

# On the outskirts of the Ilkhanate: the Mongols' relationship with the province of Kastamonu in the second half of the 13th century<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Bruno De Nicola

## Introduction

The impact of the Mongol invasions of the Middle East has been the subject of extensive research, especially in the last few decades.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have evaluated the damage and the benefits brought by the Mongols to the Islamic world in different fields such as the military, religion, politics, economy and culture.<sup>3</sup> Despite this, in the case of Anatolia, the Mongol period is still under-studied when compared with, for example, the history of the Mongols in Iran or China. This is due to a variety of reasons: on the one hand, Anatolia was a frontier land away from the center of Ilkhanid power, which was based in Tabriz, and consequently it occupies a marginal place in the principal Ilkhanid sources; on the other hand, Turkish historiography has traditionally overlooked the period, seeing it as transitional between the golden age of the Seljuqs of Rūm in the initial decades of 13th century and the rise of the Ottomans in the 14th century (Melville, 2009).<sup>4</sup> If Anatolia was a distant land in the eyes of the Ilkhanid rulers, the western areas of the peninsula were even more so, areas where different local dynasties emerged in the second half of the 13th century in a complex political scenario that combined Mongol overlordship, proximity to a decadent but prestigious Byzantium, and the presence of Turkmen tribes.

The classic approach to the history of pre-Ottoman Anatolia has often suggested that political fragmentation in the peninsula (the beylik period) began with the collapse of Mongol rule in Iran and the consequent loss of political influence over the territories of Rūm during the initial decades of the 14th century (Melville, 2016, pp. 309–35). This view implies there existed

---

<sup>1</sup> The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007–2013) / ERC Grant Agreement No. 208476, "The Islamisation of Anatolia, c. 1100–1500."

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of research in Mongol studies, see Morgan, 1985, pp. 120–5; Biran, 2013, pp. 1021–33.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Lambton, 1988; also, the collection of articles in De Nicola and Melville, 2016; more recently, see Hope, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> The omission of Ottoman–Mongol relationships is also noticed in 14th- and 15th-century Ottoman sources (see Tezcan, 2013, pp. 23–38).

political unity in the period preceding the political atomization brought by the Mongols and especially the Seljuqs of Rūm. However, this idea that there was a clear correlation between the end of Mongol domination and the emergence of the beylik period needs to be revised. Not only had the political fragmentation of Anatolia begun earlier than the 14th century, but it was a nonlinear process where enmities and alliances shifted depending on the political context. The city of Kastamonu and its surrounding areas offer a good example of these local polities during the 13th century, when the region was ruled mostly by the local Turkmen dynasty of the Çobanoğulları (r. c. 1211–1308).

The arrival of the Turks in Anatolia in the 11th century transformed the Byzantine province of Paphlagonia into a political, religious and cultural border region between Islam and Christianity. Two centuries later, this area became the far western frontier between the Mongols of Iran and Byzantium still being home of a comparatively large Greek-Christian population in the area but ruled by local elites that had become mostly Islamized by the time of the Mongol invasions of the 1240s. In addition, in the second half of the 13th century, the region embraced Islamic culture in the form of patronage of Muslim scholars and scientists and the support of Islamic institutions (Yucel, 1991). Focusing our attention on the history of this particular local dynasty, this short essay will discuss the changing dynamics of the relationship between this northwestern corner of the Anatolian peninsula and Mongol overlordship throughout the second half of the 13th century. The aim of the paper is to offer an overview of the complex relationship between center and periphery in the Ilkhanate by looking at the rule of the Çobanoğulları in Kastamonu and their political, religious and cultural development under the Mongols.

## **1. Kastamonu before and after the Mongol conquest of Anatolia**

During the few decades after the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, the region of Kastamonu was in dispute between the newly arrived Turks and a Byzantine empire immersed in internal turmoil (Cheynet, 1980, pp. 410–38; Vryonis, 1971, pp. 85–113). The first reference we have to a Turkish presence in the area suggests that a group of Danişmendid Turks took control of the region as early as 1073–4, when the Byzantine emperor, Alexios Komnenos, was forced to flee the region after an attack by Turkmen warriors surprised him in the vicinity of Kastamonu.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> C. J. Heywood, *Kaṣṭamūnī*, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.).

According to Osman Turan and traditional Turkish historiography, only a few years later, a certain general called Karatekin is credited with capturing the region and annexing it for the Danişmendid dynasty together with the neighboring cities of Sinope and Çankiri in 1084–5 (Turan, 1980, p. 85). After this short period of Danişmendid control, Byzantium recovered the region briefly in an expedition carried out by Emperor Komnenos. However, the Greek empire was unable to hold the area for long and we know that by 1143 the region was under the firm control of the expanding Seljuqs of Rûm.<sup>6</sup>

From the early days of the Turkish invasion of western Anatolia, different groups of Turkmen people settled in the area, eventually forming a military elite that de facto ruled over this region. However, the first direct reference available in the sources to a Turkmen chief being recognized by the Seljuq sultan is not officially recorded until beginning of the 13th century, when the historian Ibn Bîbî mentions that Sultan Kayqubad I counted on the support of Ḥusām al-Dîn Çoban as bey for the *uj* (region) of Kastamonu in 1219–20 (Ibn Bîbî, 1941, pp. 57–8; 2011, p. 210; Yucel, 1991, p. 37).<sup>7</sup> We know little about him but he appears to have been one of the chief military commanders of a group of Turkmen tribes that had settled in the region during the 12th century (Yucel, 1991, pp. 35–6). Despite doubts being cast over the genealogical connection between Ḥusām al-Dîn Çoban and the rest of the Çobanoğulları rulers, he is considered the founder of the dynastic line that ruled Kastamonu in the 13th century (Cahen, 1968, pp. 233–4). Most probably established by the Seljuq sultan as a military commander in charge of controlling this border region, Ḥusām al-Dîn Çoban managed to expand his field of influence over an area that was not limited to the city and region of present-day Kastamonu but included important urban centers like Ankara and Gangras (modern Çankırı), two cities that were put under the control of Kastamonu after they revolted against Seljuq authority in 1214 (Korobeinikov, 2004, pp. 92–3). This territorial expansion notwithstanding, the scant source material for the period makes it difficult to assess to what extent the ruler exercised full political control over these urban centers or whether his authority was limited to command of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Kastamonu was made an *iqta* territory belonging to the sultan's family. This information is inferred by the reference made by Aqsarā'î to the transfer of the region's tax revenues from the sultan's treasury to the vizier Tāj al-Dîn Mut'azz in 1259. See Aqsarā'î, 1944, pp. 65–6; Korobeinikov, 2004, p. 90 (see also n. 7).

<sup>7</sup> However, Ḥusām al-Dîn Çoban must have overseen the region, if only unofficially, since 1211 (Cahen, 1968, p. 239).

Turkmen tribes that were present in the rural areas of the Kastamonu region.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, other important aspects of the cultural and religious life of Kastamonu in these early decades of the 13th century remain poorly understood, such as how the interaction was between the newly appointed Turkmen bey and the still numerous Greek-Christian-Hellenized population in the area.<sup>9</sup>

If the information on the religious and cultural life in early 13th-century Kastamonu is scarce, there is more concrete information on the military participation of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban during this period. The involvement of the founder of the Çobanoğulları dynasty and his Turkmen armies as allies of a faction of the Seljuq dynasty is documented in two military campaigns of diverse characteristics and outcomes. On both occasions, the military strength of the Kastamonu Turkmen was consistently on the side of Kayqubad I before and after he was crowned in 1219–20.<sup>10</sup> The first of these participations was the military assistance provided by Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban to Kayqubad a decade before his ascension to the throne. The future Seljuq sultan had challenged the enthronement of his brother and rose in arms against him in 1211. Eventually, he had to find refuge at the fortress of Ankara where he was besieged by forces backing his elder brother, Kaykaus I (d. 1219) (Ibn Bībī, 1941, pp. 56–7; 2011, p. 137). Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban and other local Turkmen rulers came to fight side by side with Kayqubad, cementing an alliance that would become fundamental in the establishment of Çobanoğulları rule in Kastamonu. Unfortunately for both allies, the battle was decided in favor of the attackers, with Kayqubad being imprisoned and the Kastamonu forces withdrawing to their original territories in northwestern Anatolia (Cahen, 1968, p. 121). It is difficult to interpret the reasons behind Çoban's decision to back Kayqubad in this internal Seljuq contest. We do not know if Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban had any previous commitment to Kayqubad that made him support his side.<sup>11</sup> However, it is possible that the Turkmen ruler was playing his first hand in

---

<sup>8</sup> According to the Moroccan chronicler Ibn Saïd, who wrote in the 13th century, there were over 30,000 tribesmen in the region of Kastamonu (see Peacock, 2010, p. 84). An interesting comparison between the rural idea of Anatolia portrayed by Ibn Saïd and the urban view given by Simon of St. Quintin is provided in Peacock and Yildiz, 2013, pp. 1–3.

<sup>9</sup> We do know that the Seljuqs carried out razzias in the province in search of Greek slaves for the Seljuq army. See C. J. Heywood, *Kaşamūnī*, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.).

<sup>10</sup> For a quick overview of his life and reign, see C. Cahen, Kaykubad, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.).

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Bībī is not specific about Ḥusām al-Dīn's involvement, but mentions only his support for Kayqubad (Ibn Bībī, 1941, pp. 56–7; 2011, p. 137).

the Seljuq political arena in trying to expand the territories under his command and gain further influence over the politics of Anatolia.

If Çoban's gamble did not yield an immediate reward, his military support for Kayqubad paid off some years later when Kaykaus died and finally Kayqubad became Sultan of Rûm. After being confirmed as *amir* of Kastamonu by the new sultan, Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban received a command from Kayqubad in the early 1220s to partake in the first maritime campaign carried out by the Seljuqs of Rûm in Crimea (for an analysis of this campaign, see Peacock, 2006, pp. 133–49). The objective of the campaign was to reclaim the city of Sudak, which had been incorporated as an overseas protectorate of the Seljuqs a few years before and was being reclaimed by the Rus after the withdrawal of the first Mongol incursion into Russia. According to Ibn Bībī, Ḥusām al-Dīn Çobān commanded the expedition, defeated the Russian resistance in the area, brought the city of Sudak to surrender, and returned to Anatolia with members of the city's nobility as hostages, leaving behind Anatolian soldiers in Crimea to guard the city (Ibn Bībī, 1941, pp. 124–7; 2011, pp. 287–9). In addition, he would have instituted Islam as the “official” religion in the city and sharia as the code of law.<sup>12</sup> Sources go silent on the fate of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban and the region of Kastamonu on his return to Anatolia, but it appears to have stayed calmly away from the political developments in Konya during the 1230s.

The Mongol invasion of Anatolia in 1243 shook the political status quo of the peninsula and some confusing years followed, reflected in the historiography of Rûm. Kastamonu seems initially to have escaped any major turmoil during the early years of Mongol settlement in Anatolia, or at least no accounts of major events in the available sources refer to the region. While the date of Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban's death is unknown, the next Çobanoğulları ruler to emerge in the historical records is Alp Yürek (d. c. 1280) (Yucel, 1991, pp. 40–2). Despite the fact that the main sources written after the event connect Ḥusām al-Dīn and Alp Yürek as father and son, others have questioned any family connection between the two (Cahen, 1968, pp. 234–5). Perhaps due to the young age of Alp Yürek, there was a period when an apparently non-Çobanoğlu tribal chief named Shams al-Dīn Tuvtaş (Yavtash) was placed in charge of protecting the castle of Kastamonu and was for a while appointed bey of the region, until around 1256.<sup>13</sup> If Alp Yürek assumed control over the region of Kastamonu at some point after this date, it seems that he did not enjoy the same political power as his alleged father, Ḥusām

---

<sup>12</sup> As Peacock has suggested, this did not mean conversion to Islam occurred in the city (Peacock, 2006, p. 135).

<sup>13</sup> Little is known about him, but he was of Cuman origin (see Korobeinikov, 2004, p. 94).

al-Dīn. The stricter control by the Mongols of Iran over Anatolia after the establishment of the Ilkhanate appears to have relegated the authority of the Çobanoğulları in favor of new Mongol officials sent from Tabriz to obtain revenues from the region.<sup>14</sup> The economic benefits obtained by these Mongol representatives and the collection of the region's revenues did not mean that these officials exercised any direct day-to-day political authority over the region, or that they were even living in the area.<sup>15</sup> The overlapping political authority of the *pervāne*, the economic usufruct of some Mongol officials, and the military control of the local Çobanoğulları Turkmen seems to have been the way in which the Mongols controlled northwestern Anatolia in the three decades that followed its conquest.

If the authority of the local dynasty of Kastamonu initiated by Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban became less clear in northwestern Anatolia, the narrative of the local history of the region in the last decades of the 13th century became more established. Those claiming descent from Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban would seize on a new opportunity provided by the historical context of Anatolia in the early 1280s and develop more direct interaction with the Mongols of Iran. Although Shams al-Dīn Tuvtaş and Alp Yürek were politically subjugated and economically dominated by the Mongol officials deployed in Anatolia, a new dynamic of political interaction emerged in the 1280s. An internal dispute over the succession of the Seljuq Sultanate and the death of Abaqa Ilkhan (d. 1282) in Iran offered a new opportunity to Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek to search for a different relationship between these local rulers and the Mongols.

## 2. Collaboration, patronage and revolt: zenith and decline of the Çobanoğulları dynasty

After the death of the Mongol Ilkhan Abaqa (d. 1282) and, especially, with the rise to power of Arghūn to the Ilkhanate throne in 1284, the Mongols change their approach towards Anatolia and became more involved in the region's development (Melville, 2009, pp. 73–81). The

---

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, the evidence for the tax revenues of the Kastamonu territories passing from Tāj al-Dīn Mut'azz (d. 676/1277) after his death to Mudjir al-Dīn Amīrshāh (d. 701/1302), as an *iqṭā'* territory, suggesting economic control of the region by these Mongol officials. C. J. Heywood, Kaşamūnī, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.); Korobeinikov, 2004, pp. 94–6.

<sup>15</sup> For example, from 1260 to his execution in 1277, the city of Kastamonu, like other cities in the region, was officially under the control of the *pervāne* Mu'īn al-Dīn. After his death, this nominal authority passed to his son Mehmed Beg, who supposedly administered the region from his residence in Sinope until 1299, but both visited Kastamonu on only a few occasions (Korobeinikov, 2004, p. 95).

deployment of Geikhatu (d. 1295), Arghūn's brother, as governor of Anatolia is one of the measures taken by the Ilkhans to bring the region under closer political control (Anonymous, 1999, pp. 112–13; Aqsarā'ī, 1944, pp. 145–6; Rashīd al-Dīn, 1994, vol. 2, p. 1155). The closer involvement of the Mongols and the internal struggle between contending Seljuq sultans would also affect the role of the local rulers of Kastamonu after 1280. In this period, a new figure emerges in the sources as the new Turkmen commander of northwestern Anatolia. Muẓaffar al-Dīn Yavlağ Arslan, son of Alp Yürek, had a new political vision that, combined with some advantageous developments, would place the rule of the Çobanoğulları onto a new footing within the political strategy of the Ilkhanate.

The first occasion for greater direct involvement in Ilkhanid and Anatolian politics came with the succession struggle that divided the Seljuqs of Rūm after the former sultan, Kaykaus II, had died in exile in Crimea in 1280–1. Two of his sons traveled back to Anatolia with the intention of claiming the Seljuq throne. According to Ibn Bībī, the designated heir was Mesud ibn Kaykaus, but his brother Rukn al-Dīn tried to overtake him by traveling to the peninsula before his brother in an attempt to seize the Seljuq crown. However, on setting foot in Anatolia, Rukn al-Dīn was captured by Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek in the vicinity of Kastamonu. The Çobanoğulları ruler took him as a prisoner to the city of Sinope, where Muẓaffar al-Dīn submitted Rukn al-Dīn to his brother and pledged alliance to Mesud (Ibn Bībī, 2011, pp. 634–5). The two new allies allegedly traveled together sometime before 1282 to Tabriz to obtain a decree from the Ilkhan Abaqa that granted Mesud legitimacy to be recognized as Sultan of Rūm. However, in 1282 Abaqa died and both Mesud and Muẓaffar al-Dīn had to stay in the Mongol capital to obtain the approval of Aḥmad Tegüder (r. 1282–4), who had assumed control of the Ilkhanate that same year. Following the strategy of divide and rule carried out by his successors, Tegüder granted Mesud control over Diyarbakır, Harput, Malatya and the vicinity of Sivas, but kept his rival Giyath al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (d. 1284) in charge of Konya and Central Anatolia (Aqsarā'ī, 1944, p. 138). However, Kaykhusraw III did not accept this division of political authority and joined a revolt organized by Kangirtay, one of Abaqa's brothers, against Tegüder's reign (Cahen, 1968, pp. 294–5). The recently appointed Ilkhan was also facing a simultaneous uprising in the east, where his nephew Arghūn was challenging Tegüder's authority from Khurasan. Tegüder managed to suppress the Anatolian revolt by Kangirtay, by sending Giyath al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III to trail and eventually execute him in March 1284. Faced with this rebellion by the former sultan, Tegüder decided to grant Mesud sole authority over the Sultanate of Rūm. Nonetheless, although the Ilkhan had managed to

suppress the revolt in Anatolia, that on the eastern front had a different outcome. Arghūn had gathered enough support among dissident Mongol *noyans* and finally defeated Tegüder in 1284 (Amitai, 2001, pp. 15–43). When Arghūn ascended the throne, he confirmed Mesud II as the Seljuq sultan and granted Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek control of Kastamonu and the surrounding areas (Yucel, 1991, p. 43).

The time spent in Tabriz might have impressed the rural Turkmen Muẓaffar al-Dīn. The opulence of the Ilkhanid capital and the contact he certainly had with members of the court might have inspired him to attempt to take his dynasty and realm in a different direction. In fact, it is possible that, while in Tabriz, Muẓaffar al-Dīn had been in contact with the renowned scholar Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 1311) and agreed the commission of a Persian-language treatise on astronomy known as the *Ikhtiyārāt-i Muẓaffarī* (Niazi, 2011, pp. 157–8; on the Mongols' interest in astronomy, see Saliba, 2006, pp. 357–68). The work was composed in the same year (1284) and is specifically dedicated to Muẓaffar al-Dīn Çobanoğlu. Yet we know that Quṭb al-Dīn never visited Kastamonu despite having lived in both Sivas and Malatya for some time in the 1280s. The close relationship between the scholar and the Ilkhanid court occasioned several trips made by Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī to Tabriz while he was living in Anatolia, making possible an encounter at the Mongol court in Tabriz at some point in 1284 between the court scholar and the ascendant Turkmen leader, Muẓaffar al-Dīn, now an ally of the Mongols of Iran at the western borders of the Ilkhanate (Niazi, 2011, p. 110).

This patronage of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī by Muẓaffar al-Dīn was not an isolated case, but rather a common activity undertaken at the Kastamonu court during the 1280s. In fact, up to 1291 the region of Kastamonu appears to have experienced a period of economic growth and military expansion against Byzantium (Peacock, 2015, pp. 377–8). During the decade in which Muẓaffar al-Dīn ruled as the Çobanoğulları leader, other authors also received financial support for their literary activity. To date we know of five works written in Persian composed in the second half of the 13th century that were dedicated to rulers of Kastamonu. However, the number of texts produced in the region increases to ten if we include those not specifically dedicated to a ruler, but which were produced under Çobanoğulları rule. These works were written by three different authors and only after the 1280s, when, as we have seen,

Çobanoğulları rule in the region of Kastamonu became more firmly established thanks to Mongol support.

As well as financing the astronomical treatise of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī, we have evidence of the dedication of another work to Muẓaffar al-Dīn, but with a different thematic focus from Shīrāzī's scientific work. The *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adāla fī qawā'id al-sulṭana* is a rather unique text dealing with religion and politics, both subjects that were among the main interests of the works patronized by the Çobanoğulları (De Nicola, 2016, pp. 49–72). The work was composed in 1283, possibly by a certain Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭīb, and dedicated to Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek, ruler of Kastamonu. The only surviving copy of the work was made on the 10<sup>th</sup> of Ramazān, AH 990 (28<sup>th</sup> September 1582), most probably in Istanbul, and is held at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.<sup>16</sup> This is a work that includes very diverse material, such as stories of the pre-Islamic Iranian kings, stories of early Islam, unique accounts of the Qalandar dervishes, the fight of the Great Seljuqs against heresies, and it includes a particular abridged and edited version of the *Siyāsatnāmah* of Niẓām al-Mulk (1978). Nonetheless, the main characteristic is that it is written in the style of a mirror for princes, emphasizing the duties of a good ruler and the role he should play especially vis-à-vis the 'ulamā' and the people that have deviated from the right path. In addition, as we will see below, this text provides special insights into the contemporary events of Mongol Anatolia and a view on Ilkhanid overlordship.

Apart from these specific works by Khaṭīb and Shīrāzī, the most prolific author connected to the Çobanoğulları was Ḥasan bin 'Abd al-Mu'min Ḥusām al-Dīn Khū'ī (d. 1308).<sup>17</sup> We know that he was a scribe, poet and lexicographer, originally from northwestern Iran, who found his way to Anatolia at an early age and settled in his youth at the court of the Çobanoğulları of Kastamonu (on his family, see Özergin, 1970, pp. 219–29). He must have served under three of the Çobanoğulları rulers and left up to seven works, mostly in Persian but including among them a Persian–Turkish vocabulary called *Toḥfa-yi Ḥusām* and a versified Arabic–Persian vocabulary known as *Naṣīb al-fityān*.<sup>18</sup> The most prominent work dedicated to a ruler of

---

<sup>16</sup> Ms. Supplement Turc 1020.

<sup>17</sup> In Turkish works, he is generally referred as al-Hoy. For an edition with all the existing works of Ḥusām al-Dīn Khū'ī, see Khū'ī, 2000; see also Khū'ī, 1963.

<sup>18</sup> Only a fragmentary copy of the *Toḥfa-yi Ḥusām* has come to us (Khū'ī, 2000, pp. 25–7); the *Naṣīb al-fityān* was more popular in Anatolia, with different copies still available in Turkey (see Mss. Süleymaniye, Reşid Ef. 978; Lala Ismâil 644; Hasan Hüsnü 1102; Râşid Efendi, 11279). Other works not dedicated to Çobanid rulers by Khū'ī include the *Rusūm al-rasā'il wa nujūm al-fazā'il* (composed in 690/1291), the *Ghunyat al-ṭālib wa munyat*

Kastamonu is the *Nuzhat al-kuttāb wa tuḥfat al-aḥbāb*, a work that aims to provide the reader with four different types of citations that can be used in the writing of letters to dignitaries, members of the court or family members.<sup>19</sup> Manuscript copies of this work also carry a dedication to Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek.<sup>20</sup> The date of composition of the work is AH Muḥarram 684/ March 1285, the year in which Muẓaffar al-Dīn returned from Tabriz after securing Mongol support for his claim to rule Kastamonu.<sup>21</sup> In addition, another work of a similar style titled *Qawā'id al-rasā'il wa farā'id al-fazā'il* was composed by Khū'ī in Rajab 684/ September 1285 (Khū'ī, 2000, p. 293; Turan, 1958, p. 173). The author himself mentions that he composed this work at the request of some friends (*dūstān*) immediately after he had finished the *Nuzhat al-kuttāb* and that it was dedicated to the last Çobanoğlu ruler, Amīr Maḥmūd (d. c. 1309) (Khū'ī, 2000, p. 225).<sup>22</sup>

One of the main characteristics of all these works is that they were written in Persian by men of Iranian origin who had migrated to Anatolia during the 13th century. This migratory phenomenon was not exclusively a characteristic of Kastamonu, but rather a general process that affected all of Anatolia and, to a certain degree, contributed to shaping the cultural development of the peninsula from the beginning of the 13th century onwards. Traditionally, the Mongol invasions of the 1220s in Central Asia and Khurasan have been blamed as the main instigators for this migration of Iranians into Anatolia. However, this view is currently being challenged as the only reason why literate Persian-speaking men (and women) found their way into Anatolia. The debate over the real motivation behind the migrations is still open, but Anatolia was undoubtedly a pole of attraction for these literati and men of science, and this serves as an important contextual element in understanding the patronage of Persian works by the Çobanoğulları of Kastamonu. However, another characteristic of this literary patronage is that most of the works composed for the local rulers of Kastamonu were done during the 1280s

---

*al-kātib* (composed in Rabi' II 709/ September 1309); and the compilation of his poems written in Persian and compiled under the *Multamasāt* (for all these works, see Khū'ī, 2000).

<sup>19</sup> T. Yazıcı, Ḥasan b. 'Abd-al-Mo'men, *Encyclopedia Iranica*, accessed February 23, 2017 through: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hasan-b-abd-al-momen>

<sup>20</sup> See the dedication in Ms. Fatih 5406, f. 33a.

<sup>21</sup> On the composition, see the colophon in Ms. Fatih 5406, f. 58a; also Turan, 1958, p. 172.

<sup>22</sup> See the dedication in Ms. Fatih 5406, f. 60a, lines 4–5.

and early 1290s, in the period when Muḏaffar al-Dīn obanođlu maintained fruitful relationships with the Seljuqs of Rūm and the Mongols of Iran.

The period of cultural development of Kastamonu under the obanođulları dynasty changed in 1291, when several Turkmen tribes from northwestern Anatolia revolted against the Ilkhanid domination and followed the lead of the Seljuq prince Rukn al-Dīn, the rebellious brother of Sultan Mesud II who had been imprisoned by Muḏaffar al-Dīn obanođlu a decade earlier. The newly appointed Ilkhan Geikhatu (r. 1291–5) mobilized the Mongol army in Rūm to suppress the revolt.<sup>23</sup> Muḏaffar al-Dīn obanođlu remained loyal to his Mongol-Seljuq commitment and confronted the rebels before the arrival of the Mongol contingent. The obanođulları ruler was killed during the initial confrontations, either in the battlefield or as a victim of assassination.<sup>24</sup> Even though Muḏaffar al-Dīn appears to have been a solid ruler, the revolts portray the fragility of the power balance achieved in the region, where Turkmen support could shift from one leader to another in a short period of time. The motives for the revolt are unclear because the sources available do not go into much detail about the reasons beyond suggesting that some Turkmen tribes of the area were revolting against “Mongol tyranny.” However, as Korobeinikov has shown, the political situation in Kastamonu was multifaceted. The enmity between the obanođulları and Byzantium, the influence of Mongol officials having economic privileges in the region, and the potential tensions arising from nomadic Turkmen living alongside urban Persianized people who had migrated from Iran and Central Asia portray a more complex situation (Korobeinikov, 2004, p. 115). Perhaps, an intention on the part of the obanođulları in establishing themselves more firmly as rulers in the region might have also contributed to a point of conflict between different Turkmen factions in the area and the increasing political supremacy of the obanođulları.

After a few years of military confrontation, the Mongols defeated the Turkmen uprising in Kastamonu 1293. However, the defeat did not remove the Turkmen superiority from the region, nor did it trigger any dynastic change in Kastamonu. In fact, Amīr Maḥmūd (d. 1308), the son of Muḏaffar al-Dīn, assumed control of the region and the obanođulları military capability remained operational in the years to come. Between the years 1295 and 1299, contingents of

---

<sup>23</sup> An analysis of the revolt was done by Dimitri Korobeinikov (2004, pp. 87–118).

<sup>24</sup> Versions are diverse in the sources. While Aqsarā’ī suggests that Muḏaffar al-Dīn died in battle, Byzantine sources point towards an assassination plotted by Rukn al-Dīn. See Aqsarā’ī, 1944, p. 171; Gregoras, 1829–55, vol. 1, p. 137; Korobeinikov, 2004, pp. 99–100; Pachymeres, 1835, p. 327.

Turkmen led by Çobanoğlu commanders launched several attacks on Byzantium, including fighting side by side with Osman Gazi (posthumous founder of the Ottoman Empire) at the Battle of Bapheus (1302) (on the battle, see İnalçık, 1993, pp. 77–98). Incidentally, the Çobanoğulları were removed not by Byzantium, nor by the Mongols or the Seljuqs, but by a Turkmen chief subject to them who assassinated Amīr Maḥmūd in c. 1309, inaugurating the Candaroğulları/Jandarid dynasty in the region that ruled over northwestern Anatolia from Kastamonu until the 15th century, when they were incorporated into an incipient Ottoman Empire (on the Jandarid dynasty, see Yucel, 1991, pp. 53–142).

### **3. Some references and omissions to the Mongols in texts composed under the Çobanoğulları**

The patronage activity carried out by Muẓaffar al-Dīn Çobanoğlu provides us with the rare possibility of having an alternative source of information from the main historical chronicles with regard to the sociopolitical history of the region of Kastamonu. The texts composed under the Çobanoğulları of Kastamonu must be placed into the historical context described in the previous sections of this article. The literary production of this period was composed in the context of the Mongol domination of Anatolia and during different historical and political moments in the relationship between the rulers of Kastamonu and the Ilkhans. Yet it is important to bear in mind that none of the texts patronized by Çobanoğulları rulers were historical chronicles aiming to narrate the political history of their patrons. Instead they dealt with astronomy, religious precepts, advice for kings, and diplomatic letters. Therefore, the main narrative goal of these works was not to provide an account of the historical events that occurred in their time, like the better-known works produced by authors such as Ibn Bībī, Karīm al-Dīn Aqṣarā'ī (d. c. 1320s) or the anonymous Historian of Konya (for an account on these sources, see Melville, 2006, pp. 135–66). However, some of them make passing references to historical events or deliberately omit certain historical facts on different occasions, providing an interesting alternative insight into the history of the Ilkhanate that can complement the narrative of contemporary historians.

The above-mentioned *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adāla fī qawā'id al-sulṭāna* contains a surprising omission of a rather important historical event. In the second chapter of the work (ff. 1b to 27b), which covers the initial centuries of Islamic history up to the Fall of Baghdad in 1258, no reference is made to the Mongols' sacking of the city or the execution of the last Abbasid caliph ordered

that same year by Hülegü.<sup>25</sup> One would think that the fall of the capital of Sunni Islam and the execution of its highest political and spiritual representative would be a relevant historical event to include in a text that is dedicated to a local ruler of the area, and whose main aim is to guide the Turkmen rulers of Kastamonu to the right Islamic path. It is improbable to blame ignorance for the omission since not only did it occur during the lifetime of the author, but it also contrasts with an otherwise well-informed text that contains a good knowledge of other similar events in Islamic history. Perhaps the omission of such a relevant incident in the history of Islam becomes clearer when read in the context of the composition and patronage of the work. As we mentioned above, the work was dedicated to Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek and composed in 1283–4 at a time when relations between the Çobanoğulları and the Mongols of the Ilkhanate were friendly and mutually beneficial. In this context, failure to mention Mongol responsibility for the execution of the caliph of Islam and the destruction of Baghdad appears as an intentional oversight by the author, to avoid dealing with the contradiction of preaching on how to be a good Muslim to a ruler who was the subject of those who had destroyed the Abbasid dynasty. By simply avoiding this event, the power relations between the Mongols and the Çobanoğulları become less problematic in the eyes of an audience in Kastamonu that was being rapidly Islamized and was at the front line of military conflict with the infidel Byzantium.

The pro-Mongol flavor of this work is further exemplified in other parts of the text. Despite the fact that at the time of its composition the Mongols of Iran were still a pagan dynasty and its rulers were closer to Buddhism than Islam, the author of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-ʿadāla* does not prevent himself from glorifying Mongol rule when it suits the narrative of the work. In another section, there is a reference to a casual encounter between Hülegü, founder of the Ilkhanate, and a group of mendicant dervishes, the Qalandars.<sup>26</sup> The story of the encounter between the Mongol ruler and the dervishes seems to have been widespread in the Ilkhanid lands. However, it is used by the author of the text as an opportunity to place the still-pagan Mongols as the rightful overlords who had since then been fighting the Qalandars and their errant beliefs. To highlight the heretical views of these dervishes and the danger they represented for Muslims in Anatolia in the 13th century is one of the main topics covered in the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-ʿadāla* (De Nicola, 2016, pp. 49–72; Turan, 2010, pp. 531–64). They are presented as perverted people who have deviated from the right path of Islam and the rulers of Anatolia are specifically

---

<sup>25</sup> Ms. Supplement Turc 1120, ff. 26b–27a; see also De Nicola, 2016, p. 56.

<sup>26</sup> Ms. Supplement Turc 1120, f. 53b. On the Qalandar dervishes, see Karamustafa, 2006; Ocak, 1992.

encouraged to combat them. Among the examples used to illustrate the persecution of these heretics that should be carried out, the Mongol ruler is described as encountering these dervishes during one of his campaigns in the Middle East in the company of his advisor Naṣīr al-Dīn Tusī (d. 1274). Surprised by their shaved faces, their lack of shoes and their strange outfits, the Mongol ruler turned to his advisor and asked what to do with these people. The famous scholar advised the ruler to kill them for heresy and the Mongol lord ordered their execution in that same place (Karamustafa, 2006, p. 53).<sup>27</sup> The author of the work concludes the anecdote by saying that if it were not for the Mongols, the Qalandars and their heretical ideas would have spread even further into Anatolia.

While the historical context might explain some omissions and references to the Mongols in the text, some other examples are less straightforward. For example, there is a big section in the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* dedicated to describing the long-lasting persecution by the Great Seljuq sultans against the Ismaili Shia movement based at the castle of Alamut. Yet there is no reference to the campaigns performed by Hülegü against the Ismailis and the final destruction of the castle by the Mongols. It is not clear why the author did not take the opportunity to glorify the Mongols for this act when mentioning this event would have served to enhance the figure of his patron’s Mongol ally. It might be tempting once again to suggest that the author had no knowledge of the events, but this seems unlikely considering the information included on other events concerning both the Mongols and the Ismailis. Similarly, this neglect could be seen as possible evidence for the idea that the destruction of Alamut was not as definitive in its destruction of Ismailism as some of the later Mongol sources try to convey (Daftary, 2005, p. 82; Lane, 2003, p. 193). However, a further reason for the omission could lie in the inner coherence of the text and the message that the author of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* is trying to convey to his patron. If after describing what he sees as the relentless struggle of the Seljuq dynasty as the righteous Muslims against the heretical Ismailis the story ends with the conclusion that the only one capable of destroying Alamut was a pagan Mongol, then the whole narrative of a righteous Islam overcoming heresy would crumble. Hence, by ignoring the destruction of

---

<sup>27</sup> On the interaction between Mongols and Qalandars at the time of Aḥmad Tegüder (d. 1284), see Pfeiffer, 2006, pp. 383–4.

Alamut, the author of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* avoids making a link between the Mongols and the Seljuqs and leaves the battle against heresy open, to be continued by his patron.

This favorable narrative towards the Mongols found in the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* is not shared by other authors who composed works for the Çobanoğlu. Perhaps it is not surprising that there are no references to the Mongols in Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī’s *Ikhtiyārāt-i Muẓaffarī*, since the work is concerned with astronomy and has little concern with the political context. Shīrāzī’s composition of the *Ikhtiyārāt* for Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Alp Yürek might have been motivated largely by personal economic profit rather than an aim to gain political favor from what might have seemed a minor local ruler from the periphery in the eyes of a scholar well connected to the Ilkhanid court (Niazi, 2011, pp. 106–14).<sup>28</sup> Similarly, the prolific Ḥusām al-Dīn Khū’ī does not mention the Mongols either in any of his multiple works dedicated to the Çobanoğulları rulers. It is surprising that although Khū’ī’s works deal mainly with his samples of diplomatic letters and quotations on how to address rulers and the official ranks used in the court, he never mentions the Mongols or the Ilkhanate. The *Rasūm al-risā’il*, for example, lists examples of written addresses (*khiṭāb*) and accounts (*taqrīr*) to be used for diplomatic correspondence, and yet he omits all Mongol official titles present in the Ilkhanate, such as khan, *daraghuchi* or *noyan*, and instead only lists titles belonging to the Islamic-Persian tradition such as sultan, *malik* and vizier (Khū’ī, 2000, pp. 346–73). Although his patrons were subjects of the Mongols of Iran, it is as if the Ilkhanate had nothing to do with the government of 13th-century Kastamonu. Unlike the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla*, none of Khū’ī’s works recalls any historical event in which the Mongols had directly or indirectly taken part, as if the western parts of Anatolia had nothing to do with the Mongols of Iran.

In the same way as the author of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla*, Khū’ī dedicated some of his works to Çobanoğulları rulers in a period when the local rulers of Kastamonu and the Mongols were in alliance with each other. Yet the authors contrast with each other in their treatment of the Mongol role in the Middle East. Perhaps the authors’ origins might have something to do with this different approach. Unfortunately, we know nothing about the specific origin of the author of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* in order to establish a comparison with Ḥusām al-Dīn Khū’ī, but it seems clear that both shared a common Iranian origin (De Nicola, 2016, p. 65). From the

---

<sup>28</sup> Niazi also suggests that the reading of Ibn Bībī in which control over cities such as Sivas and Malatya was given to Mesud II might be claiming that these two cities were actually granted to Muẓaffar al-Dīn Çobanoğlu (see Niazi, 2014, p. 81). For Ibn Bībī’s mention of the allocation of the cities, see Ibn Bībī, 2011, p. 635.

biographical information provided in the prefaces to his works, it seems that Khū'ī's family might have been forced to leave his original homeland after the first Mongol invasion of Iran in the 1220s (on the family connections of Khū'ī, see Özergin, 1970, pp. 219–29). The memory of the forced exile of his family might have caused some personal antipathy towards the Mongols, which nonetheless could not have been openly expressed in his writings while his patrons from Kastamonu were allied to the Mongols in the 1280s.

Although antipathy for the Mongols is not evident at first sight in Khū'ī's works, his political worldview can be inferred from the texts that have come to us. For example, in his *Nuzhat al-kuttāb*, the formula Khū'ī used to dedicate the work to Muẓaffar al-Dīn Yāvlāq Arslān appeals strongly to the “Islamic merits” of the ruler.<sup>29</sup> On the contrary, the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adāla*, which is dedicated to the same ruler and composed only one year apart from Khū'ī's work, puts the emphasis on the genealogical pedigree of the ruler, considering that his legitimacy rested on the ruling tradition of his family than on the specific merit of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Yāvlāq Arslān. In other words, while in the *Nuzhat al-kuttāb* the emphasis is put on his Islamic credentials, the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adāla* always places Muẓaffar al-Dīn Yāvlāq Arslān as a ruler under the authority of the Seljuq sultan Mesud, who, as we saw above, was appointed by the Mongol Ilkhan Arghūn. In doing so, Khū'ī omits the fundamental role that the Mongol Ilkhans had in placing Muẓaffar al-Dīn Yāvlāq Arslān in power and in consolidating the Çobanoğulları dynasty in Kastamonu.

A similar appeal to Islamic merits is used by Khū'ī in a *fathnāmah* (letter of victory) that was included as an exemplary letter in his *Qawā'id al-rasā'il wa farā'id al-fazā'il* (Khū'ī, 2000, pp. 282–5). The letter provides a unique description of the capture by Muẓaffar al-Dīn of “two castles of Gideros” from the Byzantines in Rajab AH 683/September 1284.<sup>30</sup> Similar to the case of the *Nuzhat al-kuttāb* dedication mentioned above, Khū'ī highlights here the Islamic merits of his patron, Muẓaffar al-Dīn. The Çobanoğulları ruler is described as a victorious Muslim general who defeated the Christians with the assistance of his Turkmen fighters, who

---

<sup>29</sup> He is described as “protector of the frontier and borders, helper of the warriors of faith, cave of the border army, triumphant of the state and religion, succorer of Islam and Muslims, aid of the Eternal, lion of the kingdom, protector of kings and sultans, supreme royal *sipahlār* of the high lands” (*ḥāmī al-ṣughūr al-aknāf, nuṣrat al-mujāhidīn, kihf al-marābiṭīn, muẓaffar al-dawlat wa al-dīn, maghīṣ al-Islām wa al-musalmīn, 'aẓd al-ḥazrat, lais al-mamlakat, zahīr al-mulūk wa al-salaṭīn, mu'zam humāyūn sipahdār-i diyār-i auj*); see Khū'ī, 2000, p. 158; also Ms. Fatih 5406, f. 33a.

<sup>30</sup> The castles were located in the bay of Gideros, around 150 km northwest of Kastamonu on the Black Sea coast (Khū'ī, 2000, p. 282; Peacock, 2015, pp. 375–91).

were motivated not by their thirst for blood or booty but rather by jihad, to expand the Muslim faith in Anatolia. As Andrew Peacock has said in his analysis of this letter, these Turkmen “were noted for their ferocity and were inflamed by desire to fight ‘the enemies of religion’” (Peacock, 2015, p. 378). This difference in depiction of the Mongols from the glorified tone of the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* to the indifference of Khū’ī might also speak to an inner political transformation in the Çobanoğlu understanding of kingship during the decade of the 1280s. Khū’ī died during the first decades of the 14th century and was able to live through the glory days of Çobanoğulları rule, from those of Mongol support in 1284 to the anti-Mongol revolt of Kastamonu and its suppression in 1293. The political upheavals of his patrons, however, did not prevent him from continuing to write and apparently in 1309 he composed another work of chancellery literature (*inshā’*), the *Ghunyat al-ṭālib wa munyat al-kātib*, based on one of his previous works (Khū’ī, 1963, pp. 1–16).<sup>31</sup> The fact that Khū’ī continued writing beyond the revolt might suggest that he belonged to at least a part of the Kastamonu court that had sympathies for an anti-Mongol movement in the region even before the uprising of the rebels in 1291. However, while the *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adāla* was composed in 1283–4, at the time when Muẓaffar al-Dīn allegedly came back from Tabriz with a mandate from Arghūn and the support of Mesud II, this work accordingly reflects the political status of the Çobanoğulları as clear subjects of the Seljuqs and the Mongols. On the other hand, Khū’ī’s works show a different view, one in which the pagan Mongols are not mentioned directly but which depicts the Çobanoğulları as a dynasty in its own right that managed to reign over Kastamonu by the sole merit of its rulers and their commitment to rightful Islamic principles.

## Conclusions

The close relationship with the Seljuqs of Rūm developed by Ḥusām al-Dīn Çoban favored the establishment of his Turkmen faction above others in the northwestern frontier of the sultanate in the initial decades of the 13th century. With the irruption of the Mongols into the Middle East, the role played by Ḥusām al-Dīn’s descendants went through different stages of conflict, rebellion and submission to the Mongols. The return of the Seljuq prince Mesud to Anatolia and the opposition of his brother offered the possibility to Muẓaffar al-Dīn Çobanoğlu to become a political actor in the development of the region. Capturing Rukn al-Dīn not only

---

<sup>31</sup> On the date of composition, see Ms. Fatih 5406, f. 98b; Khū’ī, 2000, p. 342.

gained for Muẓaffar al-Dīn Mesud's confidence but also opened up a possibility for obtaining Mongol support as the ruler of Kastamonu. For a decade, the deal between the Çobanoğulları and the Mongols appears to have been mutually beneficial. On the one hand, it allowed the Mongols to have closer control over the peripheral territories of the western borders of the Ilkhanate. On the other, it granted enough political support to the Çobanoğulları for them to become a Turkmen military power in the region, and also to expand their territories at the expense of Byzantium and to explore courtly activities that were unprecedented in the region, such as the patronage of scientific, religious and political works from renowned scholars of the time.

The texts left by the Çobanoğulları dynasty are evidence of an attempt not only to consolidate this local dynasty in the area, but to provide this semi-nomadic Turkmen tribe with the tools for the formation of a local authority under Ilkhanid suzerainty. Together, these works form an interesting corpus of advice for kings, on rules of government and diplomatic practices that seem tailored to an incipient ruling dynasty trying to establish itself at the far corner of an empire. Further, the type of work denotes a concern with the construction of a political apparatus, an idea of kingship and a preoccupation with religious orthodoxy. Finally, references to, and omissions of, the Mongols found in these works reflect different perceptions of Mongol domination, attesting the diverse and unstable political balance that the involvement of

different layers of political authority from Mongol officials to local rulers had in governing border areas on the outskirts of the Mongol Empire.

## **Bibliography**

Amitai, R. (2001). The conversion of Tegüder Ilkhan to Islam. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 25, 15–43.

Anonymous (1999). *Tārīkh-i āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlī*. Edited by N. Jalālī. Tehran: Daftar-i Nashr-i Mīrās-i Maktūb, Āyīnah-'i Mīrās.

Aqşarā'ī, Karīm al-Dīn (1944). *Musāmarat al-akhbār va musāyarat al-akhyār*. Edited by O. Turan. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Biran, M. (2013). The Mongol Empire: The state of the research. *History Compass*, 11(11), 1021–33.

Cahen, C. (1968). *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A general survey of the material and spiritual culture and history, c. 1071–1330*. New York: Taplinger.

Cahen, C. Kaykubad. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.).

Cheyne, J.-C. (1980). Manzikert - un désastre militaire?. *Byzantion*, 50, 410–38.

Daftary, F. (2005). *Ismailis in medieval Muslim societies: A historical introduction to an Islamic community*. London: I. B. Tauris.

De Nicola, B. (2016). The *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adāla*: a unique manuscript on the religious landscape of medieval Anatolia. In A. C. S. Peacock and S. N. Yildiz (eds.), *Islamic Literature and*

*Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (pp. 49–72). Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.

De Nicola, B., and C. Melville (eds.). (2016). *The Mongols' Middle East: Continuity and transformation in Ilkhanid Iran*. Leiden: Brill.

Gregoras, Nicephorus (1829–55). *Byzantina historia: Graece et Latine*. Edited by L. Schopen and I. Bekker (3 vols.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heywood, C. J. *Ḳaṣṭamūnī. Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.).

Hillenbrand, C. (2007). *Turkish myth and Muslim symbol: The Battle of Manzikert*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hope, M. (2016). *Power, politics, and tradition in the Mongol Empire and the Īlkhānate of Iran*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ibn Bībī (1941). *Anadolu Selçukî Devleti tarihi*. Edited and translated by F. Nâfiz Uzluk. Ankara: Uzlum Bazimevi.

Ibn Bībī (2011). *Al-Avāmir al- 'alā 'īyah fī al-umūr al- 'alā 'īyah, ma 'rūf bih, Tārīkh-i Ibn Bībī*. Edited by Z. Muttahidīn. Tehran: Pizhūhishgāh-i 'Ulūm-i Insānī va Muṭāla'āt-i Farhangī.

İnalçık, H. (1993). *Oṣmān Gāzī's siege of Nicaea and the Battle of Bapheus*. In E. Zachariadou (ed.), *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389)* (pp. 77–98). Rethymnon: Crete University Press.

Karamustafa, A. (2006). *God's unruly friends*. Oxford: OneWorld.

Khū'ī, Ḥusām al-Dīn (1963). *Gunyetu'l-kātib ve munyetu'ṭ-ṭālib: Rusūmu'r-resā'il ve nucūmu'l-fazā'il*. Edited by A. Sadık Erzi. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Khū'ī, Ḥusām al-Dīn (2000). *Majmū'ah-'i āṣār-i Ḥisām al-Dīn Khūyī*. Edited by S. 'Abbās'zādah. Tehran: Mīrās-i Maktūb.

Korobeinikov, D. (2004). The revolt in Kastamonu, 1291–1293. *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 28, 87–118.

Lambton, A. K. S. (1988). *Continuity and change in medieval Persia: Aspects of administrative, economic, and social history, 11th–14th century*. Albany, NY: Bibliotheca Persica.

Lane, G. (2003). *Early Mongol rule in thirteenth-century Iran: A Persian renaissance*. London: Routledge.

Melville, C. (2006). The early Persian historiography of Anatolia. In J. Pfeiffer (ed.), *History and historiography of post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in honor of John E. Woods* (pp. 135–66). Wiesbaden: Verlag.

- Melville, C. (2009). Anatolia under the Mongols. In K. Fleet (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Turkey* (Vol. 1) (pp. 51–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melville, C. (2016). The end of the Ilkhanate and after: Observations on the collapse of the Mongol world empire. In B. De Nicola and C. Melville (eds.), *The Mongols' Middle East: Continuity and transformation in Ilkhanid Iran* (pp. 309–35). Leiden: Brill.
- Morgan, D. (1981). The Mongol Empire: A review article. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 44(1), 120–5.
- Niazi, K. (2011). *A Comparative Study of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī's Texts and Models on the Configuration of the Heavens*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University.
- Niazi, K. (2014). *Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī and the configuration of the heavens: A comparison of texts and models*. New York: Springer.
- Khaṭīb, Muḥammad al- [attributed]. *Fuṣṭāṭ al-ʿadāla fī qawāʿid al-sulṭāna*. Manuscript Supplement Turc 1120. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- Nizām al-Mulk (1978). *The Book of Government: or, Rules for Kings: The Siyar al-muluk or Siyasat-nama of Nizam al-Mulk*. Translated by H. Drake. London: Routledge.
- Ocak, A. Y. (1992). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda marjinal Sûfîlik: Kalenderîler: XIV–XVII. yüzyıllar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Özergin, K. (1970). Selçuklu sanatçisi nakkas Abdülmü'min el-Hoyî hakkında. *Belleten*, 34(134), 219–29.
- Pachymeres, Georgius (1835). *Georgii Pachymeris de Michaelae et Andronico Palaeologis libri tredecim*. Edited and translated by I. Bekker. Bonnae: Weber.
- Peacock, A. C. S. (2006). The Saljūq campaign against the Crimea and the expansionist policy of the early reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 16(2), 133–49.
- Peacock, A. C. S. (2010). *Early Seljuq history: A new interpretation*. London: Routledge.
- Peacock, A. C. S. (2015). Cide and its region from Seljuk to Ottoman times. In B. S. Düring and C. Glatz (eds.), *Kinetic landscapes: The Cide archaeological project: Surveying the Turkish western Black Sea region* (pp. 375–91). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Peacock, A. C. S., and S. N. Yildiz (2013). Introduction. In A. C. S. Peacock and S. N. Yildiz (eds.), *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and society in the medieval Middle East* (pp.1–22). London: I. B. Tauris.

- Pfeiffer, J. (2006). Reflections on a “double rapprochement”: Conversion to Islam among the Mongol elite during the early Ilkhanate. In L. Komaroff (ed.), *Beyond the legacy of Genghis Khan* (pp. 369-389). Boston: Brill.
- Rashīd al-Dīn, Faḍl Allāh (1994). *Jāmi‘ al-tavārīkh*. Edited by M. Mūsavī and M. Rawshan (4 vols.). Tehran: Nashr-i Alburz.
- Saliba, G. (2006). Horoscopes and planetary theory: Ilkhanid patronage of astronomers. In L. Komaroff (ed.), *Beyond the legacy of Genghis Khan* (pp. 357–68). Leiden: Brill.
- Tezcan, B. (2013). The memory of the Mongols in early Ottoman historiography. In H. Erdem Cipa and E. Fetvacı (eds.), *Writing history at the Ottoman court: Editing the past, fashioning the future* (pp. 23–38). Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Turan, O. (1958). *Türkiye Selçuklulari hakkında resmî vesikalar: Metin, tercüme ve araştırmalar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Turan, O. (1980). *Selçuklular ve İslamiyet-Nakışlar Yayınevi*. Istanbul: Nakışlar Yayınevi.
- Turan, O. (2010). Selçuk Türkiyesi din tarihine dair bir kaynak: *Fuṣṭāṭ al-‘adale fī kavā‘id is-sultāna*. In F. Köprülü and O. Turan (eds.), *60. doğum yılı münasebetiyle: Fuad Köprülü armağanı* (pp. 531–64). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Vryonis, Speros, Jr. (1971). *The decline of medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Yaziçi, T. Hasan b. ‘Abd-al-Mo’men. *Encyclopedia Iranica*. Accessed February 23, 2017 through: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hasan-b-abd-al-momen>.
- Yücel, Y. (1991). *Anadolu beylikleri hakkında araştırmalar* (Vol. 1). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.