

2271 BELDICEANU-STEINHERR, Irène. La repentance de Bayezid Ier et d'Émir Süleyman. *Living in the Ottoman ecumenical community: essays in honour of Suraiya Faroqhi*. Ed. Vera Costantini and Markus Koller. Leiden: Brill, 2008, (The Ottoman Empire and its Heritage: Politics, Society and Economy, 39). pp.35-44. [Scrutiny of two passages of early Ottoman historiography.]

Bayezid I
Süleyman
Faroqhi, E

30 EYLÜL 2010

İSTANBUL KÜTÜPHANESİ
SÖZLÜK VE İZLENLER
KİTAPLARI

Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community

Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi

Edited by

Vera Costantini and Markus Koller

23 Mars 2015

Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi Kütüphanesi	
Dem. No:	207780
Tha. No:	956.07 LIV. 0

MADDE YAYIMLANDIKTAN
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

Bayezid I 020337
Süleyman Çelebi Emir 181401

LA REPENTANCE DE BAYEZID I^{ER} ET D'ÉMIR SÜLEYMAN

IRÈNE BELDICEANU-S'IEINHERR

Les registres de recensement ottomans sont considérés souvent comme une source d'utilité plutôt restreinte. Ils ont été mis à contribution dans le domaine de l'économie, de la démographie et parfois de la toponymie. Ils ont servi surtout à dresser des statistiques: énumération des villages dans une région donnée, classification des paysans par catégorie, sources de revenus, en l'occurrence produits agricoles, élevage, apiculture, pour ne citer que ceux-là, montant des impôts, pourcentage du revenu par habitant. De ce fait, ceux qui sont réfractaires au jeu des chiffres les ont boudés. Pourtant les informations qu'on peut en tirer réservent parfois des surprises. Il ne faut pas oublier qu'ils furent écrits pour les besoins de l'administration et touchaient de ce fait un nombre restreint de personnes, ce qui permettait une certaine liberté d'expression. Nous avons trouvé dans les registres de recensement deux passages sur un sujet peu commun. Il s'agit de châtiments injustifiés infligés par deux souverains ottomans à l'un de leurs sujets et la réparation des torts commis.

Ces passages vont au-delà de ce qu'on pourrait appeler un fait divers. Il faut essayer de déterminer dans quelles circonstances ces événements se sont déroulés, en dresser le cadre géographique, prendre en compte la sévérité du châtiment, des mutilations qu'aucune mesure ne pouvait effacer, aussi magnanime fût-elle.

Le premier passage concerne Bayezid I^{er} qui régna entre 1389 et 1402, le deuxième, son fils connu sous le nom d'Emir Süleyman.

Textes et traductions

Le premier passage est tiré d'un registre de legs pieux conservé à Istanbul aux Archives de la Présidence du Conseil dans le fonds *tapu ve tahrir defterleri* n° 453 (cité dorénavant TD 453), fol. 113r°. Il ne porte pas de date. L'écriture étant cependant la même que celle du registre 111 appartenant au même fonds (TD 111 de *ev'il muharrem* 928/1^{er} - 10 décembre 1521), il fut réalisé à la même époque. Le TD 111 est un registre détaillé des revenus fiscaux alloués aux timariotes du gouvernement de Hüdavendigâr

35-44

Süleyman çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman chronicles*

by Elizabeth A. Zachariadou (Montreal)

Süleyman çelebi did not succeed in being officially recognized by the Ottomans as their sultan;¹⁾ his younger brother, Mehmed çelebi, emerged victorious from the fratricidal strife which followed the defeat of their father Bayazid I at the battle of Ankara (July 28, 1402) and consequently he has generally been considered to be the legitimate sultan. This being so, Ottoman historians belittled the personality of Süleyman and extolled that of Mehmed.

Ottoman narrative sources do not seem trustworthy as far as the period of the interregnum is concerned apart from their bias in favour of Mehmed. The earliest Ottoman historians dealing with that period – mainly Neshri – wrote several decades after Süleyman's death.²⁾ This

) A résumé of this article was read at the "Quatrième Congrès International des Etudes du Sud-est Européen" held in Ankara (13-18 August 1979). I am indebted to Dr. A. Luttrell, who generously shared with me the results of his work on a closely related subject. I also thank Miss Julian Chrysostomidis for reading the first draft of this paper and for her criticism. Finally I thank Prof. V. L. Ménage who helped me clarify specific aspects of my study.

¹⁾ On Süleyman çelebi see M. T. Gökbilgin, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, s. v.; N. Iorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, v. I, Gotha 1908, p. 326-353 (hereafter: Iorga, *Geschichte*); C. Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben*, v. II, Gotha 1918, p. 136-149 (hereafter: Jireček, *Geschichte*); I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, v. I, Ankara 1947, p. 175-179; J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425)*, New Brunswick-New Jersey 1969, p. 200-284 (hereafter: Barker, *Manuel II*); N. Filipović, *Princ Musa i Šejh Bedreddin*, Sarajevo 1971, p. 5-131 (hereafter: Filipović, *Princ Musa*); E. Werner, *Die Geburt einer Großmacht – Die Osmanen (1300-1481)*, Wien-Köln-Graz 1972²⁾ (hereafter: Werner, *Die Osmanen*); mainly P. Wittek, *De la défaite d'Ankara à la prise de Constantinople*, *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, v. 12 (1938) 1-34.

²⁾ Main early Ottoman chronicles on Süleyman: *Tevârikh-i Âli-i 'Osmândan 'Ashik-pashazâde ta'rikhi*, ed. Âli, Istanbul 1332, p. 80-82; F. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken*, Leipzig 1925, v. II, p. 64-67; *Die frühosmanischen Jahrbücher des Urudsch*, ed. F. Babinger, Hannover 1925, p. 36-39; *Kitâb-i Cihan-*

sidered an acceptable and even noble way to solve personal or political problems. Only in the 3rd C. did PLOTINOS take a negative stand toward suicide by equating it with murder. Christianity, in its earlier stages, was not hostile toward suicide: AMBROSE praised St. PELAGIA THE VIRGIN for killing herself after she had been raped. A position critical of suicide was taken by LACTANTIUS and esp. AUGUSTINE, who consistently rejected this course of action. At the same time the law changed its perception of suicide, which began to be treated as a confession of depravity. In the East, PALLADIOS of Galatia in the 5th C. still considered suicide a possible means of protecting one's chastity, but later canon law prohibited killing oneself. A certain ambivalence remained in the literary appraisal of martyrs, who in fact sought death through execution, and of ascetics whose starvation was a slow self-destruction: the righteous could yearn for DEATH as the gateway to union with God, but the moment of death had to remain in the hands of God. The negative attitude toward suicide was enhanced by the image of JUDAS, who died by hanging himself. The question of the guilt of those who urged others to commit suicide was discussed at the Council of Ankyra in 314; accomplices were condemned to 10 years of penitence.

Documented instances of suicide are indeed infrequent in Byz., a rare example being the scribe Melitas who hanged himself in 1303 because he was despondent over his indebtedness (Pachym., ed. Bekker 2:385–88). The vita of St. Makarios of Pelekete attributed the attempted suicide of a certain Gregory to demoniac possession (P. van den Gheyn, *AB* 16 [1897] 162.27–34). Unhappy wives sometimes used the threat of suicide by drowning, hanging, or hurling themselves from a high rock to obtain a DIVORCE (A. Laiou, *FM* 6:309–12), since suicide was considered a worse crime than divorce.

LIT. J.D. Ehrlich, "Suicide in the Roman Empire" (Ph.D. Diss., Columbia University 1983) 190–213. Y. Gris , *La suicide dans Rome antique* (Paris 1982) 283–89. A. Vandembossche, "Recherches sur le suicide en droit romain," *AI-PHOS* 12 (1952) 500–05. —A.K., A.M.T.

SUIDAS. See SOUDA.

SÜLEYMAN ÇELEBI (Σουλαιμάνης and other forms), second son of BAYEZID I, and ruler (1402–11) over part of the Ottoman realm; born 1377?,

died Dügüncü-Ili 17 Feb. 1411. After Timur's victory over Bayezid, Süleyman Çelebi fled eventually (20 Aug. 1402) to Gallipoli (KALLIPOLIS). He was acknowledged as sultan in Rumeli, but his brothers in Anatolia—Isa and MEHMED (I)—disputed his claims. He strengthened his position by accommodation with local Christian powers, including Byz. By the peace of Jan.–Feb. 1403, Constantinople recovered Thessalonike and other places and was freed from tribute payments. In 1403–10 Süleyman Çelebi expanded his rule into Anatolia, perhaps eliminating Isa before mid-March 1403 and otherwise holding his own against Mehmed. In Rumeli he generally preserved the status quo.

His position crumbled in 1410–11. Early in 1410, Mehmed dispatched his younger brother MUSA to Rumeli, and on 13 Feb. he and his Balkan allies defeated Süleyman Çelebi's *beylerbeyi* Sinan at Iambol. Facing disaster, Süleyman Çelebi renewed his accord with Manuel II (late May), possibly marrying then a daughter of THEODORE I PALAIOLOGOS. He twice defeated Musa the following summer: 15 June at Kosmidion, a suburb of Constantinople; 11 July near Edirne (ADRIANO-PLE), but the Rumelian Turks then shifted support to Musa, whose austerity and unsubmitiveness to Constantinople they esteemed. Early in 1411 Musa defeated Süleyman Çelebi's army near Sofia (SERDICA), and he fled from Edirne for Constantinople. On 17 Feb., however, he perished at Dügüncü-Ili—assassinated, or captured and then strangled on Musa's orders.

Süleyman Çelebi's passion for drink and debauchery was renowned. The historian Doukas also depicts him as gentle, guileless, compassionate, and generous; Chalkokondyles praises him as a brave soldier. Süleyman Çelebi apparently felt a special reverence for Christ, and some of his fellow Muslims viewed him as overly sympathetic to Christians.

LIT. E. Zachariadou, "Süleyman Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman Chronicles," *Der Islam* 60 (1983) 268–96. Bombaci-Shaw, *L'Impero ottomano* 289–96. Barker, *Manuel II* 247–55, 281–84. —S.W.R.

SÜLEYMAN IBN KUTULMUŞ, first Seljuk ruler in Anatolia; died near Aleppo 1086. Son of Kutulmuş (or Kutlumuş), cousin of TUGHRUL BEG, Süleyman (Σολυμάν) and his brother Mansûr were in Anatolia by 1078, where they supported the usurpation of NIKEPHOROS III and gained lands

Die Bauinschrift Emir Süleiman's an der Türbe Bajezid's I. in Brussa.

Franz Täeschner

Über die Tür der Türbe Bajezid's I. Jyldyrym¹⁾ findet sich eine einfache Inschrifttafel, deren Hauptteil in drei Zeilen die Bauinschrift der Türbe enthält; links von derselben ist ein schmales Inschriftfeld, das, dieselbe Höhe wie die Hauptinschrifttafel in fünf Zeilen aufteilend, in kleinerem Maßstab die Signatur des Baumeisters enthält (Foto MUTHMANN, Abschrift WITTEK)²⁾.

Die Hauptinschrift hat folgenden Wortlaut:

- (1) هذه روضة السلطان السعيد المرحوم المغفور بايزيد خان
(2) بن مراد خان بناها السلطان الاعظم مولى ملوك العرب والعجم سليمان خان
(3) بن بايزيد خان خلد الله ملكه في اول شهر المحرم سنة تسع وثمانائة

... (1) Dies ist das Grabgefildes des seligen Sultans, der Verzeihung und Erbarmen erlangt hat, Bajezid Hân (2) b. Murâd Hân. Erbaut hat es der hochehrhabene Sultan, der Herr der Könige der Araber und Nichtaraber Süleimân Hân (3) b. Bajezid Hân — Gott lasse sein Reich ewig währen — im Anfang des Monats *Muharram* des Jahres 809 H. [18. Juni 1406 D.]...³⁾

Während die eigentlichen Lesezeichen (Vokale usw.) sehr unregelmäßig gesetzt sind, sind die Schriftzeichen ziemlich reichlich durchsetzt mit kalligraphischen und pflanzlichen Füllmotiven. Charakteristisch ist das mehrfach aus Buchstaben, besonders dem *Nûn* herauswachsende Blattmotiv.

An der Titular des verstorbenen Sultans ist charakteristisch, daß ihm das Ehrenprädikat *شهيد* nicht zugebilligt wird. Das hängt wohl damit zusammen, daß er, wie jetzt feststeht, durch Selbstmord geendet hatte³⁾.

Die Baumeistersignatur links daneben hat folgenden Wortlaut:

- (1) قد وقع الفراغ
(2) من هذه العمارة المبار
(3) كة على يد العبد الضميف على بن
(4) حسين غفر الله لهما
(5) في ربيع الاخر لسنة تسع وثمانائة

¹⁾ Über die Türbe Jyldyrym Bajezid's vgl. auch AHMED TEVFIK in TOEM III, 1328, S. 1051ff.

²⁾ Mit einigen Ungenauigkeiten auch wiedergegeben von AHMED TEVFIK, a. a. O.

³⁾ NEGÛB 'ÂSİM, *Jyldyrym Bâjezid Hânıyñ itihârı: Darülfünûn edebiyât takvîsi mecmû'ası*, 2. Jhrg., 1338 1922, S. 78f.; FR. GÜESE in OTTO HARRASSOWITZ's *Ephemérides orientales*, Nr. 34, April 1928, S. 11.

„Die Beendigung dieses hehren Bauwerkes fand statt durch die Hand des armseligen Knechtes 'Alī b. Husain — Gott verzeihe ihnen beiden — im *Rabi' II* d. J. 809 H. [beg. 15. IX. 1406 D.]...“

Zu beachten ist die Differenz von 3—4 Monaten in den beiden Inschriften: das Datum der Hauptinschrift bezieht sich auf den Rohbau¹⁾, das der Meistersignatur schließt den Ausbau und die Dekoration in sich.

Die Ješil Ğāmi' in Brussa, ihre historischen Inschriften und ihre Künstler.

Franz Täeschner

Seit den detaillierten Veröffentlichungen der von Mehmed I. erbauten „Grünen Moschee“ (Ješil Ğāmi') in Brussa durch EDHEM PASCHA²⁾ und LÉON PARVILLÉE³⁾ besteht in der europäischen Literatur über diese Moschee sowohl bezüglich des Datums ihrer Erbauung, als auch bezüglich ihres Baumeisters eine gewisse Unsicherheit, die auf der ungenügenden Auswertung der an dem Bauwerke vorhandenen Inschriften beruht. Indem man die im Innern befindliche Inschrift des Naqqāš 'Alī (s. u. I, 3) für die Hauptbauinschrift hielt, ließ man den Bau i. J. 1423 vollendet sein und machte auf Grund einer Falschlesung dieser Inschrift einen Iljās oder Iljās 'Alī⁴⁾ zu ihrem Baumeister. Das aus der Hauptbauinschrift (s. u. I, 1) zu entnehmende Datum hielt man für das der Grundsteinlegung und bekam so eine Bauzeit von drei Jahren heraus⁵⁾.

Neben besagtem Iljās 'Alī wird auch infolge von Heranziehung einer weiteren kleinen Inschrift (s. u. I, 5) Mehmed el-Meğnūn als Baumeister angesprochen⁶⁾.

¹⁾ Vgl. die beiden um 3 Jahre differierenden Daten in den Inschriften der Ješil Ğāmi' zu Brussa u. S. 150.

²⁾ EDHEM PASCHA, *L'architecture Ottomane*, Constantinople 1873.

³⁾ LÉON PARVILLÉE, *Architecture et décoration Turques* avec une préface de E. VIOLET-LE-DUC, Paris 1874. Darauf beruht im wesentlichen die baugeschichtliche Behandlung des Werkes bei H. WILDE, *Brussa*, Berlin 1909, S. 36ff.

⁴⁾ Iljās 'Alī als Baumeister dürfte auf der fehlerhaften Wiedergabe der Inschrift bei EDHEM PASCHA, a. a. O., S. 26 und danach bei DJELAL ESSAD, *Constantinople*, Paris 1909, S. 174 beruhen.

⁵⁾ Die drei Jahre Bauzeit dürften aus J. v. HAMMER, *Umblick auf einer Reise von Constantinopel nach Brussa*.... Pesth 1818, S. 37 stammen, der diese Angabe ebenso wie die 40000 Dukaten Bausumme aus Evlijā (*Sejāhat-nāme*, II. Bd., Stambul 1314, S. 15, Z. 11f.) entnommen hat.

⁶⁾ Vgl. FR. BABINGER, *Quellen zur osmanischen Kunstgeschichte: Jahrbuch der asiatischen Kunst*, I. Bd., 1924, S. 31ff., spez. 32.

(*süret*) of imperial *fermâns* received and recorded at Aleppo in 1101-2/1689-91.

2. Studies. R. Murphey, *Continuity and discontinuity in Ottoman administrative theory and practice during the late seventeenth century*, in *Poetics today*, xiv (1993), 419-43, esp. 429-31. On the *wilâyet ahkâm defterleri* (in the 18th century), see A. Cetin, *Başbakanlık Arşivi kılavuzu*, Istanbul 1979, 62-5, and H.G. Mayer, *Das Osmanische Registerbuch der Beschwerden (Şikayet Defteri) von Jahre 1675*, Vienna 1984, 17.

(R. MURPHEY)

✓ **SÜLEYMÂN ÇELEBİ**, Ottoman prince and eldest son of Bâyezîd I [*q.v.*], ruler in Rumelia and a considerable part of northern and northwestern Anatolia in the confused years after Bâyezîd's defeat and capture by Tîmür at the Battle of Ankara in 804/1402, b. ?779/1377, d. 813/1411.

He is heard of in 800/1398, when his father sent him against the Ağ Koyunlu Kara Yülük at Sivas, and he fought at Bâyezîd's side, together with his brothers, at Ankara. He managed to escape to Europe with his retainers by being ferried across the Bosphorus by the Genoese. He had to make peace with the Venetians, the Genoese, the Knights of Rhodes and the Byzantines, ceding lands along the Black Sea and Thracian coasts plus Salonica to Manuel II Comnenus and renouncing the requirement of tribute. But he was still a powerful force in Rumelia, with the Serb Stefan Lazarević as his vassal, and when Tîmür left Anatolia in 1403, Süleymân began to reconquer the former Ottoman lands in northwestern Anatolia as far as Ankara in the east and Aydıin in the south. He was now in strenuous rivalry with his younger brothers Mehemmed in Anatolia and Mūsā in Rumelia, and was unable to maintain himself in Anatolia; by 1410 Mehemmed was in control there and began his first reign as sultan Mehemmed I [*q.v.*]. In Rumelia, Mūsā Çelebi had mixed success against Süleymân in 1410, and Süleymân endeavoured to secure Byzantine support by marrying a princess of the Palaeologi; but subsequently Mūsā managed to surprise Süleymân in his capital at Edirne and then capture him at the village of Doghandjilar as he fled towards Constantinople, executing him on 22 Shawwāl 813/17 February 1411.

Mūsā was thus now dominant in Rumelia, but became engaged in warfare there, which involved Stefan Lazarević and Süleymân's son Orkhon, released by the Byzantine Emperor to harass Mūsā; he fended off attacks from Anatolia by Mehemmed, but was finally captured and killed by the latter after a battle near Sofya in 816/1413 [see MŪSĀ ÇELEBİ].

Bibliography: The early historical sources include the *Anonymous chronicle* in Neshri, 'Ashik-pasha-zade and Lutfi Pasha; see also Sa'd al-Din, *Tadrij al-tawarikh*, i, 218-20, and *S'O*, i, 42. Of studies, see von Hammer, *GOR*³, i, 217-300; Iorga, *GOR*, i, 325 ff.; E.A. Zachariadou, *Süleyman Çelebi in Rumili and the Ottoman chronicles*, in *Isl.*, lx (1983), 268-90; N. Vatin, in R. Mantran (ed.), *Hist. de l'empire ottoman*, Paris 1989, 53, 56-61; C. Imber, *The Ottoman empire 1300-1481*, Istanbul 1990, 41, 52, 54, 56-9, 63-9; *IA* art. *Süleyman Çelebi* (M. Tayyib Gökbilgin). (C.E. BOSWORTH)

SÜLEYMÂN ÇELEBİ, DEDE (?752-826/1351-1422), Ottoman poet, author of *Wesilet el-neđiät* (*Vesiletü'n-necat*) ("Means of salvation"), a *mathnawî* [*q.v.*] in honour of Muhammad completed in 812/1409, referred to in Turkey as the *Mewlid* [*q.v.*], and see Neclâ Pekolcay, *Mewlid*, Ankara 1993, 1-3, *Mewlud*, or *Mewlid-i Sherif* ("The [noble] birth").

Sources provide little biographical information, but

show his forbears as religious scholars and bureaucrats closely connected with the Ottoman dynasty. The identity of his father Ahmed Pasha is obscure. His (maternal?) grandfather Shaykh Mahmud lectured at an Iznik madrasa, and is credited with poetry and a commentary on the *Fusus* of Ibn al-'Arabî.

Süleymân was born in Bursa and is described as having been a disciple of Emîr Sultân [*q.v.*], the "patron saint" of Bursa (and son-in-law of Bâyezîd I) and as having served as *imâm* to Bâyezîd. After the latter's death (1403), he became chief *imâm* of the Great Mosque in Bursa, where he died and was buried. His precise birth date remains in debate. A reference to his completing the *Mewlid* when he was sixty led Ahmet Ateş to posit his being born in 752/1351 (*Vesiletü'n-necat*, Ankara 1954, 25 ff.). Pekolcay, who earlier questioned that date (*IA*, art. *Süleyman Çelebi*), now agrees (*Mewlid*, 36).

Tradition claims that the *Mewlid* was composed to counter statements of a popular preacher that Muḥammad was not superior to Jesus (Gibb, *HOP*, i, 232-5). Whatever his inspiration, Süleymân displayed a familiarity with the Muslim corpus of works concerning the Prophet, and the *Mewlid* shows influence from the *Charib-nâme* of 'Ashikpasha [*q.v.*] and echoes some of the verses interposed by Muḥafâ Darîr (an Erzurum Turk writing in Mamluk Egypt) in his life of the Prophet (*Siyerü'n-nebauî*) (see A. Bombaci, *La letteratura turca*, Milan 1969, 211-12, 301-4). Many later Ottoman *mewlids* appeared, but Süleymân's remained the favourite, becoming part of the official celebration of Muḥammad's birth (12 Rabî' I) introduced under Murâd III (d'Ohsson, *Tableau général*, ii, 358-68), and continues to be recited by Turks celebrating the Prophet's birth, marking the fortieth day after bereavement, fulfilment of a vow, etc. A vivid description of its place in Ottoman life occurs in the novel *The clown and his daughter* by Halide Edib Adivar [see KHĀLIDE EDİB].

Manuscripts (the earliest from the 10th-11th/16th-17th centuries) and printed editions vary in length (from about 260 to some 1000 *bayts*) and topics covered. The work has been translated into a number of languages, including Albanian, Greek, Serbo-Croat and Kurdish, and Schimmel has noted an echo of it in a work by Abū 'Alî Kalandar, an 8th/14th-century Indian poet (*Mystical dimensions in Islam*, Chapel Hill 1975, 216-7). F. Lyman McCallum's 263-*bayt* English translation (*The Mevlidi Sherif of Süleyman Çelebi*) appeared in London in 1943; and an annotated English translation of the text published by Ateş (*op. cit.*) formed the Senior Thesis of Stephanie R. Thomas at Barnard College in New York 1988. This text, a compilation from five manuscripts, omits the well-known *Merhaba* ("Welcome") section (McCallum, 23-4).

A devout work, the *Mewlid* has a short prose prologue in Arabic, then follows a typical *mathnawî* format with praise of Allāh, apology, prayer for the author, etc. The main narrative is preceded by a discourse on the Light of Muḥammad [see NŪR MUHAMMAD], then includes not only Muḥammad's birth and the wonders preceding it, but his virtues, attributed miracles, the *Mi'râdj* [*q.v.*], his final illness and death. The metre is the hexametric *ramal*, and the language is a simple Ottoman that is both lyrical and moving.

Bibliography: For mss. and further studies, see Pekolcay's 1993 work quoted.

(KATHLEEN R.F. BURRILL)

SÜLEYMÂN PASHA (?-758/?-1357); son, probably the eldest, of the second Ottoman ruler, Orkhan [*q.v.*]. He was the first member of the dynasty to establish Ottoman rule on the European side of