

## Türkmen Revolts in the Türkiye Saldjûk State During the Reign of Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV\*

### IV. Kılıç Arslan Döneminde Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nde Ortaya Çıkan Türkmen İsyamları

Aybüke ÖZCAN<sup>1</sup> 



\*This article was written based on the author's master's thesis titled Sultan IV. Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan Dönemi Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti Tarihi (Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul 2022) and translated into English.

<sup>1</sup>Istanbul University, Faculty of Letters,  
Department of History, Istanbul, Türkiye

ORCID: A.Ö. 0000-0002-7786-3205

**Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:**

Aybüke Özcan (Res. Assist.),  
Istanbul University, Faculty of Letters,  
Department of History, Istanbul, Türkiye  
E-posta: aybukeozcan@istanbul.edu.tr

**Submitted/Başvuru:** 24.07.2023

**Revision Requested/Revizyon Talebi:**  
23.08.2023

**Last Revision Received/Son Revizyon:**  
01.10.2023

**Accepted/Kabul:** 03.10.2023

**Citation/Atf:** Özcan, Aybüke. "Türkmen Revolts in the Türkiye Saldjûk State During the Reign of Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV." *Şarkiyat Mecmuası - Journal of Oriental Studies* 44 (2024), 41-72. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jos.1331849>

#### ABSTRACT

The defeat of the Türkiye Saldjûk State (The State of Rüm/Anatolian Saldjûks) by the Mongols at Köse Dağ mobilised some elements such as Türkmens and Armenians, who were under the Saldjûks, and led to independence activities. After the death of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw II, three inexperienced maliks and statesmen who used them for their own political ambitions remained.

The period of Sultan Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV's joint and independent rule, which is the subject of this article, covers the period when many political events took place and the Türkiye Saldjûk State entered the process of collapse. As a matter of fact, various Türkmen uprisings occurred during this period. One of the reasons for the political, military, economic and social uprisings of the Türkmens, who came to the Saldjûk lands in large masses and played an important role in the formation of the state, was the relations of the aforementioned sultan with the statesmen, Mongols and İlkhâns. Furthermore, the influence of Iranian statesmen in the administration, the struggle for dominance among the sultans and the polarisation forced Türkmens to take sides. The Türkmens, who mostly sided against Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV in the fight for the throne, caused bloody clashes and large-scale casualties during the decline of the Türkiye Saldjûk State. It was not possible to suppress these uprisings without the support of various nationalities and Mongol troops. The administrative weakness of the state naturally spread to its army as well. This article will analyse and evaluate the Türkmen revolts during the independent and joint reign of the Sultan Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV.

**Keywords:** Türkiye Saldjûk State, Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV, Türkmen, Revolt

#### ÖZ

Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Moğollara karşı Köse Dağ'daki yenilgisi, Selçukluların tâbiyetinde bulunan Türkmenler, Ermeniler gibi bazı unsurları da harekete geçirmiş ve bağımsızlık faaliyetlerine neden olmuştur. II. Gıyâseddin Keyhüsrev'in vefatından sonra ise geriye tecrübesiz üç melik ve onları kendi siyasi ihtirasları için kullanan devlet adamları kalmıştır.

Makalemizin de konusu olan Sultan IV. Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan'ın müşterek ve müstakil hâkimiyet dönemi, pek çok siyasi hadisenin vuku bulduğu ve Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin yıkılış sürecine girdiği zaman dilimini kapsamaktadır. Nitekim

bu dönem içerisinde muhtelif Türkmen ayaklanmaları meydana gelmiştir. Kalabalık kitleler hâlinde Selçuklu topraklarına gelen ve devletin teşekkül aşamasında önemli rol oynayan Türkmenlerin siyasi, askerî, iktisadî ve sosyal nedenlerle ortaya çıkan ayaklanmalarının sebeplerinden birisini de mezkûr sultanın devlet adamları, Moğollar ve İlhanlılar ile olan ilişkileri teşkil etmektedir. Öte yandan İranlı devlet adamlarının yönetimde etkin olmaları, sultanlar arasındaki hâkimiyet mücadeleleri ve kutuplaşma da Türkmenleri bir taraf tutmaya zorlamıştır. Taht kavgalarında ekseriyetle IV. Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan'ın karşısında yer alan Türkmenler, Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin inhitatındaki süreçte kanlı çarpışmalara ve geniş çapta zayıyata yol açmıştır. Bahsi geçen ayaklanmaların muhtelif milletlerden ve Moğol birliklerinden destek alınmadan bastırılması pek de mümkün olmamıştır. Zira devletin idarî husustaki zafiyeti, tabii olarak ordusuna da sirayet etmiştir. Bu makalede ise IV. Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan'ın müstakil ve müşterek hükümdarlığındaki Türkmen isyanları ele alınarak değerlendirilecektir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti, IV. Rükneddin Kılıç Arslan, Türkmen, İsyân

## Introduction

During the reign of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II, the Türkiye Saldjūk State became subject to the Mongols as a severe consequence of the defeat in the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243. After the death of Sultan Kaykhusraw II, his sons Rukn al-Dīn Kılıdġ Arslan IV, ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Keykubād II struggled for the throne. Although Kılıdġ Arslan IV stayed away from his country and administration for a while due to his journey to visit the Mongol khan, he confronted ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II many times when he returned and fierce battles took place between the two sides. Kılıdġ Arslan IV was sometimes imprisoned in the struggle for sovereignty between him and his brother, and sometimes he managed to sit on the throne with the support of the Mongols. During this period, many political, military and economic firsts were experienced and it is possible to say that the state started to collapse. During the reign of Kılıdġ Arslan IV, the Türkiye Saldjūk State was plagued by uprisings, the majority of which were composed of Türkmens.

### 1. Turk Aġmed Rebellion

With the emergence of the Great Saldjūk State in the Iranian geography, the appointment of Iranian/Persian administrators to important positions in the state organization led to a confrontation between them and the Türkmens, who contributed greatly to the establishment process and came to the fore with their brave struggles in the military field. The same tradition was maintained and continued in the other Saldjūk states that succeeded the Great Saldjüks; Iranian statesmen, who were capable of administration and were scholars, were utilised. The fact that the Türkmens, who established the political unity of the state and wanted to have a say in the administration, were dismissed from the administration over time, in contrast to the Iranians who were appointed to high offices in the bureaucratic field, caused them to be discontented and to act in a rebellious manner in the following periods.<sup>1</sup> It would be wrong to classify the sole cause of Türkmen revolts as racial strife with the ruling class. It is necessary to consider these events in their economic and social dimensions.

The historian and geographer Ibn Sa‘īd al-Maġribī<sup>2</sup> (d. 685 AH/1286 AD) mentions that Türkmen mountains and cities lay to the east of Eskishehir, and that Türkmens organized raids on the so-called Harāyita<sup>3</sup> and also sold captured children to Muslims.

Türkmen communities were also a threat to the Byzantine Empire of Nicaea in southwestern Anatolia and along its borders in the Menderes region.<sup>4</sup>

1 Kansu Ekici, “Anadolu Selçukluları’nda Türkmen İsyânlarının Nedenlerine İlişkin Tespitler”, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 13 (2005): 92.

2 Hasan Çetinel, “İbn Sa‘īd el-Maġribī’nin Kitâb el-Coġrafya’sından Anadolu’ya Dair Anekdotlar”, *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 48, (2019): 585.

3 It is a term used in the author’s book for Christians who do not shorten their beards. See. Çetinel, “İbn Sa‘īd el-Maġribī’nin Kitâb el-Coġrafya’sından”, 585 fn. 11.

4 Michael Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile Government and Society Under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261)*, (Oxford University, 1975), 98; Yusuf Ayönü, “Dördüncü Haçlı Seferi’nin Bat Anadolu’nun Türkleşme

Türkmen tribes fleeing from the destructive invasions and persecutions of the Mongols, who were considered to be the greatest danger of the XIIIth century, took refuge in Anatolia. The intense Türkmen refugees to Anatolia during the reign of Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Keykubād I were eliminated without leaving any threat to the Saldjûk country as a result of the sultan’s timely and appropriate migration policy. While some Türkmen communities were settled in order to Turkify the newly conquered areas, others were settled in the border areas in order to prevent them from causing turmoil in the event of possible social unrest in the Saldjûk State. Thus, while ensuring the protection of the newly annexed Saldjûk territories, some forces were also made ready on the border against enemies.

During the reign of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II, the Türkiye Saldjûk State was defeated by the Mongols in Köse Dağh and was subjected to heavy taxes. While this defeat plunged the state into an economic crisis that it would not be able to overcome for many years, it also led to rebellions against the government. Unlike those settled in the west, the Türkmens in the south were unable to finance themselves. They were incapable of obtaining the pastures they needed, and they were not satisfied both economically and politically by the sultan, who lacked administrative qualities, and they felt excluded. Considering all these factors, rebellions against the government became inevitable. New ones were added to the Türkmen uprising, which first emerged under the name of revolt of Bābā’r<sup>5</sup> and could hardly be suppressed.

Another revolt that struck a blow to the calm administration of the Vizier Shams al-Dīn al-Isfahānī and his tyranny was carried out by Türkmens in 1249. A Türkmen known as Aḥmed rebelled in the *uc (end)*.<sup>6</sup> This person, referred to in the sources as Turk Aḥmed, emerged claiming to be the son of the late Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Keykubād I and succeeded in gathering

Sürecine Etkisi”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 24 (2009): No. 1, 11.

5 For detailed information see. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Babaîler İsyanı*, (İstanbul: 2020).

6 Mustafa Akdağ states that the rebellion, which spread widely in a short time, took place in Eskişehir-Afyon Karahisar. (*Türkiye’nin İktisadî ve İçtimai Tarihi 1243-1453*, (İstanbul; Tekin Yayınevi, 1979), 1:72); Faruk Sümer noted that this rebellion probably took place in Denizli (“Anadolu’da Moğollar”, *SAD* 1, (1970), 28.

large masses around him.<sup>7</sup> According to the author Ibn Bîbî (d. after 684 AH/1285 AD),<sup>8</sup> upon his return to Kayseri in the spring of 1238, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw II ordered the killing of his imprisoned stepmother, Malike-i 'Adiliyye, in Anqara and her siblings in Borgulu. It was Mubâriz al-Dîn Armaghânsâh who executed this order on behalf of the maliks. However, according to a report, it is also stated that Armaghânsâh, overcome by mercy, did not kill them. As for the cause of the rebellion, it is thought that the Türkmen revolt was related to the rumor that spread by word of mouth.<sup>9</sup>

It is certain that the revolt spread to a large area with the participation of other Türkmens in the region. According to Ibn Bîbî,<sup>10</sup> Konya was informed that if necessary measures were not taken, no soldier in favor of the sultanate would be left in the land in two months. Alarmed by the news and seeking an immediate solution, Vizier Isfahânî dispatched all available troops to suppress the rebellion.<sup>11</sup> However, the Saldjûk army, faced with the troops of Turk Ahmed

7 *Anonim Selçuknâme*, trans. Halil İbrahim Gök-Fahrettin Coşguner, (Ankara: Atf Yayınları, 2014), 44; Ibn Bîbî, *Al-Awâmir al-'alâ'iyya fi'l-umûr al-alâ'iyya II*, trans. Mürsel Öztürk, (Ankara: TTK, 2014), 545-546; Yazıjioghlu 'Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, [Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Târihi], ed. Abdullah Bakır, (İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları 2017), 590; Münedjdim Bashi, *Câmi'ud-Düvel Selçuklular Tarihi Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikleri 2*, ed. Ali Öngül, (İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2017), 85-86. Cf. Nejat Kaymaz, *Pervâne Mu'înü'd-dîn Süleyman*, (Ankara: TTK, 1970), 45; Mehmet Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, (Ankara: Altınordu Yayınları, 2010), 101; Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, *Türkiye Tarihi Selçuklular Devri 2*, ed. Refet Yinanç, (Ankara: TTK, 2014), 200; Ali Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, (İstanbul: 2017), 247; Osman Turan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2018), 483; Id. "Keykâvus II", İA, c. VI, 642; Sümer, "Anadolu'da Moğollar", 28; Id. "Keykâvus II", DİA, c. XXV, (Ankara: TDV, 2022), 355; Coşkun Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", *Doğuştan Günümüze Büyük İslâm Tarihi* (İstanbul: Çağ Yayınları, 1992), 8:312. Saint Simon states that after the Turks were destroyed by the Tatars after the Köse Dağh defeat in 1243, a person he calls Coterinus, who claimed that his brother was not worthy of ruling, expressed his desire to be sultan, invited those around him to be witnesses, and claimed to be the son of Sultan 'Alâ' al-Dîn Kaykubâd I, as he appeared in the "Turk Ahmed" revolt. The author states that Coterinus, who plundered the villages around Konya and was almost successful in declaring himself sultan, was captured and hanged together with his brother as a result of the pursuit of the beg of Lampron (Namrun) while travelling to Alanya and that this rebellion lasted for three months. (*Bir Keşiş'in Anılarında Tatarlar ve Anadolu 1245-1248*, trans. Erendiz Özbayoğlu, (Alanya: DAKTAV, 2006), 59-60). Claude Cahen, however, mentioned Coterinus, the main character of the rebellion that took place during the reign of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw II, referred to him as Turk Ahmed, and noted that the sultan asked Constantine of Lampron for help in suppressing this rebellion. (*Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu'da Türkler*, trans. Yıldız Moran, (İstanbul: E Yayınları, 1979), 245). Vladimir Gordlevskiy mentions a rebel named "Koterin" who emerged immediately after the defeat of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw II in Köse Dağh and states that after three months of chaos, the rebel was captured and hanged as he approached Adana. (*Küçük Asya'da Selçuklular*, (Trans. Abdülkadir İnan, Ankara: 2019), 51). Tamara Talbot Rice, based on Gordlevskiy's record, also mentioned the same rebellion and mentioned that the rebel was hanged in Alaiye. (*Anadolu Selçuklu Tarihi*, trans. Tuna Kaan Taştan, (Ankara: Nobel Yayınları, 2015), 75). Although some research studies consider the two rebellions to be the same due to the overlap of the events, the regions where they occurred (Coterinus targeted Konya, while the rebellion of Turk Ahmad took place on the fringes) and the years (probably in 1243/1244, since the rebellion of Coterinus took place after the Battle of Köse Dağh, The Turk Ahmed rebellion took place in 1249, when Shams al-Dîn al-Isfahânî's influence in the administration was at its peak), there is an approximate time span of five to six years, so they are thought to be two separate rebellions.

8 Vol: II, p. 455-456

9 *Ibn Bîbî*, 2:545-546. Cf. Turan, *Türkiye*, 483.

10 Vol: II, p. 546.

11 *Anonim Selçuknâme*, 44; İbn Bîbî, 2: 546; Yazıjioghlu 'Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 590-591; Münedjdim Bashi,

and his followers, could not muster the courage to attempt an attack, thinking that they would not be able to resist, and began to act laxly and take their time in the face of the enemy. This attitude of the Saldjūk amīrs towards the rebels was probably due to their anger against the Vizier Shams al-Dīn Isfahānī, whose administration they were dissatisfied with. They then sent a messenger to Şāhib Shams al-Dīn al-Isfahānī and asked for support. In response, the vizier sent his troops from Syria, consisting of Khwarizmites,<sup>12</sup> Kurds and Kipcaks, under the command of Haṭīr al-Dīn Sujāsī to help them.<sup>13</sup>

Due to the inadequacy of information in the sources, it was not possible to determine whether Turk Aḥmed was the son of Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kaykubād I or not. In addition, there is no information on how this rebellion was suppressed or how it was concluded.

This attitude of the Saldjūk administration, which remained silent despite the ever-increasing Mongol pressure and economic burden, led to rebellions by the Türkmens. Of course, Türkmen revolts would not end with Turk Aḥmed and would continue to occur under different names, as will be discussed later.

It is worth mentioning that during the reign of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II, the Türkiye Saldjūk State also attempted to punish<sup>14</sup> the Armenians after the Köse Dağ defeat. Vizier Isfahānī, who heard the news of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn’s death during the battle, declared that a treaty should be signed before the other side heard about it, and as a result of Isfahānī’s initiative, Prakana (Bragana) Castle and a few other castles were captured by the Saldjūk during the negotiations with the Armenians. However, two years later (1248), the Armenians, taking advantage of the turmoil in the Saldjūk administration during the Türkmen

*Cāmi’ud-Düvel*, 2: 85.

- 12 After the death of Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārazm-Şāh, the Khwarizmites, who were left without a leader, were settled in Anatolia during the reign of the Sultan of Türkiye Saldjūk State, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kaykubād I, who captured Ahlat. However, during the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II, they left Anatolia due to the arrest of their chieftain Kayrhan and entered the service of al-Malik al-Sālih, the ruler of al-Djazira. In 1244, they defeated the Crusaders, captured Jerusalem and dominated Palestine with the call of al-Malik al-Sālih, the Ayyūbid ruler of Egypt. Al-Malik al-Sālih, who succeeded in capturing Dimashk with their support, confronted the Khwarizmits because he did not allow the city to be sacked. In the end, the Khwarizmites were defeated by the Ayyūbid ruler and the majority of them were exterminated; the remaining Khwarizmites took refuge in the Türkiye Saldjūk State. They were settled in the Saldjūk country by Shams al-Dīn Isfahānī in the extremities. It can be assumed that those who were among the troops sent to suppress the rebellion were from the aforementioned Khwarizmites. Yinanç, *Türkiye Tarihi*, 2:191-192; Aydın Taneri, “Hârizmşahlar”, DİA, (İstanbul: TDV, 1997), c. XVI, 230.
- 13 Anonim Selçuknâme, 44; Ibn Bībī, 2:546; Yazijoghlu ‘Ali, *Tevârîh-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 591. Cf. Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti’nin Dağılışı*, 101; Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 247; Turan, *Türkiye*, 483; İlhan Erdem, “Türkiye Selçukluları-İlhanlı İlişkileri (1256-1308)” (Phd Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 1995), 109; Alptekin, “Türkiye Selçukluları”, 312.
- 14 The reason for this initiative of the Saldjūks against the Armenians was that the Armenians, who were supposed to take part in the army of the Saldjūks in the Saldjūk-Mongol struggle in accordance with the treaty, did not fulfil their promises with various excuses. After the defeat at Köse Dağ, Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw’s wife, mother, ghulāms and cariyes travelled from Konya to Aleppo with their possessions, and when they arrived in Cilicia, they were detained by the Armenian king of Cilicia. See. Abu’l-Faraj, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu’l-Faraj 2*, trans. Ömer Rıza Doğrul, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), 542-543. Cf. Mehmet Ersan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu’da Ermeniler*, (Ankara: TTK, 2019), 186-189; Gordlevskiy, *Küçük Asya’da Selçuklular*, 49.

revolts, recaptured Prakana Castle with a sudden raid.<sup>15</sup> Another important event, which cost the arbitrary rule of the Vizier Shams al-Dīn al-Isfahānī and even his life, and which marked the beginning of a long-lasting struggle for the sultanate among the viziers, was the return of Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV with a *yarliq* from the Mongol khan.

Following the Battle of Köse Dagh in 1243, the Türkiye Saldjūk State came under the rule of the Mongols and after the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw (1246), the administration remained in the hands of child sultans. According to Claude Cahen,<sup>16</sup> the fact that the central administration was run by elect of Iranian statesmen over time led to a shift away from Turkishness and the effects of Iranianization became more visible.

### 2.1.1. Revolt of Oyuz Malik

Another matter that needed to be resolved after the administrative issues were settled was the revolt of Oyuz<sup>17</sup> Malik, the first Türkmen rebellion and political problem that the “*joint sultanate*” faced.<sup>18</sup> Although there is not much information about it in the sources and the exact date is unknown, it is possible to say that the event, which is recorded as the revolt of Oyuz Malik, took place in 1249 in the *end (uc)* region. The Saldjüks, who had witnessed similar uprisings of Türkmens who wanted to express their dissatisfaction with the government in previous years, made great efforts to suppress the rebellions against the government. The Beglerbegi Shams al-Dīn Yavtaşh and Amīr Akhūr Fakhr al-Dīn Arslanogmuşh were assigned to eliminate these rebels, whom Ibn Bībī<sup>19</sup> described as “*outsiders (harici/Kharidji)*”, “*rebels*” and “*obstinate*”.<sup>20</sup>

Although we do not have detailed information about the rebellion, it can be considered as one of the indicators of the existence of Türkmen masses who were dissatisfied with the administration of the Türkiye Saldjūk State and the increasing Mongol oppression. In addition, this happened in parallel with the gradual decline in the central power of the Saldjüks as a reflection of disputes over the throne, conflicts among statesmen and the appointing of important amīrs in charge instead of small troops to suppress the uprisings.

15 A. G. Galstyan, “Simbat Sparapet’in Vakayinamesi’nden Bir Bölüm”, *Ermeni Kaynaklarına Göre Moğollar*, trans. İlyas Kemalöglü, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2017), 92-93. Cf. Ersan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu’da Ermeniler*, 189-190. Cf. Yasemin Aktaş, “Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti’nin Diploması Tarihi”, (Phd Thesis, Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2015), 275.

16 Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu’da Türkler*, 158.

17 This name in Ibn Bībī is translated by Mürsel Öztürk as “Oyuz” (II, 556), M. Nuri Gençosman “Ayvaz” (*Anadolu Selçukî Devletleri Tarihi*, 244), Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (*Selçuknâme*, trans. M. Halil Yinanç, ed. Refet Yinanç, Ömer Özkan, (İstanbul: 2017), 200) recorded it as “Uyuz”. Claude Cahen refers to it as “Vayuz/Vâyüz” (*Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu’da Türkler*, 266; *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 244). Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 49 fn. 95.

18 Züriye Çelik, “Moğol İstîlâsı ve Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti”, (Phd Thesis, Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2014), 129.

19 Vol: II, 556.

20 *Ibn Bībī*, 2:556; Yazijioghlu ‘Ali, *Tevârîh-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 597. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 49; Erdem, “Türkiye Selçukluları-İlhanlı İlişkileri”, 113; Yinanç, *Türkiye Tarihi*, 2:206; Turan, *Türkiye*, 489; Ergin Ayan, “Türkiye Selçuklularında Köle Emîrleri (II): Şemseddin Yavtaşh”, *Omeljan Pritsak Armağanı*, (Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), 478.



## 2.2. Invasion of the Aḡaç Erī Türkmens

After Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II emerged victorious from the battle against his brother, according to Āqsarā’ī’s (d. 733 AH/1332-1333 AD) record,<sup>21</sup> the state was administered by Vizier ‘Izz al-Dīn Muhammad Rāzī, Beglerbegi Shams al-Dīn Yavtash, Atabeg Fakhr al-Dīn Arslandogmush, Amīr Dād Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Ali, Mustawfi Nedjeb al-Dīn, Parwāna (Parwānācī) Nizām al-Dīn Khurshīd and Amīr Hādjib Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān. The territories of the Türkiye Saldjūk State were as follows; Akhlāt (Wān, Vastan, Erciş), Erzurum (İspir, Bāybūrd, Koçmaz/Kaçmaz), Erzindjan (Ak Shehr, Dercan, Kemah, Kögonya<sup>22</sup>), Diyarbekir (Harput, Malatya, Sumeysat, Mīnşār), Sivas, which was called Dār al-ālā, and the land of Dānishmend (Nīksār, Amasya Tokat, Komanat, Çankırı, Ankara, Samsun, Sīnūb, Qaştamūniye, Turhal, Borlu/Bolu), Qayşeriyya (Nīgde, Ereğli, Ermenek), Konya, Denizli, Qara Hişār (Afyūn), Demürlü (Qara Hişār), Ak Sarāy, Antalya and ‘Alaiye.<sup>23</sup>

The Saldjūks, who made great efforts to prevent the Mongols from intervening in Anatolia and who gave their all, both materially and spiritually, were able to protect their borders, but they also suffered from the rebellions of the Türkmens who fled from the Mongols and took refuge in Anatolia. The economic, political and social reasons for the rebellions of the Türkmen masses, which jeopardized the peace and security of the state, have already been mentioned in the section on the *Türk Ahmed Rebellion*. The Türkmen tribes, who were generally acting for looting purposes, found the opportunity to settle in Western Anatolia and attacked Byzantine villages when they could not resist the Saldjūks.<sup>24</sup> This time, the Saldjūks would face a new test in the face of the rebellion of the Aḡaç Erīs.

There are various opinions in the sources about the origins of this tribe called Aḡaç Erīs. Contemporary authors of the period are mostly in agreement that the Aḡaç Erīs were Türkmen.<sup>25</sup>

The Aḡaç Erīs lived on the plains and forests of Mar‘ashīs in the Elbistan region; they settled in the mountains, hills and valleys around Malatya.<sup>26</sup> Considering the fact that Türkmens migrating to Anatolia since the Mongol invasion became a threat to the Türkiye Saldjūk State

21 *Musāmarat al-akhbār wa musāyarat al-akhvār*, trans. Mürsel Öztürk, (Ankara: TTK, 2000), 31.

22 This place, known today as Shebīn Karā Hişār with its name in the XIXth century, was referred to as “Koloneia” in the IXth and Xth centuries. The Saldjūks, however, used “Kögonya/Kögonya”, the Armenian form of Koloneia. See. Fatma Acun, “Şebinkarahisar”, *DİA*, Vol: XXXVIII, (İstanbul: 2010), 393.

23 Baybars al-Manşūrī, *Zubdat al-fikra fi ta’rīkh al-hijra*, ed. Donald S. Richards, (Beirut: 1998), 30-31; al-‘Aynī, *‘İkdü’l-cümān, el-Meketebetü’ş-Şāmīle (e-book)*, 35. Cf. Turan, *Türkiye*, 495; Özeydin, “Anadolu Selçukluları”, 179.

24 Gordlevskiy, *Küçük Asya’da Selçuklular*, 50-51.

25 Faruk Sümer, “Aḡaç-eriler”, *Bellekten*, c. 26, (Ankara: 1962), No. 103, 521; Id. “Aḡaçeriler”, *DİA*, c. I, 460.

26 Ibn Bībī, 2: 573; Abu’l-Faradī, 2: 564; Yazijioghlu ‘Ali, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Selçuk*, 614. Cf. Faruk Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler) Tarihleri-Boy Teşkilâtı-Destanları*, (Ankara: 1972), 157; Id. “Aḡaç-eriler”, *Bellekten*, 523; Id. “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, *SAD*, 29; a.m.f., “Keykâvus II”, *DİA*, 356; Türkan Gökçe Tekin, “Selçuklu Tarihi Boyunca Ortaya Çıkan Türkmen İsyânları”, (Master Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University, 2019), 52; İlyas Gökhan, “Türkiye Selçukluları Zamanında Maraş Uç Beyliği”, *Selçuklu Medeniyeti Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1, (2016), No. 1, 159; Mustafa Akkuş, “Moğol İstilası ve İlhanlılar Döneminde Maraş Bölgesi”, *Uluslararası Selçuklu Döneminde Maraş Sempozyumu* 1, (2017), 210; Zeki Velidi Togan, “Azerbaycan”, *İA*, c.II, 98.



were settled on the fringes, i.e. in the provinces of Mar'ashīs and Malatya, it is possible to confirm the source information with modern researchs. Faruk Sümer<sup>27</sup> states that the Ağaç Erīs, so named because of the forested area they inhabited, settled here out of necessity due to the unfavorable living conditions of the region and that they may have been the remnants of the Türkmens of the Bābā'ī Rebellion of 1240, and considers them as the ancestors of the tribe that would later emerge as Takhtadjis<sup>28</sup>.

During the Saldjūk period, two roads of great commercial importance were located in the region where the Ağaç Erīs resided. The first was the Caesarea-Elbistan-Mar'ashīs-Aleppo route, which provided trade with Syria. In fact, one of the factors that made it valuable was Yabanlu Bazaar<sup>29</sup> (Pazarören), which hosted an international fair that lasted for 40 days. The other was the Sivas-Malatya road. Merchants from Syria, al-Jazeera and 'Iraq came here.<sup>30</sup>

The Ağaç Erīs, who were engaged in activities that put the state in a difficult situation, took advantage of the struggle for sovereignty of the Saldjūk sultans and started to plunder caravans in various parts of Rūm, Syria (Dimashk) and Armenian regions (Cilicia and Cukurova), massacring the people in the caravans and cutting the roads.<sup>31</sup> Finally, in order to put an end to these plundering raids, Qādī 'Izz al-Dīn, Beglerbegi Shams al-Dīn Yavtaşh and some of the state elders took action and set out for Kayseriyya. At that very moment, it was heard that Baiju Noyan had arrived in Anatolia with a large number of soldiers, animals, women and children, and that his vanguard had even reached Erzindjan. Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykâ'ūs II returned to Konya from Kalanda<sup>32</sup> as soon as he received the news. Those who had gone to Elbistan to resolve the issue of the Ağaç Erīs also came to Konya to join the sultan.<sup>33</sup> With the arrival of the Mongol commander and his troops, who were known to be more serious than the current issue for the Türkiye Saldjūk State, the Ağaç Erīs incident was shelved. Thus, left alone for a while longer, the Ağaç Erīs had the opportunity to spread to even wider regions. The events regarding their fate will be mentioned again in the following phases.

27 "Ağaçeriler", 460.

28 See. Yusuf Ziya Yörükân, *Anadolu'da Aleviler ve Tahtacılar*, ed. Turhan Yörükân, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1998); Ali Selçuk, *Ağaçeri Türkmenleri Tahtacılar*, (İstanbul: I Q Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2008).

29 For further information see. Faruk Sümer, *Yabanlu Pazarı Selçuklular Devrinde Milletlerarası Büyük Bir Fuar*, (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1985).

30 Sümer, "Ağaçeriler", 460.

31 *Ibn Bībī*, 2: 573. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 60; Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 250; Yinanç, *Türkiye Tarihi*, 2: 222; Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 252-253; Turan, *Türkiye*, 496; Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 102; Id. *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu'da Ermeniler*, 196; Tekin, "Selçuklu Tarihi Boyunca Ortaya Çıkan Türkmen İsyânları", 54; Sümer, "Ağaç-eriler", 523; a.mlf., "Ağaçeriler", 461; Id. "Keykâvus II", *DİA*, 356; Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", 316.

32 The place, which has different names such as Kalamos, Gelembe, Gelenbe historically, is located between Akhisar and Bālīkesrī. See. W. M. Ramsay, *Anadolu'nun Tarihi Coğrafyası*, trans. Mihri Pektaş, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1960), 139; Bilge Umar, *Türkiye'deki Tarihsel Adlar Türkiye'nin tarihsel coğrafyası ve tarihsel adları üzerine alfabetik düzende bir inceleme*, (İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitapevi, 1993), 364-365.

33 *Ibn Bībī*, 2: 573. Cf. Turan, *Türkiye*, 496.

### 3.1. The Struggle for Dominance over Malatya and the Re-emergence of the Aġaç Erîs Issue

In order to consolidate his rule, ‘Izz al-Dîn Kaykâ’ûs II also stepped up his campaigns in the interior of the country. To this end, he ordered one of his slaves, Tuġhr Hapa<sup>34</sup>, who had always been hostile to the Mongols and were his greatest supporters, to go to Malatya to prepare an army composed of Kurds and Türkmens. After Malatya, he went to Zait Castle in Kharpert and ordered Şharaf al-Dîn Aġmed (Ibn al-Balas), son of Belas, to take control of Malatya and Sharaf al-Dîn Meġmed, son Sheyh ‘Adî (Adiy), to take control of Zait Castle.<sup>35</sup> When Sharaf al-Dîn Aġmed arrived in Malatya, he encountered resistance from the city’s inhabitants, who had previously recognized and obeyed the reign of Sultan Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdj Arslan IV, resulting in a clash between the two sides. These clashes cost the people dearly and famine broke out in the city. Unable to cope with prices that exceeded their purchasing power, the Malatyans revolted and killed approximately 300 of the men accompanying Şharaf al-Dîn Aġmed. Forced to leave the province in the face of this massacre and the events that had transpired, Şharaf al-Dîn Aġmed fled to the Klaudia region and destroyed several monasteries in the vicinity. On his way to Āmid, his life was ended by the amîr of Meyyâfârikîn.<sup>36</sup> Additionally, Şharaf al-Dîn Meġmed, who was appointed to Zait Castle, was slaughtered by Engürek Noyan’s<sup>37</sup> soldiers as he was heading to Kemah to join Sultan ‘Izz al-Dîn after persecuting the people in the castle.<sup>38</sup>

Sultan ‘Izz al-Dîn Kaykâ’ûs II, who could not achieve the desired results through the men he appointed, sent his amîr Ali Bahâdir, who was described by Abu’l-Farâdj<sup>39</sup> as a man with high fighting skills despite his short stature, to Malatya. Ali Bahâdir arrived in the city, relieved the suffering of the people in distress and ‘Izz al-Dîn Kaykâ’ûs II’s rule was recognized.<sup>40</sup>

Ali Bahâdir’s main action was the campaign he organized against the Aġaç Erî Türkmens. The Aġaç Erîs, who lived in Mar’ashîs and its environs, were raiding the cities and Christian villages in a plane extending to the mountains of Malatya and persecuting the people. Therefore, they had to be brought under control immediately. The issue of the Aġaç Erîs, which was not

34 The name mentioned by the historian Abu’l-Farâdj was translated by Ö. Rıza Doğrul as *Tuġr Hapa/Tuġr Balaba* (Vol: II, p. 563); in another book by the author, this name is recorded as *Tagarbelaba* by Şerefeddin Yaltkaya. (Id. *Târîhu Muhtasar’id-Düvel*, trans. Şerafeddin Yaltkaya, (Ankara: TTK, 2011), 30).

35 Abu’l-Farâdj, 2:563; Id. *Târîhu Muhtasar’id-Düvel*, 30. Cf. Tülay Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, (Malatya: Malatya Kitaplığı 2013), 77; Turan, *Türkiye*, 505.

36 Abu’l-Farâdj, 2: 563; Id. *Târîhu Muhtasar’id-Düvel*, 30. Cf. Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, 77.

37 Engürek Noyan, a Mongol commander, was one of those who came to Anatolia with Baiju Noyan together with Kġodja Noyan. See. Aqsarâ’î, *Musâmarat al-akġbâr*, 29. Cf. Togan states that he was appointed to Anatolia by Batu Kġhan (*Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2019), 326); Mustafa Akkuş-Büşra Bağcı, “Hülâgû Han Döneminde Anadolu’da Görev Yapan Moġol Komutanları”, *USAD*, (Konya: 2018), No. 9, 160.

38 Abu’l-Farâdj, 2:563; Id. *Târîhu Muhtasar’id-Düvel*, 30. Cf. Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, 77; Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 254-255.

39 2: 563-564.

40 Abu’l-Farâdj, 2:564; Id. *Târîhu Muhtasar’id-Düvel*, 30. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 70; Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, 77; Turan, *Türkiye*, 505-506; Sümer, “Aġaç-eriler”, *Belleten*, 523.

fully resolved after Baiju's arrival in Anatolia, came to the agenda again after Kaykā'ūs II regained the throne. Amīr Ali Bahādir organized an expedition to the region, defeated them, captured their chief named Cuti (Juti) Beg and imprisoned him in Minşar (Minşar) Castle.<sup>41</sup>

While these events were going on, Baiju Noyan came to the Elbistan region, occupied the city and massacred many people.<sup>42</sup> He took the young girls and young men he had taken as captives and left for Malatya. Ali Bahādir was forced to flee to the castle of Ƙahtā after Baiju's arrival. Baiju, who apparently went there on behalf of Rukn al-Dīn Ƙilidj Arslan IV and carried out occupation activities, asked the people of Malatya to recognize Ƙilidj Arslan's sovereignty and obey him. After making them swear allegiance to Ƙilidj Arslan, he took a large amount of dinars from the people. Baiju Noyan, who was supposed to join Hülāgū Ƙhan's Baghdad expedition, left Fakhr al-Dīn Ayāz, one of Rukn al-Dīn Ƙilidj Arslan's slaves, in Malatya and went to Zait Castle.<sup>43</sup>

Ali Bahādir arrived in Malatya as soon as he heard that Baiju had left the region. The people of Malatya, whose biggest reservations were Baiju Noyan and who recognized Ƙilidj Arslan's sovereignty, did not open the city gates to Ali Bahādir. Then he tried to enter the city again with a troop formed from the Ağaç Erīs whom he had subjugated, but the siege lasted for days and resulting in people suffering the most, since famine broke out in the city. Unable to resist any longer and unable to cope with the famine, some of the people allowed Ali Bahādir and his army of Ağaç Erīs' to enter the city. Ali Bahādir then said that he would spare the people, that everyone could go about their business and that his problem was not with them but with their rulers. It seems possible to say that Ali Bahādir was not true to his word on this issue. For Fakhr al-Dīn Ayāz, Ƙilidj Arslan's governor, was imprisoned, Şhāhāb Ārid was killed after being taken around on a donkey, and İğdişbaşı (İgdishbashi) Mu'in was killed after being subjected to various humiliating treatments. In addition to them, Rūm and Kurdish amīrs were also killed.<sup>44</sup> The execution of the Rūm priest Mustawfī Kaloyan, his son Kiryori and his brothers Basil and Manoli after their property was confiscated reveals that they acted in cooperation with Ƙilidj Arslan's Muslim supporters and resisted together.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore,

41 Abu'l-Faradj, 2:564; Id. *Tārīhu Muhtasar'id-Düvel*, 30. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 70; Osman Turan, *Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1993), 230; Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, 78; Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 254-355; Sümer, "Ağaç-eriler", 523-524; Id. "Ağaçeriler", 461; İlyas Gökhan, "XIII. Yüzyılda Maraş", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13, (2005), 206; Selim Kaya, "Malatya'da Tarihi Bir Kale: Masāra (Minşar) Kalesi", *Ortaçağ'da Malatya -Makaleler-*, Malatya: 2020, p. 214-215.

42 Abu'l-Faradj recorded different figures in two of his works. In one of them, he states that 7.000 people were killed (2:564); while in the other he says that this number was 6.000 (*Tārīhu Muhtasar'id-Düvel*, 30-31).

43 Abu'l-Faradj, 2:564; Id. *Tārīhu Muhtasar'id-Düvel*, 31. Cf. Erdem, "Türkiye Selçukluları-İlhanlı İlişkileri", 131; Metin, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*, 78; Yınanç, *Türkiye Tarihi*, 2:234; Turan, *Türkiye*, 506; Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", 319.

44 Abu'l-Faradj, 2:565; Id. *Tārīhu Muhtasari'd-Düvel*, 31. Krş. Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 255; Turan, *Türkiye*, 506.

45 Abu'l-Faradj, *Tārīhu Muhtasari'd-Düvel*, 31. Cf. Dimitri A. Korobeinikov, "Orthodox Communities in Eastern Anatolia in the Thirteenth to Fourteenth Centuries Part 2: The Time of Troubles", *Al-Masaq: Islam and The*

the presence of Kaloyan in the position of the mustawfī, which today can be considered as the “*minister of finance*”, is an indication that non-Muslims as well as Iranian subjects were appointed to high civil service positions in the Türkiye Saldjūk State. This example proves that the Saldjūks, regardless of race, nationality, religion and sect, placed people who were popular and respected by the people in administrative positions.

The Syriac writer Abu'l-Faradj, a native of Malatya, records the events these in detail, stating that the famine in the city had reached great proportions, that Malatya had turned into a desert due to the raids and banditry of the Aḡaç Erī Türkmens, and that some people not only sold their children to the Aḡaç Erī, but also boiled and consumed the skin of their shoes and even roasted and ate their own children.<sup>46</sup>

Hearing that the Mongols were approaching, Ali Bahādir knew that he could not resist them, so he left Malatya and went to Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II and killed Husayn Choban (Chupan) and Bar Sauma son of Andrios during the journey.<sup>47</sup>

### 3.1.1. The Issue of Meḥmed Beg, Chief of the Uç (End) Türkmens

The person appointed by the Ilkhāns ruler to collect the taxes from the Saldjūk lands was Tād̲j al-Dīn Mu’tazz. However, Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV and the Mu’tin al-Dīn Sulaymān in order to discredit ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II, informed Tād̲j al-Dīn Mu’tazz that the reason for his departure from Konya to Antalya was to prepare for a rebellion by uniting with the *uc (end)* Türkmens. But, the leading role of the rebellion is attributed to Meḥmed Beg. Prof. Dr. Mikail Bayram has made some evaluations based on the *Meḏj̲mū’a al-Resāil*, which contains information about the lineage of Meḥmed Beg, who is described as the leader of the *uc (end)* begs.<sup>48</sup>

What is important for the subject under consideration is to reveal whether the statements of Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV and Vizier Mu’tin al-Dīn about Kaykā’ūs II are authentic or not. Therefore, it is necessary to make an explanation in the light of the records that provide information on the mentioned subject.

Türkmens played an active role in the process from the first formation of the Saldjūk States to their disintegration, especially in the establishment phases, in the struggle against foreign nations and sometimes in the throne fights between the sultans, leaning towards one side and playing an active role in making that sultan the dominant power. As one of the examples of this situation, Sultan Gh̲iyāth al-Dīn Kayk̲husraw I’s struggle for the throne can be shown. Sultan Gh̲iyāth al-Dīn Kayk̲husraw I, who regained the throne in 1204 as a result of the support of the Türkmens, created an end principality by appointing his father-in-law

*Medieval Mediterranean*, 17/1, (March 2015), 5.

46 Abu'l-Faradj, 2:565; Id. *Tārīhu Muhtasari’d-Düvel*, 31-32.

47 Abu'l-Faradj, 2:565-566; Id. *Tārīhu Muhtasari’d-Düvel*, 32. Cf. Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 255; Turan, *Türkiye*, 506.

48 Mikail Bayram, “Türkiye Selçukluların Uç Beyi Denizlili Mehmet Bey”, *Türkler*, 6:483 ff.

Manuel Mavrozomes to the Denizli-Honaz (Honas) region.<sup>49</sup> Mikail Bayram<sup>50</sup> writes that the aforementioned Meḥmed Bey, in addition to the title “*Malik*”, the treatise also includes the title “*Meḥmed al-Mavrezemī*”, he notes that he may have been the grandson of Amīr Mavrozomes, that is, the son of Ioannes, and that he later converted to Islam because he was mentioned with a prayer used for apostates. Therefore, based on the information that Mavrozomes was not a Muslim, it is possible to say that the Mavrozomes’ conversion to Islam started after Meḥmed Beg. This is also in part because he had a brother named İlyās (İlyas) and a son-in-law named ‘Ali.<sup>51</sup> However, Mehmet Ali Hacıgökmen<sup>52</sup> states that Meḥmed Beg was the son of Mavrozomes. Meḥmed Beg is also known for laying the first foundations of Inancoghullari (Inanjids) Principality<sup>53</sup> (1261-1368), also known as Ladiq/Denizli Principality.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, when ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II was persecuted by Baiju’s grandson Yisutay, he took refuge in Denizli and the sultan’s treasures were kept by Meḥmed Beg, who seems to have been a *khaznadār* at the time.<sup>55</sup>

After the Battle of Alashehir in 1211, Denizli, which formed the Turkish-Byzantine border for many years, was given to the Byzantine emperor in 1256/1257 by when ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II in return for Baiju’s sending reinforcements in order to return to Konya after Baiju left Anatolia.<sup>56</sup> With this act, Sultan Kaykā’ūs II must have experienced the first tension between himself and the Türkmens, whom he had received the greatest help from in his struggle for the throne. Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn, who was also notable for his fondness for entertainment with the encouragement of his amīrs and uncles, was still a more acceptable ruler compared to Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıç Arslan IV, who had established cordial relations with the Mongols. For this reason, the Türkmens were enraged when the sultan they trusted gave the province they had been inhabiting to a Byzantine. Nevertheless, the Türkmens, unwilling to give up their

49 Ibn Bībī, 2:120. Cf. Tuncer Baykara, *I. Gıyaseddin Keyhusrev 1164-1211 Gazi-Şehit*, (Ankara: TTK, 1997), 41; Selim Kaya, *Sultan I. Gıyâseddin Keyhüsrev ve II. Süleymanşah Dönemi Selçuklu Tarihi (1192-1211)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), 142-143; Turan, *Türkiye*, 296; Mehmet Ali Hacıgökmen, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devlet Adamları*, (Konya: Çizgi Yayınları, 2018), 57; Feridun Emecen, “Uç Beyi”, *DİA*, Vol: XLII, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012), 38.

50 “Türkiye Selçukluları Uç Beyi Denizlili Mehmet Bey”, 484.

51 Ibn Kḥaldūn describes ‘Ali Beg as the brother and helper of Meḥmed Beg (*Tārīhi İbn Haldūn ve Divānū ‘l-Mübtedā ve ‘l-Haber fī ‘eyyāmī ‘l-Arab ve ‘l-Acem ve ‘l-Berber ve men ‘Asarahūm min Zevī ‘l-Sultani ‘l-Ekber*, (ed. Halil Şehade, Süheyl Zekkār), (Beirut: 2000), 5:200); al-Kalkaşhandī, *Şubḥ ul-a şhā*, ed. Muhammed Hüseyin Şemseddin, (Beirut: 1987), 5:345. Cf. Muharrem Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, (İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Yayınları, 2018), 203; Bayram recorded his brother under the name “*İshak*” (“Türkiye Selçukluları Uç Beyi Denizlili Mehmet Bey”, 484-485).

52 *Türkiye Selçuklu Devlet Adamları*, 65.

53 For detailed information on this principality see. İbrahim Balık, *Denizli (Lâdik) İnançoğulları Beyliği*, Konya: Çizgi Yayınları: 2022.

54 Muharrem Kesik states that it was founded by Türkmens fleeing the Mongol invasion (*Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 203); Tuncer Baykara, “İnançoğulları”, *DİA*, Vol: XXII, (İstanbul: TDV, 2000), 263.

55 Bayram, “Türkiye Selçukluları Uç Beyi Denizlili Mehmet Bey”, 485.

56 Georgios Akropolites, *Vekayinâme*, (trans. Bilge Umar), (İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 2008), 138-139.

cause, recaptured the city in 1259 under Meḥmed Beg.<sup>57</sup> Osman Turan,<sup>58</sup> based on a document by the author Rashīd al-Dīn, states that the Türkmen masses under Meḥmed Beg first came to Eastern Anatolia and settled in Erzindjan and Bāybürd, but they caused great destruction and casualties in Anatolia with the raids they organised, and finally the Mongols took over and massacred those in Erzindjan, and Meḥmed Beg and the survivors came to Denizli.

Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II had to clash with Meḥmed Beg, the leader of the uç Türkmen, at the same time that he referred the envoys from the Ilkhāns to Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV to collect taxes and debts. Āqsarā’ī<sup>59</sup> states that the reason for this battle was Meḥmed Beg’s animosity towards Kondistabl (Connetable). In the battle, Meḥmed Beg’s troops defeated Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn’s troops between Alanya and Antalya.<sup>60</sup> Nejat Kaymaz<sup>61</sup> states that Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II went to Antalya to suppress the rebellion. As seen in the rebellions of Turk Aḥmed, Oyuz Malik and Aḡaç Erīs, the Türkiye Saldjûk State’s sultans were not successful in suppressing these rebellions with their own troops alone; they were able to put down the rebellions by sending prominent amīrs in person, providing mercenaries from various nations in the surrounding regions, or by the intervention of the Mongols. Therefore, ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II, as a sultan who had experienced this before, was aware that he could not overcome the rebellion without preparation and reinforcements. His departure to Antalya can be interpreted as a way to dodge the envoys from the Ilkhāns and continue his life of debauchery.

The clash between the Türkmen and Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II should not be reduced to a minor matter of hatred. The Türkmen had been engaged in various rebellion attempts for quite some time in order to show their social and especially economic dissatisfaction. Nevertheless, they were still loyal to the center. However, at this point, it is seen that they started to act more independently and freely.

Although there is no clear basis for Vizier Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s statement that Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II was preparing for rebellion, it is seen that the sultan returned to Anatolia after obtaining the throne he wanted from Hülāgū Kḥan and continued his old life and took a contrary attitude towards the Mongols again by relaxing. As a matter of fact, it was not a coincidence that he chose the province<sup>62</sup> with the highest concentration of Türkmen, where he could feel the strongest and get help when he was in a difficult situation. When the events are evaluated in this context, one might think that ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II might have attempted a rebellion, but he had no reason to do so. Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn had lost his throne several times

57 Tuncer Baykara, *Denizli Tarihi (İkinci Kısım) 1070-1429*, (İstanbul: Fakülteler Matbaası, 1969), 31; Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 203.

58 *Türkiye*, 533-534.

59 *Musāmarat al-akḥbār*, 50.

60 Nāib Shāms al-Dīn Yavtash was also killed in this battle. (al-Yūnīnī, *Dḥayl Mir’āt al-zamān*, Haydarabad 1954-1955, 2:114. Cf. Turan, *Türkiye*, 532).

61 Nejat Kaymaz, *Anadolu Selçuklularının İnhitātında İdare Mekanizmasının Rolü*, (Ankara: TTK, 2011), 146.

62 There were 200.000 Türkmen tents in and around Denizli. See. Abu’l-Fidā, *Ebü’l-Fidā Coğrafyası (Takvimü’l-Büldan)*, trans. Ramazan Şeşen, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi), 2017, 302.



and had gone to great lengths to regain it; in the last instance, out of desperation, he had even swallowed his pride and confronted Hülāgū. He no longer had the strength to resist the Mongol/Ilkhāns forces, nor did he have a respected amīr other than his Vizier Faḫr al-Dīn Ali. If he wanted serious success, in a word sultanate on his own, he could have achieved this by forming an alliance with a powerful state that could stand against the Mongols. As a matter of fact, this is what happened. Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II was going to ask for help from Baybars, the Mamluk Sultan, and Berke, the ruler of Golden Horde (Batuids), the arch rival of the Mongols.

#### 4.1. Rebellions During The Independence Reign of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn ̐ilidj Arslan IV

Although the reign of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn ̐ilidj Arslan IV, who succeeded to the throne of the Türkiye Saldjūḳ State, was a period of numerous Türkmen revolts, these rebellion movements intensified with the end of the joint sultanate, and as a result of the ongoing rivalry between the sultans, they caused dissolution in the society as well as the country, especially after ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II left Anatolia. While the supporters of ̐ilidj Arslan IV had already achieved their desired positions in the administration, the supporters of ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II were made away one by one by Sultan ̐ilidj Arslan IV and his most powerful statesman Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān Parwāna. Some of the rebels were annihilated by Sultan ̐ilidj Arslan’s entourage because they adopted the reign of Kaykā’ūs II and refused to recognize the sovereignty of ̐ilidj Arslan, while some of the obedient ones were eliminated by Sultan ̐ilidj Arslan’s entourage because they could not prove their loyalty and continued their outbursts. Those who revolted during this period were the uç beg Meḫmed Beg, Karāmān, Zayn al-Hāj and Bunsuz, Ali Bahādir and Amīr Āḫur Muzaffar al-Dīn Ughurlu, Hurmaoghlu, Amīr Āḫur Esed and Bayraqdār (Amīr al-‘alam) Shāh-Malik. As will be explained and evaluated separately below, these rebels were eventually brought under control.

##### 4.1.1.1. The Persecution of Meḫmed Beg

After his brother’s desertion, Sultan Rukn al-Dīn ̐ilidj Arslan IV seized all but “*the frontiers, mountains and coastline*” from the lands of ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II in the western part of the Türkiye Saldjūḳ State.<sup>63</sup> The reason for this was that the Türkmens consisting of 2.000 tents<sup>64</sup> led by Meḫmed Beg<sup>65</sup> and including his brother İlyās, his son-in-law ‘Ali, his relatives Sevinç (Sevinch) and Salur Beg had made Denizli, Honas and the Dalaman Stream their home and did not recognise or want to recognise the rule of ̐ilidj Arslan IV.

63 Baybars al-Manşūrī, *Zubdat al-fikra*, 73. Cf. A. C. S. Peacock, “The Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm and the Türkmens of the Byzantine Frontier 1206-1279”, *Al-Masāq Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean*, (2014), 26:283.

64 Abu’l-Fidā, *Ebü’l-Fidā Coğrafyası*, p. 302.

65 The writer Aflākī records that the “akbörk” (white cone) was invented by Meḫmed Bey and mentions that he was a disciple of Mawlānā (*Manāqib al-‘arifīn*, trans. Tahsin Yazıcı, (İstanbul: MEB Yayınları: 1964), 1:470). Mikail Bayram, however, states that the production of akbörk was carried out by Bacılar in the Külāh-duzlar Bazaar in ̐ayseriyya (*Fatma Bacı ve Bacıyân-ı Rum*, (Konya: Nüve Kültür Merkezi Yayınları, 2008), 84-85).



The Türkmen held the Turkish-Byzantine frontier formed by the Menderes River in the north and the Dalaman Stream in the south.<sup>66</sup> However, in order for Kīlidj Arslan to establish full sovereignty in his country, he had to control these regions as well. Meḥmed Beg, who was aware of this and realised that it was their turn and that Kīlidj Arslan IV would march on them with his troops, found the solution by appealing to Hülāgū Khan. Meḥmed Beg sent an envoy to Hülāgū Khan and told him that he would be subject to the Ilkhāns khan, that they would pay their taxes directly to the Ilkhāns treasury, and that a shihna sent by the khan could reside with them, and accordingly asked for an edict and a standard from Hülāgū Khan. Accepting these demands of Meḥmed Beg's, Hülāgū gave them a yarlık (yarliq) granting them Denizli, Honaz, Dalaman and the surrounding areas. In addition, he appointed a man named Kulshar as shihna in charge of the Türkmen.<sup>67</sup>

As a result of Hülāgū Khan's granting them the provinces mentioned above, the first Türkmen principality formed in Anatolia was recognised by the Ilkhāns independently of the Saldjūks. Meḥmed Beg's consent to pay taxes to the Ilkhāns suggests that he had previously made payments to the sultans as well, since they were connected to the Saldjūk centre. There are opinions that Meḥmed Beg established good relations with Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV and paid his taxes regularly when travelling to Konya.<sup>68</sup> However, this situation should be approached with caution. Meḥmed Beg, who had fallen out with Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn due to Kondistabl, did not go to the aid of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs' troops in the battle between Kīlidj Arslan and Kaykā'ūs' soldiers in front of Altun-Aba Caravanserai, even though he was expected to support 'Izz al-Dīn due to his anti-Mongol stance. When Kīlidj Arslan declared his independent sultanate, one of his first acts was to try to take the Türkmen under his control, which worried the Türkmen, who were fond of their independence and used to act freely, and they did not recognise Kīlidj Arslan's rule. As a matter of fact, even if they were paying their taxes, the Türkmen residing in the western lands of the country, which had been divided in two before Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn's desertion, were expected to pay their share to 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II, not to Kīlidj Arslan IV. Considering that Meḥmed Beg's application to Hülāgū coincided with the middle of 1262, when Kīlidj Arslan ascended the throne, it becomes clear that not enough time had passed for a process such as paying taxes or establishing good relations with the sultan. Prior to these events, there is no information about the relations and

66 Baykara, *Denizli Tarihi (İkinci Kısım) 1070-1429*, 27, 29; Flemming, *Geç Ortaçağ Dönemi'nde Pamfilya, Pisidy ve Likya'nın Tarihi Coğrafyası*, trans. Hüseyin Turan Bağçeci, (Ankara: TTK, 2018), 43.

67 Baybars al-Manşūrī, *Zubdat al-fikra*, 73; Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīhi Ibn Haldūn*, 5:200; al-Ḳalkāshandī, *Ṣubḥ ul-a' shā*, 5:345. Cf. Baykara, *Denizli Tarihi (İkinci Kısım) 1070-1429*, 32; Id., "İnançoğulları", 263; Kaymaz, *Pervāne*, 93-94; Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 103; Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, 261; Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 268-269; Turan, *Türkiye*, 533; Kesik, *Anadolu Beylikleri*, 203; Flemming, *Geç Ortaçağ Dönemi'nde Pamfilya, Pisidy ve Likya*, 43; Erdem, "Türkiye Selçukluları-İlhanlı İlişkileri", 175-176; Sümer, "Anadolu'da Moğollar", 48; Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", 324-325; Sait Kofçoğlu, "İnanç Oğulları Beyliği", *Anadolu Beylikleri El Kitabı*, (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2016), 248-249. Hüseyin Kayhan, "Lâdik Beyliği", *Türkler*, 6:1332.

68 Salim Koca, "Anadolu Türk Beylikleri", *Türkler*, 6:1234; Sait Kofçoğlu, "İnanç Oğulları Beyliği", 248.

correspondence between Meḥmed Beg and Sultan Kılıdġ Arslan IV in the current resources. In the book of the author Aflākī,<sup>69</sup> the only account of Meḥmed Beg's being a disciple of Mawlānā Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī states that Meḥmed Beg came to Konya upon the call of Parwāna Mu'tīn al-Dīn Sulaymān and met Mawlānā. Meḥmed Beg, a ḡhazī of the end, may have seen the position Parwāna Mu'tīn al-Dīn had been placed in by the Ilkhāns at this time, and he may have appealed to Hülāgū, thinking that his power would increase if he himself became a follower of the Ilkhāns. Of course, this assessment is hypothetical. As a matter of fact, Meḥmed Beg's allegiance remained symbolic and he lost his life because he did not fulfil its requirements duly. In addition to this information, as mentioned in the same work,<sup>70</sup> Meḥmed Beg's men also seized 50.000 dirhams worth of fabrics from the merchants of a person named Khōdja Majd al-Dīn. Although Khōdja Majd al-Dīn said that he would not forgive Meḥmed Beg, Mawlānā Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī prevented this enmity and peace was made between the sides with his efforts. As can be understood from this, the Türkmen communities in the south were not as fortunate as those in the west. As a matter of fact, since they were not neighbours of a non-Muslim state, they did not have the opportunity to organise raids to generate income. Their material inadequacy probably pushed them into looting and extortion activities within the borders of the country.

After a while, Hülāgū Khan must have wanted to test the loyalty of Meḥmed Beg, whom he did not trust enough, and summoned the ḡhazī to his presence. The reason for this was that the Türkmens under Meḥmed Beg's command were still in favour of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II and could carry out activities in this direction. Meḥmed Beg rejected this invitation and refused to go to Hülāgū who was in Azerbaijan at that time. The Ilkhāns ruler was very angry at this disobedience of Meḥmed Beg and ordered Sultan Kılıdġ Arslan IV and the Mongol soldiers accompanying him to capture Meḥmed Beg. Furthermore, he attracted 'Ali Beg, who was known as the son-in-law of the uç ḡhazī, to his side with the promise of becoming the head of the principality, because the Türkmens had a large population and additional measures were necessary to break Meḥmed Beg's power just in case. Thus, Meḥmed Beg, who was also betrayed by his son-in-law, was expected to be easily captured by being left alone. As a matter of fact, 'Ali Beg made Kılıdġ Arslan IV's job easier by mentioning the weakness of his father-in-law Meḥmed Beg. Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıdġ Arslan IV marched against the Türkmens with the Saldġük-Mongolian troops in line with the orders he received from Hülāgū Khan. Besieged in Dalaman, Ilyās and Salur Beg were taken prisoner while Meḥmed Beg fled to the mountains. Although the Türkmen leader Meḥmed Beg hid in the place where he fled for a while, he realised that he could not resist and decided to obey. Thus, with the capture of their leader, the Türkmens operating on the Saldġük-Byzantine line on the western side of the Saldġük country would also be taken under control. Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kılıdġ Arslan IV

69 *Manāqib al-'arifīn*, 1:470.

70 Aflākī, *Manāqib al-'arifīn*, 1:470.

appealed to Mehmed Beg with the promise that his life would be spared in exchange for his surrender and gained his trust. Mehmed Beg believed the sultan's promise and went to his presence. However, Kīlidj Arslan broke his promise and had Mehmed Beg killed in Uluborlu (Borgulu) on their return to Konya. As agreed upon his death, his son-in-law Ali Beg<sup>71</sup> was appointed as the leader of the Türkmens in the south-western region.<sup>72</sup>

The aforementioned incident is narrated in a different way by Āqsarā'ī. The author<sup>73</sup> states that after Kīlidj Arslan IV ascended the throne, the entire region up to the border of Istanbul (Constantinople) was taken under control, the rebels were annihilated, Mehmed, Ilyās and Salur Begs were captured, the region was under the administration of Parwāna Mu'īn al-Dīn and castle guards were appointed to the provinces of Antalya and Alanya. Historian Āqsarā'ī does not mention the Türkmens' meeting with the Ilkhāns ruler Hülāgū Khan and their attempts for independence. This record of his shows that he attributed the greatest share in the elimination of the Türkmen forces, which were difficult to subdue, to Parwāna Mu'īn al-Dīn.

Considering the fate of 'Ali Beg, it is seen that he retained his position as an *uç* beg until the arrival of the Mamlūks Sultan Baybars in Anatolia. However, following the arrival of Baybars to the Saldjūk country, he, like other Türkmens who became emboldened following the arrival of Baybars, displayed a insurgent and rebellious attitude against the Türkiye Saldjūk State, which was subject to the Mongols. 'Ali Beg, who was wanted to be subjugated due to these behaviours, was captured and imprisoned in Karā Hīşār Dawla,<sup>74</sup> where he died of grief after a while.<sup>75</sup>

#### 4.1.2. Karāmān, Zayn al-Hāj and Bunsuz Rebellion

The Karāmān, Zayn al-Hāj and Bunsuz Rebellion was another one of the revolts that took place one after another.

The arrival of Karāmān Türkmens in Anatolia can be traced back to the reign of Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Kaykubād I in 1228. Sultan Kaykubād I had settled the Karāmān-oghullari fleeing from the Mongol invasion in and around Ermenek, also called Kamār al-Dīn, which he captured in

71 Although 'Ali Beg continued to be subject to the Saldjūks for a while, in 1276 he adopted the rule of the Germiyānoğhullari and declared his independence by taking advantage of the Siyavush Cimri incident in 1277. However, after a short period of time, he was captured by Saldjūk-Mongolian troops as a result of the repulse operation and died of grief in 1278 in Karahisar-ı Devle/Karahisarısāhib (Afyūn Kara Hīşār) Castle where he was imprisoned. See. Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 204; Baykara, "İnançoğulları", 264.

72 Baybars al-Manşūrī, *Zubdat al-fikra*, p. 73, 76; Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīhi Ibn Haldūn*, 5:200; al-Kalkaşhandī, *Şubh ul-a'shā*, 5:345-346. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervāne*, 94; Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 103-104; Cahen, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu*, p. 261; Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 268-269; Turan, *Türkiye*, 532-533; Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 203; Flemming, *Geç Ortaçağ Dönemi'nde Pamfilya, Pisidiya ve Likya*, 48; Sümer, "Anadolu'da Moğollar", 49.

73 *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 53.

74 See. Metin Tuncel, "Karahisar", DİA, (İstanbul: TDV, 2001), 24:416-417.

75 Ibn Bībī, 2:664-665; Āqsarā'ī, *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 103. Cf. Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 104.

1225 after his campaign<sup>76</sup> against the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia.<sup>77</sup> According to Yazijioğlu ‘Ali,<sup>78</sup> they belonged to the Afshār tribe of the Oghuz. Ibn Bībī<sup>79</sup> first records that the ancestor of the ̤arāmān-oghullari, ̤arāmān (who was probably Nüre/Nür al-Dīn Süfī), was a coal miner who lived in the vicinity of Ermenek and earned his living by hauling coal from the mountains to Laranda. Historian Shīkāri<sup>80</sup> states that Nüre Süfī, after leaving his son ̤arāmān in his place as beg, travelled to Sivas and became an ascetic by joining Baba Ilyās. Although al-Djannābī (d. 999 AH/1590 AD) states that Nüre Süfī was of Armenian origin, there is no information in the works of contemporary authors that we can confirm this information.<sup>81</sup> Nüre Süfī b. Sadr al-Dīn, the ancestor of the ̤arāmān-oghullari, had fought on their side against the Saldjūks after he joined the Bābā’ī sect.<sup>82</sup> The relations between the ̤arāmān-oghullari and the Bābā’īs, which are thought to have started with this incident, were taken over by the successors of both sides and it is seen that they continued their struggle during the reign of Sultan ̤iliđj Arslan IV.

Historians mention different names about the begs who came after Nüre Süfī, who is considered to be the grandfather of the ̤arāmān-oghullari. While Ibn Bībī<sup>83</sup> mentions “̤arāmān” and “Bunsuz”, Āqsarā’ī<sup>84</sup> also records the name “Zayn al-Hāy”. al-‘Aynī states that he had three sons named “̤arāmān”, “Oguz Khan” and “Timur Khan” Karāmān settled in Konya and Laranda, Oguz Khan in Alaiye and Timur Khan in Damascus.<sup>85</sup>

His son Karīm al-Dīn Karāmān Beg, who was seen to be active after Nüre Süfī, became very powerful in time and took advantage of the chaotic atmosphere created when Baiju Noyan came to Anatolia in 1256 and gained population and carried out plundering activities.<sup>86</sup>

76 For more information on this expedition see. Ersan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu’da Ermeniler*, 179-181.

77 Neshīrī, *Kitāb-ı Cihan-Nümā Neşri Tarihi*, ed. F. Reşit Unat-M. Altay Köymen, Ankara: TTK, 1949), 1:43-45. Cf. Erdoğan Merçil, *Müslüman-Türk Devletleri Tarihi*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1985), 302; Fuad Köprülü, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluşu*, (Ankara: 1991), 35; Emine Uyumaz, *Sultan I. Alâeddin Keykubād Devri Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti Siyasî Tarihi*, (Ankara: TTK, 2003), 102; Faruk Sümer, “̤arāmān Oghulları”, EP, Vol: IV, 619; Şehabeddin Tekindağ, “Karamanlılar”, İA, 4:316.

78 Yazijioğlu ‘Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 676. Cf. Faruk Sümer, “Karamanoğulları”, DİA, Vol: XXIV, (Ankara: TDV, 2001), 454.

79 Vol: II, 629.

80 Shīkāri, *Karamannâme [Zamanın kahramanı Karamaniler’in tarihi]*, ed. Metin Sözen-Necdet Sakaoğlu, (Karaman: Karaman Valiliği, 2005), 107. Cf. Ocak, *Babailer İsyanı*, 166; Tekindağ, “Karamanlılar”, 317.

81 See. Stanley Lane-Poole, *Düvel-i İslamiye, İslam Devletleri Tarihi Başlangıçtan 1927 Yılına Kadar*, (trans. Halil Edhem Eldem), (ed. Samet Alıç), (İstanbul: Selenge Yayınları, 2020), 270 n. 140.

82 Merçil, *Müslüman-Türk Devletleri Tarihi*, 302; Paul Wittek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Doğuşu*, (trans. Fatmagül Berktaş), (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1995), 52; Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti’nin Dağılışı*, 104; Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 348; Turan, *Türkiye*, 537; Sümer, “Anadolu’da Moğollar”, 50.

83 2:629.

84 *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 53.

85 Tekindağ, “Karamanlılar”, 318.

86 Ibn Bībī, 2:630; Yazijioğlu ‘Ali, *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 676. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 98-100; Merçil, *Müslüman-Türk Devletleri Tarihi*, 303; Kesik, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*, 348; Alptekin, “Türkiye Selçukluları”, 325; Murat Serdar-Murat Hanar, “Moğol Hâkimiyeti Sırasında Ermenek ve Çevresinde Yaşanan Siyasî ve Sosyal Gelişmeler (1277-1292)”, *Ermenek Araştırmaları*, (Konya: Palet Yayınları, 2018), 1:242.

Ḳarāmān Beg, who captured Ermenek and was granted the title of Beg of Ermenek, killed many Christians here and gained a power that became increasingly difficult to prevent. This situation caused Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV to worry, and the sultan sought a solution for Ḳarāmān Beg, who was having difficulty to be obeyed in the face of his growing power.<sup>87</sup> As a matter of fact, Ḳarāmān Beg frequently organised raids as far as the Isauria (Izauria) and Silifke region and even managed to defeat the Armenian King Hetum's (1226-1269) troops twice.<sup>88</sup>

*The Anonymous Saldjûknâme*<sup>89</sup> records that Parwāna Mu'īn al-Dîn Sulaymān was able to distract the Ḳarāmān-oghullari, who were causing trouble in the country, by granting them manşib<sup>90</sup> and to remove the obstacles to the reign of Kılıdî Arslan IV. Ibn Bībī<sup>91</sup> and Yazijioghlu 'Ali's book<sup>92</sup> contain similar statements in this regard, and it is mentioned that Ḳarāmān and his nōkers<sup>93</sup> who came to the presence of Sultan Kılıdî Arslan IV were given principalities (beyliks), rank (manşib) and timars. Bunsuz, who is referred to as the brother of Ḳarāmān Beg, was given the position of amīr-i jāndār;<sup>94</sup> thus Sultan Kılıdî Arslan IV succeeded in subjugating the Ḳarāmān-oghullari with his words and promises.<sup>95</sup> Sultan Kılıdî Arslan's assignment of Bunsuz to the palace can be explained by the fact that he wanted to keep him with him as a hostage. However, since the Mongol enmity of the Ḳarāmān-oghullari, who stood out with their successful struggle against the Armenians, was also known and it was thought that they would take part in the front against Kılıdî Arslan just like the uç għazī Meḥmed Beg after 'Izz al-Dîn Kaykā'ūs II left the Saldjûk throne, Sultan Kılıdî Arslan and Parwāna Mu'īn al-Dîn Sulaymān must have aimed to politically attract them to their side with the given iḳtā. However, this subordination of the Ḳarāmān-oghullari did not last long.

The events at which the Sultan of the Türkiye Saldjûk State, Rukn al-Dîn Kılıdî Arslan IV, and the Ḳarāmān-oghullari diverged and how the Ḳarāmān-oghullari begs were disposed of are described differently in the records of contemporary authors. Among these sources, there are three works that should be taken as basis. These are the works of Ibn Bībī, Āqsarā'ī

87 Tekindağ, "Karamanlılar", p. 318.

88 Turan, *Türkiye*, 536; Ersan, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu'da Ermeniler*, 196-197; Cahen, "Quelques Textes Négligés Concernant Les Turcomans De Rûm Au Moment de L'Invasion Mongole", *Byzantion*, (1939), 14/1:133.

89 46-47.

90 Manşib is a term that is used in a close sense with the word "câh" and refers to the position, honour and fame that gives a person a reputation in the society. See. Mustafa Çağrıncı, "Câh", *DİA*, Vol: VII, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993), 14-15.

91 2:629.

92 *Tevârih-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 676.

93 It is a term meaning the servant class in Mongolian and also Turkish states. It also means comrade and friend. See. Zerrin Günal, "Nöker", *DİA*, Vol: XXXIII, (İstanbul: TDV, 2007), 216-217.

94 In Nuri Gençosman's translation of Ibn Bībī's work, it is recorded that Bunsuz became Sultan Kılıdî Arslan's amīr-i jāndār after the death of Ḳarāmān Beg (*Anadolu Selçukî Devleti Tarihi*, 290); This information is not mentioned in Mürsel Öztürk's translation. Cf. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, (Ankara: TTK, 1937), 3; Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 100; Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 270; Turan, *Türkiye*, 537; Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, "Anadolu Beylikleri Tarihine Aid Notlar", *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 1928, II, (trans. Samet Aliç), *Gaziantep University Journal Social Sciences*, 15/3, (2016), 961.

95 Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 104.

and an *Anonymous Armenian Veķāyināme*, which we had the opportunity to examine with Claude Cahen.

According to the *Anonymous Armenian Chronicle (Veķāyināme)*,<sup>96</sup> Karāmān, who belonged to the Ismā'īliyya, confronted the Armenian King Hetum after gaining power, defeated him, and was wounded in a battle with Hetum and his forces after besieging the Manyan (Maniaun, Manion) Castle for seven/nine months in 1262/1263. Although he managed to return to his country wounded, he lost his life. Bunsuz and his son-in-law died directly in this battle. This source also indicates that Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Ƙilidj Arslan IV was afraid of Karāmān, who was a powerful figure. As a matter of fact, it matches the records of two other authors who mention Sultan Ƙilidj Arslan's granting him a manşıb (rank) and a place as an iķtā. According to the anonymous source, the story of Karāmān, Bunsuz and Zayn al-Hāj ends here.

Simbat Sparapet<sup>97</sup> also confirms what is written in the *Anonymous Armenian Chronicle (Veķāyināme)* and provides more detailed records. In addition to the above records, he mentions that the emerging Karāmān wanted to be addressed as "sultan" because of his power and might, that Rukn al-Dīn Ƙilidj Arslan IV could not oppose him because he was afraid, that he oppressed the people of İcīl and Silifke, and that he defeated King Hetum three times. Simbat mentions that Karāmān threatened him because he captured Manyan Castle before the Muslims and maintained Armenian sovereignty for three years. In sum, Karāmān held the fortress for nine months and was wounded in the battles with the Armenians; Bunsuz and his son-in-law died on the battlefield, and he died some time later from the effects of the wound.

Āqsarā'ī, a very important historian for the 13th century Anatolian history, records the events between these three figures and the Saldjūks in a way that is not mentioned in other sources. Before moving on to his record, it is necessary to go back a few years and review the actions of Sultan Ƙilidj Arslan IV and the current situation in Anatolia. The last reign of Rukn al-Dīn Ƙilidj Arslan IV, who finally ascended to the throne alone after the triumvirate in the Türkiye Saldjūk State and the double-headed administration, which was disrupted again and again despite its establishment many times, began, as customary, with the control of a number of political organisations. The first of these to come to the fore was the Meĥmed Beg Rebellion. Led by Meĥmed Beg, whose sincerity in his loyalty to the Saldjūk-Mongol troops was not trusted and who was still considered to be a supporter of 'İzz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II, an army was sent against the Türkmens in the Denizli region, resulting in Meĥmed Beg's tragic death. The Karāmān-oghullari in the south were an organisation with at least as much power as the Türkmens in the west, and would undoubtedly reach an even larger mass in time. As a matter of fact, both sides were aware of this. According to Āqsarā'ī's statement,<sup>98</sup> the Karāmān-

96 Kaymaz, *Pervāne*, 101; Cahen, "Quelques Textes Négligés Concernant Les Turcomans De Rûm Au Moment de L'Invasion Mongole", 133-134.

97 Galstyan, "Simbat Sparapet'in Vakayinamesi'nden Bir Bölüm", *Ermeni Kaynaklarına Göre Moğollar*, 101-102.

98 Āqsarā'ī, *Musāmarat al-akĥbār*; 53-54. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervāne*, p. ;Öngül, *Anadolu Selçukluları*, 270; Turan, *Türkiye*, 537;



oghullari, who were in support of ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II, decided to take action immediately, probably because they thought that they would suffer the same fate after what happened to Mehmed Beg. Karāmān-oghullari marched towards Konya with an army of 20.000 soldiers. However, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn, who had met with the troops under the command of Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV and waited in readiness, met the incoming Karāmān-oghullari troops in front of Gāvele Castle. A fierce battle took place between the two sides. Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV had fewer troops than the Karāmān-oghullari, but the sultan’s army was victorious in the battle. The Karāmān-oghullari suffered a great defeat against the Saldjūks. The consequences of their endeavours were also very heavy. Bunsuz and Zayn al-Hāj, who were taken prisoner after the battle, were taken around the bazaars of Konya and subjected to insulting treatment such as slaps on the back of their necks; shortly afterwards, all the rebels were hanged in front of the gate of the inner castle of Konya. The good news of this victory of the Türkiye Saldjūk State against the Karāmān-oghullari was announced with fathnāme sent to the provinces.

Ibn Bībī, who provides the most accurate information about the Türkiye Saldjūk State during the reign of Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV and can be considered the most important historian of the period, does not mention the battle that took place in front of the Gāvele Castle in Āqsarā’ī’s record. It is because of this that the authors, with the exception of Nejat Kaymaz, who is one of the researchers analysing the period, have generally taken Āqsarā’ī’s statements as a basis when describing the relevant phase of Saldjūk-Karāmān relations, and have pushed Ibn Bībī’s records into the background. However, the record of Ibn Bībī, who was raised by his father Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad,<sup>99</sup> who entered the service of Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kaykubād I in 1231-1233 and served as the muḥshif of the firāshhāne-i khāḥ,<sup>100</sup> munshī, interpreter and ambassador, and who took over these duties after his father’s death and was a close witness to the events, is also important for our subject. Ibn Bībī<sup>101</sup> states that Karāmān and his brother Bunsuz became emboldened after Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV gave them iktā and titles, and they came to the point of rebelling against the sultan. Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV, who was not at all pleased with their behaviour, wanted to give the Karāmān-oghullari their comeuppance, but he could not punish Bunsuz because he refrained from the revolt of Karāmān, who was in Armenia at the time. Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV took action after receiving the news of Karāmān Beg’s death and ordered his amīr-i jāndār to capture Bunsuz and had him arrested. Karāmān’s sons Mehmed, Maḥmud, Qāsim and Ḥalil were sent to Gāvele Castle.

The primary conclusion that can be drawn from the available data is that Bunsuz and Zayn al-Hāj did not die in the fight against the Armenians, as stated in the *Anonymous Armenian Chronicle (Veḳāyināme)*, and that they continued to live for a while. Karāmān in the Armenian province continued his raids after he received large iktās from Kīlidj Arslan IV, which led to his conflict with King Hetum. Saldjūk Sultan Kīlidj Arslan tried to stop Bunsuz, who continued his

99 Abdülkerim Özaydın, “İbn Bībī”, DİA, Vol: XIX, (İstanbul: TDV, 1999), 379.

100 Responsible for the preparation of the sultan’s bed.

101 2:629. Cf. Tekindağ, “Karamanlılar”, 318.



plundering and destruction activities, but this was only possible after the death of his brother Karāmān. When Āqsarā'ī's statement is analysed, it can be accepted that although it is partially true, it includes some exaggerated expressions. Making a single and definite judgement that the reason for the confrontation between Sultan Kīlīdj Arslan and the Karāmān-oghullari was their support for 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II would be incomplete in explaining the relations between the parties. Because Karāmān had obtained the title of amīr and the provinces he wanted, and Bunsuz was appointed by the sultan as amīr-i jāndār, a very prestigious position in the palace. The fact that the Karāmān-oghullari, no matter how powerful their army was, were officially recognised by a Saldjūq sultan, even though they were under Mongol domination, undoubtedly increased their prestige. Therefore, the conflict between the two sides should not be attributed to the partisanship of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II, but rather to the fact that the Karāmān-oghullari, despite having achieved what they wanted, did not stop and behaved in a manner that was not pleasing to Sultan Kīlīdj Arslan IV. Of course, it is possible that after hearing what happened to Mehmed Beg, they too became anxious and adopted an attitude against the Saldjūq administration. However, it is also debatable whether they had the strength to resist a Saldjūq army supported by the Mongols. Bunsuz and Zayn al-Hāj are not mentioned in the events that follow these events. Then, either he was killed by hanging after being taken captive as mentioned by Āqsarā'ī or Bunsuz, who was imprisoned in the castle according to Ibn Bībī's record, must have died there after a while. Āqsarā'ī's information also makes the fate of Karāmān Beg uncertain. If it is accepted that Karāmān, Zayn al-Hāj and Bunsuz were the initiators of the rebellion and that all of them except Karāmān were hanged, the information on what Karāmān did after this battle is unclear. Although the sources whose records are analysed separately do not agree with each other, they are complementary at some points.

When Karāmān Beg fled wounded from the battle with King Hetum in 1262, Zayn al-Hāj and Bunsuz were either not with him or they had fled from the Armenians on the battlefield and settled in a safe area. Bunsuz, who escaped, continued his activities against the Saldjūqs, and Kīlīdj Arslan IV set out to punish Bunsuz as soon as he learnt of the death of Karāmān, whom he feared. Bunsuz and Zayn al-Hāj, who heard the news of the situation, marched to Konya with their armies, but they must have been defeated and captured. After the elimination of the Karāmān-oghullari rebels, a number of rumours emerged. They said that light descended on the graves, including Zayn al-Hāj, and that in their dreams they saw Zayn al-Hāj, dressed in precious clothes, entering a large tent set up in a beautiful garden. When Zayn al-Hāj was asked how he had earned such a place for himself despite all his rebellion, it is narrated that he said that God had pity on him because of the bad and humiliating treatment he had received.<sup>102</sup>

102 Āqsarā'ī, *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 55.

### 4.1.3. Ali Bahādir and Amīr-i Ākhur Muzaffar al-Dīn Ughurlu's Last Attempt at Rebellion

Ali Bahādir was always a supporter of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II and took part in the opposition to Kīlidj Arslan IV. As a matter of fact, he recognised the sovereignty of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II in Malatya during his campaign against the Ağaç Erīs. However, Ali Bahādir and Muzaffar al-Dīn Ughurlu, who could not resist against the army of Kīlidj Arslan IV supported by Mongol troops, realised that they could not resist any longer and fled to the uç.<sup>103</sup>

Ali Bahādir, Amīr-i Ākhur Muzaffar al-Dīn Ughurlu and the amīrs who joined them had first fled to the uç after their unsuccessful rebellion attempts against the new and victorious Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV and since they did not feel safe, they followed Kaykā'ūs II to Istanbul. Ali Bahādir, one of the Saldjūq amīrs who was welcomed by the Byzantine emperor during his stay in Constantinople (İstanbul), in addition to being assigned to Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II, successfully fought against the enemies of Byzantium and received attention and gifts with his increasing prestige.<sup>104</sup> However, after a short time, these people, who were understood to have returned, started a new preparation. 'Ali Bahādir and Amīr Ughurlu recruited soldiers and supporters from various places and once again rebelled against Sultan Kīlidj Arslan in Konya.<sup>105</sup> Āqsarā'ī states that<sup>106</sup> the rebellion started in Anḳara and Çankiri provinces with the encouragement and organisation of the aforementioned amīrs. It is obvious that the amīrs, who had not lost hope and still kept alive the idea of placing 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II on the throne, had undoubtedly set out on this journey by risking everything that might happen to them.

Parwāna Mu'in al-Dīn Sulaymān, who did not spare caution, met the rebels at Altunaba (Altınapa) Caravanserai with the support of Mongol troops. They suffered a heavy defeat against Parwāna's army and lost their lives. However, people in important positions of the state such as Mustawfī Sadr Nedjeb al-Dīn of Duleyjan,<sup>107</sup> Mushrif-i Mülk Qiwām al-Dīn Erzindjanī, Kāḍī 'Askar Sivrihisarlı Djalāl al-Dīn, Sayf al-Dīn Kayıaba, Karīm al-Dīn 'Alishir, Amīr-i Silāh Badr al-Dīn Gawhartash (Gühertaş)<sup>108</sup> and Ustādār Amīn al-Dīn Yāḳūt were still in favour of Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II. On the grounds that they were still in favour of

103 İbn Bībī, 2:588-589, 593; Yazijioḡlu 'Ali, *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 630; Münedjdim Bashi, *Câmi'ud-Düvel*, 2:93. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 89-90; Ersan, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Dağılışı*, 89; Sümer, "Anadolu'da Moğollar", 35; Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", 321. Özaydın states that Yavtaşh was also present with Ali Bahādir in this battle ("Anadolu Selçukluları", 182). Historian al-Yūnīnī, records the date of the battle as 25 Ramadan 659/25 August 1261 (2:113-114). Cf. Turan, *Türkiye*, 513.

104 İbn Bībī, 2:589.

105 İbn Bībī, 2:593.

106 *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 56.

107 In the poem written by Mawlānā's son Sultan Veled to the Vizier Tādī al-Dīn Mu'tazz, it is written that the village of Karaarlan, which was endowed to Mawlānā's lineage by Badr al-Dīn Gawhartash (Gühertaş), was taken away from them by the wrath of Mustawfī Nedjeb, but that Nedjeb also got into trouble. Kaymaz, *Pervâne*, 103 fn. 18.

108 The author Ahmed Aflākī mentions that Badr al-Dīn Gawhartash (Gühertaş) was known as castle warden and was Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Keykubād's lala (atabak) and one of the chief masters of the palace (*Âriflerin Menkabeleri*, 1:43). Cf. Merçil, *Saray Teşkilâtı*, 202.

Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II, they were captured, brought to the sultan’s palace and sent to Alıncak Noyan, the Mongol governor in charge of Anatolia. Alıncak Noyan killed the rebels who were handed over to him.<sup>109</sup>

#### 4.1.4. Other Revolts During the reign of **Ḳılıdġ Arslan IV**

The last uprising, led by Ali Bahādir and Amīr-i **Akhūr** Muzaffār al-Dīn Ughurlu was finally suppressed with difficulty.<sup>110</sup> However, after the departure of Sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II, who was supported by the majority of the country, the amīrs, who were not willing to immediately adopt the rule of the sole owner of the throne, Rukn al-Dīn **Ḳılıdġ Arslan IV**, and especially the officials, started to revolt one by one, taking advantage of the existing confusion. One of the rebels of the period was a person named Hurmaoġhlu, whose personality and duties in the **Salđjūk** country are not mentioned in the sources.

Hurmaoġhlu’s rebellion movement started in **Dānışmēnd** province (**Toġat**) and spread as far as **Ḳaştāmūnī**. Moreover, the aforementioned insurgent’s siege of the **Dānışmēnd** province and the capture of the city took place in a period of a few days.<sup>111</sup> The fact that this place, which was mentioned as **Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s** **ikṡā**, was captured in a short period of time as a result of an uprising reveals the weakness of law and order in the region and the inadequacy of **Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s** population. The fact that the rebellion spread to another province not far away shows the seriousness of the situation. Nevertheless, **Āqsarā’ī’s** record<sup>112</sup> shows that the uprising was suppressed by the **Rūm** army (the troops of **Ḳılıdġ Arslan IV**). When we look at the precedent rebellions, in which Mongol troops were often called upon to help, it is seen that they were not very large-scale but still caused chaos in the country.

Another one of those who revolted following Hurmaoġhlu’s rebellion was Amīr-i **Ākhur Esed**. Although his name was not mentioned in the previous events, it is possible to say that he was appointed during the reign of ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II and that he was one of the sultan’s men.<sup>113</sup> Amīr-i **Ākhur Esed** entered the **Salime (Salima, Selime) Castle**<sup>114</sup> and threw

109 Ibn Bībī, Vol: II, p. 593; **Āqsarā’ī** records only **Mustawfi Neđjeb al-Dīn, Qiwām al-Dīn Erzindġanī**, also known as **Ḥamīd Oġhlu**, and the **ķādī ‘askar**, and mentions that they supported the rebellion of **Ḳarāmān-oġhullari** and lost their lives for the sake of position (*Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 54). Cf. **Kaymaz, Pervāne**, 103.

110 **Āqsarā’ī, Musāmarat al-akhbār**, 56.

111 **Āqsarā’ī, Musāmarat al-akhbār**, 56. Cf. **Kaymaz, Pervāne**, 109-110; **Turan, Türkiye**, 539; Id. “**Kılıç Arslan IV**”, 705.

112 *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 56.

113 **Merçil, Saray Teşkilâtı**, 89.

114 Although it is not possible to determine the exact location of the castle, it is possible to make an inference from the books of the authors of the period. Mentioning the castle, which is likely to be located near **Aġ Sarāy**, and the aforementioned rebellion, the historian **Āqsarā’ī** records that the **Sālime Castle**, which he mentions several times in his account of the events of the following years, was located in his own property (*Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 247). However, there is no information on the date on which it was given to the administration of the author. On the other hand, an Iranian historian, **‘Aziz b. Erdeşhūr Esterābādī**, points out that the castle mentioned in his work is located east of **Aġ Sarāy** (*Bezm u Rezm (Eğlence ve Savaş)*, trans. **Mürsel Öztürk**, (Ankara: Kültür

Ağ Sarāy and its neighbourhood into turmoil, disrupting the order in the places he visited. The disturbances caused by him continued for about six months and were suppressed by the Amīr of Kırşehir Cacaoghlu Nūr al-Dīn<sup>115</sup> (d. after 676/1277). After a long period of siege by Cacaoghlu Nūr al-Dīn, the rebellion of the rebel Esed was put an end by throwing him out of the castle. The rebels accompanying him were slaughtered one by one.<sup>116</sup> Considering the duration of this uprising, it is observed that it occupied the sultan's army for six months and was put an end to with the interventions made for six months and the efforts of Cacaoghlu Nūr al-Dīn. This is because between Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II and Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV, just like the country, the people and amīrs were divided and the parties had established an administrative staff in line with their own wishes. As a manifestation of this situation, the political and social polarisation did not end with the departure of Kaykā'ūs II to Istanbul, and his remaining followers refused to join the service of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV. The reaction of the amīrs, who were motivated by national sentiments against Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan's reign based on the Mongols and who, perhaps taking advantage of the situation, pursued the ideal of independence, by revolting against the sultan and his men, dragged the Saldjūk country into an even more chaotic environment.

One of the leaders of the rebellion against Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV was Amīr al-'alam<sup>117</sup> Shāh-Malik. He was once one of the special amīrs of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II, but after his defection to Byzantium, fearing for his life, he went to the Mongols to offer his allegiance in order not to endanger himself and was subsequently appointed as the Şu Bashi of Simre<sup>118</sup> after gaining the favour of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV.<sup>119</sup> In the struggle for the throne of Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV against his elder brother (1257-1258), Shāh-Malik, who commanded the army of 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykā'ūs during the battles at Yıldız Mountain, rebelled after a few years of tranquillity. Two contemporary authors of the period give different accounts of his rebellion.

Bakanlığı, 1990), 428).

- 115 He is the son of Bahā'-al-Dīn Caca (Sadi S. Kucur, "Cacağlu Nüreddin", DİA, Vol: VI, (Ankara: TDV, 1992), 541). Ibn Bībī refers to him as "Cacaoglu, the camel-keeper, one of the scoundrels and degenerates of the mercenary Turks" (2:596). From this record of the author, it is understood that he was a disreputable person before he was appointed as amīr of Kırşehir.
- 116 Āqsarā'ī, *Musāmarat al-akhbār*, 56. Cf. Kaymaz, *Pervāne*, 110; Turan, *Türkiye*, 539; Alptekin, "Türkiye Selçukluları", 326; Kucur, "Cacaoglu Nüreddin", 541.
- 117 "Amīr al-'alam" or in another form "mīr-i 'alam" is a title used in Turkish and Islamic states for commanders in charge of carrying the flag of the sovereign. For detailed information see. H. Bowen, "Bayraqdār", EI<sup>2</sup>, Vol: I, 1134-1135; Abdülkerim Özyayın, "Mīr-i alem", DİA, Vol: XXX, (Ankara: TDV, 2020), 123-124.
- 118 Sources suggest that it was located near Amasya and was founded by the Türkiye Saldjūk Sultan Mas'ūd I. For detailed information about the mentioned city see. Muharrem Kesik, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti Tarihi Sultan I. Mesud Dönemi*, Ankara: TTK, 2003), 134-135; Id. "Selçuklu Türkiyesi'nde Bir Hayal Şehir: Simre (Simere)", *Türkiye Selçukluları -Makaleler-*, (İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları, 2014) 320-334.
- 119 Ibn Bībī, 2:593. Cf. Merçil, *Saray Teşkilâtı*, 92.

Ibn Bībī<sup>120</sup> does not provide any information about the cause of this rebellion but states that Shāh-Malik rebelled and took refuge in Gedaghze (Gideğaz,<sup>121</sup> Gedağz, Kedagre,<sup>122</sup> Kadagre,<sup>123</sup> Kedagra<sup>124</sup>) Castle.<sup>125</sup> According to the author, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān held Shāh-Malik under siege here for a while and waited for him to be convinced and leave the castle. Shāh-Malik, who was probably assured that his life would be spared, came down from the castle after a while. However, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, who was seen to have broken his promise, had Shāh-Malik killed by Mongol soldiers.

al-Yūnīnī, who records remarkable and important information about the rebellion in question, narrates this event separately from Ibn Bībī. According to al-Yūnīnī,<sup>126</sup> in 661 (1262-1263), when Hülāgū returned to the army in a defeated state,<sup>127</sup> he sent a message to Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān to come to his presence. Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, however, perceived this call of Hülāgū as a threat and thought that he would attack him. Therefore, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān and Shāh-Malik discussed the situation between them and prepared a plan. According to this plan, Shāh-Malik was to take refuge in the fortress and rebel, while Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān was to besiege him, thereby delaying his visit to Hülāgū and claiming that he was busy with Shāh-Malik’s rebellion. As per the plan, Shāh-Malik went to the castle with his troop of 2.000 Turkish horsemen, closed the gates and gave the appearance of rebellion. Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān came to the front of the castle with his Rūm and Mongolian troops and surrounded Shāh-Malik. Here, fierce battles took place between the parties. As the struggle became increasingly heated, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, who was worried about the safety of his soldiers, secretly sent a message to Shāh-Malik and asked for a meeting. In their meeting, Parwāna condemned Shāh-Malik for these fierce battles. Shāh-Malik retorted that he was the cause of it and threatened Parwāna by saying that he would tell the whole thing to Hülāgū. Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, who was frightened by Shāh-Malik’s threat, tried to persuade Shāh-Malik to surrender the castle by making some promises. Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s promises, which are unknown what they were, must have worked because

120 2:593; Yazijioghlu ‘Ali, *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçuk*, 634.

121 Ali Açık, in his study on place names in Artukabadı of the 15th and 16th centuries, identified the Rūm word Gideğaz and attributed this place to the village of Dereağzı in Çamlıbel district of Toğat (“Artukabad Kazısı Yer Adları (1455-1600)”, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20/2 (Ankara: 2003), 185 fn. 8, 193, 198.

122 Osman Turan recorded the name of the castle as Kedagre (*Türkiye*, 539).

123 Coşkun Alptekin, on the other hand, refers to this castle as Kadagre and states that Shāh-Malik revolted with the courage of the rebellions (“Türkiye Selçukluları”, 326)

124 Abdī-zâde Hüseyin Hüsameddin Yasar transcribes the place as Kedagra and states that Sultan Mas‘ūd I named this city near Amasya Kedagra in 578/1143-1144 (*Amasya Tarihi*, ed. Mesut Aydın, (Amasya: Amasya Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2004), 1:225).

125 Nejat Kaymaz has determined that it is now recorded as Gedaghze and is a village in the Artova district of Toğat (*Pervâne*, 110).

126 *Dhayl Mir‘at al-zamān*, 1:536-537.

127 The defeat of the Ilkhāns ruler mentioned here is probably the defeat of the Golden Horde Khān Berke. For more information on the dispute between the two sides, which began in 1261 see. Yuvalı, *İlhanlı Tarihi*, 196.

Shāh-Malik came down from the castle. However, Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān had him killed as soon as he came down.

Based on the information recorded by al-Yūnīni, it is understood that Parwāna organised a fake rebellion with Shāh-Malik. Ibn Bībī, however, mentions Shāh-Malik’s rebellion without giving a reason. This incident, which is described in al-Yūnīni’s record within the events of the year 661 (1262-1263), fits the chronology of the period.<sup>128</sup> As a matter of fact, unlike the amīrs who continued to favour the sultan they were subject to after he left the country, there was no reason for Shāh-Malik, who was now in the umarās of Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV, to rebel. It does not seem reasonable for an amīr who had submitted his allegiance to the Mongols and obeyed Kīlidj Arslan to put himself in such danger. Therefore, considering Parwāna Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s personal characteristics and the things he did for his own benefit since he started to make a name for himself, it is possible that he designed a false uprising in order to avoid going to the court of Hūlāgū. However, things did not go as expected. Shāh-Malik attacked Parwāna with the same fury as in their previous encounter, and a fierce struggle took place between the two sides. Moreover, the threatening sentences he uttered to Parwāna prepared the end of Shāh-Malik.

### Conclusion

During the joint and absolute reign of Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Kīlidj Arslan IV, many revolts took place in the Türkiye Saldjūk State. The various reasons for these revolts were the desire of those who were dissatisfied with poor economic situation of the state to gain political independence, difficulties due to the Mongol domination, disagreements between Iranian rulers and Türkmens and the struggle for sovereignty between the sultans.

Türkiye Saldjūk State, which entered a period of stagnation and then collapse after Köse Dagh, suffered great internal damage as well as external problems due to these rebellions. As a matter of fact, the Saldjūk army was insufficient to suppress the rebellions that spread over large regions from time to time, and the rulers had to ask for help from the Mongols to whom they were subject. There were casualties in the clashes between the rebels and the Saldjūks, and polarisations occurred between the people and the administrative staff.

The political rivalry between Sultan Kīlidj Arslan IV and his brother ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykā’ūs II caused great damage to the territorial integrity, political unity, economy and military power of the state. The intervention of the Mongols in every unit of the country caused the conflicts to spread to wider areas and the people paid the price of the conflicts. As a matter of fact, the heavy taxes imposed by the Ilkhāns on the Saldjūks resulted in the impoverishment of the state and the complete loss of its independence.

128 Nejat Kaymaz states that al-Yūnīni recorded the year 659 (1260-1261) for the aforementioned rebellion, that is, when there was a dispute between Hūlāgū and Berke K̄han, which is also incorrect (*Pervāne*, 110-111). However, the year recorded in the chapter on Shāh-Malik’s uprising in al-Yūnīni’s work is 661 (1262-1263). Therefore, the year stated by the historian must be correct, contrary to Kaymaz’s statement.

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

**Grant Support:** The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

**Hakem Deęerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

## References/Kaynakça

- Abdi-zâde Hüseyn Hüsâmeddin Yasar, *Amasya Tarihi I*. Ed. Mesut Aydın. Amasya: Amasya Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2004.
- Abu'l-Faraj, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj II*. Trans. Ömer Rıza Doğrul. Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Târihu Muhtasar'id-Düvel*. Trans. Şerafeddin Yaltkaya. Ankara: TTK, 2011.
- Abu'l-Fidâ, *Ebü'l-Fidâ Coęrafyası (Takvimü'l-Bıldan)*. Trans. Ramazan Şeşen. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2017
- Acun, Fatma, “Şebinkarahisar”, *DİA*. XXXVIII: 393-395. İstanbul: TDV, 2010.
- Açikel, Ali, “Artukabad Kazısı Yer Adları (1455-1600)”, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20/2 (2003): 181-202.
- Aflâkî, *Manâqib al-'arîfîn I*. Trans. Tahsin Yazıcı. İstanbul: MEB Basımevi, 1964.
- Akdaę, Mustafa, *Türkiye'nin İktisadî ve İçtimai Tarihi 1243-1453*. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1979, Vol: I.
- Akkuş, Mustafa, “Moęol İstilasî ve İlhanlılar Döneminde Maraş Bölgesi”, *Uluslararası Selçuklu Döneminde Maraş Sempozyumu I*, içinde 181-202. Kahramanmaraş: Kahramanmaraş Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2017.
- Akkuş, Mustafa-Büşra Baęcı, “Hülâgü Han Döneminde Anadolu'da Görev Yapan Moęol Komutanları”, *USAD* 9 (2018): 150-171.
- Aktaş, Yasemin, “Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti'nin Diplomasi Tarihi”, Phd Thesis, Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2015.
- Alptekin, Coşkun, “Türkiye Selçukluları”, *Doęuştan Günümüze Büyük İslâm Tarihi VIII*, içinde 209-383. İstanbul: Çaę Yayınları, 1992.
- Angold, Michael, *A Byzantine Government in Exile Government and Society Under the Laskarids of Nicea (1204-1261)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Anonymous Salđıjüknâme*. Ttrans. Halil İbrahim Gök-Fahrettin Coşguner. Ankara: Atıf Yayınları, 2014.
- Âqsarâ'î, *Musâmarat al-akhbâr wa musâyarat al-akhyâr*. Trans. Mürsel Öztürk. Ankara: TTK, 2000.
- Ayan, Ergin, “Türkiye Selçuklularında Köle Emîrler (II): Şemseddin Yavtaş”, *Omeljan Pritsak Armaęanı*, içinde 471-482. Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi Basımevi, 2007.
- al-'Aynî, *'İkdü'l-cümân*, el-Meketebetü's-Şâmîle (e-kitap).
- Ayönü, Yusuf, “Dördüncü Haçlı Seferi'nin Bat Anadolu'nun Türkleşme Sürecine Etkisi”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* XXIV/1 (2009): 5-20.
- 'Aziz b. Erdeşhîr Esterâbâdî, *Bezm u Rezm (Eęlence ve Savaş)*. Trans. Mürsel Öztürk. Ankara: TTK, 1990.
- Balık, İbrahim, *Denizli (Lâdik) İnançoęulları Beylięi*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi, 2022.
- Baybars al-Manşürî, *Zubdat al-fıkra fî ta'rîh al-hijra*. Ed. Donald S. Richards. Beirut: 1998.
- Baykara, Tuncer, *Denizli Tarihi (İkinci Kısım) 1070-1429*. İstanbul: Fakülteler Matmaası, 1969.



- \_\_\_\_\_, *I. Gıyaseddin Keyhusrev 1164-1211 Gazi-Şehit*. Ankara: TTK, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “İnançoğulları”, *DİA*. XXII: 263-264. İstanbul: TDV, 2000.
- Bayram, Mikail, *Fatma Bacı ve Bacıyân-ı Rum*. Konya: Nüve Kültür Merkezi Yayınları, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Türkiye Selçukluları Uç Beyi Denizlili Mehmet Bey”, *Türkler*. VI: 294-298. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002.
- Bowen, H., “Bayrakdâr”, *EI<sup>2</sup>*. I: 1134-1135.
- Cahen, Claude, *Osmanlılardan Önce Anadolu’da Türkler*. Trans. Yıldız Moran. İstanbul: E Yayınları, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Quelques Textes Négligés Concernant Les Turcomans De Rûm Au Moment de L’Invasion Mongole”, *Byzantion* 14/1 (1939): 131-139.
- Çağrıncı, Mustafa, “Câh”, *DİA*. VII: 14-15. İstanbul: TDV, 1993.
- Çelik, Züriye, “Moğol İstilası ve Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti”, Phd Thesis, Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2014.
- Çetinel, Hasan, “İbn Saïd el-Mağribî’nin Kitâb el-Coğrafya’sından Anadolu’ya Dair Anekdotlar”, *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* XLVIII/48 (2019): 581-588.
- Ekici, Kansu, “Anadolu Selçukluları’nda Türkmen İsyanlarının Nedenlerine İlişkin Tespitler”, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 13 (2005): 89-101.
- Emecen, Feridun, “Uç Beyi”, *DİA*. XLII: 38-39. İstanbul: TDV, 2012.
- Erdem, İlhan, “Türkiye Selçukluları-İlhanlı İlişkileri (1256-1308)”, Phd Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi 1995.
- Ersan, Mehmet, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti’nin Dağılışı*. Ankara: Birleşik Dağıtım Kitabevi, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Selçuklular Zamanında Anadolu’da Ermeniler*. Ankara: TTK, 2019.
- Flemming, Barbara, *Geç Ortaçağ Dönemi’nde Pamfilya, Pisidya ve Likya’nın Tarihî Coğrafyası*. Trans. Hüseyin Turan Bağçeci. Ankara: TTK, 2018.
- Galstyan, A. G., *Ermeni Kaynaklarına Göre Moğollar*. Trans. İlyas Kemaloğlu. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2017.
- Georgios Akropolites, *Vekayinâme*. Trans. Bilge Umar. İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve sanat Yayınları, 2008.
- Gordlevskiy, Vladimir, *Küçük Asya’da Selçuklular*. Trans. Abdülkadir İnan. Ankara: TTK, 2019.
- Gökhan, İlyas, XIII. Yüzyılda Maraş”, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 13, (2005), 191-222.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Türkiye Selçukluları Zamanında Maraş Uç Beyliği”, *Selçuklu Medeniyeti Araştırmaları Dergisi* I/1 (2016): 115-171.
- Günel, Zerrin, “Nöker”, *DİA*. XXXIII: 216-217. İstanbul: TDV, 2007.
- Hacıgökmen, Mehmet Ali, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devlet Adamları*. Konya: Çizgi Yayınevi, 2018.
- Ibn Bîbî, *Al-Awâmir al-‘alâ’iyya fi’l-umûr al-‘alâ’iyya II*. Trans. Mürsel Öztürk. Ankara: TTK, 2014.
- Ibn K̄haldûn, *Târihî İbn Haldûn ve Divânü’l-Mübtedâ ve’l-Haber fi eyyâmi’l-Arab ve’l-Acem ve’l-Berber ve men Âsarahüm min Zevî’l-Sultani’l-Ekber*, Vol: V. Ed. Halil Şehade, Süheyl Zekkâr. Beirut: 2000.
- al-Kalkaşhandî, *Şubh ul-a’shâ*. Ed. Muhammed Hüseyin Şemseddin. Vol: V, Beirut: 1987.
- Kaya, Selim, *Sultan I. Gıyâseddin Keyhüsrev ve II. Süleymanşah Dönemi Selçuklu Tarihi (1192-1211)*. Ankara: TTK, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Malatya’da Tarihi Bir Kale: Masâra (Minşar) Kalesi”, *Ortaçağ’da Malatya -Makaleler*, içinde 197-221. Malatya: Bilsam Yayınları, 2020.
- Kaymaz, Nejat, *Pervâne Mu’înüd-dîn Süleyman*. Ankara: TTK, 1970.

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Anadolu Selçuklularının İnhitâtında İdare Mekanizmasının Rolü*. Ankara: TTK, 2011.
- Kesik, Muharrem, *Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti Tarihi Sultan I. Mesud Dönemi*. Ankara: TTK, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Türkiye Selçukluları -Makaleler-*. İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Anadolu Türk Beylikleri*. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Yayınları, 2018.
- Koca, Salim, “Anadolu Türk Beylikleri”, *Türkler*, VI: 703-755. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002.
- Kofođlu, Sait, “İnanç Ođulları Beyliđi”, *Anadolu Beylikleri El Kitabı*, Ed. Haşim Şahin içinde 247-256. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2016.
- Korobeinikov, Dimitri A., “Orthodox Communities in Eastern Anatolia in the Thirteenth to Fourteenth Centuries Part 2: The Time of Troubles”, *Al-Masaq: Islam and The Medieval Mediterranean* 17/1 (March 2015): 1-29.
- Köprülü, Fuad, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu*. Ankara: TTK, 1991.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad, “Anadolu Beylikleri Tarihine Aid Notlar”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 1928, II, Trans. Samet Alıç, *Gaziantep University Journal Social Sciences* 15/3 (2016): 949-970.
- Kucur, Sadi S., “Cacađlu Nüreddin”, *DİA*. VI: 541-542. İstanbul: TDV, 1992.
- Merçil, Erdoğan, *Müslüman-Türk Devletleri Tarihi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1985.
- Metin, Tülay, *Selçuklular Döneminde Malatya*. Malatya: Malatya Kitaplığı, 2013.
- Münedjdim Bashi, *Cami'ud-Düvel Selçuklular Tarihi Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikleri*, Vol: II, Ed. Ali Öngül. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2017.
- Neshri, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-Nümâ Neşri Tarihi*. Ed. F. Reşit Unat-M. Altay Köymen. Ankara: TTK 1949. Vol: I.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar, *Babailer İsyanı*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2020.
- Öngül, Ali, *Anadolu Selçukluları*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları, 2017.
- Özaydın, Abdülkerim, “İbn Bîbî”, *DİA*. XIX: 379-382. İstanbul: TDV, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Mîr-i alem”, *DİA*. XXX: 123-124. Ankara: TDV, 2020.
- Peacock, A. C. S., “The Seljuk Sultanate of Rûm and the Türkmen of the Byzantine Frontier 1206-1279”, *Al-Masaq Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean* 26, (2014), 267-287.
- Ramsay, W. M., *Anadolu'nun Tarihi Coğrafyası*. Trans. Mihri Pektaş. İstanbul: MEB Basımevi, 1960.
- Rice, Tamara Talbot, *Anadolu Selçuklu Tarihi*. Trans. Tuna Kaan Taştan. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları, 2015.
- Saint Simon, *Bir Keşif'in Anılarında Tatarlar ve Anadolu 1245-1248*, Trans. Erendiz Özbayođlu. Alanya: DAKTAV, 2006.
- Selçuk, Ali, *Ağaçeri Türkmenleri Tahtacılar*. İstanbul: IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2008.
- Şhikârî, *Karamannâme [Zamanın kahramanı Karamanîler'in tarihi]*. Ed. Metin Sözen-Necdet Sakaođlu. Karaman: Karaman Valiliđi, 2005.
- Sümer, Faruk, “Anadolu'da Mođollar”, *SAD* 1 (1970): 1-147.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ođuzlar (Türkmenler) Tarihleri-Boy Teşkilâtı-Destanları*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Yabanlu Pazarı Selçuklular Devrinde Milletlerarası Büyük Bir Fuar*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Ağaç-eriler”, *Belleten* XXVI/103 (1962): 521-528.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Ağaçeriler”, *DİA*. I: 460-461. İstanbul: TDV, 1988.

- \_\_\_\_\_, “Karamân Oğulları”, EP. IV: 619-625.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Karamanoğulları”, DİA. XXIV: 454-460. İstanbul: TDV, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Keykâvus II”, DİA. XXV: 354-356. Ankara: TDV, 2022.
- Taneri, Aydın, “Hârizmşahlr”, DİA. XVI: 228-231. İstanbul: TDV, 1997.
- Tekin, Türkan Gökçe, “Selçuklu Tarihi Boyunca Ortaya Çıkan Türkmen İsyanları”, Master Thesis, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Tekindağ, Şehabeddin, “Karamanlılar”, İA. VI: 316-330. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1977.
- Togan, Zeki Velidi, *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2019.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Azerbaycan”, İA. II: 91-118. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1979.
- Tuncel, Metin, “Karahisar”, DİA. XXIV: 416-417. İstanbul: TDV, 2001.
- Turan, Osman, *Doğu Anadolu Türk Devletleri Tarihi*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Keykâvus II”, İA. VI: 642-645. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1977.
- Umar, Bilge, *Türkiye’deki Tarihsel Adlar Türkiye’nin tarihsel coğrafyası ve tarihsel adları üzerine alfabetik düzende bir inceleme*. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitapevi, 1993.
- Uyumaz, Emine, *Sultan I. Alâeddin Keykubâd Devri Türkiye Selçuklu Devleti Siyasî Tarihi*. Ankara: TTK, 2003.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu Karakoyunlu Devletleri*. Ankara: TTK, 1937.
- Yazıjioglu ‘Ali, *Tevârîh-i Âl-i Selçuk, [Oğuznâme-Selçuklu Târîhi]*. Ed. Abdullah Bakır. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları 2017.
- Yinanç, Mükrimin Halil, *Türkiye Tarihi Selçuklular Devri II*. Ed. Refet Yinanç. Ankara: TTK, 2014.
- Yörükân, Yusuf Ziya, *Anadolu’da Alevîler ve Tahtacılar*. Ed. Turhan Yörükân. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1998.
- al-Yünînî, *Dhayl Mir’ât al-zamân*, Haydarabad: 1954-1955, Vol: II.