

Lesson 10: Turkey in Eastern Europe

In 1305, the long-awaited event took place. The patriarch of Constantinople, at the insistence of King Iurii I, agreed to institute a metropolitanate in Halych. The new prelate received the title of Metropolitan of Little Rus' (Rusia minor). This original term, which just belonged to this ecclesiastical sphere, has its origins in the Greek tradition to call the original land micra and the colony megali. The same thing happened with the Greek colony in Italy. The first person who was consecrated as metropolitan died very soon, and the second, Peter of Ratna, who was symbolic for the further development. But apparently there were some misunderstandings between the princely administration and the new metropolitan, because one year after his consecration, he left Halych and went to Moscow. It was he who made Moscow the permanent seat of the Kievan metropolitanate, because he now became metropolitan of Kiev and Vladimir and since that the time after the seat was transferred from Vladimir, Moscow was made the ecclesiastic center of Northern Rus'. I would like to add that this Peter of Ratna, Ratna a city near L'viv, is known as Peter of Moscow. He is known as the man who created more or less the theory of Moscow's supremacy and he was then made a saint, St. Peter

of Moscow. He was the first pillar of the further hegemony of Moscow.

One might ask why the new metropolitan of Halych, decided to leave Halych and to go to Moscow. Unfortunately, our sources provide no answer and this also very significant. The Hypatian Chronicle, which one might without exaggeration regard as the most significant non-ecclesiastic monument in princely Rus', described the events in 1290. There was no continuation. Why? We are witnessing a very strange situation. The writing of chronicles went from Kiev to Halych or to Peremyshl and reached its peak in the Hypatian Chronicle. After 1290, no one was interested in continuation. Several lessons ago, I mentioned the reason may be in the transformation of European economics. Kiev developed as the most important economic and cultural center in Eastern Europe due to the fact that it was the main route from the Varangians to the Greeks. We know now that this route ceased to be important after 1071. It is a very important date in the history of Eastern Europe because, on one hand, it was the year of Manzikert, when the first Turks, the so-called Seldjuk Turks, started their successful penetration. On the other hand, Bari was captured in southern Mesopliamy and the Byzantine fleet ceased to exist. Of course, the initial reaction was that a new power had emerged to contest Byzantium.

It was Hungary, just complicating the equation, and mixing in all East European affairs, trying to be the successor to Byzantium. During the twelfth century, a new trade route developed from the Baltic via the Vistula and the Dniester and Halych, of course, got problems, but we should not forget that in 1205 it was the time when the center of the Byzantine empire ceased to exist and this trade and cultural connection ceased to exist. Now the princes who ruled in Galicia and Volhynia had to find connections with the other centers of international trade, especially to the Balticum, where Hansa was the leading power at the time. This is the reason, for instance, why King David transferred his princely residence from Halych to Kholm. Now during the thirteenth century we witness a special development in the principedom of Galicia and Lodomeria. It gradually took shape. It was an interesting process--the transformation of an Orthodox state into a West European state. Magdeburg law was introduced and the residence of Prince Leo of L'viv was founded on the basis of Magdeburg law. Latin took the place of Church Slavonic in princely correspondence. It is very interesting that even the title of the metropolitan and that the title of the king of Galicia and Lodomeria were styled in two versions--Greek and Latin. Apparently, this was not appreciated

by the traditional clergy and, so the result, was the migration from Galicia and from Volhynia and even from Chernigov--migration to the north. The problems connected with Lithuania and with the Baltic Sea were already discussed. Let us turn to the south.

During the twelfth century, the Dniester was the Galician trade route and have here the whole territory colonized by the Galicians. At the moment when Constantinople ceased to be the point of attraction, people are deserting this territory. New elements are entering here. This is very important because this elements will also play a role in the Ukrainian developments. By 1223, the Mongols destroyed the Kipchak reign. They found their refuge in the Carpathian Mountains. Their rule now could be compared to that of the Avars in the sixth and seventh centuries. In the same way as the Avars discovered the Slavs, organized them, and prepared for their entrance into the European scene around 800, after the Avar empire was destroyed, so too now the Cumans, the Kipchaks discovered the Wolochs, Wlachs, the Romanians of today. The history of the Romanians to the latter part of the middle ages is obscure and their origins are the subject of much discussion. Romanian historians, with rare exceptions, resolutely defend the point of view that Romanians are the descendants of

Roman settlers and ancient Dacians, who were Romanized during the imperial period. Outside Romania, the more probable view is generally held that the origin of the Romanian people is to be found south of the Danube, in the Romanized population of the Balkan peninsula, which after the settlement of the Slavs in the sixth and seventh centuries took themselves to the mountains to become a race of herdsmen. Some of these Vlachs, as they were known since the end of the tenth century, remained in the Balkans and they were gradually assimilated into the people amongst whom they were living. The last traces of them are the Chinkari in Macedonia and Northern Greece. In the course of time, the word Vlach lost its ethnical significance and a synonym for shepherd. The Vlachs played a part in the development of the second Bulgarian Empire, organized by the Cumans. By virtue of their great number in Thessaloniki, this province became known as great Wallachia. While Epirus was known as upper Wallachia. After they crossed the Danube and settled in the Carpathian region and they started to slowly infiltrate the neighboring plains. In the thirteenth century, the first implication of the political activity under the Polovtsian leadership became apparent and it was soon clear that soon the Hungarian kings would attempt to keep them under control, because they were trying to shake the

Hungarian rule. In 1324, a large political unit developed south of the Carpathian mountains, under the leadership of Voevod (this title, of course, had a Balkan Slavic origin, adopted by the Hungarians and later by the Romanians. The voevoda's name was Basaraba, the member of the Polovtsian clan of Basar. It has a very good Turkic etymology. He was a Hungarian vassal, but soon he started the struggle for emancipation from Hungary.

King Charles Robert, from the new dynasty. Charles Robert led an expedition against this mutinous vassal, but the Hungarian army was surrounded and destroyed in the Carpathians in 1330. Other attempts also failed. So we now have a new principality of Wallachia. After the death of Mamluk hominus *Mamluk Council* we are witnessing a new situation: the Byzantines were occupied with the Crusaders. In the meantime, some Polovtsian political organizations took leadership over the Bulgarians and Vlachs. So, the so-called Second Bulgarian Empire was created (1185-1396). There were three main dynasties: all three were of Kipchak origin. The first was the dynasty of Assen and here they were related to the Polovtsian dynasties who ruled here. They were just a ruling branch of the former Polovtsians, of the southern Ukrainian and southern Russian territories. A new center came into being.

Soon, after 1205, the Byzantine culture continues to develop, but

outside the Byzantine territory. The first state which took the leadership was Bulgaria of the Assens and such centers as Ternomo came into being. A little later, during the fourteenth century, here we have the Serbian state, led by the Nimaid dynasty, especially important ruler was Stephen Dushak, well-known because of his code of law. For the Ukrainian territories this was very significant that this development found its peak not before 1340. Only after 1340, there is a penetration of this new version of Byzantine learning in Slavic form to Eastern Europe. So, by the end of the fourteenth century, we have in Kiev and in Moscow territories, we have the representatives of this new Slavic-Byzantine culture. I would like to mention that Dushak or some of the Bulgarian kings--they styled themselves as the emperors of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Byzantium. The idea of the Third Rome was born here and later was transferred to the North. So, if the second southern-Slavic impact, which as you know in the history of Eastern European literatures has a very great significance. If it would happen fifty years earlier, probably, there would have been no migration of Peter of Ratna to Moscow, but it happened too late.

From the cultural point of view, this new, emerging state, Wallachia, which emerged from the Hungarian supremacy became just a province of the

Slavic-Bulgarian culture. In the same way, as another realm, which is now going to be by 1340--the Moldavian realm. From the cultural point of view, this Moldavian realm was just a continuation of the Old Halych. Since the middle of the fourteenth century, we have a tremendous amount of documents from both Romanian principalities. All of them are written in Slavic, because Slavic was the language of the ruling class. The ruling class, of course, were Turks. Linguistically, they became Slavs, but they ruled over shepherds and the language for the culture of the shepherds was Romance, later to become Romanian. This is a very important point.

In 1401, the principedom of Moldavia got finally a metropolitan see. By doing so, it became independent of the metropolitancy of Halych. Now, we have two rival metropolitan sees, which at one time it is Halych and later in Sucava. The rebirth of the Rus' faith, which happened in the beginning of the seventeenth century, was the work done by a man who was a member of the Moldavian dynasty--Peter Mohyla. It is a very interesting moment, because it was Peter Mohyla as metropolitan of Kiev who convinced Vassili Lypul, who himself was an Albanian soldier. Macedonia at this time was a vassal state of the Ottomans. Vassili Lypul has a great importance in the history of the Ukraine. Both Mohyla and Lypul are now trying to



create a kind of union between the emerging Cossack state of Khmelnytsky and Moldavia. As you know, it was Vassili Lypul, who married his daughter to Timish Khmelnytsky in order to establish a new dynasty in the Ukraine. The defeat in 1653 and the Pereiaslav treaty in 1654 defeated all these plans. Vassili Lypul was the last Moldavian Lospodar who was interested in the Galician-Slavonic tradition of the Moldavian principality. In 1640, a kind of branch of the Kievan Academy was created in Yasen, a printing office was created there, and printers from L'viv and Kiev who were active there. But after the death of Vassili Lypul, there was a reaction. It had its center here in Transylvania. Transylvania is interesting from other points of view. When the Magyars first entered this territory, a Turkic tribe of Seklers were settled. At the moment when Stephen accepted Christianity, he invited German settlers there. They were the famous Transylvanian Saxons. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it is the period of the Reformation. This Reformation spread to Transylvania and from here we have now this trend first spread to Wallachia and then to Moldavia. It meant that in the second half of the sixteenth century, we have already a translation of Luther's translation of the Bible into Wallachian. Due to a kind of romanticism, we have the birth of Romanian, non-Slavic consciousness.

1653 is the end. Mateus Basaraba, now the leader of the Romanian linguistic and cultural orientation, destroyed both Timish Khmelnytsky and Vassili Lypul. Since 1653, the linguistic border was established on the Dniester.

The Ottoman Empire was born on the border between Islam and Christendom, but it was not responsible for the Turkization of Anatolia. There were other factors and I would like to describe them. For centuries, after Manzikert, we have different principalities. One of them was not before 1300, the Ottoman principality. They were principalities of large warriors, who cohabited with Byzantium in intense intimacy of frontier warfare, imitating and influencing each other in tactics and weapons, in clothing and diet, drawing closer to each other through the subtle working of assimilation and conversion and marriage by capture. Not a few Turkish frontiersmen were suckled by Greek mothers, not a few of the noble families of early Ottoman and other Turkic states in Anatolia were descended from converted Greeks. In the popular religion of both Greek Christians and Turkic Muslims, there are many common elements, common sayings, common festivals, common holy places, and common acts. What is called akritor in Greek is called gaza in Turkish. It is essentially the same thing. This penetration is responsible for the Turkization of Anatolia, not the creation of this or another type of

reign, because the reign was then later Turkified. First, the reign existed. They would be very happy, as were the Seldjuks, to imitate the Iranian or the Abbasid traditions. This trend died out in the course of the fifteenth century, which is important because of the impact of several events.

The incorporation of the former frontier lands into the sphere of the old classic Islamic civilization (It was very clear when Selim I conquered Cairo and styled himself as Caliph). Then, of course, the decay and disappearance of the Byzantine Empire also contributed to this. When the Ottomans took over the Karaman principality, where the significance of the Karaman principality is that it goes back to the ruling dynasty of the Turks in Central Asia. They were conscious of their Turkic origin and they also brought to Anatolia the Turkic version of Islam, not the popular one, but the higher one.

I will mention it here in only a few words. It is strange. You remember that there were all possible invasions from Central Asia, Eastern Europe, and the Near East (the Huns, Avars, Khazars, etc.). If you will take the statistics, you will notice that there are 100 million Turks and approximately three million Mongols, despite the fact that the Mongols had

their empire comparatively late and only approximately 40,000 Tungus. The last Tungus empire was the Manchu empire, which they ruled China until 1912. But linguistically they completely assimilated to the Chinese.

So, if we see the balance, we must ask how it happened. Why are there approximately 100 million Turks? Why are there different tribes and nations and different organizations which speak Turkic today? The answer is that the Turks created an independent province of a religion, which for one or another reason, had appeal. Religions may be compared to political parties. A party may have the best theory, but for that or another reason it cannot appeal somehow and will never come to power. The same thing for a religion. Even if you take the Turks. They appear first around 550 on the scene. They appear first as Buddhists, then Nestorian Christians, then Manicheans, a part of them accepted Judaism. But only those Turks who accepted Islam made a career. Not the frontier Turks, but these center of Turkism was here. It was not accidental that the greatest Turkic state was Mirlana. I will try to be brief as possible.

The Ottomans started around 1300 as vassals to the Persian branch of the Mongols, the Ilkhanids. They ended by 1475, being the sovereigns of the Genghis dynasty in Crimea. In the course of 175 years--this was the

development of their position in the steppe realm. In 1326, Ottoman forces captured Bursa and made Bursa their center. By 1340, Byzantine possessions in Asia minor were reduced to a few coastal towns near Constantinople. In 1362, Murad captured Adrianople and the center was moved to Adrianople. In 1362, an allied army of Serbs, Bulgars, Wallachians, Bosnians, Hungarians, headed by Louis of Hungary, because Hungary was the successor to Byzantium, was routed on the Maritsa River. In 1389, the battle of Kosovo Pole spelled the end of Bulgaria and Serbia. In 1396, the coalition of Christian armies, headed by the Hungarian king and emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg, was routed in front of Nicopolis. There was a short Mongolian intermezzo. So Timur defeated the Ottomans at Ankara in 1402. But in 1413, Mehmed I recovered nearly all of his father's territories. In 1444, the last Christian coalition was defeated at Varna. In 1453, Mehmed II conquered Constantinople. 1475 is an important date in the history of Eastern Europe and the Ukraine, because now the Turkish resident is here in Kaffa and we have the same situation. In the moment when the Dnieper trade route lost its significance and the Volga trade route replaced it, there are two points which are of vital interest. It is the old Bosphorian predmet. Whether it is Kaffa or Tmutorokan or anything else, it doesn't make a difference. Then the old colony of the

Old Bosphorian empire to assure this route. It was Asak. It was taken in 1479.

The entrance of Muscovy as master of Eastern Europe started with the taking of Asak in 1696 by Peter the Great.

In 1499 the Turkish Navy won their first naval victory over Venice at Lepanto. During the sixteenth century, the empire reached its effective limits of its expansion and it came upon barriers it could not pass. On the Eastern borders, despite the victories of Selim and Suleiman the Magnificent, the Ottoman armies could not advance into Persia. The new centralized monarchy of the Sakuids, the high plateau of Iran which posed problems for logistics, and calling for new and unfamiliar military techniques, the difficulties of leading a war against Muslim adversaries--all this combined to halt the Ottoman forces at the frontiers of Iran and the overexpansion into Central Asia and India. On the eastern borders they met the Portuguese, whose shipbuilders and navigators were trained to meet the challenge of the Atlantic, who were more than a match for the cold water ships of the Ottomans. Beyond the Crimea and Azov, the Ottomans were halted by a new power--the Ukrainian Zaporozhian Cossacks, and the successor to the Golden Horde, Muscovy, and then some other Cossack organizations, the so-called Don Cossacks.

In 1579, the Ottomans launched a plan to open a canal between the Don and the Volga by acquiring a shipping to Central Asia to break out of the Portuguese vise. But this plan was never realized and the main adversary became organized here, a kind of West Point Academy: the Zaporozhian Sich.

The classical areas of Ottoman expansion had been more of this. Since the first crossing of the Bosphorus, in the middle of the fourteenth century, Europe had been the promised land of the Ottomans, the so-called Red Apple. Here, the power and the glory of Islam would be advanced against the infidels. In 1527, after conquering Hungary, the armies of Suleiman the Magnificent reached Vienna, but they could not conquer the city. The event was decisive. For the next century and a half inconclusive warfare was waged against Hungary and the Habsburgs, who ruled Hungary. In 1683, another attempt, the last, was made against Vienna. But the Ottoman Empire had reached the line beyond which it could not advance.

This is an important moment, when the Ottomans reached the Ukrainian territory of today, it was the end. Had the Ottomans been Christians, they would have had supremacy over Kiev and Eastern Europe. If the Cossacks had accepted Islam, which was not impossible, the Ottomans would have had supremacy over Kiev and Eastern Europe. The Polish drang nach osten created

a reversal of Rus', which made such plans impossible. Khmelnytsky, while he was in Turkish captivity, accepted Islam, as his predecessor Vladimir the Great was first a Muslim then a Christian.

The halting of the Ottoman advance into Europe is comparable in some ways with the closing of the frontier in the United States and the events in the Ukraine after 1774, after Kuchuk Kinarkji, but with a more shattering impact. The Ottoman state was born on the frontier between Christendom and Islam. Its leaders and warriors were warriors in the holy wars, advancing the face sword of Islam in new lands. The Ottoman acquitai (gazis) and dervishes, like the American pioneers and missionaries, believed themselves to be bringing civilization and the true faith to the people sunk in barbarism and unbelief, and like them, reaped the familiar rewards of the frontier warrior and the colonist. For the Ottoman state, the frontier had provided work and booty, both for its men of the sword and of religion, and in a very real sense--the raison d'etre of its statehood. By the sixteenth century, the state had already evolved from a principality of warriors into an empire, but the traditions of the frontier were still deeply rooted in the military, religious, and social life of the Ottomans. In the late middle ages, the Ottomans entered history as the only state in Europe



which already possessed a new apparatus of warfare, I mean the standing army, the Janissary Corps and a well-trained bureaucracy which they got from Byzantium and Iran. But, fundamentally, the Ottoman empire remained or reverted to medieval state with a medieval mentality and medieval economy. If there had not been humanism, reformation, secularization of culture, certainly the Ottoman Empire would have succeeded. But, in the meantime, something unique happened in the history of the civilization of mankind and then of course the Ottoman Empire could not pass the challenge. The Ottoman fiscal system comprised two main elements which eventually proved impossible to maintain in a satisfactory condition. On one hand, we have the feudal system, combined with the religious foundation, ef-kaf. It could have all-embracing provided for the livelihood of every person who held public office, including the sultan. But the Ottoman economy was never entirely organized on a purely feudal basis. The powerful military was their advantage and disadvantage at the same time, because it needed cash. The Ottomans needed cash and in order to get cash to continue wars and to do that they had to maintain armies. But by 1550, they reached what was possible for them. Therefore, from that point on, only a decline was possible. Now we reach the period when the Ukrainian Cossacks enter the scene.