».

- P. 373. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀσχολοῦντο τὰ πλοῖα τοῦ τυράννου ἐν τῇ πραιδᾷ καὶ τῷ σκυλμῷ τῆς πόλεως, οὐκ ἂν ἀφέθη μία καὶ μόνον. Ἄλλ' οἱ Τοῦρκοι ἀφέντες τὰ πλοῖα, πάντες ἔνδον ἦσαν καὶ οἱ Λατῖνοι ἄδειαν εὐρόντες ἐξήρχοντο τοῦ λιμένος. Ὁ δὲ τύραννος ἔτρυζε μὲν τοὺς ὀδόντας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠδύνατο πλεόν τι πράξει καὶ ἄκων ἐκαρτέρει.

P. 373: «If the complements of the ships of the tyrant (Mehmed) had not preoccupied themselves with the pillaging and looting of the city not even one (of the Latin ships) would have been allowed to depart. But all the Turks having abandoned the ships, were inside (Constantinople), and the Latins having found the opportunity sailed out of the harbor. The tyrant (Mehmed) gnashed his teeth but he was unable to do anything and so he persevered, unwillingly».

- P. 381. .. Πρωῖας δὲ γενομένης, παρελθούσης ἐκείνης τῆς πρώτης καὶ ζοφερᾶς ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ ἐγένετο ἡ πανωλεθρία τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν,

P. 381: «The day dawned (second day) and that gloomy first day passed during which occurred the complete destruction of our nation...»

- P. 381. Ἦν γὰρ ἡ πᾶσα ἄοικος, οὐτ' ἀνθρώπος οὔτε κτῆνος οὐτ' ὄρνειον κραυγάζον ἢ λαλῶν ἐντὸς αὐτῆς, μόνον τινὲς τῶν μὴ δυνηθέντων σκυλεῦσαι τι διὰ τὸ ἀνίσχυρον αὐτῶν, διότι καὶ πολλοὶ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἐφονεύθησαν ἔλκοντες ὁ εἷς ἐξ ἐτέρου τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ὁ δυνηθεὶς ἥρπαζεν, ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος ἀντιστῆναι καιρίαν λαμβάνων πληγὴν ἔκειτο. Τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ, τριακοστὴν ἄγων ὁ Μάϊος, εἰσῆλθον καὶ τὰ ἐγκαταλείπομενα αὐτοὶ συνέλεγον.

P. 381: «The entire city was uninhabited and there was neither human nor beast nor fowl crying out or speaking inside (the city). There were only a few who had not been able to plunder something, because they were weak, for many (of the sultan's army) killed one another as one tried to take away the booty of another. And he who was powerful grabbed it away, but he who was not able to resist, receiving a fatal blow, fell. On the second day, 30th of May, they entered and gathered what had been left».

- P. 385. Ὁμοίως καὶ ὅσους τῶν εὐγενῶν καὶ ὀφφικιαλίων τοῦ παλατίου μεγιστᾶνας ἐξηγόρασε, πάντας, στείλας τὸν σπεκουλάτορα, κατέσφαξεν· τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας αὐτῶν ἐξελέξατο, τὰς ὥραιας κόρας καὶ εὖειδῃ ἡρβῆνα, καὶ παρέδωκε τῷ ἀρχιευνούχῳ τοῦ τηρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν παρέδωκεν ἄλλοις τοῦ φροντίζεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν.

Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν τὴν ἄπασαν Πόλιν ἐν ταῖς σκηναῖς τοῦ φωσάτου, τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἔρημον, νεκρὰν καίμενην, γυμνήν, ἄφωνον, μὲ ἔχουσαν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος.

P. 385: And as many of the (Greek) aristocrats and nobles of the officials of the palace that he (Mehmed) ransomed, sending them all to the 'speculatoria' he executed them. He selected their wives and children, the beautiful daughters and shapely youths and turned them over to the head eunuch to guard them, and the remaining captives he turned over to others to guard over them...

«And the entire city was to be seen in the tents of the army, and the city lay deserted, dead, naked, mute, having neither form nor beauty».

P. 391-93. Μεθ' ἡμέρας οὖν τρεῖς τῆς ἀλώσεως ἀπέλυσε τὰ πλοῖα, πορεύεσθαι ἑκαστον εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν ἐπαρχίαν καὶ πόλιν, φέροντα φόρτον, ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι. Ὁ δὲ φόρτος τί; ἱματισμὸς πολυτελής, σκεύη ἀργυρᾶ, χρυσᾶ, χαλκᾶ, καττιτέρινα, βιβλία ὑπὲρ ἀριθμόν. αἰχμάλωτοι καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ λαϊκοὶ καὶ μονάζουσαι καὶ μοναχοί, τὰ πάντα πλήρης φόρτου. αἱ δὲ σκηναὶ τοῦ φωσάτου πλήρης αἰχμαλωσίας καὶ τῶν ἀνωθεν ἀριθμηθέντων παντοίων εἰδῶν. Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν βαρβάρων ἓνα φοροῦντα σάκκον ἀρχιερατικὸν καὶ ἕτερον ζωννύμενον ἐπιτραχήλιον χρυσοῦν, ἔλκοντα κύνας ἐνδεδημένους, ἀντὶ τῶν σαγισμάτων ἀμνοὺς χρυσοῦφάντους. ἄλλοι ἐν συμποσίοις καθήμενοι καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς δίσκους ἔμπροσθεν, συνδιαφόρους ὑπώρας ἐσθίοντες, καὶ τὸν ἄκρατον πίνοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν κρατῆρων, τὰς δὲ βίβλους ἀπάσας ὑπὲρ ἀριθμόν ὑπερβαινούσας ταῖς ἀμάξαις φορτηγώσαντες ἀπανταχοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ δύσει διέσπειραν. Δι' ἐνὸς νομίσματος δέκα βίβλοι ἐπιπράσκοντο, Ἀριστοτελικοί, Πλατωνικοί, Θεολογικοὶ καὶ ἄλλο πᾶν εἶδος βίβλου. Εὐαγγέλια μετὰ κόσμου παντοίου ὑπὲρ μέτρον, ἀνασπῶντες τὸν χρυσὸν καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον, ἄλλ' ἐπώλουν, ἄλλ' ἔβριπτον. Τὰς εἰκόνας ἀπάσας πυρὶ παραδίδουν· σὺν τῇ ἀναφθείσῃ φλογὶ κρῆν ἐψώντες ἥσθιον.

P. 391-3: «After three days, after the capture (of Constantinople) he released the ships so that each could go off to its own provinces, bearing a load so as to sink. And what sort of a load? Luxurious garments, silver, gold, copper, tin vessels, countless books, prisoners both of the priesthood and laity, nuns and monks. All (the ships) were fully loaded and the tents of the army were full of captives and of all types of goods enumerated above. And there was to be seen another girt with a golden epitrahelion (brocade worn by a bishop around his neck and down over his chest), leading dogs about that were clothed... Others were seated feasting with holy patens with various fruits and drinking unwatered wine from the holy chalices. Having loaded the wagons with all the books, more than can be counted, they scattered them everywhere in the east and west. And so ten books were sold for one coin, i.e. Aristotelian, Platonic, theological and every type of book. Tearing loose the gold and silver from countless gospels which were covered with

every type of ornamentation some they sold and others they threw away. They consigned all icons to the flames and having roasted meat with the fire, they ate».

2. Chalcocondyles is particularly well informed on Ottoman affairs and society and even though he does not have as much detail as does Ducas on the city's fall, he is nevertheless informative as to the overall picture. (Chalcocondyles, ed. Darko, II)

P. 160:

οἱ δὲ νεήλυδες ὑπερβάντες τὸ μέγα τεῖχος (κατέρριπτο γάρ τοι καὶ αὐτοῦ μέγα μέρος ὑπὸ τοῦ τηλεβόλου) εἰσερχόντο ταύτῃ ἐς τὴν πόλιν καὶ διήρπαζον τὴν πόλιν, τραπόμενοι, ὅποι ἐκάστω προχωροίη.

«The Janissaries having scaled the great wall... they poured through at this point into the city and plundered it, each one turning to whatever place each might advance to».

P. 161:

οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες, πλῆθος πολὺ γενόμενοι ἐνταῦθα ἐπιρρεόντων αἰεὶ συχνῶν, ἐτράποντο ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγίστου νεῶ τῆς πόλεως, τῆς ἁγίας Σοφίας καλουμένης, καὶ ἐνταῦθα συνελέγοντο ἄνδρες τε, καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες. οὐ πολλῶ μέντοι ὕστερον ἐάλωσαν ὑπὸ τῶν Τούρκων ἀμαχητί, καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ὀλίγοι ἐντὸς τοῦ νεῶ διεφθάρησαν ὑπὸ Τούρκων. ἄλλοι δ' αὖ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄλλῃ τῆς πόλεως τραπόμενοι ἐν ἀπορίᾳ τε εἶχοντο, καὶ οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον οἱ μὲν ἀπώλοντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἡλίσκοντο.

«And the men and women having become a great multitude, many of them fled, continuously, there, and turned to the great church of the city, that is called St. Sophia, and there gathered there men, women and children. Not much later they were captured, without resistance by the Turks, and not a few of the men were slaughtered inside the church. Others of the Greeks fled elsewhere in the city not knowing what to do, and not much later they were either killed or enslaved».

P. 162-3.

ἦν τε τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἀπανταχῇ πλέω ἀπολλύντων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων καὶ διωκόντων τε καὶ φευγόντων.

«And throughout, the regions of the city were full of those killing and those being killed, and of those pursuing and of those fleeing».

P. 162:

Οἱ μὲν οὖν νεήλυδες αὐτίκα τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῦ βασιλέως ἐνέπλησαν [καὶ] γυναικῶν τε ἅμα καὶ παιδων τῶν περιφανεστάτων Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ὄλβον

πολὺν ἀποφερόμενοι μέγα εὐδαιμόνες ἐγένοντο καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἀπανταχῇ πλέων ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν ἀλλήλους ἐπιβουμένων καὶ παίδων ἐκπεπληγμένων ταύτῃ τῇ συμφορᾷ. καὶ χρυσὸς μὲν πολλὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἐφορεῖτο τῆς πόλεως ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον, καὶ λίθων εὐπορία ἦν, καὶ ἐσθήτων παντοδαπῶν πλέως ἡ χώρα ὥστε μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ μέγα δὴ ὄλβιον γενέσθαι τοῦτο τὸ στρατόπεδον ἀπὸ τε ἀνδρῶν περιφανῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ τῆς ἄλλης εὐδαιμονίας, ὥστε πολλοὺς μὲν οὐκ ἔχειν ὅτι χρῆσαιντο τῶν νεηλίδων τῇ παρουσίᾳ εὐδαιμονίᾳ. καὶ λίθους μὲν ἐξωνησάμενοι ὀλίγης τιμῆς, ἅτε μὴ εἰδόντων τῶν νεηλίδων, ὅπως αὐτὰ δέοι ἀποδόσθαι, μέγα ὄλβιοι ἐγένοντο, καὶ χρυσόν, ἥ ἔστιν, ἀντὶ χαλκοῦ φαίνονται ἀποδόμενοι οἱ νεηλυδες.

«And immediately the janissaries filled the camp of the emperor (sultan) with women, children, and the most illustrious of the Greeks, and bringing away much wealth they became greatly wealthy. And there was to be seen, throughout the camp, (that it was) filled with men and women screaming out to one another and children dazed from the catastrophe. Much gold and silver were carried off to the camp and there was a plentitude of precious stones and the area was filled with every type of garment, so that the army became very wealthy in illustrious men (captives) and wealth and other prosperity in one day, so that many of the janissaries did not know what to do with this real prosperity. And they sold the precious stones for a low price as the Janissaires did not know for how much they ought to sell, and they became wealthy. And the Janissaries seemed to be selling the gold...for copper».

P. 163: ἐν ᾧ γὰρ ταῦτα ἐγένετο καὶ πάντες σχεδὸν ἐγένοντο τετραμμένοι ἐπὶ διαρπαγὴν,

«And while these things were occurring, practically all (of the Turks) turned to looting». (Chalcocondyles is here speaking of the fact that Venetian triremes used this event to escape the city, i.e. no Turks were in the Turkish vessels as they had gone ashore to take part in the plunder).

3. Critobulus (edition Grecu, translation Riggs)

P. 141, 61, 1. Οἱ δὲ ὀπλῖται ἐσεχέοντο ἤδη διὰ τῆς πολίδος ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν, οἱ δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ κατεβρίμμενου μεγάλου τείχους ἐσέπιπτον· τὸ δὲ ἄλλο στρατεύμα πᾶν ἐπόμενον ὠθισμῷ καὶ βίᾳ ἐσεχεῖτο λαμπρῶς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν σκεδαννύμενον.

2. Βασιλεὺς δ' ἐστῶς πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου τείχους, ἵνα καὶ ἡ μεγάλη σημαία ᾖ καὶ τὸ ξύθημα, ἀπεσκόπει τὰ δρώμενα· ἤδη γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ὑπέφαιεν. Ἐνθα δὲ φόνος πολλὸς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ἐγένετο, τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, — ἤδη γὰρ ἐξήρσαν τινες τῶν οἰκιῶν θέοντες πρὸς τὴν βοήν καὶ τοῖς

P. 143. Ξίφεσι τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀπροόπτως ἐνέπιπτον, — τῶν δὲ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις αὐταῖς, ἐπεσπιπτόντων βία τῶν γενητζάρων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων στρατιωτῶν ξὺν οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ καὶ λογισμῷ τῶν δὲ καὶ ἐς ἀλκὴν τρεπομένων, τῶν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἱεροῖς καταπεφευγόντων τε καὶ ἰκετευόντων, ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν, παιδῶν, πάντων ἀπλῶς, μηδεμιᾶς οὔσης φειδοῦς.

3. Ὅργῃ γὰρ καὶ θυμῷ πολλῷ ἐχώρουν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς οἱ στρατιῶται, τοῦτο μὲν ἀχθόμενοι τῇ τριβῇ τῆς πολιορκίας, τοῦτο δ' ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπάλξεων σκώμμασι τε καὶ ὕβρεσιν οὐκ ὀλίγοις ἐβαλλον αὐτοὺς ἔνιοι τῶν ἀνοήτων παρ' ὅλον τὸν πόλεμον, τὸ δ' ὅλον ὅπως ἂν θροήσωσι τὸ πᾶν καὶ φοβήσωσι καὶ δουλώσωνται ταῖς σφαγαῖς.

4. Ὡς δὲ ἄλλοι εἶχον τοῦ φόβου καὶ ἡ πόλις ἤδη ἐδεδούλωτο, τρέπονται οἱ μὲν ἐν ταῖς τῶν δυνατῶν οἰκίαις κατὰ συμμορίας τε καὶ συνωμοτίας καὶ τάξεις ἐπὶ διαρπαγῇ καὶ σκυλμῷ, οἱ δὲ πρὸς σύλησιν τῶν ἱερῶν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς κοινὰς τε καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οἰκίας ἐσκεδασμένοι, διαρπάζοντες, σκυλεύοντες, ληϊζόμενοι φονεύοντες, ὕβριζοντες, ἀπάγοντες αἰχμαλώτους ἀνδρας, γυναῖκας, παῖδας, πρεσβύτας, νέους, ἱερεῖς, μοναχοὺς, πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν καὶ τάξιν ἀπλῶς.

5. Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν θέαμα δεινὸν καὶ ἐλσεινὸν καὶ πέρα τραγωδίας ἀπάσης, γυναῖκας νέας καὶ σώφρονας, εὐγενεῖς τε καὶ τῶν εὖ γεγονότων, τὰ πολλὰ οἰκουρούσας καὶ οὐδὲ τὴν αὐλῖον προελθούσας ποτέ, καὶ παρθένους εὐπρεπεῖς καὶ ὥραιας λαμπράς τε καὶ λαμπρῶν οἰκιῶν καὶ μέχρι τότε ἀβρόντων ὀφθαλμοῖς ὅλως ἀψάστους, τὰς μὲν βία τῶν θαλάμων ἐξελκομένας ἀπηνῶς τε ἅμα καὶ ἀναιδῶς ἀρπαζομένας, τὰς δὲ —κακὸν αὐταῖς ἔτι κοιμωμένας ἐπιστάμενοι ὄναρ ἄνδρες ξιφῆρεις, ἡμαγμένοι τὰς χεῖρας τῷ φόβῳ, θυμοῦ πνέοντες, φονικὸν βλέποντες, ἀπηρυθριασμένοι πρὸς πάντα τὰ χεῖριστα, ἅτε πλῆθος ξύμμικτον ὄντες, ἐκ παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ γένους καὶ τύχης ξυνειλεγμένοι, ὥσπερ θῆρες ἄγριοι καὶ ἀνήμεροι ἐσπηδῶντες ἐς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ σύροντες ὤμῳ, ἔλκοντες σπαράσσοντες, βιαζόμενοι, ἀπάγοντες αἰσχρῶς, ἐπὶ τῶν τριόδων ὕβριζοντες, καὶ τί δεινὸν οὐχὶ ποιοῦντες; φασὶ γέ τοι πολλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ πρὸς μόνην ἀήθη τὴν θεάν τε καὶ ἀκοὴν τούτων καταπλαγείσας ἐγγὺς ἐλθεῖν ἀφεῖναι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν.

6. Ἔτι δὲ γέροντας ἐντίμους ἐλκομένους τῆς πολιᾶς, τοὺς δὲ καὶ τυπτομένους ἀνηλεῶς· παρθένους μοναζούσας σεμνάς τε καὶ ἀπρότους τὸ ὅλον καὶ τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ προσανεχούσας καὶ ζώσας, ᾧ καθιέρωσαν ἑαυτάς, τὰς μὲν τῶν δοματίων βιαίως ἐξαγομένας καὶ συρομένας, τὰς δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποσπωμένας, ἐν οἷς κατέφευγον, ἀπαγομένας ξὺν ὕβρει καὶ ἀτιμῇ, ξαινομένας τε τὰς παρειὰς ξὺν οἰμωγῇ καὶ ὀλολυγμῷ καὶ κοπτομένας πικρῶς· παῖδας ἀπαλοὺς ὥμῳ ἀποσπωμένους μητέρων, κόρας ἐλσεινῶς χωριζόμενας τῶν νεογάμων ἀνδρῶν· ἄλλα μύρια εἰργασμένα δεινὰ.

62, 1. Τὴν δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ὕβριν καὶ σύλησιν καὶ διαρπαγὴν πῶς ἂν τις ἐξεῖποι τῷ λόγῳ; Κατεβάλλοντο μὲν ἀτίμως ἐς γῆν εἰκόνες καὶ ἀφιδρύματα καὶ ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν, ἀπεσπάτο δὲ κόσμος ὁ τούτων, ἐδίδοτο δὲ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν τῷ πυρί, τὰ δὲ ἐς λεπτὰ τεμνόμενά τε καὶ ξυντριβόμενα ἐπὶ τῶν τριόδων ἐβρίπτετο, ἡνολίγοντο δὲ θῆκαι τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὰ τούτων ἐξήγετο λείψανα καὶ ἀτίμως λεπτυνόμενα καὶ λυόμενα ἐς ἀέρα ἐλικμαῖτο, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμφοδῶν ἐβρίπτετο.

2. Κρατηρῆς τε καὶ φιλάλι καὶ ἅ τὴν παναγεστάτην θυσίαν ἐδέχετο, αἱ μὲν ἐς προπόσεις καὶ μέθην ἦσαν αὐτοῖς, οἱ δὲ ξυντριβόμενοι τε καὶ χωνευό-

P. 145.

μενοι ἀπεδίδοντο, ἱερὰ δὲ σκεύη καὶ πέπλα τίμια πολυτελῆ τε καὶ πολλῶν χρυσίῳ ἐνυφασμένα, τὰ δὲ καὶ λίθοις διαφανέσι καὶ μαργάροις καταστραπτόμενα, τὰ μὲν ἀπεδίδοντο πονηροτάτοις ἀνδράσιν εἰς ἀπόχρησιν οὐ καλήν, τὰ δὲ πυρ παρεδίδοντο, χωνεύμενα διὰ τὸν χρυσόν.

3. Βίβλοι τε ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἔξω μαθημάτων καὶ φιλοσόφων αἱ πλείσται, αἱ μὲν πυρὶ παρεδίδοντο, αἱ δὲ ἀτίμως κατεπατοῦντο, αἱ πλείους δὲ αὐτῶν οὐ πρὸς ἀπόδοσιν μάλλον ἢ ὕβριν δύο ἢ τριῶν νομισμάτων, ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ ὀβολῶν ἀπεδίδοντο.

4. Τράπεζαι δὲ ἱεραὶ ἐκ βάθρων αὐτῶν ἀνεσπῶντο καὶ ἀνετρέποντο, τοῖχοι τε τῶν ἀβάτων καὶ ἀψαύστων τόπων ἀνηρευνῶντο καὶ τὰ τῶν τεμενῶν ἱερὰ ἔδη ἀνωρύττετο τε καὶ κατεσκάπτετο ἐπὶ ζητήσῃ χρυσοῦ, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἐτολμάτο.

63, 1. Οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ ἐτέρου τείχους τεταγμένοι τε καὶ μαχόμενοι κατὰ γῆν τε καὶ θάλασσαν δυστυχεῖς Ῥωμαῖοι νομίζοντες σὼν εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθῆ καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρους, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἤδεσάν πω τὰ γινόμενα, εὐρώστως τε ἡγωνίζοντο καὶ μετὰ ῥώμης ἡμύοντο τοὺς ἐπionτας καὶ ἀπεωθοῦντο λαμπρῶς τοὺς ἐπιβαίνειν πειρωμένους τοῦ τείχους.

2. Ὡς δὲ κατὰ νότου τε εἶδον τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ βάλλοντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔνδον καὶ τῆς πόλεως αὐτοὺς καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας ἡνδραποδισμένους ἐώρων καὶ ἀπαγομένους αἰσχυρῶς, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀθυμία ληφθέντες ἐρρίπτουν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τῶν ὀπλῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους καὶ ἀπέθνησκον, οἱ δὲ ἀπογόνοντες τοῖς ὅλοις καὶ τὰ δπλα τῶν χειρῶν ἐκλυομένων ἤδη ἀπολύνοντες, παρεδίδουν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἀμαχί χρησασθαι ὅτι καὶ βούλιντο...

P. 147.

ἐσελθὼν μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει, εὐρίσκει πολλοὺς ἐκεῖσε τῶν Ῥωμαίων ξυνισταμένους, καὶ ἐς ἀλκὴν τρεπόμενος, οὕτω γὰρ ἐφθάκει πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἡ κατὰ γῆν στρατιὰ, καὶ ξυμβαλὼν αὐτοῖς τρέπεται καὶ φονεύει πάντας αὐτοῦ, ὥστε διὰ τῶν πυλῶν αἷμα ῥυτῆναι πολύ.

66, 1. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη στρατιὰ ἐφθάκει, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων παραλίων πυλῶν ἐσερχέοντο λαμπρῶς ταύτας ξυγκλῶντες καὶ καταβάλλοντες, καὶ οὕτως ἅπαν τὸ στράτευμα τῶν νεῶν ἤδη σκεδασθὲν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν τρέπεται ἐς διαρπαγὴν, ληϊζόμενον πάντα τὰ ἐν ποσὶ καὶ ἐμπίπτον πυρὸς ἢ σκηπτοῦ καὶ ἐμπιπτῶν πάντα καὶ ἀφανίζον, ἢ χεიმάρρου δίκην παρασῦρον καὶ διαφθεῖρον· καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι πάντα διηρευνήσαντο ἀκριβέστερον ἢ Δᾶτις, φασί, τὴν Ἑρετρικὴν, ναοὺς, ἱερὰ, θήκας τε παλαιὰς καὶ τᾶφους ἀναβρύγγυντες, στοὰς τε ὑπογείους καὶ καταδύσεις καὶ κρηφύγετα καὶ ἄντρα καὶ χηραμοὺς καὶ ἄλλο πᾶν κεκρυμμένον ἀνηρευνῶντες καὶ εἰ πού τις ἦ τι ἦν κεκρυμμένον, ἐς φῶς ἐξάγοντες.

2. Ἐς δὲ τὸν μέγιστον ἐσελθόντες τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας νεῶν εὗρον ἐκεῖ πολὺ τι πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν καταφυγόντας τε καὶ θεοκλητοῦντας· οὓς καὶ δίκην σαγήνης ξυγκλείσαντες παρεστήσαντο πάντας ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ ἀπήγαγον αἰχμαλώτους, τοὺς μὲν ἐς τὰς τριήρεις, τοὺς δὲ ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον.

P. 149.

67, 1. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐν τῷ Γαλατᾷ, ὡς εἶδον τὴν πόλιν ἐχομένην ἤδη καὶ διαρπαζομένην, εὐθὺς προσεχώρησαν ὁμολογίᾳ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπὶ τῷ μηδέν τι κακὸν παθεῖν, καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὰς πύλας ἐσεδέχοντο τὸν Ζιάγανον μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν ὁλως ἠδίκηντο.

2. Ἡ δὲ στρατιὰ πᾶσα, ἡ τε κατὰ γῆν ἢ τε κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἐσχυθεῖσα

ἐς τὴν πόλιν, ἀπὸ πρωίας βαθείας καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ περιόρθρου μέχρι δελιῆς ὀψίας ἐλπίζετο καὶ διηρπάζετο ταύτην, ἐκφοροῦσα πᾶσαν τὴν λείαν ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον, τὴν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς ναῦς· ἔστιν ἃ δὲ ταύτης καὶ διαρπάζοντες ἔνιοι ὥσπερ φῶρες καὶ λαθραίως ἐξιόντες τῶν πυλῶν ἀπήεσαν ἐς τὰ οἴκοι.

3. Οὕτω δὲ πᾶσαν ταύτην ἐκένωσε καὶ ἡρήμωσε καὶ πυρὸς δίκην ἡφάνισε καὶ ἡμαύρωσεν, ὥσθ' ὅλως ἀπισθῆναι, εἰ καὶ ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ ποτε ἡ ἀνθρώπων οἴκησις ἢ πλοῦτος ἢ περιουσία πόλεως ἢ ἄλλη τις κατ' οἶκον κατασκευὴ τε καὶ περιφάνεια, καὶ ταῦτα οὕτω λαμπρᾶς καὶ μεγάλης ὑπαρχούσης πόλεως· οἴκοι δὲ μόνον ἐναπελείφθησαν ἔρημοι καὶ φόβον παρέχοντες τοῖς ὁρώσι διὰ τὴν ἐρημίαν πολύν.

4. Ἀπέθανον δὲ τῶν μὲν Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν ξένων, ὡς ἐλέγοντο, παρ' ὅλον τὸν πόλεμον καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ δὴ τῇ ἀλώσει πάντες, ἄνδρες, φημί, καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες, ἐγγὺς που τετράκις χίλιοι. ἐλήφθησαν δὲ καὶ αἰχμάλωτοι ὀλίγῳ πλείους πεντάκις μυρίων, τῆς δὲ στρατιᾶς ἀπάσης ἀμφὶ τοὺς πεντακοσίους.

68, 1. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσελθὼν ἐς τὴν πόλιν, κατεθεᾶτο τό τε μέγεθος καὶ τὴν θέσιν αὐτῆς τὴν τε λαμπρότητα καὶ καλλονήν, τό τε πλῆθος καὶ μέγεθος καὶ κάλλος τῶν τε ναῶν καὶ τῶν δημοσίων οἰκοδομημάτων, τῶν τε ἰδιωτικῶν οἰκιῶν καὶ κοινῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν δυνάμει ὄντων τὴν πολυτέλειαν, ἔτι δὲ τὴν τε τοῦ λιμένος θέσιν καὶ τῶν νεωρίων καὶ τὸ πρὸς πάντα ἐπιτηδείως ἔχει τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὐφυῶς, καὶ ἀπλῶς πᾶσαν αὐτῆς τὴν κατασκευὴν καὶ τὸν κόσμον.

2. Ἐώρα δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀπολλυμένων καὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν τῶν οἰκιῶν καὶ τὴν παντελῆ φθορὰν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν ὀλεθρον· καὶ οἰκτος αὐτὸν εὐθὺς ἔσῃει καὶ μετὰμελος οὐ μικρὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας τε καὶ διαρπαγῆς, καὶ δάκρυον ἀφῆκε τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καί, μέγα στενάξας τε καὶ περιπαθὲς, «οἶσάν», ἔφη, «πόλιν δὲ διαρπαγὴν καὶ ἐρήμωσιν ἐκδεδῶκαμεν» οὕτως ἔπαθε τὴν ψυχὴν.

P. 151.

3. Καὶ γὰρ ὄντως πάθος μέγα τοῦτο γέγονεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐν μιᾷ δὴ ταύτῃ πόλει ὅλον ἐν οὐδευιᾷ τῶν πάλαι μνημονευομένων τε καὶ ἱστορουμένων μεγάλων πόλεων μεγέθει τε τῆς ἀλούσης πόλεως καὶ δξύτητι καὶ ἀποτομίᾳ τοῦ ἔργου· οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ πάντας ἐξέπληξε τοὺς τε ἄλλους καὶ αὐτοὺς δὴ τοὺς δρᾶσαντας καὶ παθόντας τῷ τε παραλόγῳ καὶ ἀήθει τοῦ γεγονότος καὶ τῷ ὑπερβάλλοντι καὶ ξενίζοντι τοῦ δεινοῦ...

9. Καὶ ἄλλαι δὲ πόλεις πολλαὶ καὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τε Ἀσίᾳ καὶ Εὐρώπῃ ἐάλωσαν, καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ καὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἀρετῇ τῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθοῦσαι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὰ τούτων πάθη λόγον ἔχει πρὸς τὰ παρόντα δεινά.

P. 153.

69, 1. Ἐάλω καὶ ἡ δυστυχὲς αὕτη πόλις πρῶν παρὰ τῶν ἐσπερίων γενομένων, ἐξήκοντα ἔτη τυραννουμένη, καὶ πλοῦτον ἀφῆρέθη πολὺν καὶ ἀναθήματα τῶν ἱερῶν πλεῖστα καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ πολυτελῆ, καὶ τὰ λαμπρὰ καὶ σεμνὰ καὶ περιμάχητα ταύτης θεάματα καὶ ἀκούσματα τὰ μὲν ἐς ἐσπέραν μετεκομίσθη, τὰ δ' ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει πυρὸς γέγονε παρανάλωμα, ἀλλὰ μέχρι τούτων ἦν αὐτῇ ἡ ζῆμια καὶ τὸ δεινόν· εἰ μὴ δὲ ταῦτα μικρά, τῶν οἰκητόρων δὲ οὐδένᾳ ἀπεβεβλήκει οὐδ' ἐς παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τιμιώτατα παρεβλάβη, ἀλλ' εἶχε πάντας τοὺς ἐνοικούντας ἀσινεῖς ὅλως καὶ κακῶν ἀπαθείς· καὶ πάλιν ἀπωσαμένη τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ ἑαυτὴν ἀνακτησαμένη ἐς τὴν προτέραν ἦκε κατὰστασιν, καὶ βασιλείῳ ἦν καὶ γενῶν ἦρχε πολλῶν ἐν τε Ἀσίᾳ καὶ Εὐρώπῃ καὶ νήσων οὐκ ὀλίγων, καὶ ἦν ἐν περιφανείᾳ καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ δόξῃ καὶ λαμπρότητι

ἦν καὶ τῶν καλῶν ἀπάντων ἡγεμῶν καὶ παράδειγμα, καὶ λόγων ἦν ἔστια καὶ παιδείας ἀπάσης καὶ σοφίας καὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν καλλίστων ὁμοῦ.

2. Νῦν δ' ὄντως ἐξήκει τὰ κατ' αὐτήν, καὶ τὰ καλὰ ξυλλήβδην ἔρρει, καὶ ἀφῆρεται πάντων, πλούτου, δόξης, ἀρχῆς, περιφανείας, τιμῆς, γένους λαμπρότητος, ἀρετῆς, παιδείας, σοφίας, ἱεροσύνης, βασιλείας, πάντων ἀπλῶς· καὶ ὅσον ἐς ἄκρον εὐδαιμονίας καὶ τύχης ἤλασε, τοσοῦτον ἐς πυθμένα δυστυχίας καὶ κακοδαιμονίας κατήχθη· καὶ μακαρισθεῖσα πρώην ὑπὸ πολλῶν, νῦν ὑπὸ πάντων δυστυχῆς καὶ βαρυδαίμων ἀκούει· καὶ μέχρι τερμάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης προελθοῦσα τῇ δόξῃ, νῦν πᾶσαν ὁμοῦ γῆν τε καὶ θάλασσαν μεστὴν πεποίηκε τῶν ἑαυτῆς ξυμφορῶν καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἀδοξίας ἐνέπλησε, πανταχοῦ τῆς αὐτῆς κακοδαιμονίας ὑπομνήματα φέρουσα τοὺς οἰκήτορας, ἄνδρας ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας διασπαρέντας αἰσχροῦς ἐπ' αἰχμαλωσίᾳ καὶ δουλείᾳ καὶ ὕβρει· καὶ ἡ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπάρξασα πρότερον μετὰ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης καὶ πλούτου καὶ περιφανείας λαμπρᾶς, νῦν ὑφ' ἐτέρων ἄρχεται μετὰ πενίας καὶ ἀδοξίας καὶ ἀτιμίας καὶ δουλείας αἰσχίστης· καὶ παράδειγμα πάντων οὕσα καλῶν καὶ λαμπρᾶς εὐδαιμονίας εἰκῶν, νῦν εἰκῶν ἐστὶ δυστυχίας καὶ ξυμφορῶν ὑπόμνημα καὶ στήλη κακοδαιμονίας καὶ μῦθος τῷ βίῳ.

P. 155.

P. 71.
(Riggs
translation)

"§ 236. The heavy infantry were already streaming through the little gate into the City, and others had rushed in through the breach in the great wall. Then all the rest of the army, with a rush and a roar, poured in brilliantly and scattered all over the City. And the Sultan stood before the great wall, where the standard also was and the ensigns, and watched the proceedings. The day was already breaking.

Great Rush, and Many Killed

§ 237. Then a great slaughter occurred of those who happened to be there: some of them were on the streets, for they had already left the houses and were running toward the tumult when they fell unexpectedly on the swords of the soldiers; others were in their own homes and fell victims to the violence of the Janissaries and other soldiers, without any rhyme or reason; others were resisting, relying on their own courage; still others were fleeing to the churches and making supplication — men, women, and children, everyone, for there was no quarter given.

P. 72.

§ 238. The soldiers fell on them with anger and great wrath. For one thing, they were actuated by the hardships of the siege. For another, some foolish people had hurled taunts and curses at them from the battlements all through the siege. Now, in general they killed so as to frighten all the City, and terrorize and enslave all by the slaughter.

Plunder of the City

§ 239. When they had had enough of murder, and the City was reduced to slavery, some of the troops turned to the mansions of the mighty, by bands and companies and divisions, for plunder and spoil. Others went to the robbing of churches, and others dispersed to the

simple homes of the common people, stealing, robbing, plundering, killing, insulting, taking and enslaving men, women, and children, old and young, priests, monks — in short, every age and class.

Here, too, a Sad Tragedy

§ 240. There was a further sight, terrible and pitiful beyond all tragedies: young and chaste women of noble birth and well to do, accustomed to remain at home and who had hardly ever left their own premises, and handsome and lovely maidens of splendid and renowned families, till then unsullied by male eyes—some of these were dragged by force from their chambers and hauled off pitilessly and dishonorably.

§ 241. Other women, sleeping in their beds, had to endure nightmares. Men with swords, their hands bloodstained with murder, breathing out rage, speaking out murder indiscriminate, flushed with all the worst things—this crowd, made up of men from every race and nation, brought together by chance, like wild and ferocious beasts, leaped into the houses, driving them out mercilessly, dragging, rending, forcing, hauling them disgracefully into the public highways, insulting them and doing every evil thing.

§ 242. They say that many of the maidens, even at the mere unaccustomed sight and sound of these men, were terror-stricken and came near losing their very lives. And there were also honorable old men who were dragged by their white hair, and some of them beaten unmercifully. And well-born and beautiful young boys were carried off.

§ 243. There were priests who were driven along, and consecrated virgins who were honorable and wholly unsullied, devoted to God alone and living for Him to whom they had consecrated themselves. Some of these were forced out of their cells and driven off, and others dragged out of the churches where they had taken refuge and driven off with insult and dishonor, their cheeks scratched, amid wailing and lamentation and bitter tears. Tender children were snatched pitilessly from their mothers, young brides separated ruthlessly from their newly-married husbands. And ten thousand other terrible deeds were done.

Plundering and Robbing of the Churches

§ 244. And the desecrating and plundering and robbing of the churches—how can one describe it in words? Some things they threw in dishonor on the ground—ikons and reliquaries and other objects from the churches. The crowd snatched some of these, and some were given over to the fire while others were torn to shreds and scattered at the crossroads. The last resting-places of the blessed men of old were opened, and their remains were taken out and disgracefully torn to pieces, even to shreds, and made the sport of the wind while others were thrown on the streets.

§ 245. Chalices and goblets and vessels to hold the holy sacrifice,

some of them were used for drinking and carousing, and others were broken up or melted down and sold. Holy vessels and costly robes richly embroidered with much gold or brilliant with precious stones and pearls were some of them given to the most wicked men for no good use, while others were consigned to the fire and melted down for the gold.

P. 75.

§ 246. And holy and divine books, and others mainly of profane literature and philosophy, were either given to the flames or dishonorably trampled under foot. Many of them were sold for two or three pieces of money, and sometimes for pennies only, not for gain so much as in contempt. Holy altars were torn from their foundations and overthrown. The walls of sanctuaries and cloisters were explored, and the holy places of the shrines were dug into and overthrown in the search for gold. Many other such things they dared to do.

§ 247. Those unfortunate Romans who had been assigned to other parts of the wall and were fighting there, on land and by the sea, supposed that the City was still safe and had not suffered reverses, and that their women and children were free—for they had no knowledge at all of what had happened. They kept on fighting lustily, powerfully resisting the attackers and brilliantly driving off those who were trying to scale the walls. But when they saw the enemy in their rear, attacking them from inside the City, and saw women and children being led away captives and shamefully treated, some were overwhelmed with hopelessness and threw themselves with their weapons over the wall and were killed, while others in utter despair dropped their weapons from hands already paralyzed, and surrendered to the enemy without a struggle, to be treated as the enemy chose....

P. 75.

§ 250. Entering the City with his marines, he found there many of the Romans gathered and making a brave stand. The [Ottoman] land forces had not yet reached that point, as they were plundering the rest of the City. Encountering these, he overcame them and killed them all, so that much blood flowed out of the gates. At that juncture the land army also arrived.

§ 251. In the same way, the sea army streamed in victoriously through the other shore gates, smashing them and throwing them down. Thus the whole naval force, scattering through the whole City, turned to plunder, robbing everything in their way, and falling on it like a fire or a whirlwind, burning and annihilating everything, or like a torrent sweeping away and destroying all things. For they hunted out everything, more carefully than Datis is said to have done in Eretria. Churches, holy places, old treasuries, tombs, underground galleries, cisterns and hiding-places, caves and crannies were burst into. And they searched every other hidden place, dragging out into the light anybody or anything they found hidden.

§ 252. Going into the largest church, that of the Holy Wisdom, they found there a great crowd of men, women, and children taking refuge and calling upon God. Those they caught as in a net, and took

P. 76.

them all in a body and carried them captives, some to the galleys and some to the camp.

Surrender of Galata to the Sultan

§ 253. Upon this, the men of Galata, seeing the City already captured and plundered, immediately surrendered en masse to the Sultan so as to suffer no ills. They opened their gates to admit Zaganos and his troops, and these did them no harm.

§ 254. The entire army, the land force and the marine, poured into the City from daybreak and even from early dawn until the evening. They robbed and plundered it, carrying all the booty into the camp and into the ships. But some, like thieves, stole some of the booty and secretly went out of the gates and off to their abodes. Thus the whole City was emptied and deserted, despoiled and blackened as if by fire. One might easily disbelieve that it had ever had in it a human dwelling or the wealth or properties of a city or any furnishing or ornament of a household. And this was true although the City had been so magnificent and grand. There were left only ruined homes, so badly ruined as to cause great fear to all who saw them.

Number of Romans who died in the struggle, and of the prisoners taken

§ 255. There died, of Romans and of foreigners, as was reported, in all the fighting and in the capture itself, all told, men, women, and children, well-nigh four thousand, and a little more than fifty thousand were taken prisoners, including about five hundred from the whole army.

Entry of the Sultan into the City, and his seeing of it all, and his grief

p. 77. § 256. After this the Sultan entered the City and looked about to see its great size, its situation, its grandeur and beauty, its teeming population, its loveliness, and the costliness of its churches and public buildings and of the private houses and community houses and of those of the officials. He also saw the setting of the harbor and of the arsenals, and how skilfully and ingeniously they had everything arranged in the City — in a word, all the construction and adornment of it. When he saw what a large number had been killed, and the ruin of the buildings, and the wholesale ruin and destruction of the City, he was filled with compassion and repented not a little at the destruction and plundering. Tears fell from his eyes as he groaned deeply and passionately: «What a city we have given over to plunder and destruction!»

Sympathy

§ 257. Thus he suffered in spirit. And indeed this was a great blow to us, in this one city, a disaster the like of which had occurred in no one of the great renowned cities of history, whether one speaks of the size of the captured City or of the bitterness and harshness of the deed. And no less did it astound all others than it did those who went through it and suffered, through the unreasonable and unusual character of the event and through the overwhelming and unheard-of horror of it.....

P. 79.

Comparison with Other Cities

§ 263. Therefore the fall of those other cities cannot be compared with that of this City. Still other cities, many and large, in Asia and Europe, have been captured. They were flourishing in wealth, glory, learning, the valor of their inhabitants, and in many other worthy aspects. But the sufferings of these cities were not comparable to the present horrors.

Comparison of this City with itself, that is,
with the capture by the Latins and....alas!

§ 264. This hapless City was also captured by the Western peoples, tyrannized over for sixty years, and robbed of great wealth and of many very beautiful and costly 'statues' from the churches. The brilliant and honored and sought-after masterpieces which had been seen and heard of by all were carried off to the west, while those which were left in the City became the prey of the flames. But loss and suffering were limited to that, though of course that alone was no small thing. Of the inhabitants, however, no one lost wife or children or was deprived of his most valuable things. All the inhabitants were unharmed and unmolested. Then, having overthrown the tyranny and recovered herself, the City regained its former state and was a seat of empire again, ruling over many races in Asia and Europe and not a few islands. It became splendid and rich and glorious and famed, a ruler and an example in all good things, the center of learning and culture and wisdom and virtue, in fact, of all the best things in one.

Personal Lamentation and Soliloquy over the City

§ 265. But this time the City's possessions vanished, its goods summarily disappeared, and it was deprived of all things: wealth, glory, rule, splendor, honor, brilliance of population, valor, education, wisdom, religious orders, dominion—in short, of all. And in the degree in which the City had advanced in prosperity and good fortune, to a corresponding degree it was now brought down into the abyss of misfortune and misery.

P. 80.

§ 266. While previously it had been called blessed by very many, it now heard everyone call it unfortunate and deeply afflicted. And while it had gloriously advanced to the boundaries of the civilized world, it now filled land and sea alike with its misfortunes and its ignominy, sending everywhere as examples of its misery the inhabitants, men, women, and children, who were scattered disgracefully in captivity and slavery and insult.

§ 267. And the City which had formerly ruled with honor and glory and wealth and great splendor over many nations was now ruled by others, amid want and disgrace and dishonor and abject and shameful slavery.

§ 268. While it had been an example of all good things, the picture of brilliant prosperity, it now became the picture of misfortune, a reminder of sufferings, a monument of disaster, and a by-word for life».

The English translations of Critovoulos are those of Ch. T. Riggs, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* by Kritovoulos (Princeton, 1956), pp. 71-77, 80.

4. Macarius Melissenus, a chronicler of the sixteenth century (edition Grecu) gives a traditional account as to Mehmed's order allowing the sacking of Constantinople for three days.

P. 412-414.

Ἐνταῦθα δὲ πάλιν πᾶς ὁ ἐμὸς στρατὸς
καὶ ἄρχοντες τῆς αὐλῆς μου, ἐὰν νικήσωμεν, παρ' ἐμοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἄχρι τέ-
λους ζωῆς αὐτῶν ἔξουσιν τὸν μισθὸν ἕκαστος τούτων διπλάσιον, οὐ τὰ νῦν
ἔχουσιν. Καὶ ἡμέραις τρισὶν ἢ πόλιν πᾶσα ὑμῶν ἔσεται· καί, εἴ τι δ' ἂν σκυ-
λεύσῃτε καὶ εὕρητε, χρυσίον ἢ ἀργύριον σκεῦος καὶ ἱματισμόν, αἰχμαλώτους
τε ἀνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας, μικροὺς τε καὶ μεγάλους, οὐδεὶς δυνήθειν αὐτοὺς ὑ-
μῖν αἰτῆσαι ἢ ἐνοχλῆσαι εἰς οὐδένα. Καὶ τελειώσας τοῦ λέγειν ὤμοσεν αὐτοῖς
φυλάξαι, τὰ ὅσα διετάξατο αὐτοῖς.

«For my part, if the City falls I will double the salaries of all soldiers and courtiers from this day on to the rest of their lives. The entire City will be yours for three days. I will permit you to loot and keep all gold and silver vessels and garments that you can find; you will be allowed to enslave men and women of all ages. You have my word, no one will be allowed to demand them from you or to annoy you in the least». (Tr. M. Philippides, p. 119).

P. 430-432.

4. Καὶ τῶν μὲν προσπιπτόντων ἢ ἀρπαγὴ καὶ αἰχμαλωσία ἦν, τῶν δὲ καταλαμβανομένων καὶ ἀνθισταμένων σφαγὴ. καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἢ γῆ ἔν τισι τό-
ποις ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν διεφαίνετο. Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν θέαμα ξένον καὶ θρήνους πολλοὺς
καὶ ποικίλους καὶ ἀμετρήτους ἀνδραποδισμοὺς τῶν εὐγενῶν ἀρχουσῶν καὶ

παρθένων καὶ ἀφιερωμένων τῷ Θεῷ, συρομένων ὑπὸ τῶν Τουρκῶν διὰ τῶν ἐθειρῶν καὶ κομῶν καὶ πλοκάμων τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔξωθεν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ ὀδυρμῶν ἀνάλειων, τὴν βοήν καὶ κλαυθμῶν τῶν παίδων, τοὺς ἱεροὺς καὶ ἁγίους οἴκους λεηλατισμένους. Τὸ φρικῶδες καὶ ἀκούμενον· ἦν τὸ θεῖον αἶμα καὶ σῶμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ γῆς χερόμενον καὶ ριπτόμενον καὶ τὰ τιμαλφῇ δοχεῖα τούτου ἀρπάζοντες, τὰ μὲν διέθραυνον, τὰ δὲ σῶα ἐνεκολπίζοντο. Καὶ τοὺς ἐγκεκροσμημένους κόσμους ὁμοίως ἐποιοῦν. καὶ τὰς ἐγκεκροσμημένας ἀγίας εἰκόνας μετὰ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ λίθων πολυτίμων καταπάτουν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αἶροντες, κλίνας καὶ τραπέζαν ἐποιοῦν· καὶ μετὰ τῶν τῶν ἱερῶν ἐνδυμάτων τῶν ἐκ σηρικῶν καὶ χρυσοῦφάντων ὄντων τοὺς ἱπποὺς ἐσκέπαζον· καὶ ἄλλοι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἤσθιον· καὶ τοὺς πολυτίμους μαργάρους τῶν ἀγίων κειμηλίων ἀναρπάστους ἐποιοῦν, τὰ ἅγια λείψανα καταπατοῦντες. Καὶ ἕτερα ἀνοσιουργήματα πλεῖστα ἐποιοῦν ἄξια θρήνου οἱ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου πρόδρομοι.

P. 130 (tr. Philippides)

«As soon as the Turks were inside the City, they began to seize and enslave every person who came their way; all those who tried to offer resistance were put to the sword. In many places the ground could not be seen, as it was covered by heaps of corpses. There were unprecedented events: all sorts of Lamentations, countless rows of slaves consisting of noble ladies, virgins, nuns, who were being dragged by the Turks by their headgear, hair, braids out of the shelter of churches, to the accompaniment of mourning. There was the crying of children, the looting of our sacred and holy buildings. What horror can such sounds cause! The Turks did not hesitate to trample over the blood and body of Christ poured all over the ground and were passing His precious vessels from hand to hand, some were broken to pieces while others, intact, were being snatched away. Our precious decorations were treated in a similar manner. Our holy icons, decorated with gold, silver, and precious stones were stripped, thrown to the ground, and then kicked. Our wooden decorations in the churches were pulled down and turned into couches and tables. The enemy's horses were clothed in priestly garments of silk embroidered with golden thread, which were also used as tablecloths. They stripped our saintly vessels of their precious pearls, they scattered and trampled over all sacred relics. Many other lamentable crimes of sacrilege were committed by these precursors of antiChrist».

The Fall of the Byzantine Empire: A Chronicle by George Sphrantzes, 1401-1477, tr. M. Philippides (Amherst, 1980).

5. Matthew Camariotes (Pat. Gr. vol. 160, p. 1065) says it in a few words: Οἱ ναοὶ οἱ Θεῷοι κατεστράφησαν, τὰ θυσιαστήρια βεβήλωται,

κατεπατήθη τὰ ἱερά. Ἡ πόλις καταπεφρόνηται, ἡ νεότης διέφθαρται. οἱ δὲ δουλείᾳ διακαρτεροῦς αἰσχροῖ. Αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ. τῶν παίδων, οὐ τὸ θῆλυ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄρρεν, ἐνεσελγαίνειν αὐτῷ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐκδέδοται, τὸ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐλεεινῶς μετατίθεται.

«The churches were destroyed; the altars were profaned; the holy were trampled underfoot. Old age was held in contempt, youth was destroyed. O! the aged were consigned to the sword, others were consigned to shameful slavery. Of the children, not only the girls but the boys as well were shamefully ravished by the barbarians. And they were pitifully converted to impiety».

6. An anonymous threnos or lament of the period of the fall of the city recounts all these events (Ellissen, *Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur* Leipzig, 1857, vol. III, 124, 132-4, 140, 148, 158.

Western sources, many of them participants in the defence and fall of the city and some of them captives of the Turks, are of particular value.

a) Nicolo Barbaro (tr, JR Jones, 1969)

P. 67: «But when the men in these ships saw that the Christians had lost Constantinople, and that the standard of Mahomet Bey the Turk was raised over the principal tower of the city... then they all disembarked. And at the same time all those in the fleet on the Dardanelles side disembarked and left their ships by the shore without anyone in them, because they were all running furiously like dogs into the city to seek out gold, jewels, and other treasure, and to take merchants prisoner. They sought out the monasteries, and all the nuns were led to the fleet and ravished and abused by the Turks, and then sold at auction for slaves throughout Turkey, and all the young women also were ravished and then sold for whatever they would fetch, although some of them preferred to cast themselves into the wells and drown rather than fall into the hands of the Turks, as did a number of married women also. The Turks loaded all their ships with prisoners and with an enormous quantity of booty. Their practice was, that when they went into a house, at once they raised up a flag with their emblem on it, and when other Turks saw this flag flying, they left this house alone, and went in search of another house without a flag, and so they put their flags everywhere, even on the monasteries and churches. As far as I can estimate, there would have been two hundred thousand of these flags flying on the houses all over Constantinople: some houses

had as many as ten, because of the excitement which the Turks felt at having won such a great victory. For the rest of the day these flags were kept flying on the houses, and all through the day the Turks made a great slaughter of Christians through the city. The blood flowed in the city like rainwater in the gutters after a sudden storm, and the corpses of Turks and Christians were thrown into the Dardanelles, where they floated out to sea like melons along a canal».

P. 70: «The fighting lasted from dawn until noon, and while the massacre went on in the city, everyone was killed; but after that time they were all taken prisoner». (Diary of the Siege of Constantinople, 1453, tr. JR Jones, New York, 1969).

2. Leonard of Chios (tr. JR Jones, 1972) adds certain details to the account of Nicolo Barboro:

P. 33: «In the Sultan's camp it was now proclaimed that for the three days preceeding Tuesday the 29th of May they should light bright fires and call upon their god, fasting the whole day long and preparing themselves for battle... The heralds cried at the top of their voices that it was their ruler's will that the city should be given to the soldiers for three days to sack. The sultan swore by their immortal god, by the 4,000 prophets, by Mahomet, by the soul of his father and by the sword with which he was girded, that his warriors would be granted the right to sack everything, to take everyone, male or female, and all property or treasure which was in the city; and that under no circumstances would he break his oath».

P. 38: «Imagine our amazement at such an astonishing turn of events! The orb of Phoebus had not yet shown half of itself over the horizon, and the whole city was in the hands of the pagans, for them to sack. Their soldiers ran eagerly through it, putting to the sword all who resisted, slaughtering the aged and the feeble-minded, the lepers and the infirm, while they spared those of the rest who surrendered to them. The heathen infidels entered Sancta Sophia, the wonderful shrine of the Holy Wisdom, which not even the temple of Solomon could equal, and showed no respect for the sacred altars or holy images, but destroyed them, and gouged the eyes from the saints. They broke and scattered their holy relics too, and then their sacrilegious hands reached out for the sacred vessels of God, and they stuffed their pouches with gold and silver taken from the holy images and from the sacred vessels. Screams and cries rose to the heavens, and everyone of both sexes, and all the precious metal and property of all kinds in the city,

were subject to their pillage. With axes they broke open our store-chests, and dug in the earth in their search for valuables, which they found, both new and old, in such abundance, that no city in this age could show the like for wealth....

P. 39. «After ranging through the city for three days, the Turks left it to their sultan. All the valuables and other booty were taken to their camp and as many as 60,000 Christians who had been captured. The crosses which had been placed on the roofs or walls of churches were torn down and trampled. Women were raped, virgins deflowered, and youths forced to take part in shameful obscenities. The nuns left behind, even those who were obviously such, were disgraced with foul debaucheries».

3. Riccherio (tr. JR Jones, 1972):

P. 123: «After the Turks had entered the city in this manner, they set about sacking it, slaying anyone who opposed them. They swarmed about the place, and gave vent to their natural cruelty and inhumanity with every kind of cruel and lustful act, showing respect neither to sex nor to age. Some they murdered, some they debauched. They hustled the weak and aged into slavery and they chained together the young, both male and female, of every class. When they found any well-formed girl, they struggled with each other to possess her, and for the sake of the sacred treasures they fought to the death on many occasions

Their army compounded of so many nations, customs and languages, spent three days in sacking the unfortunate city. There was no act, however wicked, that was not committed by these heathen. They laid hands even on the Church of the Holy Wisdom, that marvellous work of the Emperor Justinian, and after despoiling it of an enormous amount of gold and silver, they engaged in every kind of vileness within it, making of it a public brothel and a stable for their horses. They took the relics of the Saints from this and other churches, threw them in the middle of the streets for swine and dogs to trample on, and to be trodden under foot by every passer-by; and the images of our Lord Jesus Christ and of his Saints...»

4. Lömellino (tr. JR Jones, 1972):

P. 132: «They put the city to the sack for three days, and you «never saw such suffering; the extent of their plundering cannot be calculated».

(The translations of Leonard of Chios, Riccherio, and Lomellino come from JR Jones, *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts*, Amsterdam, 1972).

One comes back to Prof. Shaw's characterization of the events of May 29, and thereafter, in the year 1453 and surrounding the manner in which the city of Constantinople was taken by the Turks (p. 57):

«Once within the city the Ottomans advanced slowly and methodically, clearing the streets of the remaining defenders. While Islamic law would have justified a full-scale sack and massacre of the city in view of its resistance, Mehmed kept his troops under firm control, killing only those Byzantines who actively resisted and doing all he could to keep the city intact so that it be the center of his empire».

Most of these Ottoman (7), Greek (6), and Italian (4) sources, a total of 17 quoted here (and there were others as well) were available to Prof. Shaw both in the original texts and in translations. Yet he did not consult them for the relevant data. Instead, he manufactured false historical evidence. If one assumes as he claims in his preface, that he did consult the primary sources, then the conclusion is forced upon the analyst that here Prof. Shaw had ignored intentionally what they say and has thus distorted history with full knowledge of that fact. The dilemma of intent remains here, but the charge of manufacturing false historical evidence is substantiated in either case, whether intentional or unintentional.

A second example of the category of error which the author commits by the manufacture of false historical data through his neglect of the primary sources has to do with the section on Ottoman literature in chapter five. This section is so flawed that it will be discussed later in the monograph to appear separately. In the process of delivering himself of an unbelievable series of evaluations and supposed facts about this literature he discusses early Turkish poets (p. 141): He speaks of the «saz folk poets» who wrote in a simpler and more Turkish tradition and who «entered Anatolia with the Turks following the battle of Manzikert, spreading not only the messages from Central Asia but also describing the battles and praising the victories won over the enemy... Their work is best exemplified in the 12 epic poems (sic) (Destans) of Dede Korkut as in the works of Seyyit Battal Ghazi and the Danishmentname written by Danishment Ahmet Ghazi, founder of one of the strongest Turkoman principalities in eastern Anatolia». *Comment:* Seyyit Battal Ghazi was an *Arab* (not a Turk), a ghazi warrior (not a poet) killed in the holy war between the Muslim Arabs and Byzantines in the eighth century of the Christian era. Since he was an Arab warrior who died in the eighth century of the Christian

era, it would be nothing short of miraculous had he reappeared in Asia Minor as a Turkish saz poet using «the older syllabic meter as well as Turkish folk stories», subsequent to the battle of Manzikert in 1071 no matter whether he were «spreading...the messages from Central Asia,» or «even describing the battles and praising the victories won over the (Byzantine) enemy.» No matter, for Prof. Shaw he was a Turkish poet of the eleventh century (in the book's index of the twelfth century). He could have easily ascertained the data by reading the two articles of M. Canard and I. Melikoff, both entitled «al-Battal,» in the second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam* (which section appeared considerably before his own book appeared), wherein he could have ascertained the Arabic and warrior (not Turkish and poetic) identity of al-Battal. Second, he would have been instructed that the epic named after him, the *Battalname*, was written originally in Arabic at a much earlier date, and that when the Turks invaded Asia Minor they took over his figure and composed an epic about his person in Turkish. It is obvious that never having read the *Battalname* he simply fabricated false historical evidence.

But this is not the end of his fabrication of false historical data in this paragraph... «And the *Danishmentname* written by Danishment Ahmet Ghazi...» Again the figure in question (*Danishmend*) was not a poet, he wrote nothing so far as we know. He was a tribal-ghazi leader who consummated the Turkish conquest of northeastern Asia Minor in the later eleventh century. His deeds became the stuff of oral epic which was written down for the first time only in the thirteenth century, in 1245 by Mawlana Ibn 'Ala'. This text seems to have been lost so it was re-committed to writing in 1360 by 'Arif 'Ali. For this Prof. Shaw should have consulted the article «*Danishmendids*», in the second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam* by I. Melikoff, where it is all set out. It is obvious that Prof. Shaw has not read the text of the poem, edited with a French translation and long historical commentary by Melikoff, *La geste de Melik Danişmend. Étude critique du Danişmendname* (Paris, 1960), 2 vols.

Thus in the case of this early «saz folk poetry» the author's faulty methodology has caused him to «create» two additional Turkish poets and to swell the already existing catalogue of such poets, to convert two men of the sword into men of the pen, and finally to transform one of them from an eighth century Arab to an eleventh century Turk. His methodology is once more characterized by the failure to utilize pri-

mary sources materials (on the grounds of which he castigates European scholars additionally to his charges that they lack the necessary linguistic and aesthetic qualifications to appreciate Turkish literary achievements) and it results in the fabrication of false historical data.

A third case of the fabrication of false historical data arising from the author's failure to use primary sources occurs on pages 248-9 of his book where he deals with the spectacular appearance of Catherine the Great's fleet in the Mediterranean 1770-71. According to our author this induced many Greeks to rebel against the sultan including «Greeks on the island of Zanta (sic) and Cephalonia (who) also joined the revolt by attacking their Ottoman garrisons as well as the local Muslim populations». It is true that Greeks in the Maina (southern Peloponnese) revolted against the Turks, but Prof. Shaw in order to raise the talley of vile Christian acts (as he sees them in his book) against the Ottomans, drags in the Cephalonians and Zantiotes and accuses them of not only attacking their local Ottoman garrisons, but also the poor Muslim population of these two islands. If he had looked at his primary sources, he would have realized that both islands were solidly and uninterruptedly in the hands of the Venetian Signoria at least from 1500, and that during this time they had no Ottoman garrisons (only Venetian and Greek garrisons), and that there was at no time during this period of close to three centuries any Muslim Turkish population on these islands. Again, he has manufactured false historical data.

4. A fourth category of error is that in which Prof. Shaw faithfully reproduces the errors of his secondary sources. Let us look very quickly at three such errors, not so important in themselves as errors but as errors which indicate to us the manner in which the author works.

a) On p. 132 Prof. Shaw discusses the crews of the Ottoman fleet who were often composed of a group known as 'levend'.

«Manning the ships... were men recruited from the adjacent coasts including Turks, Greeks, Albanians, and Dalmatians, to whom the name *levant* was applied, probably a corruption of the Italian term *Levantino* then used for the sailors of most of the Mediterranean fleets».

In fact the general word denoting sailor in the Mediterranean was not Levantino, as per Prof. Shaw, but was a derivative of the old Venetian word *marinarius* from which all the Mediterranean derivatives come (Kahane & Tietze, *The Lingua Franca of the Levant*, 293-4). The word *levantino*, which has nothing to do with the Ottoman *levend*, was never used anywhere to denote sailor. But rather it denoted a class

of Latin Christians who lived in the orient and intermarried with the local Christians but had absolutely nothing to do with the life of the sailor.

The word *levend* seems to come from Persian and is defined in the historical dictionary of M. Z. Pakalin (cited in the bibliography by Prof. Shaw) under the entry «Levent». It refers to an individual who is characterized by laziness, shiftlessness, or freedom of movement, unemployment, womanizing, drunkenness. It came to be applied to the people who filled the fleets because they were often recruited (as in Western Europe) from drifters. Thus the word came to signify sailor. There is an entire book on the subject by the modern Turkish scholar, M. Cezar, *Osmanlı tarihi levendler* (Istanbul, 1965), esp. 4-17, where he gives the meaning in detail. Though Prof. Shaw again lists this book in the general bibliography (p. 317), it is obvious that he has not consulted it. It is but one more indication that much of what appears in the bibliography is «dead» i.e., the contents of the books and articles referred to there are not often incorporated into his knowledge.

How then did Prof. Shaw come to the conclusion that *levend* was derived from the Romance word *Levantino* rather than from this Persian word *levend*?

Our author has simply copied his secondary source, Gibb-Bowen, I¹, 98-99 who says: «The name by which these sailors went in Venice was *Levantino*-Throughout this area the term *Levantine* or *Levantino*, thus came to mean specifically a sailor. It was corrupted in Turkish to *Levend*».

Even more interesting than the fact that Prof. Shaw is repeating the error of his secondary source and is not relying on a primary source, is that which emerges from the discovery that Gibb-Bowen's source for this piece of information is yet another secondary source, the old, first edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

A second error of this type, wherein Prof. Shaw repeats the error of his principle secondary source, *Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi*, I, 46 is the following statement in page 16, of Prof. Shaw's book:

«In 1349 when the Serbian Stefan Dushan (1331-1355) took Salonica from the Byzantines, Orhan, at Cantacuzene's request, sent Suleyman Pasha with 20,000 men to regain it. With the help of the Byzantine fleet Suleyman forced the Serbs back and so regained Salonika for the Byzantines».

It is a pity that no one ever bothered to tell Suleyman Pasha and

his 20,000 Turks that the Serbian emperor had really never ever taken Salonika and that his help was not needed there. Prof. Shaw has relied on his secondary authority, who is notoriously weak on this period and who does not command the necessary primary sources and who commits a historical blunder by placing a Serbian monarch in the second city of the Byzantine empire at that time. But it seems that Prof. Shaw has even less knowledge of the period, its history and primary sources. Even so, had he bothered to consult the standard work on this period, known to all undergraduates who take Byzantine or Balkan history at UCLA, he would have known immediately that no Serbian ruler or army entered this city then or ever. The work is G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 2nd ed.

5. A fifth category of error is that which arises from the failure of the author to use recent scholarly works. This is evident in individual statements and in his treatment of broader topics. I shall not go into the specific details, but shall instead refer to incidents at which this failing is evident and refer to the bibliographical material left unread.

a) His detailed remarks on Bedreddin-i Simavni in footnote no. 6, page 40, reveal a basic failure to update himself in the current literature on this important individual, but illustrate further his failure to avail himself of an important segment of Turkish and international scholarship on Ottoman and Turkish sufism. In the bibliography at the end of the volume Prof. Shaw refers to only two works on the sufi orders: J. Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (Oxford, 1937); F.W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), 2 vols). Obviously, he has also used Gibb-Bowen. Birge however is old, unsatisfactory, for the period Prof. Shaw is treating in chapter V, whereas Hasluck deals with the symbiosis of popular christianity and popular Islam, not with the dervish orders per se. There is a large and very important body of scholarly literature, especially in Turkish, today that must be consulted. Most important are the works of the prolific authority, A. Gölpınarlı, including *Mevlana Celaleddin* (Ist. 1959) and especially his *Mevlanadan sonra Mevlevilik* (Ist. 1953). Then the works of the German orientalist H. Ritter on Rumi are the foundation study of the sources and manuscripts, especially «*Philologika*, XI, *Maulana Galaladdin Rumi und sein Kreis*,». *Der Islam*, XXVI (1942), 116-58. The many works of the German Turkologist Kissling on the Ottoman dervish orders remain fundamental, and yet these have not been men-

tioned (with the exception of the study on Bedreddin). Specifically, as regards his highly erroneous section on Bedreddin, Prof. Shaw obviously did not consult the fundamental work of the Bosnian Muslim scholar Nedim Filipović, *Princ Musa i Seyh Bedreddin*. Prof. Shaw's failure to use modern scholarly literature effectively, and I leave out of account that he does not even begin to know the primary literature and sources, is demonstrated again on page 154 where he discusses the Kalender order of dervishes.

b) The entire section on Ottoman and Turkish literature on pages 139-149 suffers not only from the fact that the author basically has not read most of this literature at first hand and so is basically unfamiliar with it. It suffers from the fact in this section, it would seem, Prof. Shaw relies on two secondary works, essentially, for the quarrying of his data, and these two works are both old and in most instances outdated. The work of Banarlı, *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarih* (1949-1950) is in essence an unsophisticated encyclopedic compendium already a quarter of a century old when Prof. Shaw's volume came out. The second work, A. Adıvar's *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim* (Istanbul, 1943) though more scholarly in tone was over 30 years old. Thus his major foray into Turkish and Ottoman literature is superficial (it is not based on an extensive reading of the literature itself) and does not take into account a substantial body of secondary scholarly literature. This section is a slavish repetition of names and titles, with hardly any significant analysis and literally studded with the most fundamental errors.

At the beginning of his ten pages on Ottoman literature and culture Prof. Shaw castigates western scholars for their ignorance of this literature and culture:

«European observers have long maintained that Ottoman strength lay in military achievement and political organization, with little or no cultural contribution. Such observations have largely been products of European ignorance of and prejudice against Islam. They result from the lack of linguistic as well as aesthetic qualifications needed to discern and appreciate cultural developments outside the European sphere of experience and awareness».

It is not obvious thus from his treatment of Ottoman literature that Prof. Shaw has presented us with something better than that given us by western European scholars with their lack of the «aesthetic and the scholarly qualifications to appreciate this literature and culture». The proof of it is that this section on literature is at best a dreary recitation of names and at worst what Menage in his review called «comic».

«The remarks on learning and literature can only be called comic, especially after 'European observers' are castigated for a lack of linguistic as well as aesthetic qualifications needed to discern and appreciate cultural developments» (Menage, *English Historical Review*).

c) His incursions into all the adjacent and peripheral historical phenomena is often marred by the inability and /or the failure to consult relevant scholarship: Byzantium, the Caliphate, the historical experience of the Balkan subjects of the Ottomans: Rumanians, Albanians, Bulgars, Serbs, Greeks. His lack of knowledge of Armenian history is matched only by the dislike which he feels for it.

The errors which arise from Prof. Shaw's failure to utilize a significant body of recent scholarship, even in those cases where he goes through the formality of listing it in his bibliography at the end of the book, contribute heavily to making of this work one which suffers from a substantial scholarly 'antiquity'. It is very stale indeed.

6. A sixth category of mistakes is of a geographical nature and indicates that often the author does not know where he is. He experiences this geographical disorientation at the maritime, riverine, and continental levels. Because of the shortness of space, I shall do no more than list one from a myriad of examples (also see the remarks, in detail, of Menage).

a) For our author Lepanto, on page 178, is a large bay in the Aegean; on page 75, is in the Adriatic, on 1477 it suddenly moves to Albania (p. 178), and on page 48 again is said to be a Venetian base in the Adriatic. Prof. Shaw has some difficulty with this elusive piece of real estate. In fact Lepanto (Navpactus) is located in none of these varied and constantly alternating places, but is a very small port located on the Gulf of Corinth in Greece, adjacent to the Ionian Sea. Thus it is located not in Albania, not on the Adriatic, not even on the glamorous Aegean. Further, it has no large bay, as our author asserts, but a very tiny harbor artificially protected and formed by walls.

7. There is a further and seventh category of errors which, when taken together, reveal a general shallowness and narrowness of historical knowledge and thought. These mistakes reveal the lack of grasp of the history of the Ottoman conquests in the Balkans, a complete unfamiliarity with the history of the peoples and societies subdued during these conquests. This is fundamental inasmuch as Ottoman institutions were basically formed in response to the conditions, traditions and peoples that the sultans found there and elsewhere. His total

unfamiliarity with the history of Venice, the Ottoman empire's principal European foe until the rise of the Hapsburgs, similarly flaws the work. The author simply does not understand the history and institutional functioning of the so-called millet-system and so attributes to it a history, socio-religious function, and position which are largely wrong. His work is frequently characterized by anachronisms which are based on chauvinistic or nationalistic predilections of the period of modern nationalism which institute or provoke distortion of the interpretation of events and which render him unable to deal with so-called ethnic issues. Similarly, he often interprets central events in the internal history of the empire within the emotional framework of later nationalistic developments. But nowhere is the historical shallowness of this volume more apparent than in his encyclopedic, or rather lexicographical, presentation of Ottoman literature.

As to his ignorance of the historical conditions which prevailed in the Balkans during the crucial conquest of the area by the Ottomans let us look at one crucial event only, the battle of Kossovo Polje which transpired in 1389. The victory of the Ottomans crushed the last major obstacle to this expansion in the peninsula for the battle resulted in the subjugation of the Serbian state and principalities to the status of Ottoman vassals who henceforth fought in the Ottoman armies and so increased, accordingly, Ottoman military power.

Prof. Shaw writes «Among the Balkan princes who accompanied Lazar were King Tvrtko of Bosnia, Vuk Brankovic, son-in-law of Lazar, the Wallachian prince Mircea the Great and George Castriotis (sic), one of the princes of Albania....

The sources differ widely on the number of soldiers involved, but apparently the Balkan Union managed to gather about 100,000 men, while Murad had no more than 60,000 at best. In the battle itself Lazar and his forces gained the upper hand initially, but a last minute defection by the forces led by Vuk Brancovic seems to have turned the tide ... In any case the Battle of Kossova (sic) was the first Ottoman success against a major allied European military force» (Shaw, 21-2).

The mustering of Christian forces in an effort to halt the further Ottoman advance into the peninsula could with some propriety be termed a «Balkan Union» as the author does. However, to say that it resulted in «the first Ottoman success against a major allied European military force», is totally incorrect. First, European in this context would have meant the inclusion of the military forces of one of the

«European» powers i.e. Venice or Hungary. But even the term Balkan Union under close analysis seems incorrect. The Byzantines and Latins of the Levant did not participate. Contrary to Prof. Shaw's assertion, the Bosnian monarch Tvrtko was not present and the Wallachian prince Mircea similarly was absent from the battle. Since «prince» George Castriotis (sic) was not born until 1405 his participation in this battle (1389) would have called for a *leger de main* admittedly difficult even for an Albanian. Perhaps more extraordinary than Castriota's feat of having done battle some 16 years before his birth, while he was still no more than an Albanian gleam in his father's eyes, is the fate of the Serbian leader prince Lazar. On page 29, Prof. Shaw gives us further details in the amazing career of this Serbian ruler. The Sultan, «instead of using Kosova (sic) as a tool to conquer Serbia from Dusan's son Lazar, he agreed to allow Lazar to remain in power in return for token tribute and military assistance in Anatolia... Bayazit also guarded himself against the possibility of Serbian treachery by recognizing a rival Serbian prince, Vuk Brankovic, as ruler of Pristina, allowing the latter's son and successor George Brankovic (1389-1457) to struggle with Lazar for the right to dominate the whole country».

Thus, according to our author, Prince Lazar remained actively involved in Balkan and Ottoman affairs after his defeat at Kossovo Polje. This is indeed even more remarkable than Castriota's cleverness in making his way to the battle of Kossovo Polje 16 years before his nativity, for prince Lazar was not only taken captive on the field of Kossovo Polje, but was promptly executed along with the Serbian nobility (Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, New Brunswick, 1969, 546-7). Thus Lazar was appropriately named after the resurrected Lazarus, but, unlike his namesake, was resurrected not by the Lord Jesus but had to await the appearance of Prof. Shaw. Prof. Shaw has not only given prince Lazar a new, second life on earth, but he also has made of him in his second life a son of the great emperor Stephan Dusan, something which Lazar had never been able to become in his first life, though we are not told whether he had really ever tried.

On page 52 Prof. Shaw once more, and mercifully, employs his powers to resurrect Serbian monarchs from the dead, this time bestowing upon Stephan Dusan himself (first death in 1355) a second life. But he does so for a short period of time bringing him to rest finally in 1427. For, Prof. Shaw informs us, shortly before the Crusade of Varna (1444) Murad II made a general settlement with the Serbian

ruler Brankovic: «He was given back all Serbian territory in return, thus essentially restoring the kingdom as it had been in 1427 at the death of Stephan Dusan».

The author's complete innocence of the facts and conditions of the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans is clearly apparent and the mere narration of these error-studded two paragraphs reveals the author's historical poverty and the fertility of an uncritical imagination.

An equally brief examination of Ottoman-Venetian relations is no more encouraging that the author is in command of that particular dimension of Ottoman expansion and international relations. On page 33, Prof. Shaw tells his reader that among the complications that Bayezid I had to face in the west during the late fourteenth century was «...the advance of Venice into Macedonia (when Salonica was sold to Venice by Byzantium)». Actually Venice pursued no territorial expansion into Macedonia in the fourteenth century, and it was offered the sale of Salonica in 1423 by the Byzantines who could no longer withstand the sieges of the city by Murad II, and who offered, unsolicited, to sell it to the Venetians rather than see it fall into the hands of the Ottomans.

Prof. Shaw proceeds to place Montenegro under a «Venetian protectorate» up to 1491 (p. 75), and relates that the capture of Cyprus in 1570 «...freed the Greeks from centuries...under the aegis of Venice» (p. 178). Thus the author in his mood of territorial generosity adds territory (Montenegro) to the Venetian imperium which Venice had never possessed, and increases the years of Venetian rule of Cyprus by several centuries (Venice actually took possession of the island only in 1489). But this generosity in extending spatially and temporally the dominion of the Signoria is cancelled by our author in favor of maintaining an even balance. In the great military confrontations of the late seventeenth century which herald a major turning point of the Ottoman polity in its external relations with European powers, Prof. Shaw «directs» the Venetians to the invasion of and attack on Cattaro and the Dalmatian coast (1685-7), which invasions he tells us «were beaten back» by the Ottomans. Inasmuch as the Venetians had controlled these areas uninterruptedly since the fifteenth century it is strange, to say the least, to see them invading their own lands and being repelled from them by Ottomans who were never there.

Prof. Shaw's inexperience of Venetian and Greek history has led him to expand the Venetian empire at one end and to curtail it at the other. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh.

Millets

Until the conquests of the sixteenth century brought Syria, Palestine and Egypt under Ottoman rule, the Christians probably constituted a majority of the sultan's subjects. Even after these conquests of the Arab lands the Christians remained very important demographic, economic, and social elements in the empire. Thus the description of institutions through which the Ottomans regulated their life constitutes a very important, indeed, one of the most important tasks of the historian. Among these institutions central is that which the guild of Ottomanists terms the «millet system». Prof. Shaw turns his attention to the structure, function, and history of the millet system on at least three different occasions in the first volume. Writing of the reign of Mehmed II in chapter four, he informs us of the following.

«The sultan also sought the support of the Christian religious leaders. He assured the Greek Orthodox clergy that it would retain its religious freedom, both internally and against the possibility of union with Rome; he appointed the chief opponent of union, Genadius Sclarius (sic), as patriarch, and gave him civil as well as religious authority over Orthodox Christians in the empire to assure his support of the new regime. Thus was created the millet system of autonomous self-government under religious leaders, later extended to the Armenians, the Jews, and the other major non-Muslim minorities. In return the millet leaders found their self-interest cemented to that of the sultan since it was by his order that they were given more extensive power over their followers than had been the case in the Christian states that had previously dominated the area. The complete conquest of South-eastern Europe once again united most of the Christians in the area, Greek and Slav alike, under the authority of the Greek patriarchate, making the church a particular beneficiary of the Ottoman expansion and further uniting the interests of patriarch and sultan» (pp. 58-9).

In chapter five on the Dynamics of Ottoman Society and Administration Prof. Shaw discusses the millet system more generally devoting attention to the various distinct millets of which the most important was that of the Orthodox Christians (pp. 151-3).

«The Ottomans recognized three basic millets in addition to that of the Muslims. At the end of the fifteenth century by far the largest millet was that of the Orthodox, which included Slavic subjects as well as those of Greek and Rumanian heritage. The Orthodox had been divided into a number of independent patriarchates before the Ot-

toman conquest, with the Bulgarian patriarchate being established at Ohrid and Tirnovo and those of the Serbs at Ipek in addition to the ecumenical Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Constantinople. But their rites and doctrine were more or less the same except for language, so that Mehmed II was able to unify them under the leadership of the patriarch of Constantinople soon after the conquest, gaining the latter's support for Ottoman rule in return. The patriarch had to be confirmed by the sultan and was installed with as many of the Byzantine rituals as could be performed without the presence of the emperor. He was given the Ottoman rank of pasa with three horsetails, (This last section is a virtual word for word rendering of the section in Gibb, I², 216: «The Patriarch was duly installed with as many of the traditional ceremonies as might be performed in the absence of an Emperor; he was assigned the ceremonial rank of a Paşa with three tugs;» etc.) with the right to apply Orthodox law to his followers in secular as well as religious matters from his headquarters in the Fener district (this he continues to take right out of Gibb, I², not realizing that Gibb is talking about a much later period, 18th cent., by which time the Greek patriarchate had moved into the Phanar district; but for the period being described by Prof. Shaw, the patriarchate was located elsewhere) of Istanbul, thus adding important secular responsibilities to his extensive religious duties». This section of Prof. Shaw's book, pp. 151-2, is all taken right out of Gibb-Bowen, I², 214-16, including the many mistakes made by his secondary sources.

Our author turns next to the Jewish millet, which will not concern us here (Shaw, p. 152, which he takes directly from Gibb, I², 218-220, in a very close paraphrase) and he then proceeds to an analysis of the Armenian millet.

«The Armenian national church was monophysite in doctrine and so had been condemned as heretical by the Orthodox church. Its members were concentrated in the traditional center of the ancient Armenian kingdom in the easternmost reaches of Anatolia, in the Caucasus, and in areas of Cilicia where they had migrated following the absorption of their homeland first by the Byzantines and then the Turks. There also were many Armenians in Istanbul, since they had played a significant political and commercial role in the late Byzantine period. The catholicus of the Armenian church at the time of the conquest of Istanbul was at Echmiadzin, outside Ottoman territory in the Caucasus, and there was a rival see in Cilicia as well. When Mehmet II

recognized the Armenian millet in 1461, he brought the archbishop of Bursa, the highest-ranking Armenian official, into his empire and made him Armenian patriarch, giving him the same authority over his followers as was possessed by the Greek patriarch and the grand rabbi. The Armenian millet also was given authority over all subjects not included in the two other millets, most numerous among which were the Gypsies (called Kibti, or Copts, by the Arabs and Ottomans, apparently because of a mistaken identification of them with the original inhabitants of Egypt), the Assyrians, the Monophysites of Syria and Egypt, and the Bogomils of Bosnia, who were in fact doctrinally related to the Manicheans». (Shaw, p. 152. This too, as well as everything else that Shaw says on the millets on pages 151-3, comes right out of Gibb-Bowen, I², 214-232. Gibb-Bowen openly acknowledge that most of what they have written in this section they have taken from yet another secondary source, the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, with the icing on their cake being provided by unfounded statements in an even older secondary work, that of Lybyer which Ottomanists so belabor and criticize. But as we see once more, this book has remained fundamental in the works of so many historians of the Ottoman phenomenon).

When we shift to page 84, Prof. Shaw tells us something quite different about the origins and circumstances of the Armenian millet, that it was founded in the circumstances of the immediate aftermath of the battle of Marj Dabiq, where Selim I had defeated the Mameluke forces, 1516, and was organizing the newly conquered areas of Syria and Palestine.

«As Selim marched through Syria, he managed to conciliate the principal towns and provinces as well as the Bedouin tribal leaders and chiefs of the Muslim and non-Muslim religious groups. The Greek Orthodox had already been given their autonomous millet following the conquest of Constantinople, but the Armenian Gregorians were given their separate status only now in return for support against the Mamluks, with their patriarch promising loyalty and obedience to the sultan and his successors in return». (Shaw, p. 84. On p. 111, footnote no. 8 he gives a cryptic reference to TKS, E4312 (29) without further explanation. The reference is highly dubious for reasons to be discussed elsewhere).

Moving back to page 153, we see that the author discusses the effect of these further, Levantine conquests of Selim I on the millets. (Here our author continues his complete reliance on Gibb-Bowen, I², 224-31).

«The sixteenth-century conquests brought considerable changes to the millets. The conquest of the Arab world brought such an increase of Muslim subjects that they constituted a majority of the population for the first time, giving the Muslim millet a numerical dominance. However, the conquests brought sufficient numbers of new adherents to the non-Muslim millets to enable them to withstand the resulting pressures as well as the problems created by the increasing political, economic, and social stresses of the time. In so far as the Orthodox patriarch in particular was concerned the conquests of the Arab world, and later of Cyprus and Crete, brought under his control major new areas of Orthodox persuasion including the ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, which long had been sources of heresy in the church although they had been under Muslim rule since the seventh century. Bringing new patriarchates under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch inevitably increased his political problems in maintaining his primacy. But regulations issued by the sultan under the patriarch's influence prevented Arab and later Slavic natives from entering the higher ranks of the priesthood and began the process by which the Greek element emerged dominant. In so far as the Armenians were concerned, they were particularly affected by Selim I's conquests of the great centers of Armenian life following the defeat of the Safavids at Caldiran 1514. The seat of the catholicus now was incorporated into the empire, but overall authority within the millet continued to be exercised by the patriarch of Istanbul. It was at this time also that the struggles began between the Armenians, who attempted to establish themselves in a large section of eastern Anatolia between Greater and Lesser Armenia, and their current occupants, the Kurds, who resisted strongly all efforts to remove them from their homes. This created tensions and problems that also were to survive to modern times». (Shaw, 153. All of this, with slight alterations by Prof. Shaw, comes from Gibb I², 224 ff).

Such is the picture which Prof. Shaw gives, on pages 58-59, 84, 151-154, on the origins, development and historical circumstances and and finally of the forms of the millet system in the Ottoman empire during the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

Before proceeding to a detailed *demonstratio errorum* of his historico-descriptive analysis of this key Ottoman institution it would be well to give a brief description of this part of the work.

1. Practically all of the section on the millets is factually incorrect.

2. It reveals an almost complete ignorance of the structure and detailed history of the institution.

3. It is untouched by any knowledge of a history of the church in late Byzantine and Ottoman times.

4. It is based *entirely* on one secondary work, that of Gibb-Bowen, I², 214-232 (with the exception of the material on page 84 and its mysterious reference on page 111, no. 8).

5. Therefore, it repeats all (and they are profuse) the errors of Gibb-Bowen.

6. Further, Gibb-Bowen admittedly base their presentation very largely on the Encyclopedia Britannica. In one instance they refer to Lybyer's work, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent*, published seventy years ago (1913). Professor Shaw in blindly following Gibb-Bowen repeats perhaps the most absurd of all the many mistakes to be found in Gibb-Bowen on the millets (see below section discussing the Armenian millet).

7. He ignores completely, for he is not able to read it, an extensive and fundamental bibliography in Serbo-Croatian, Rumanian, Bulgarian and Greek (he also ignores the Arabic literature on the Coptic Church), which establishes the basic facts, history, and evolution of the Orthodox millet and this bibliography does so on the basis of the Ottoman primary sources as well as the Greek, Slavic, Rumanian, Latin, and Italian primary sources.

8. Prof. Shaw, further, in reproducing the materials which he takes from his sole secondary reference, Gibb-Bowen, occasionally subjects it to a historical anachronism based on strong chauvinist or nationalist ideas stemming from the historical developments of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

Let us glance first at the Orthodox millet. Prof. Shaw states, and then repeats the proposition that the geographical and jurisdictional authority of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate was greatly extended as a result of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and of the Arab lands in 1516.

«In 1454... the millet leaders...were given more extensive power over their followers than had been the case in the Christian states that had previously dominated them» (page 59).

Further: «The complete Ottoman conquest of Southeastern Europe once again united most of the Christians in the area, Greek and

Slav alike, under the authority of the Greek patriarchate» (Shaw, p. 59). Previous to these Ottoman conquests of the Balkans «The Orthodox had been divided into a number of independent patriarchates... with the Bulgarian patriarchate being established at Ohrid and Tironovo and those of the Serbs at Ipek in addition to the ecumenical Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Constantinople» (Shaw, p. 151-2).

In the sixteenth century Ottoman expansion in the east brought the churches of Cyprus, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria «under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch» (Shaw, p. 153). Prof. Shaw furnishes his reader with the background information necessary for the understanding of what this «incorporation» of the eastern patriarchates and churches meant for the patriarch of Constantinople. The incorporations of «...the ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, which long had been sources of heresy in the church although they had been under Muslim rule since the seventh century», also «increased inevitably his (the Constantinopolitan patriarch's) problems in maintaining his primacy» (Shaw, p. 153).

In addition, the reader goes on to learn, the great jurisdictional expansion of patriarchal authority, which Prof. Shaw sees in the purported subjection of the churches of the Balkans, Syria, Egypt, Palestine, Egypt, and Cyprus, is matched by the purported fact that for the first time the ecumenical patriarch acquired the right (from the Ottomans) to apply Orthodox religious law to the members of the Orthodox secular community.

In the time of Mehmed II the patriarch was given «...the right to apply Orthodox law to his followers in secular as well as religious matters from his headquarters in the Fener district of Istanbul, thus adding important secular responsibilities to his extensive religious duties» (Shaw, p. 152).

This concatenation of errors and false assumptions is based largely on Prof. Shaw's secondary source, Gibb-Bowen, and it is his only source.

Let us begin with the lesser and last mentioned information. In the time of Mehmed II the Greek patriarch was not resident in the Fener district but in the church of Pammacaristos, which the sultan Murad III in 1586 announced he would convert to a mosque. The patriarch eventually had to leave it and, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, had transferred the patriarchal residence and church to the district known in Turkish as Fener (Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1968, 189-91).

Second, the right of the patriarch to apply Orthodox law to his followers in secular as well as religious matters is nothing new in the period of the Ottoman empire. Had our author studied Byzantine legal and ecclesiastical history he would have learned that the episcopacy of the Orthodox church is already acknowledged as a legal instrument in the Byzantine legal codes of the fifth and sixth century, he would have also learned that Byzantine canon law (or Orthodox law as Prof. Shaw terms it) came increasingly to dominate many aspects of human and social relations in Byzantine and Balkan societies, and further that by the late Byzantine period the patriarchal and episcopal courts of Byzantium had already the legal and juridical authority which Prof. Shaw tells us was acquired by the church for the first time in Ottoman times. Further, the legal picture among the Christian *rāja* was much more complex than our author leads us to suspect. For side by side with the legal authority, law, and courts of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate there were urban and rural systems of law and courts presided over by the laity. This is described in great detail by Greek historians and by Greek historians of law (See for the subject as well as for further bibliography, A. Vacalopoulos, *Istoria tou neou Ellenismou. Tourkokratia 1453-1669* (Thessaloniki, 1964), vol. II). Thus Prof. Shaw's reliance on one secondary source, his neglect of the relevant secondary bibliography, his inability to read the relevant Greek bibliography, and his total neglect of primary sources have conspired to put him in a very unscholarly predicament.

His error in referring to the Fener district as patriarchal residence in the fifteenth and sixteenth century as well as his lack of knowledge about the legal and juridical functions of the Byzantine church prior to the Ottoman conquest are nevertheless of minor stature when compared to the magnitude of errors which follow one another pell mell in this short section on the Orthodox millet. Similarly, he reveals his close dependence on Gibb-Bowen when he repeats their statement on the emergence of heresy in the lands of the Levant. The ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria... «had long been sources of heresy in the church although they had been under Muslim rule since the seventh century» (Shaw, 153). First, the patriarchates themselves had never been sources of heresy. On the contrary, they opposed heresy, or what they considered to be heresy. Second, the heresies that were spawned in the Levant were spawned outside the patriarchates by groups not acknowledging the patriarchate. Third, Prof. Shaw leads the reader to suppose that these heresies were spawned despite the

fact that the Levant was ruled by Muslims since the seventh century, in other words that they arose after the seventh century. In fact all the major heresies had arisen by the fourth and fifth centuries, long before Muslim rule. Further, it seems to be implied that they arose despite Muslim rule, which of course is irrelevant.

What of Professor Shaw's assertion that the Ottoman conquests meant the sudden expansion, geographical and jurisdictional, of the power of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate over the entirety of Balkan Orthodox and over the churches of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Cyprus? In this statement one sees that he and Gibb-Bowen, his secondary source, have not comprehended the nature of ecclesiastical polity in the Orthodox church, a polity which differs radically from that of the Catholic church in the West and which cannot be used analogously to comprehend Orthodox ecclesiology. The Catholic Church developed in such a manner that it acquired administrative jurisdiction and authority over the entirety of the Catholic Church. Such a hierarchical structuring of ecclesiastical power and hierarchy was foreign to the Orthodox tradition.

What developed in the Orthodox realm, historically, was the tandem of conciliar authority and autonomous churches. Thus the concept of the supreme authority of the supreme bishop, in the Catholic church the Pope, was foreign to Byzantium where all decisions at every level, episcopal and patriarchal were taken by the appropriate synod, in which the chief ecclesiastic had but one vote, equal to the one vote of any other member of the assembly. This tradition continued right down through the Ottoman empire so that the patriarch was in no way supreme but merely a member of the synod. Second, in the Orthodox church, or more appropriately the Orthodox churches, there is a series of autonomous churches, both in Byzantine and post Byzantine times. That is to say that each of these autonomous churches is/was independent in the running of its own affairs. It is self-sufficient. This theory was worked out in the historical practice of the Byzantine era and was sanctioned, always, as the guiding principle of the Orthodox polity. Thus already in the fourth and fifth centuries the Byzantine canon law established the principle that no bishop may tread upon the diocese and flock of another. Consequently, the churches of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Cyprus were completely independent, jurisdictionally from one another. Later on the churches of Bulgaria and Serbia similarly achieved autonomous jurisdictional standing. Having said enough about the conciliar

liar and patriarchal theory of the Orthodox church, let us return to the statements of Prof. Shaw. «In so far as the Orthodox patriarch was concerned, the conquests of the Arab world, and later of Cyprus..., brought under its control major new areas of Orthodox persuasion including the ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria...(and) bringing new patriarchates under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch inevitably increased his political problems in maintaining his primacy» (Shaw, p. 153).

In reality the incorporation of the eastern patriarchates and the autonomous church of Cyprus into the territorial boundaries of the Ottoman empire in the sixteenth century did not affect their jurisdictional status within the world of Orthodox Christianity one iota. They remained as they were before, completely autonomous from one another, recognizing as always the honorary primacy of the patriarch of Constantinople, the patriarch of the New Rome. They continued to administer their churches through their own synods, independently of the Constantinopolitan patriarch and the Constantinopolitan synod. They did not, as Prof. Shaw relates, come under the «control» and under the «jurisdiction» of the patriarch of Constantinople. Therefore, the eastern expansion of the Ottomans in the sixteenth century did not bring «considerable changes» to the Orthodox church of Constantinople. Further, it follows that contrary to Prof. Shaw's assertion that «bringing new patriarchates under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch inevitably increased his political problems in maintaining his primacy», there was no problem at all. First, as we saw, these newly entered patriarchates (newly entered into the Ottoman Empire) did not come under the jurisdiction of the patriarchal. Second, they never contested the primacy of the patriarch of Constantinople, the bishop of New Rome. They always acknowledged his honorary primacy, but at the same time they retained full jurisdictional control (together with their synods) within their own patriarchates.

So much for the effects of the conquest of the Ottomans in the sixteenth century Levant on the churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Cyprus. But how about the situation in the Balkans? On page 59 he asserts: «The complete conquest of Southeastern Europe (under Mehmed II) once again united most of the Christians in the area, Greek and Slav alike, under the authority of the Greek patriarchate».

«The Orthodox had been divided into a number of independent

patriarchates before the Ottoman conquest, with the Bulgarian patriarchate being established at Ohrid and Tirnovo and those of the Serbs at Ipek in addition to the ecumenical Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Constantinople. But their rites and doctrine were more or less the same except for language, so that Mehmet II was able to unify them under the leadership of the patriarch of Constantinople soon after the conquest» (Shaw 151-2). Thus for Prof. Shaw the total result of Mehmed's conquest of Balkans, in the domain of the millet system was that it resulted in the suppression of all the independent Orthodox churches in the Balkans (save that of Constantinople) and their complete subjection to the church of Constantinople. Let us begin with his assertion that there was a number of patriarchates in the Balkans on the eve of the Ottoman conquests: The Bulgarian patriarchate at Ohrid and Tirnovo; the Serbian patriarchates of the Serbs at Ipek; the patriarchate of Constantinople. First, it should be noted that there was only one Bulgarian patriarchate and it had been at Tirnovo. Similarly, there was only one Serbian patriarchate at Pec (Ipek). The church of Ohrid was not a patriarchate, but was instead an autonomous metropolitanate, long established as an autonomous church and often at odds with the churches of Serbia and Bulgaria. Thus when Basil II suppressed the Bulgarian patriarchate he nevertheless retained the special position of Ohrid as the autonomous center of the Bulgarian church, giving to Ohrid's prelate a very high position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. It remained in and retained a special status. Thus it was not a patriarchate at the time of the Ottoman conquests, but still retained its special status as an autonomous archbishopric free of Constantinople (usually its archbishop had been appointed by the emperor) (See Ostrogorsky, 311, *passim*).

Thus we see that Ochrid was not a patriarchate at the time of the Ottoman conquests, but an autonomous church, a status which it seems to have retained after the conquest, with the result that it was not under the immediate jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan patriarch either before or after the conquest, in the period that concerns us here. The autonomy of the church of Ochrid was not suppressed until 1767, well within the so-called Phanariote period (Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge, 1968, 379-80).

Well then, what of the Serbian patriarchate? Prof. Shaw relates that it was also suppressed at the time of the Balkan conquests and the entirety of the Serbian church was placed under the jurisdiction of

Constantinople. Is this in fact true? Shaw uses only the work of Gibb-Bowen, I², and bases his assertion on the entire status of the church in the Balkans upon what these two authors say in this work. As we saw, this was based largely on the articles of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, hardly the stuff of which primary research results. Earlier on it was mentioned that the bibliographical literature of modern Balkan scholarship is extremely important and cannot be ignored. Unfortunately Prof. Shaw does not know the contents of this scholarly literature and so he delivers himself of opinions in this instance that he found in an older secondary work, which in turn found the material in a much older and an even more unsatisfactory secondary work. Most important for the question of the fate of the Serbian church during the long period of Ottoman rule of the Yugoslav lands, is the second volume of the joint work, *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije: Od pocetka XVI-do kraja XVIII veka* (Belgrade, 1960) (A History of the Yugoslav Peoples; From the beginning of the Sixteenth to the End of the Eighteenth Century). The work, 1, 335 pages in length, meets the highest scholarly standards, even after its Marxist orientation is taken into account, and is based on a rigorous examination first of all of the Ottoman sources, secondarily on the other primary sources in Greek, Latin, Italian, and Slavic languages, and finally it is completely conversant with the international bibliography on the subject. The fact that it is not even mentioned in Prof. Shaw's bibliography indicates the degree to which his scholarly enterprise is deficient. This is the treatment of the Yugoslav lands during the Ottoman rule, par excellence.

What, then, does this massive work tell us about the Serbian church under the Ottomans. Did it in effect completely disappear and was the Serbian church completely suborned to the church of Constantinople?

Chapter four of this monumental work is entitled «Status and Role of the Serbian Church» and the first section is entitled «Conditions of the Serbian Church in the fifteenth and the beginning of the Sixteenth century». (Chapter four occupies pages 98-108 in the second volume). It is relevant to translate the appropriate sections, keeping in mind Prof. Shaw's assertions.

«The Serbian church was preserved under Turkish rule. After the fall of Smederevo (1459) in the time of the Patriarch Arsenij II (1457-63), the Turks recognized the Patriarchate of Pec and imposed tribute upon it. After Arsenij II there is mention of Jovan, in 1508-1509, who 'held the throne of Saint Sava'. In the second half of the fifteenth cen-

ture and in the first decades of the sixteenth century Bosnian monks, according to documents from the monastery of Fojnice, complained to the sultan that the Serbian patriarch (sirf patrijarj) imposed taxes on them. As a result of this, firmans were issued by which these (taxes) were prohibited. These sources not only clearly prove that the Serbian church existed at that time but they also prove that the church was recognized by Turkish authority...»

The author continues: «It appears that at that time the north of Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro were under the jurisdiction of an independent Serbian church and that from 1455 the southern eparchies of the patriarchate of Pec and Pec itself belonged to the archbishopric of Ohrid.

«Actually there are monasteries and churches which on the occasion of the Turkish conquest were burned, and even some of the most beautiful churches in the cities were converted to mosques. Also, the largest monasteries lost a great part of their enormous property. But it was not true that they were completely neglected and that they lost everything.

«The relations of Turkish authority toward the Serbian church, up to 1525, were tolerant, especially in northern Serbia. The church retained some of its property» (op. cit., II, 98).

The author goes on to reveal the further evolutions in the history of the Serbian church in this early Ottoman period.

«The rebellion of Pavle, bishop of Smederevo, which began in 1528, reveals that some years before this the Serbian church has been abolished and was subject to the archbishopric of Ohrid (op. cit. 99). But the Serbian clergy had resisted this development.

«When Prochor, Archbishop of Ohrid, called a synod in order to suppress the resistance, the bishops of the independent Serbian church refused to respond. They elected Pavle the bishop of Smederevo, as their archbishop. In this struggle Pavle succeeded for a period in throwing the archbishop of Ohrid into jail. He seized Pec and was acclaimed patriarch, removing those bishops who acknowledged the authority of the archbishop of Ohrid. The structure of the Serbian church in northern Serbia, especially economically, was based on the strong support of the Serbian clergy. The movement enjoyed the full support of the feudal and semi-feudal representatives of the Serbian people and of the rich urban class. It emerges clearly in the documents that Pavel obtained abundant financial support so that his success was

obtained through bribery. But this movement of the Serbian clergy must have had, for other reasons, the support of the local Turkish authority in the sancak of Smederevo. One must take into consideration that the sancakbey of Smederevo at that time was carrying on raids into the south Hungarian regions and had to seek support among the Serbian people, and so he would have the advantage (of the support) from the group of the *martolos*.

«With the support of the Constantinopolitan patriarch and supported by a sultanic order, Prochor was obliged to summon a new synod in Ohrid, 1532, at which were represented all eparchies and from northern Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro. A good part of the Serbian bishops was removed along with the throne (patriarchal) and new bishops were appointed. Pavle was present at the synod but as a deposed bishop.... (op. cit. 100-1).

«Though the movement of the Serbian clergy suffered defeat, because the existing independent Serbian church remained under the archbishopric of Ohrid, nevertheless the decisions of the synod of Ohrid could not effect them (clerics). Some of the removed bishops, far away in their seats, created new opposition. The Serbian clergy thus far away, elected archbishops although they were not officially recognized. Moreover some of the bishops anathematized by the synod of Ohrid were elected archbishop. So that the division (between the two groups) would be pacified, after the death of Prochor, Simeon the bishop of Sasca was elected archbishop of Ohrid, but it (the condition) remained in the same state for a whole half century» (op. cit. 100-101).

What is to be surmised from these details, details emerging from contemporary primary sources? First, the Serbian patriarchate had not only not been suppressed at the time of the Ottoman conquests, it in effect was officially recognized by the Turks. As such it existed as an independent church down to some time just prior to 1532, at which time we see that it had been temporarily suppressed. In 1532 the Serbian clergy rebelled and attempted to revive the patriarchate of Pec, succeeded briefly only to be defeated and its movement undone. Second, the Serbian church was for the time being subjected to another independent church, the archbishopric of Ohrid, not to the church of Constantinople. This church seems at that time to have been manned by archbishops of Slavic and not Greek origin at... for we see that Prochor was succeeded by the Slavic bishop of Rasca. Thus, the Constantinopolitan patriarchate has still not taken over the Serbian church.

But the Serbian church soon regained its independence and its patriarchal status in 1557 when it was revived by the Ottoman grand vizir Mehmed Sokolović, who appointed his brother Makarij as patriarch. «The patriarchate of Pec retained under its jurisdiction northern Macedonia to the south, and part of Bulgaria to the east, Montenegro, Vojvodina, Bosnia, as also the Serbs who inhabited Croatia, Dalmatia and Hungary. The patriarchate had about 40 metropolitans and bishops» (op. cit. II, 101-2).

For further details on the position of the Serbian church under the Ottomans, see: P. Radoman et al., *Pravni položaj i karakter srpske crkve pod turskom vlašću (1459-1766)* (Belgrade, 1965), 60-69, and passim; B. Djurdjev, *Uloga crkve u starijoj istoriji srpskog naroda* (Sarajevo, 1964), 104-121, and passim; *Srpska pravoslavna crkva 1219-1969* (Belgrade, 1969), the article by D. Kashich, «Srpska crkva pod turskom vlašću», especially pp. 140-8, and ff. The newly reestablished patriarchate of the Serbs had important revenues and taxed its flock according to its needs. The tax burden of the faithful began to increase as the demands of the Ottoman authorities became such that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Ottoman government demanded some 100,000 akches annually from the patriarch, and indeed this came to be the common plight of all the patriarchates (op. cit., 101-2). The reconstituted patriarchate of the Serbs at Pec continued for almost two centuries until about 1755. Then it became an autonomous metropolitanate for a few years and was suppressed finally in 1766 one year before the suppression of the other autonomous metropolitanate of Ohrid (1767) (Runciman, op. cit., 379-80). The suppression of these two autonomous churches, independent of the patriarchate of Constantinople up until this late date, ushers in the Phanariote period of these churches.

Thus not only is Prof. Shaw in error when he asserts that the independent churches had passed under the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate at the time of the Balkan conquests of Mehmet II in the fifteenth century, but he is guilty of a gross anachronism. For he asserts that «regulations issued by the sultan under the patriarch's influence prevented..Slavic natives from entering the higher ranks of the priesthood and began the process by which the Greek element emerged dominant» (Shaw, op. cit., 153). It is obvious from the brief summary of the churches of Pec and Ohrid under the Ottomans, indeed from the mid - fifteenth century until the second half of the

eighteenth century (a period of over 300 years), that these two churches never lost, basically, their Slavic character or their autonomy. Thus Shaw attributes to this long period of Ottoman history conditions which came to prevail in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, when there arose truly national conflicts over control of the various Orthodox churches. This is further motivated by the desire to show that two Christian groups in particular, the Greeks and the Armenians, were the exploiters of the subject peoples and not the Ottomans themselves. (See in detail his treatment of the Rumanians under the Phanariotes).

This combination of anachronism and chauvinist sentiments that arose in the historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth century is again apparent in Prof. Shaw's treatment of the rise of the millets particularly in the case of the Armenians. It is not necessary to go into any detail as to his contradictory statement that the Armenian millet and patriarchate were created (1) by Mehmed II in 1461, (2) by Selim I in 1516. In effect there is no contemporary evidence whatever that the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople was created at either of these two dates. But it is of some interest to notice how Prof. Shaw treats the subject more generally. After Selim I's victory at Caldiran in 1514 many Armenian-inhabited regions were incorporated into the Ottoman Empire. «The seat of the catholicos now was incorporated into the empire, but overall authority within the millet continued to be exercised by the patriarch of Istanbul. It was at this time also that the struggles began between the Armenians, who attempted to establish themselves in large sections of eastern Anatolia between Greater and Lesser Armenia, and their current occupants, the Kurds, who resisted strongly all efforts to remove them from their homes. This created tensions and problems that also were to survive to modern times» (Shaw, 153). The infusion of modern political problems into this event of the early sixteenth century is so crude as to merit some time and attention. Prof. Shaw gives no primary source for the assertion that there was a mass movement of Armenians into these areas, and further that they attempted to dispossess the Kurds of their homes, that the Kurds resisted this violent action on the part of the predatory Armenians, and that thereby the Armenians were the cause-originators of «tensions and problems that also were to survive to modern times». One must assume that what Prof. Shaw is conveying rather unsubtly to his reader is that the Armenians were the ultimate cause of the Armenian massacres because shortly after 1516 they came en masse into eastern Anatolia and began to take away the homes of the Kurds. It

is, I must admit, a novel theory and one that I hear for the first time... though the same has been asserted by Prof. Shaw for later times, and is after all not so new to us. Not only does Prof. Shaw not give us the archival or primary sources for this statement, he fails to mention even a secondary work which might be the source of the information.

Where might he have found such information? When in doubt as to the origin of portions of Prof. Shaw's first volume the safest bet is to go to *Uzunçarsili*, the *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, and then to Gibb-Bowen. In this case the matrix for the entirety of what he says on the millets is exclusively the relevant section of Gibb-Bowen I². Further, Prof. Shaw's section on the purported migration of Armenians into parts of Eastern Anatolia and their attempts to violate the property of the Kurds is somehow related to Gibb-Bowen, I 2, 227, the text of which follows:

«The Armenian provinces had long been distracted by wars, invasions and raids. The Selcukid invasion had been followed by the Mongol, the Mongol by that of Timur. The Turkmen dynasties of the Black and White Sheep had ravaged the whole country and fought out their quarrels with grievous consequences to its prosperity. The numbers of the Armenians had been greatly depleted both by sudden death and emigration; and into the lands thus vacated enterprising Kurdish tribes from the south and southeast had pushed their way, till the more southerly parts of what had been Armenia had become as much Kurdish as Armenian in population. When this region was acquired by Selim he found it a prey to local feuds, and determined to reorganize it. In the anarchy much of the arable land in the valleys and plains had been abandoned by its inhabitants, who had sought refuge in the mountains. The Ottoman policy was to re-people the vacant lands with Kurds; to divide the whole area up into small sancaks; and to place those that were easily accessible under the control of officials appointed by the Porte, leaving the rest in that of local chieftains. This was to favor the Kurds, who had aided Selim against Isma'il, because the latter had sought to control their depredations. Although, therefore, the Ottoman conquest restored some tranquility to the region, it was in the long run deleterious to the Armenians, since it added to their disabilities as Dimmis a dominance by their mortal enemies the Kurds. As long as the central government remained strong enough to maintain some kind of control through its officials, a certain balance was maintained between the two races. But in later times the Kurds had matters all their own way and the Armenians suffered accordingly».

Now as we have seen, Prof. Shaw relies completely on Gibb-Bowen for his utterances on the millet system, and he reproduces faithfully Gibb-Bowen's contents, even down to their manifold errors. Thus it is not surprising to see that in the case of this aspect of the Armenian millet, i.e. their relations with the Kurds in the sixteenth century there too he takes the theme from Gibb-Bowen, but he intentionally reverses the series of cause and effect. Whereas Gibb-Bowen assert that the Kurds were brought into the eastern Anatolian regions in large numbers and the Armenians suffered in both the short and long term, Prof. Shaw turns this round and makes the Kurds the innocent victims of rapacious Armenians who begin to come into the region in large numbers and who then attempt to seize the homes of the Kurds. The apparent intent of the author is further evident when one considers the following difference of detail in the two texts. Gibb-Bowen assert that Selim brought the Kurds into the area: «This was to favor the Kurds, who had aided Selim against Ismai'il, because the latter had sought to *control their depredations*». Prof. Shaw asserts that after 1514 the Armenians «attempted to establish themselves in large sections of eastern Anatolia» (Shaw, 153). Further, he says, Selim favored the Armenians «in return for support against the Mamluks» (Shaw, 84). The subject and its insertion at this point in Prof. Shaw's narratives clearly fit into the contents and sequence on the millets which he has apparently taken right out of Gibb-Bowen. But the reversal of the roles of Armenians and Kurds is intentional, so it would seem, and as was mentioned above he apparently wishes to trace to this so-called 'fact' the ultimate cause of the Armenian massacres. That is to say, the Armenians first provoked the peaceful Kurds and as a result of a strong Armenian immigration into the area the latter began to take the homes of the Kurds arbitrarily. The passage in Prof. Shaw's work is both anachronistic and nationalistic. Further, it would seem to be an intentional attempt to distort Ottoman history in order to prepare the unsuspecting reader for what he has to say about Armenians in volume two of his book.

A careful examination of the demographic studies of some of these regions, studies carried out on the basis of the tahrir defers of the Ottoman archives, seem to confirm Gibb-Bowen and would support the proposition that indeed Prof. Shaw has intentionally reversed the roles of Kurds and Armenians without consulting the Ottoman archives. Let us look at the demographic studies carried out for the sancaks of Mardin and Bayburt in the first half of the sixteenth century, by two

serious and trustworthy Turkish scholars and on the basis of the Ottoman archives. I do not go into the question of «hane» here, nor the degree to which tahrir defters are completely accurate demographically. They are important indications which must be taken into account.

<i>Sancak of Mardin</i>	<i>Muslims</i>	<i>Christians</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Total</i>
1518	26,896 57.25 %	19,621 41.75 %	480 1.05 %	46,997
1526	58,115 78.43 %	15,882 21.43 %	103 1.4 %	74,100
1540	58,267 72.93 %	20,962 26.24 %	664 0.83 %	79,893

(N. Goyunç, XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı, Istanbul, 1969, 81-88.).

<i>Sancak of Bayburt</i>	<i>Muslims</i>	<i>Christians</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Total</i>
1516	5,585 25.4 %	16,391 74.6 %		21,976
1520	32,277 51.3 +	30,665 48.7 %		62,942
1530	19,866 46.4 +	22,928 53.6 %		42,794

(I. Miroğlu, XVI. Yüzyılda Bayburt Sancağı, Istanbul, 1975, p. 119, table no. X. Other studies give us set figures for single years and thus do not allow us to trace the fluctuation over a period of years. N. Goyunç, «Onaltıncı yüzyılın ilk yarısında Diyarbakır, «Belgelerle Türk Tarih Dergisi, no. 7, 76-80; M. Sertoğlu, «XVI yüzyılda Erzincan», Belgelerle Türk Tarih Dergisi, no. 8, 76-80; this latter study confirms what Gibb-Bowen say about the relative depopulation which Selim and Suleyman found in eastern Anatolia and their measures to repopulate the region. In 1534 the city was almost entirely empty, only 21 families in 27 mahals, whereas 51 years later there are 1,450 Muslims and 1,250 Christians. Also, T. Gökbilgin, «XVI asır başlarında Kayseri şehre ve livası», 60 doğum yılı münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Toğan'a Armagan (Istanbul, 1950-1955), 91-108. See also, İslam Ansiklopedisi, «Bayburt», 366.

The statistics for the sancak of Mardin show clearly that in 1518 there were 26, 896 Muslims, 19, 621 Christians and 480 Jews, and this just after the occupation of the area by the Ottomans. In 1540 the population consisted of 58,267 Muslims, 20,962 Christians, and 664

Jews. In terms of absolute growth the Muslims have increased by 31,371, a growth of 117% whereas the Christians only show an absolute growth of 1,341 or 6.83 or little less than 7%.

The sancak of Bayburt in 1516 immediately after its conquest had 5,585 Muslims and 16,391 Christians for a total of 21,972. In 1530 the Muslims were 19,866 and the Christians 22,928 for a total of 42,794. In terms of absolute growth the Muslims had increased by 14,281 or 256%, the Christians had increased by 6,537 or by 40%.

We see then that the very substantial growth of population in both provinces is primarily due to the influx of large numbers of Muslims, not of Christians.

Absolute growth of Muslims in the two provinces	45,652
Absolute growth of Christians in the two provinces	7,878
Absolute growth of Jews in the two provinces	184
Total absolute growth	<hr/> 53,714
Total pop. of 2 provinces in 1514-16	68,973
Total pop. of 2 provinces in 1530-40	122,687

Of the total absolute growth of population in these two provinces, the Muslims account for 45,652 or about 85% whereas the Christians account for 7,878 or little less than 15%.

Thus we come back to Prof. Shaw's strange statement that «It was at this time...that the struggles began between the Armenians who attempted to establish themselves in large sections of eastern Anatolia between Greater and Lesser Armenia, and their current occupants, the Kurds, who resisted strongly all efforts to remove them from their homes».

As we saw from these partial samplings of statistics, in these two sancaks at least, the massive immigration consisted of Muslims and not of Christians, and if there were pressure on the land and the tak-

ing of «homes» it could not have come from the side of the Christians who only accounted for a little less than 15% of the total population increase, at least in the areas which have so far been studied.

Not only has Prof. Shaw distorted, intentionally, his secondary source (Gibb-Bowen) which reveals that the massive influx of populations into eastern Anatolia after the Ottoman conquest were Muslim (Kurd), but it was their traditional predatory behaviour which in the long term contributed to the disorder and violence of the region. When one realizes Prof. Shaw's long standing theories on the Armenian massacres of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century then the suspicion of manipulation of the historical facts of the sixteenth century lies heavily upon him.

Before moving on to other demographic distortions in the book of Prof. Shaw, induced, it would seem, by the strong grip of nineteenth-twentieth century anachronistic and chauvinistic historiography which so heavily permeates Prof. Shaw's outlook, let us finish with his statement on the status of the Armenian millet-patriarchate. He writes on page 152:

«The Armenian millet also was given authority over all subjects not included in the two other millets, most numerous among which were the Gypsies.... the Assyrians, the Monophysites of Syria and Egypt, and the Bogomils of Bosnia, who were in fact doctrinally related to the Manichees».

This seems, on first sight, a bizarre statement, and indeed Prof. Shaw gives no reference to a primary source or to secondary literature for this statement. But once more he bases himself completely on Gibb-Bowen, I², page 226, who relate:

«A curious feature of the Armenian millet was that besides Armenians proper it was held to include all the subjects of the sultans otherwise unclassified». (Lybyer, *The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Sulayman the Magnificent*, in note no. 5, pages 34-35, says: «All who were not Muslims or Greek Orthodox», ignoring the Jewish millet, which had undoubtedly been recognized earlier. He, who is the source for Gibb and Bowen on this matter, relied on yet another secondary work, Steen (see below) 61-62, who states that the Jews were at first included in the Armenian millet).

Gibb and Bowen thus make this general statement, transmitted by Prof. Shaw in his book, on the basis of a secondary source, Lybyer, note no. 5, pp. 34-35:

«For the time when these different communities were formed within the Ottoman state see Steen de Jehay, *passim* (Steen de Jehay, Le comte F. Van Den, *De la situation legale des sujets ottomans non-musulmans*, Brussels, 1906). In brief, the Greek community was organized in 1453, and the Armenian in 1461. The latter was at first supposed to include all subjects who were not Moslem or Greek Orthodox; those who were not Gregorian Armenians were gradually separated off by a process of differentiation which may be said to be active still».

Though Prof. Shaw has given no reference to his strange statement that for a period of time in the development of the millet system all the non Greek-Orthodox Christians, including the Bogomils, were included within the administrative structure of the Armenian millet-patriarchate, it is obvious that he took this data, completely uncritically from Gibb-Bowen, I², 226. As we have seen Gibb-Bowen in turn took it, equally uncritically from another secondary source, Lybyer, pp. 34-35. He in turn took it, in the same uncritical way, from yet another secondary work, Steen de Jehay 61-62, and *passim*. In fact this is historical scholarship at its worst for we are in the presence of four generations of the passing on of what someone else has said. For four generations there was no attempt to see what the primary sources said, and for four generations no one stopped to examine the *prima facie* evidence of such a paradoxical statement. It makes no sense in and of itself and so someone during this four generations of false historical 'hadiths' should have queried the inherent improbability that all of these disparate, widespread groups could have been under the direction of a patriarchate that had not as yet been established!

Just as there was an extensive scholarly literature for the Serbian church after the Ottoman conquest, which Prof. Shaw should have consulted but did not (he could not handle, it would seem the language), so there is an extensive literature for the Monophysite churches which he should have consulted and which would have kept him from repeating the age-old myth which he found in Gibb-Bowen as to the supposed incorporation of Jacobite, Coptic Christians, Gypsies and Bogomils in the non-existent Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople. For example, B. Spuler in his *Die morgenländischen Kirchen* (Leiden, 1964) published 12 years before the appearance of Prof. Shaw's volume, sets all these matters straight.

P. 258: «Der Sultan übertrug dem Patriarchen weitgehende Vollmachten über die inneren Angelegenheiten seiner Glaubengenossen nach

dem Vorbilde des Ökumenischen Patriarchen, dem die Oberaufsicht über alle Orthodoxen des Türkischen Reiches (auch nicht-griechischer Nationalität) eingeräumt wurde. Anders als bei diesem fiel freilich bei den Armeniern Religion und Nationalität völlig zusammen: mit den syrischen Monophysiten oder den Kopten hatte ein armenisches Kirchenoberhaupt jurisdiktionell nie etwas zu tun».

He also goes on to say that there was a polyarchy in the Armenian church. There was a catholicus of Etchmiadzin, a patriarch of Jerusalem, a catholicate on Aghtamar for the Van region, and the catholicus of Sis.

«Wenn auch der armenische Patriarch von Konstantinopel während der Blütezeit des osmanischen Reiches ohne Zweifel der rechtliche Vertreter seiner Kirche gegenüber dem Sultan und damit gegenüber dem Staate war, so war doch das hierarchische und jurisdiktionelle Verhältnis zwischen diesen verschiedenen Katholikaten und Patriarchaten nicht geregelt, ein Zustand der sich im Wesentlichen bis auf heutigen Tag erhalten hat...jurisdiktionelle Streitigkeiten mussten wiederholt durch muslimische Herrscher geschlichtet werden». As for the Coptic church, he indicates that it was never under the Armenian church (see above) and that it continued its existence under its own patriarchs following the Ottoman conquest.

P. 298: «Im Gegensatz zu der Behandlung der Ökumenischen Patriarchen und ihres Klerus durch die Türken selbst kamen aber Eingriffe in die Hierarchie (of the Coptic church) so gut wie nicht vor. Während mancher Konstantinopoler Patriarch hingerichtet und viele (nach bis zu fünf Regierungsperioden) wiederholt abgesetzt wurden, so dass die durchschnittliche Regierungszeit dieser Kirchenfürsten zwischen dem 16. und 18. Jh. nur zweieinhalb Jahre betrug, blieben die koptischen Patriarchen unbehelligt und regierten oft Jahrzehntlang bis zu ihrem Ableben (z.B. gab es in den 105 Jahren zwischen 1484 und 1589 nur drei Patriarchen».

The 'reigns' of the Coptic patriarchs during this early period just before and long after the Ottoman conquest of Egypt by the Ottomans is also set out by Iskandar, *Tarih al-Kanisat al-Qibtiyat*, vol. II.

As for the Jacobite church Spuler, pp. 211-213, notes the existence of the patriarchal lists for the period following the Timurid invasion, though we know little of the life of the forty or so Christian communities around the Tur Abdin area which were Aramaic speaking, as well as other of the communities. But he traces, in skimpy lines, pp.

210-211, the continuity of the patriarchal position in Ottoman times down into the seventeenth century, and there is no mention of the imaginary subservience to the patriarch of the Armenian church.

Recapitulation of the 24 errors in Prof. Shaw's section on the millets.

1. When Mehmed II revived the Greek patriarchate it was installed in the Fener district (it moved there only in the seventeenth century).

2. The Orthodox patriarchs applied religious law to the lay Orthodox for the first time when Mehmed gave them the right to do so (they had always done so under the Byzantine emperors).

3. Mehmed gave the Greek Orthodox freedom against union with Rome (this is not a freedom, it is a negative «freedom» at best, since there is no choice. What the sultans did was to disallow the possibility of union with Rome. It would have been outside of the realm of possibility for the Orthodox to choose union as no sultan would have allowed it).

4. The Greek patriarchs were given more powers than they had ever had before (theoretically they had exactly the same powers as under the emperors, though less so than they had had before the creation of the Bulgarian and Serbian patriarchates. Further they now had a powerful sultan of a different faith over them, and they were controlled and changed much more ruthlessly and frequently).

5. The conquests of the sultans united a majority of the Balkan Christians under the patriarchate of Constantinople (the majority of the Balkan Christians seems still to have been under ecclesiastical authority other than that of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. Serbs had their own patriarchate down to the second half of the eighteenth century; Ochrid remained an autonomous archbishopric. The Bogomils did not come under the patriarchate of Constantinople nor did the Catholics of Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia and Albania).

6. There had been a Bulgarian patriarchate at Trnovo and Ochrid prior to the Balkan conquests (only at Trnovo).

7. Ochrid was a patriarchate (it was an autonomous archbishopric).

8. There were many Armenians in Constantinople prior to the fall of 1453 (they seem to have been rather few).

9. The Armenians exercised great political and economic impor-

tance in Constantinople on the eve of the Turkish conquest of the city (they were insignificant in politics and commerce. They had long been replaced by Italians in both domains. Armenian prominence in Constantinople is over by the late eleventh century).

10. The Serbs had patriarchates (they had but one patriarchate).

11. Mehmed created the Armenian patriarchate in Constantinople in 1461 (not the case).

12. The Armenian patriarchate thus 'constituted' was given jurisdiction over all non-Muslims not in the millets of the Orthodox or of the Jews. (This was not the case as the independent patriarchates of most of these continued to exist).

13. Assyrians, Jacobites, Copts were under the Armenian patriarchate (not so).

14. Selim established the Armenian millet in 1516 for support the Armenians rendered him against the Mamelukes (both assertions are incorrect).

15. The Ottoman conquest caused the extension of the authority of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate (the church of Cyprus remained autonomous after the conquest, as it had been before, and as it remains today).

16. After the Ottoman conquests of the Levant and Egypt the Greek patriarchates of the east came under the jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch of Constantinople (they never did so and always retained their ecclesiastical autonomy as in Byzantine times).

17. Heresies proliferated in the eastern patriarchates from the seventh century despite the fact that they were ruled by Muslims (a series of non-sequiturs. Whether heresy 'flourished' or not, had nothing to do with Muslim rule in the Umayyad and Abbasid period. The heresies arose in the 4-6th centuries and therefore well before Islamic rule. Further, they did not flourish within the churches of these eastern patriarchates but outside of them).

18. The inclusion of these eastern lands into the Ottoman empire created political problems for the Constantinopolitan patriarch in terms of maintaining his primacy vis-a-vis the other Greek patriarchates (no such problem was created as the eastern Greek patriarchates always acknowledged the preeminence of the patriarch of New Rome=Constantinople, which in no way infringed upon their own autonomy).

19. The sultan issued regulations under the influence of the pa-

triarch limiting Arab and Slavic ability to rise in the ecclesiastical hierarchy (no such Ottoman regulation exists and Prof. Shaw gives no reference to a primary source indicating its existence. Second, the Serbs had their own patriarchate, and there was an autonomous archbishopric of Ochrid, both independent of Constantinople to the second half of the eighteenth century, and thus there was a domination of these churches by the Slavic hierarchy).

20. The authority of the Armenian patriarch was extended over all Armenian churches in 1514 (As Spuler has indicated, there was a system of polyarchy at that time in the Armenian churches).

21. The Armenians suddenly flock into eastern Anatolia after 1514 (they were already there, whatever was left of them).

22. The Armenians attempted to take away the houses of the Kurds in that region (there is no single reference in the sources to this, and if anything it was the massive influx of Kurds which caused any strain on land and housing that might have conceivably occurred. But at that time the area was so depopulated that there does not seem to have been any of the kind of tensions that Prof. Shaw puts forth in his book).

23. This effort of the Armenians to take away, by force, the homes of the Kurds is at the base of the «later difficulties» i.e. the Armenian massacres (since there is no evidence for his earlier assertion that the Armenians tried to take away, by force, the homes of the Kurds in the early sixteenth century, this proposition too is built on false assumptions).

24. Therefore, the Kurds resisted the taking away of their homes by the Armenians (proposition which is the erroneous extension of false premises as above).

Two other examples, demographic, that have nothing to do with eastern Anatolia reinforce this suspicion of falsification of historical facts consequent to positions taken in historical issues of modern times.

As heated in these days as the issue of the Armenian massacres is the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the entire embroglio of Greeks and Turks beginning with the pogrom that destroyed the large and prosperous Greek community of Istanbul in 1955. (That this was a pogrom of major proportions is indicated not only by the foreign correspondents who were in the city at the time, but by Turkish sources as well. The Greek delegate, from Istanbul, to the Turkish National Assembly, on September 12 and in the meeting of the Turkish Nation-

al Assembly, protested and outlined the massive destruction of the wealth, shops and buildings of the Greek community of Istanbul, while the Turkish police stood by idly, and which led to the destruction and damaging of 70 of the 74 Greek churches of the city (Türk Büyük Millet Meclisi, Zabıt Ceridesi, Devre X, Cilt 7, Ictima 1, Sept. 12, 1955, pp. 675-677). The New York Times, Sept. 17, 1955, reported the attack on 73 Greek churches, of which 29 were destroyed, 34 badly damaged, 10 partially damaged, and of 26 schools and 5 athletic clubs as well. When the representatives of the World Council of Churches came to Istanbul in November of 1955 to survey the condition of the Greek churches they estimated the damage to the churches at \$150,000,000,000. The Turkish press tried to minimize the extent of the damage saying that 'only' 862 Greek shops and stores were destroyed / damaged (Hurriyet, Sept. 17, 1955; F. Armaoğlu, Kibris Me-selesi 1954-1959: Türk Hükümeti ve Kamu Oyunun davranışları, Ankara, 1963, p. 124). Though the Menderes government officially denied, on September 7, any connection with the organization of the riots and blamed the whole affair on a communist plot, he and his government were charged with the entire responsibility for the riots during the trials of Yassıada. The portion of the trials dealing with the anti-Greek riots began on October 19, 1960 and ended on January 5, 1961. Menderes, Bayar, Zorlu, Hadımlı (former governor of Izmir), and others were accused of arranging and executing the anti-Greek riots of September 6, 1955, and with the killing of 3 and the injuring of 30 individuals, and with the destruction of 5,000 Greek properties (Cumhuriyet, October 20, 1960). They were also held responsible for the explosive device placed in the courtyard of the Turkish consulate in Thessaloniki which broke the windows of the Turkish consulate and of the adjacent house of Atatürk and which episode the Menderes government had utilized to arouse and justify the anti-Greek riots of Istanbul and Izmir on September 6, 1955. As to Menderes' assertion that the riots were the result of a communist plot, M. F. Köprülü, who was also on trial at Yassıada and who had been Menderes' deputy prime minister at the time of the riots, testified as follows. The idea of blaming the riots on a communist plot had been given to Köprülü at that time by Allen Dulles, the chief of the American CIA, who happened to be in Istanbul on September 6, 1955, attending an international congress of criminology. Menderes and the others accused at Yassıada were found guilty of the charges which, as we saw above,

included the responsibility for destroying 5,000 Greek properties. The figure is fairly consistent with the Greek claims that there were destroyed: 1,004 houses, 4,348 shops, 27 pharmacies and labs, 21 factories, 110 restaurants, cafes, and hotels (total of 5,510 properties). When the Turkish government announced the payment of reparations, 4,433 Greeks applied, as did of course the Greek patriarchate. The Turkish government's niggardliness in paying even the scaled-down reparations which they offered, is but yet one more lamentable aspect in the whole tragic affair. All this information, available to authors and researchers for more than two decades, was purposely ignored by Prof. Shaw whose narrative is once more burdened with what one must term political journalism. All this data, available for two decades, has been brought together in the interesting book of A. Alexandris, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek - Turkish Relations 1918-1974*, Athens, 1983, pp. 256-266, and passim. Yet Prof. Shaw who has much to say about what he considers to be Greek misbehaviour in the Cyprus episode makes no mention of all this in the second volume of his book).

One turns to Prof. Shaw's treatment of the conquest of Cyprus by the Ottoman expedition of 1570-71.

«Regular Ottoman administration was introduced, and a large number of Turks from Anatolia were resettled there, thus laying the foundations for the large Turkish community that has remained on Cyprus to the present day. Some Greek Cypriots were resettled in Anatolia, as hostages for the good behaviour of their compatriots, but the latter in fact warmly welcomed Ottoman rule, since it freed them from centuries of Catholic persecution under the aegis of Venice» (Shaw, 178).

As has been pointed out above, how could the Greeks of Cyprus have been «freed from centuries of Catholic persecution under the aegis of Venice» when Venice acquired the island only in 1489? Further, the Republic of Venice never allowed the institution of the Inquisition to enter its sovereign territories, either in Italy or in its colonial empire. There were frequently quarrels over higher ecclesiastical administration, but there seems to have been no persecution of its Greek colonial subjects on religious grounds. In fact they tended to fuse with the Venetians particularly on the bourgeois and aristocratic levels. The peasants were pretty much in the same state as they were in Ottoman lands: doomed to produce for the governing classes. If in fact the Greeks «warmly welcomed Ottoman rule» why then were «some Greek Cypriots... resettled in Anatolia.. as hostages for the good behavior

of their compatriots»? In fact we learn, from Uzunçarşılı, III¹, 15, and the *Islam Ansiklopedisi* article «Selim III», 438, that the Ottoman authorities were so uncertain of the Greek population that they resettled over 400 Greeks in the district of Antalya, a sizeable number so as to guarantee the submission of the Greeks in Cyprus. Finally, since Cyprus is at the focal point of the Graeco-Turkish embroglio today and consequently the question of the respective numbers of Greek and Turkish Cypriots has been a principle axis for the propagation of claims by the two sides, Prof. Shaw puts forward the Turkish claims (which were not at issue in 1570-71) of today by attempting to boost the original Turkish population of the island in 1571.

«A large number of Turks from Anatolia were resettled there, thus laying the foundation for the large Turkish community that has remained on Cyprus to the present day». He says nothing about the size of the original settlement. Though this was an important part of the Ottoman plans for Cyprus, the documents that have come to light today indicate that the Ottoman government was not able to effect a substantial settlement of Turkish colonists in the beginning. Also, when he speaks of the «large Turkish community that has remained on Cyprus to the present day» he does not say how large it is and in relation to what is it large. In relation to the Greek community it was certainly not large as prior to the invasion of Cyprus by the Turkish army in 1974 the Turks were about 18% of the isle's populace whereas the Greeks constituted about 80%. That is not to say that as a decided minority of the total population the Turkish community is not important. Nevertheless, the section on the conquest of Cyprus has been infused by the author with the modern nationalistic passions over Cyprus.

A third example in which Prof. Shaw plays with demographic proportions in order to boost the Turkish presence has to do with the territory covered by present-day Bulgaria. The disputes between Bulgars and Turks in recent times, particularly over the status of the Pomaks (Muslims of Slavo-Bulgarian origin that converted at various times during the Ottoman period, see the works of Petrov, *Asimilatorskata politika na turskite zavoevateli* (Sofia, P. 1964) 19 ff.), have reached the level of political action. Prof. Shaw informs us of the demographic effects of the Ottoman conquests in Bulgaria.

«Murad brought Bulgaria under direct Ottoman control (1446),*

*Bulgaria had been brought under "direct Ottoman control" by 1395, Inalcik, "Bulgaria", *Encyclopedia of Islam* and ed. Murad II simply quelled a rebellion.

eliminating the remaining native princes and 'Turkifying' and 'Ottomanizing' it more than any other Balkan province. Large numbers of Turkish tribesmen were settled in the north and east, so that, in less than a century, they formed a majority of the population» (Shaw, p. 53).

Our author gives neither primary sources nor secondary work to support such a sweeping assertion. What do the sources and secondary works state on the matter? Although the complete Ottoman records for this question have not been collected and studied, that part of them which has been studied by Turkish scholars (Barkan and Gökbilgin) indicate just the opposite of Prof. Shaw's demographic assertions. Barkan published the statistics recording the taxable hearths (households) of Muslims, Christians and Jews for the Ottoman Balkans in the early sixteenth century and those administrative districts which were in what constitutes present day Bulgaria as well as those districts which border this area show the following numbers.

	Muslim	Christian	Jewish	Total
Pasha	66,684	183,512	2,998	253,194
Tchirmen	12,686	1,578		14,264
Silistria	17,295	6,615		23,910
Nikopolis	9,122	31,891	206	41,219
Vidin	914	19,517	7	20,438
Sofia	1,569	24,341		25,910
Keustendil	6,640	56,988	49	63,677
Ohrid	641	32,748		33,389
	115,551	357,190	3,260	481,158

Thus some 75 years after Murad's substantial settlements of Turkish tribes in the Bulgarian regions the taxable Muslim hearths of the above regions still formed only slightly less than 25%. Obviously, this does not taken into account later developments and especially the process of conversion, but even so there is no indication that the Muslim population of Bulgaria was ever a majority of the populace. (Barkan, «Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire ottoman au XVe siècle», *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, I(1958), 32). But Prof. Shaw's statement insists on the purported fact that this Turkish majority on the Bulgarian lands did not come from converts even but from the «large num-

ber of Turkish tribesmen (who) were settled in the north and east... and who «in less than a century... formed the majority of the population» (Shaw, 53). His insistence on Turkish racial purity (somehow a second class historical status in his scheme of things is reserved for those who later became Turks by conversion) is at issue here and it is an emphasis which as we shall see occurs elsewhere in the first volume. Is it possible that the majority of the Muslim population of the Bulgarian lands was descended from these Turkish tribesmen settled by Murad II? Again let us see what the Ottoman statistic and archival materials have to say on the subject.

In the census of 1520-30 the Balkan provinces of the empire contained record 832,707 taxable Christian hearths, 194,958 taxable Muslim hearths and 4,134 taxable Jewish hearths. Further, these records give us the breakdown between sedentary Muslim and nomadic Muslim hearths. Of the total of 194,958 taxable Muslim hearths, there are only 37,435 taxable nomad hearths; therefore, the nomadic hearths make up only 19% of the taxable Muslim hearths in the Balkans. Further, it is highly probable that most of the nomads settled had preserved their nomadic status in the registers as of this time (this seems to be indicated by the study of Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad-i Fatihan*, Istanbul, 1957. Their ocaks begin to dissolve only in the 17th century). Thus it is not only incorrect that the Muslims came to form a majority in Bulgarian lands, but it is paradoxical to maintain that this majority of the Muslim population descended from the Turkmen tribes settled by Murad II, for in 1520-30 their ocaks amounted to only 37,435 hearths for the entirety of the Balkans, whereas the Christian households of the Bulgarian regions amounted to 357,190 at that time. [For qualifications on tahrir defters see my remarks above].

These three examples of willful disregard of Ottoman statistics, statistics based on the very archives on which he purports to rely, is a serious comment on the veracity of his assertions that he has utilized them, and casts even darker shadows on his methodology.

Internal History, Political Strife, and «Political Parties»

Perhaps the worst part of the entire book consists of those sections which attempt to reconstruct events that deal with the internal struggle for power: competitions for succession to the Ottoman throne, struggle for influence and power in and around the palace, the doling out

of timar estates in the provinces, regulation of the ghazi band of raiders on the borders, the building up of the slave system of court officials, Janissaires and Spahis of the Porte. (The reader may consult, and will be absolutely bewildered by the maze of supposed and real factors in this internal political life he will find there, pages 27, 36-39, 41, 45-46, 49-50, 52-53, 55-56, 58, 67, 70-72, 74, 76, 79-80, 85, 90, 92, 109-110, 170, 186-187, 190, 192-195, 197, 203-204, 206).

These sections lack any clear structural analysis, there is very little definition of the parties to these struggles that he regularly trots out on the appropriate pages: He speaks of antagonisms of *devshirmes*, Janissaries, *kapikullarî* on the one hand, and of Turkish nobles, Turkish nobility, Turkish notables, Turkman aristocracy on the other hand without ever clearly defining them. Further, the stands he often attributes to them and their supposed causation are most often internally inconsistent and contradictory. Finally, at the basis of his ultimate explanation is a simplified kind of 19-20th century nationalistic outlook which is completely anachronistic, and which characterizes all the very worst historical writing of various Balkan and Turkish nationalistic historians. Let us examine a few examples, since we are once more reminded of the author's claim in the Preface to be free of prejudice and of the claims on the back side of the jacket cover that «the volume sweeps away the accumulated prejudices of centuries.....»

On page 41 Prof. sets up the first major antithesis of the heroes and villains of his ongoing drama as Mehmet I removes non-Turkish elements from court and government.

«This did not prevent Mehmet from moving to eliminate from the Ottoman court the Byzantine and Christian influences that had led Bayezit to abandon the gazi tradition. The Byzantine women and advisers were driven out of the palace. Greek was replaced by Turkish and Persian as languages of administration. Emphasis was placed on the dynasty's Turkish past, and historians were subsidized to stress this in the process of writing its history. The connections of the dynasty with the *ahi* guilds were restored, and the *kapikullarî* were suppressed, deprived of their timars, and dismissed from their positions. With the *kapikullarî* out of the way the feudal cavalry, still the military arm of the nobility, resumed its former role at the center of the Ottoman army. With the Christian and slave elements largely eliminated and the gazi leaders in eclipse, Mehmet fell under the control of the Turkish notables, led by the Çandarlı family, which had arranged his triumph over Musa».

By the reign of Murad II (p. 45) this control of the «Turkish notables» under which Mehmed I had fallen is suddenly transformed to the exact opposite:

«The conflict now was between the Turkish notables supporting the sultan, who wanted to establish centralized control of all parts of the empire, and the gazi frontier leaders and military commanders of Rumeli, supported by the Turkoman vassals of Anatolia, who wanted to be as independent as possible...»

Thus this seemingly contradicts what he says about their having the previous sultan under their control (i.e. the Turkish notables).

He does this only to contradict himself vis-a-vis the intentions of the «Turkish notables», still in the reign of Murad II, on page 46, only one page later:

«After his Anatolian problems were settled, Murat was free to establish himself and his dynasty in Edirne and to formulate new plans for conquest. First, however, he had to consolidate his own power, eliminate vassals, and achieve centralized control of the empire. He gave more money and timars to the Çandarlı ministers who supported this policy, broke down the power of the frontier gazi leaders, and restored the *kapıkulu* slaves to gain some independence from the feudal forces of Rumeli, whose support had proved so unreliable in the recent past. To build the power of the sultanate and make it more independent of the Çandarlı and the Turkish notables as well, he also began to develop his slaves as a major class in the Ottoman state, but under his control, to be used as his creatures against those who could contest his power...

Conquest thus became a means of building Murat's slave family against the Turkish nobility. The latter, therefore, turned toward a policy of peace, advocating an end of the European conquests that were, strengthening their rivals, while the increasingly powerful slaves became the war faction. With the two groups now largely equal in strength, Murat was able to balance them, accepting the demands of one group and then the other, keeping them in rivalry for his favor, and thereby achieving control over both in a system that was to become traditional in Ottoman politics during the next three centuries.

Murat set in motion factors that eventually were to assure the triumph of the slaves a century later. The *kapıkulu* men now became the basis of the Ottoman army and were divided into two services: (1) the *Sipahi* cavalry, supported mainly by feudal timars and under the control of the old Turkish nobility and (2) the Janissary infantry, supported by treasury salaries and hence more directly under the control of the central government.»

One should note here further contradictions and confusions. First, on page 45, he tells us that the Turkish notables had wanted cen-

tralized authority of the sultan, whereas here, without further explanations, the sultan is presented as struggling to free himself from their control and to establish centralized control on his own behalf and in opposition to them. Further, he has confused the provincial spahis with the spahis of the Porte. The latter are under the control of the sultan, are his slaves, and are not under the control of the old 'Turkish nobility'. He makes the same confusion between provincial spahis and those of the Porte later, on page 186, where he says of the «Sipahi cavalymen in Istanbul» that they «were mostly Anatolian Turks». Finally, on page 46, the author informs us that the «slaves» were the war party and the Turkish aristocracy the peace party.

The lack of definition and precision in his use of the terms denoting these two basic factions matches the imprecision with which he attempts to present the ins and outs of their internal strife, and is manifest in his accounts of internal events in the reign of Mehmed II, page 52:

«Murad's retirement and Mehmet's accession, however, unleashed new forces that threatened the Ottoman state. Mehmet's supporters, representing the *devşirme* as well as the *gazi* leaders of Rumeli, attempted to eliminate the Candarlı and Turkish notables».

And further on page 53, Prof. Shaw relates:

«Murat still hoped to retire to Anatolia and leave the throne to Mehmet. But pressure applied by the Candarlı and Turkish notables finally convinced him that Mehmet's continued rule at this point would lead only to the triumph of the *devşirme*».

We are then astonished to read, in the same paragraph,

«Murat, therefore, returned to the throne in August 1446 with the full support of the Turkish notables and the Janissaries».

The Janissaries are themselves *devşirmes*, and he thus lumps them together elsewhere. So his terms of analysis are slipshod, and thus so also is the analysis itself.

When Mehmed II comes to the throne for the second time, he sets out to fight the dominance of the 'Turkish nobility', forgetting that he has already informed his reader, page 46, that Murad II had already effectively broken their grip.

«The first step was to remove the Turkish nobility as a dominating political force and to wipe out all members of the Ottoman family who had any aspirations for the throne. In any case, a move against the Turkish nobility and particularly the Candarlı family had

long been desired by Mehmet, who blamed Çandarlı Halil (with some justice) for his deposition in 1446 and for the latter's continued opposition to the conquest of Constantinople. On June 1, 1453, only two days after the conquest, Çandarlı Halil was dismissed as grand vezir on false charges of having received bribes from the Byzantines for opposing the attack. His property was confiscated, and he was imprisoned along with most members of his family. His replacement with Mehmet's close adviser Zaganos Paşa, member of the *devşirme* class, began a new tradition whereby the most important positions of the central government were reserved for the slaves of the sultan. Large-scale confiscations of timars and private properties soon reduced the power of the major Turkish families; they were awarded to *devşirme* members, who then accelerated their rise to power.

Two paragraphs later the author then informs us that after all Mehmed had not reduced the power of the Turkish nobility so drastically:

This is not to say that the sultan left his supporters unchecked. His aim was to create a balance of forces so that no group would have sufficient power to control him. Therefore, some important administrative functions were withheld from the grand vezir and given to three other major officials, the *kazasker* (chief judge), *defterdar* (chief treasurer), and *nişancı* (chief scribe), who controlled the hierarchies of the religious, financial, and scribal administrations respectively. Nor did Mehmet wish to substitute *devşirme* domination for that of the Turkish nobility—thus he did not eliminate the latter. Many Turkish notable families kept their properties and were retained in positions, leaving them about equal to the *devşirme*. By balancing the Turkish aristocracy and the *devşirme*, Mehmet could play them off and hence assure himself of the loyalty and support of both.

On page 67 the position of the two 'parties' is shifted: The Turkish «aristocracy» became the war party and the *devşirme* became the peace party. Generally, the inability of Prof. Shaw to sustain a sophisticated political analysis is by now evident. There are contradictions from page to page, even from paragraph to paragraph. He tells us that Murad II achieved a balance of these «parties» that was to last for three centuries, only to attribute the same accomplishment to Mehmed II (pages 46, 55, 67).

This supposed «balance» he then disrupts with the accession of practically every sultan, beginning with Bayezid II, the successor of Mehmed II (p. 70-71). Further, in speaking of Bayezid's attempt to «achieve control of the system», he had to resort to certain measures:

«To reduce the power of the devşirme Bayezit had to accomplish the opposite of what Mehmet II had done, namely build up the Turkish leadership and the Ulema by giving them positions and revenues» (p. 72). As his narrative progresses, Prof. Shaw begins to reveal what he means by the Turkish «notables-nobility-aristocracy»: they are the representatives of the ethnic Turks. Their opponents are those who are of Christian origin: Albanians, Slavs, Greeks. To speak of Turkish leadership in Ottoman government of the late fifteenth and sixteenth century is academic here and smacks of nineteenth-twentieth century mentality which is not applicable to the period in question. But this direction in Prof. Shaw's writing becomes more pronounced as the narrative advances and vitiates increasingly the validity of what he has to say about the dynamics of Ottoman government and politics.

In his account of the strife of these purported 'parties' under Bayezid II he once more reverses their positions, making of the «devşirme men» the war party whereas earlier they had been converted to the «peace party», having before that time been the war party (p. 74).

In discussing the accession and reign of Selim I he speaks of the Janissaries as under control of the devşirme and yet as an independent party from the devşirme, never having up to this point stopped to define either term. He relates that Selim's plan was to free himself from the devşirme party and to base himself on the Janissaries. The question then, for Prof. Shaw, was how could Selim control the Janissaries once he was in power? The problem is further complicated for the reader because in the previous sections Prof. Shaw relates that Bayezid II had already managed to attain a balance of these forces. Nevertheless, he would have us believe that Selim controlled the Janissaries as follows:

«He sought to make the Janissaries the instrument of the sultan by conciliating them, enlarging their numbers to 35,000 men, increasing their salaries, paying high 'accession tips', and finally, by the more direct means of replacing their officers with his own slaves» (p. 79). No one of these reasons would explain how an enlarged and more powerful body of Janissaries could be restrained from exercising their greatly increased strength.

The breakdown of the analysis is complete by the time that Prof. Shaw carries it into the reign of Suleyman I and it mires down into effortless but turgid contradiction (p. 90):

«In the meantime, the rise of Ibrahim Paşa to the grand vezirate marked a fundamental change in the politics of the Ottoman Ruling

Class. Frenk Ibrahim, as he was known, had come into the Ottoman system as a youth captured in a raid near his home at Parga, Italy, in the time of Bayezit II. His triumph over his Turkish predecessor, Piri Mehmet, marked the final triumph of the *devşirme* class over the old Turkish aristocracy. *Devşirme* men assumed a larger and larger proportion of the principal positions of state, whereas most members of the Turkish aristocracy were forced to retire to their estates in Anatolia, where they began to intrigue against the Istanbul government, contributing significantly to the Celali revolts that were to shake the dynasty later in the century. By this time, however, the old distinctions between the *devşirme* party and members of the old Turkish aristocracy and their descendants were modified because the Turks and Muslims serving the sultan now included in their number many descendents of *devşirme* men who because of intermixture with Turkish women and training had come to identify themselves with the opposition to the *devşirme*.

The *devşirme* - no longer challenged by the Turkish aristocracy - divided into political groupings formed by individual leaders to gain power and wealth for themselves rather than for their class».

Prof. Shaw has already caused the 'devshirme party' to triumph in the reign of Mehmed II (p. 58), and yet they are once more triumphing here. Second, he falls into contradiction so soon as he says that the descendants of devshirme men came to identify themselves with the opposition to the devshirme, for in the very next sentence he says that the Turkish aristocracy no longer challenged the devshirme. He lets us understand that these older parties were no longer really relevant in the reign of Süleyman:

«Just beginning to participate in the resulting power struggles were the sultan's mother, Hafsa Hatun, and other women in the harem, who began to promote the candidacy of their children and to work for influence over the sultan and in the government by cooperating with one or another of the political parties. It appears that Ibrahim's Paşa's triumph was the result of the intrigues of the party that he led jointly with Arnavut Ahmet Paşa and in cooperation with the sultan's wife Roxelana (Hürrem Sultan), a woman of Russian origin captured in Galicia by the Crimean Tatars. Hürrem Sultan contributed to the plot by exciting Süleyman's suspicions of the last Turkish grand vezir, Piri Mehmet, who as a result of his military victories had begun to dominate the young sultan. As we have seen, Ibrahim's triumph had been followed by Arnavut Ahmet's assignment to Egypt and subsequent revolt. If it marked anything, therefore, it was less the triumph of the *devşirme* as a class than the beginning of the process by which the Ottoman system came to be dominated by the political parties and the women of the harem. It also marked the beginning of the

process by which the sultans increasingly relied on their chief ministers, who began to use their power for their own benefit rather than that of the sultans and the empire. Ibrahim was given additional positions and revenues, making him the second most powerful individual in the empire. His marriage to Hatice Sultan, daughter of Selim I, symbolized the prestige enjoyed by him and his successors, who tended to dominate the sultans in the middle years of the sixteenth century despite all the efforts of the latter to free themselves» (p. 90).

The contradictions, confusion, and analytical anarchy reach new heights in his description of the revolts in Anatolia, 1526-27, where his analysis becomes openly confounded with anachronistic nationalistic historiography:

«In addition, the devşirme triumph in Istanbul and the consequent return to Anatolia of most members of the Turkish aristocracy gave the Celali movement a distinctly Turkish character, emphasizing resentment against devşirme domination in Istanbul» (p. 92).

Actually, this rebellion had as a fundamental basis the support of Shiite Turkmans for the Safavi dynasty of Iran, not the type of nationalism which Prof. Shaw attributes to the malcontents (see Gök-bilgin, *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, «Süleyman», 109-110). He is further caught up in contradiction when he seemingly equates Turkish aristocracy with Turkomans, and when he remarks that the Turkomans were crushed by the «local feudal levies» which he has identified elsewhere as constituting the arm of the Turkish aristocracy (see above). So we are left with the paradox that the Turkish aristocracy rebelled and then squashed its own rebellion!

By the time that Prof. Shaw has reached the competition of the princes Selim and Bayezid for the throne he is conscious of his dilemma and contradiction:

«The conflict between the princes emerged as a new duel for power between the old Turkish aristocracy, now represented by the Anatolian fief holders (who, pray tell, had represented them before?), and the devşirme. These distinctions were somewhat blurred, however, by the tendency of many of the fighting men on both sides to gravitate to the highest bidder...» (p. 110).

His parting efforts to raise high the role of this «Turkish aristocracy» in the scheme of Ottoman history comes on pages 170 and 186. On the former page he decides to make awards to all those worthy institutions and factions which had made the empire great, and censure to those who had played a negative role.

«It should be noted, incidentally, that the old theory that Ottoman greatness was due to a system that made the slaves into the Ruling Class, to the complete exclusion of born Muslims, and that decline resulted from the entry of the latter into the system, while appealing to Christian Europe, is without foundation. The Ottoman rise to power had been led and sustained largely by elements from the old Turkish and Muslim aristocracies. It was only in the period of decline that the slaves achieved control, but this led not to triumph but to decay».

It is amazing how short the memory of the author is. He has the «slaves» in control, or else he shows them to have replaced the «Turkish aristocracy» in the reigns of Mehmed II, Bayezid, and Suleyman I, periods which are by his own admission well within the time usually described as the apogee of the Ottoman Empire.

On page 186, he converts the Celali revolts of the early seventeenth century into the manifestation of «Turkish resentment against devşirme misrule from Istanbul» and he then scrambles devşirmes, Janissaries, spahis of the Porte, Anatolian Turks, Turkish nobility into a nationalistic omelette. By the time that the reader reaches page 190 he is mercifully informed that after the death of Suleyman the Magnificent:

«The division between devşirme and Turk was no longer a significant factor in political life».

Further:

«As the devşirme system of recruiting came to an end, the great devşirme parties that had risen to dominate Ottoman affairs after the death of Suleyman the Magnificent broke into parties based on individual ambitions».

Nevertheless; on page 192 the «devşirme influence» is back in business, specifically in relation to what Prof. Shaw terms «The Reform Efforts of Osman II»:

«His first effort involved a feeling on his part-most likely nourished by his mother and his teacher, Omer Effendi-that it was the devşirme influence that had led to the nepotism, corruption, and decentralization that had infected the empire; he believed the sole remedy for these conditions was to «Turkify» both the palace and the Janissary corps. After his return from Hotin, Osman developed a plan to replace the Janissary and Sipahi corps, which he considered to be too heterogeneous, with a kind of national militia composed entirely of Muslim peasants from Anatolia and Syria. He also seems to have thought of moving the Ottoman government from the devşirme center of Istanbul to some

place in Anatolia where Turkish traditions and values would prevail, perhaps to Bursa or Ankara, thus presaging the reforms of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk by some three centuries».

The crudity of this anachronistic thinking is almost beyond belief and hardly needs any comment. It is the product of a state of mind that completely dominates the author's thinking and prevents him from saying anything that is historically valid about the spirit of the government and politics of the Ottoman government in the periods under consideration.

I have attempted to present the reader with a detailed analysis of Prof. Shaw's *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, volume I, inasmuch as the book is not what its author and publisher claim that it is, and because the book has already been utilized extensively in the classroom and research in three continents. I am astonished that, with the exception of a few reviews, Ottoman specialists have failed to alert scholars, both those inside and outside the field, of the serious liabilities which the volume brings with it as an instrument of teaching and research. It is the moral responsibility of every branch of scholarship to maintain intellectual integrity of the field.

University of California, Los Angeles