Sosyal Bilimler
EKEV AKADEMİ
dergisi

Makalenin geliş tarihi: 06.09.2025
1.Hakem Rapor Tarihi: 07.01.2026
2.Hakem Rapor Tarihi: 21.01.2026
Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 16.02.2026
Yayın Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

eISSN:2148-0710 - pISSN:1301-6229

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS IN ḤARRĀN DURING THE AYYŪBID PERIOD (1182-1260)

Bedrettin BASUGUY[*]

Abstract

This study aims to examine the political and social developments in Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period (1182-1260 CE). The research focuses on revealing Ḥarrān's position under Ayyubid rule, beginning with the process that started when Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri, the last ruler of the Begteginids, pledged allegiance to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīnal-Ayyûbî. The study adopts the historical research method, employing descriptive and analytical approaches to examine Ḥarrān's position during the Ayyubid period. Additionally, the city's political, social, and cultural transformation has been analyzed through periodical analysis methodology. In this context, primary sources such as Ibn Jubayr's Riḥla*, Ibn Shaddād's* al-A'lāq al-Khaṭīra*, Ibn Wāṣil's* Mufarrij al-Kurūb*, and Ibn al-Athīr's* al-Kāmil *have been utilized. Particularly, the direct observational data obtained from Ibn Jubayr's and Ibn Shaddād's visits to the city played a significant role in the analysis of social life. The research reveals that Ḥarrān experienced one of its most brilliant periods in history during the Ayyubid era. The process that began with Gökböri's submission to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 578/1182 transformed Ḥarrān into a strategic base for the Ayyubid army's military activities directed toward the al-Jazīra and Mosul regions. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's use of Ḥarrān as his headquarters and his residence there during his illness increased the city's political importance. Through the Treaty of Ḥarrān in 581/1186, the political unity that had disintegrated after Nūr al-Dīn Zangī's death was reestablished, bringing Southeast Anatolia and Northern Iraq entirely under Ayyubid dominion. This treaty also laid the groundwork for Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's launch of his comprehensive jihad movement against the Crusaders. After Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's death, the city became the center of al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's possessions east of the Euphrates, later coming under al-Kāmil's rule and contributing to the expansion of regional power. The activities of the Khwārazm-Shāhs in the region from 635/1237 onward and their use of Ḥarrān as a base demonstrate that the city maintained its military-strategic position. After their defeat against the Bilād al-Shām-based Ayyubid forces in the Battle of Ruḥā in 638/1241, the Khwārazmians were forced to leave Diyār Muḍar. Following this victory, Ḥarrān passed to the control of the Aleppo Ayyubids and remained under their rule until the Mongol invasion of 658/1260.*

Keywords: *Ayyūbids, al-Jazīra, Ḥarrān, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī, Khwārizmiāns.*

Eyyûbîler Döneminde Harran'da Siyasi ve Sosyal Gelişmeler (1182-1260)

Öz

Bu çalışma, Eyyûbîler döneminde (1182-1260) Harran'daki siyasi ve sosyal gelişmeleri incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, Begteginliler'in son hükümdarı Muzafferüddîn Gökböri'nin Sultan Selâhaddîn'e bağlılığı ile başlayan süreç çerçevesinde Harran'ın Eyyûbî hâkimiyetindeki konumunu ortaya koymaya odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmada tarihsel araştırma yöntemi benimsenmiş, betimleyici ve analitik yaklaşımlarla Harran'ın Eyyûbîler dönemindeki konumu ele alınmıştır. Ayrıca dönemsel analiz yöntemiyle şehrin siyasi, sosyal ve kültürel dönüşümü incelenmiştir. Bu bağlamda İbn Cübeyr'in Rihle'si, İbn Şeddâd'ın el-A'lâkü'l-Hatîre'si, İbn Vâsıl'ın Müferricü'l-Kürûb'u, İbnü'l-Esîr'in el-Kâmil'i gibi birincil kaynaklar kullanılmıştır. Özellikle İbn Cübeyr ve İbn Şeddâd'ın şehre yaptıkları ziyaretlerden elde edilen doğrudan gözlem verileri sosyal hayat analizinde önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Araştırma, Harran'ın Eyyûbîler döneminde tarihinin en parlak dönemlerinden birini yaşadığını ortaya koymaktadır. 578/1182'de Gökböri'nin Selâhaddîn'e tabi olması ile başlayan süreç, Harran'ı Eyyûbî ordusunun el-Cezîre ve Musul bölgelerine yönelik askerî faaliyetlerinin stratejik üssü haline getirmiştir. Selâhaddîn'in Harran'ı karargâh olarak kullanması ve hastalığı esnasında burada ikâmet etmesi, şehrin siyasi önemini artırmıştır. 581/1186 Harran Anlaşması ile Nûreddîn Zengî'nin ölümünden sonra dağılan siyasi birlik yeniden tesis edilerek Güneydoğu Anadolu ve Kuzey Irak tamamen Eyyûbî hâkimiyetine girmiştir. Bu anlaşma aynı zamanda Selâhaddîn'in Haçlılara karşı geniş çaplı cihad hareketini başlatmasına zemin hazırlamıştır. Selâhaddîn'in vefatından sonra şehir, el-Melikü'l-Âdil'in Fırat'ın doğusundaki varlıklarının merkezi olmuş, daha sonra el-Kâmil'in hâkimiyeti altına girerek bölgesel gücün genişlemesine katkıda bulunmuştur. Hârizmlilerin 635/1237'den itibaren bölgedeki faaliyetleri ve Harran'ı üs olarak kullanmaları, şehrin askerî-stratejik konumunu koruduğunu göstermektedir. 638/1241 yılındaki Ruha Savaşında, Bilâdüşşâm merkezli Eyyûbî kuvvetlerine yenilen Hârizmliler Diyârımudar'ı terk etmek zorunda kalmış, bu savaştan sonra Halep Eyyûbîlerinin hâkimiyetine geçen Harran, 658/1260 Moğol istilasına kadar bu statüsünü sürdürmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Eyyûbîler, el-Cezîre, Harran, Selâhaddîn-i Eyyûbi, Hârizmliler.*

[*] Assoc. Prof., Bingöl University, Faculty of Theology, Department of Islamic History and Arts, bedricanan@hotmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7655-7559.

1. Introduction

Due to its position on the caravan routes connecting Anatolia and Syria to Iraq and Iran, Ḥarrān possessed strategic importance and was conquered by ʿIyāḍ ibn Ghanm in 19/640 during the caliphate of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. Ḥarrān, one of the important cities of the Diyār Muḍar region, received the attention of the Umayyad caliphs. After becoming caliph, ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz transferred a medical school from Alexandria to Ḥarrān and Antioch (Ibn Abū Uṣaybiʿa, n.d., p. 171). Marwān II moved the capital of the Umayyad State from Damascus to Ḥarrān in order to consolidate his dominion in the East. Marwān II had a grand palace built in Ḥarrān, spending 10 million dirhams on it. When the Abbasids occupied an important part of Iran and Mesopotamia, Marwān II departed from Ḥarrān with an army of 12,000 men to confront the Abbasid forces. In the battle fought on the banks of the Greater Zab River in Jumādā al-Ākhira 132/February 750, the Umayyad army was defeated. After the battle, the Abbasid army that occupied Ḥarrān plundered and destroyed the palace built by Marwān (Fehérvári, 1971, pp. 227-228; Şeşen, 1993, p. 11).

Ḥarrān emerged as an important center of learning where intense cultural activities took place throughout the early Abbasid period. During this time, numerous books written in Greek on Mathematics, Astronomy, and Medicine were translated into Arabic in Ḥarrān by a committee led by Thābit ibn Qurra. Likewise, al-Battānī, considered one of the greatest Islamic astronomers, was a native of Ḥarrān and continued his work there (Bosworth, 2003, p. 14; Fehérvári, 1971, p. 228).

Ḥarrān later came under the rule of the Numayrids, a small nomadic dynasty. The Numayrids, who ruled in Ḥarrān until 474/1081, recognized the supreme authority of the Fatimids. In 1081, Sharaf al-Dawla Muslim ibn Quraysh, an ally of the Seljuks, captured Ḥarrān. Yaḥyā ibn Shātir was appointed as governor of Ḥarrān, but two years later the people of Ḥarrān rebelled against him and the Seljuks. Thereupon, Sharaf al-Dawla suppressed the rebellion and severely punished the people of Ḥarrān (Fehérvári, 1971, p. 228).

Upon the death of ʿIzz al-Dīn Masʿūd, the lord of Ḥarrān, in 521/1127, the Seljuk sultan Maḥmūd appointed ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī as atabeg. Thus, Ḥarrān, which was under the threat of the Crusaders, was attached to the Mosul atabegate. During the reign of Nūr al-Dīn Zangī, who brought Ḥarrān under his rule in 544/1149, the city recorded significant developments. Nūr al-Dīn began by fortifying Ḥarrān and had the buildings and the Great Mosque that were damaged in the earthquakes of 508/1114 and 522/1157 repaired. The period of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri, who seized control of Ḥarrān in 576/1180, constitutes one of the most brilliant periods of Ḥarrān. During the period of Gökböri, who joined the side of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī in 578/1182, agriculture, trade, and scholarly life flourished in the city, and reconstruction activities accelerated (Şeşen, 1993, p. 20-21).

A comprehensive examination of Ḥarrān's political-strategic position, socio-economic structure, and regional importance during the Ayyubid period has not been adequately addressed in the literature. This article aims to fill an important gap in the literature by examining the political and social history of Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period. In the research, the period from Gökböri to the Mongol invasion has been systematically analyzed in light of the primary sources of the Ayyubid era, and the city's position during this critical period has been reevaluated from a historical science perspective. Particularly, the social life analyses based on the direct observations of Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Shaddād, along with the detailed examination of the political consequences of the Treaty of Ḥarrān, constitute the original contributions of this study.

2. Methodology

This study adopts the historical research method, examining the political and social structure of Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period using descriptive and analytical approaches. The historical research

method is a systematic approach that aims to understand and interpret past events through the critical analysis of primary and secondary sources (Tosh, 2015, pp. 89-92; Howell & Prevenier, 2001, pp. 17-23). This method is particularly suitable for examining historical phenomena within their temporal and spatial contexts, establishing cause-and-effect relationships, and reconstructing past social structures through available documentary evidence. The application of historical research methodology to this study is justified by the need to systematically analyze Ḥarrān's transformation during the Ayyubid period through authentic medieval sources. As Humphreys (1991, pp. 1-15) emphasizes in his methodological framework for Islamic studies, the proper contextualization of political and social developments requires rigorous source criticism and multi-layered analysis of primary texts. This approach enables the reconstruction of urban history through the evaluation of diverse source materials, including chronicles, travel accounts, and administrative records.

The methodological framework of the research includes comparative historiography techniques. Through periodical analysis methodology, the city's political, social, and cultural transformation has been systematically evaluated, and the reliability of information obtained from different authors has been enhanced using multi-source verification techniques. Periodical analysis methodology, as defined by Braudel (1980, pp. 25-54) and further developed by Le Goff (1992, pp. 11-28), is a historiographical approach that examines historical phenomena by dividing them into distinct chronological periods to identify patterns of continuity and change. This method allows historians to trace transformations in political structures, social organizations, and economic systems across different temporal phases (Green & Troup, 1999, pp. 105-120). The application of periodical analysis to Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid era is methodologically appropriate because it enables the systematic examination of the city's evolution through distinct phases: the initial integration under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (578-589/1182-1193), the consolidation under al-ʿĀdil and al-Kāmil (589-635/1193-1238), the Khwārazmian period (635-638/1238-1241), and the final Aleppo Ayyubid phase until the Mongol conquest (638-658/1241-1260). As Eddé (2011, pp. 45-67) demonstrates in her periodization of Ayyubid history, such temporal divisions facilitate the identification of structural transformations that might otherwise remain obscured in linear narrative accounts.

The primary data sources of the research are fundamental sources of Ayyubid history such as Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Kāmil*, Ibn Jubayr's *Riḥla*, Ibn Wāṣil's *Mufarrij al-kurūb*, and Ibn Shaddād's *al-Aʿlāq al-khaṭīra*. Particularly, the direct observational data obtained from Ibn Jubayr's and Ibn Shaddād's visits to the city played an important role in the analysis of social life. These eyewitness testimonies provide important data for periods when archival documents are limited. While systematically evaluating the city's political, social, and cultural transformation through periodical analysis methodology, the works of modern researchers such as Humphreys (1977), Eddé (2011), and Şeşen (1993, 2007) have been used as supporting sources. During data analysis, methods of chronological ordering, thematic grouping, and identification of cause-and-effect relationships have been applied.

2.1. Research Ethics

This research, being a historical study, does not involve human subjects and does not directly require ethical committee approval. However, principles of academic integrity and research ethics have been rigorously applied. All primary and secondary sources used in the study have been appropriately cited. Objectivity has been maintained in the translation of source texts, and personal interpretations have been clearly indicated. There are no conflicts of interest in the research process, and all findings have been presented within the framework of the transparency principle.

3. Findings

3.1. The Rise of Ḥarrān as an Ayyubid Military Base During the Reign of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī

Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the founder of the Ayyubid State, had the *khuṭba* read in the name of the Abbasid caliph in Muḥarram 567/September 1171, thereby attaching Egypt to the Abbasid caliphate (Ibn Wāṣil, 1957, vol. 2, p. 45). This situation meant the end of the Fatimid caliphate, which had ruled Egypt for more than two centuries. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who organized successful campaigns against the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem and captured Eilat, sent a unit under the command of his brother Tūrānshāh to Yemen in 569/1174 and conquered a large part of the region. He captured Barqa in the Libyan region, where he had been conducting campaigns since 568/1173 (al-Iṣfahānī, 1965, p. 127).

Upon the death of Nūr al-Dīn Zangī in Damascus in 569/1174, when his eleven-year-old son al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl succeeded him, the balances in the region began to change. Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, the lord of Mosul, declared his independence and besieged and captured al-Jazīra (Ibn al-Athīr, 1997, vol. 11, p. 298). The emirs of Damascus and Aleppo, who thought that al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ was not of age to govern the state, engaged in struggle with each other to seize Ismāʿīl's atabegate.

When the diploma (*taqlīd*) arrived on 12 Shawwāl 570/6 May 1175 indicating that the Abbasid Caliph recognized Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's dominion over Egypt, Syria, and al-Jazīra, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn declared his independence and began having the *khuṭba* read in his name (Abū Shāma, 1962, vol. 2, p. 156). For Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who declared his independence, to be successful in his *jihād* against the Franks, he needed to restore the fragmented political unity among Muslims and establish solid dominion in Syria and al-Jazīra.

The invitation from Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri, the lord of Ḥarrān, while Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was besieging Beirut in 578, became an important turning point for the sultan in achieving political unity. Gökböri informed the sultan through the envoys he sent that he loved his state, that he would help him if he crossed the Euphrates, and that he would submit to him (Ibn Shaddād, 1994, p. 89). Ibn Wāṣil attributes Gökböri's entry into Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's service to his desire to distance himself from ʿIzz al-Dīn Masʿūd and Mujāhid al-Dīn Qaymaẓ (Ibn Wāṣil, 1957, vol. 3, p. 203). ʿIzz al-Dīn Masʿūd's giving Mosul to Mujāhid al-Dīn Qaymaẓ, who had long been an enemy of Gökböri, appears to be the fundamental reason for Gökböri's joining Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's side. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn gave Gökböri the cities of Edessa, Samosata, and al-Muwazzar as *iqṭāʿ* in addition to Ḥarrān and married him to his sister Rabīʿa Khātūn (al-Bundarī, 1900, p. 178).

After Gökböri joined Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's side, Ḥarrān became the base for the Ayyubid army's military activities directed toward the al-Jazīra and Mosul regions. After Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn captured Sinjar in Ramaḍān 578/December 1182, he returned to Ḥarrān and withdrew to rest in Ḥarrān with his elite unit (*khāṣṣa*) to spend the winter season (Ibn Shaddād, 1994, p. 134). During his Second Eastern campaign in 581/1185, when Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn set out to bring Mosul under his dominion, he fell ill while besieging the city. His brother al-ʿĀdil, learning that his condition was gradually worsening, came from Aleppo to Ḥarrān with a group of doctors (al-Iṣfahānī, 1965, p. 287). During his residence in Ḥarrān, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn distributed large amounts of charity (*ṣadaqa*). No poor or needy person in his country remained who did not benefit from the sultan's beneficence (*iḥsān*) (Abū Shāma, 1962, vol. 2, p. 445).

3.2. The Treaty of Ḥarrān and the Reestablishment of Political Unity

The fundamental aim of the siege of Mosul that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn undertook in 581/1185 was to bring the Zangid atabegate in Mosul under his dominion and thereby achieve the political unity that had disintegrated after Nūr al-Dīn's death. The subjugation of Mosul was of critical importance because it

would prevent a potential al-Jazīra alliance that might threaten the sultan's position in Syria and would provide the opportunity to control the military resources of the region (Humphreys, 1977, p. 56). However, the sultan fell ill during the siege and was forced to return to Ḥarrān.

While Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn was beginning to recover, a delegation from Mosul came to Ḥarrān to negotiate with the sultan. The Mosul forces, who had shown resistance to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's dominion for a long time, had finally decided to seek reconciliation with the sultan. The Mosul delegation, thinking they could not find a better opportunity to reconcile with the sultan, came to Ḥarrān at the beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijja 581. As a result of the negotiations conducted, a definitive treaty was made on 9 Dhū al-Ḥijja 581/3 March 1186. According to the agreement, the Mosul forces, recognizing Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's supreme authority, would have the *khuṭba* read in his name and mint coins. During *jihād*, the Mosul army would be present alongside Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, while in return, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn would respect Mosul's autonomous structure and return to them a small piece of land he had taken from Mosul. As a result of the Treaty of Ḥarrān, Southeast Anatolia and Northern Iraq came entirely under Ayyubid dominion, and the political unity that had disintegrated after Nūr al-Dīn's death was reestablished (Humphreys, 1977, p. 58; Demir, 2013, p. 59). Having gained the support of the Mosul forces through the treaty, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn concentrated on the conquest of territories held by the Crusaders and launched a comprehensive *jihād* movement against the Franks.

When Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAlī, the lord of Erbil, died in 586/1190, his elder brother Gökböri renounced his rights over Ruḥā, Ḥarrān, Samosata, and al-Muwazzar and requested Erbil, which his brother had possessed, from Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who did not refuse this request from Gökböri, who had brought great benefits to the Ayyubid State and had shown important heroism in winning the Victory of Ḥiṭṭīn, gave him the administration of Shahrazūr along with Erbil (Ibn Khallikān, 1994, vol. 4, p. 115). He gave the places vacated by Gökböri, including Ḥarrān, as *iqṭāʿ* to his nephew Taqī al-Dīn ʿUmar (Ibn al-Athīr, 1997, vol. 10, p. 203).

Upon the death of his nephew Taqī al-Dīn ʿUmar in 587/1191 while besieging Malazgirt, Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn gave the al-Jazīra territories, including Ḥarrān, as *iqṭāʿ* to his young son Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad. However, when Nāṣir al-Dīn also demanded the territories belonging to his father in Syria, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn gave Ḥarrān and the other regions east of the Euphrates first to his son al-Malik al-Afḍal for a short time, then to his brother al-ʿĀdil (Ibn al-Athīr, 1997, vol. 10, p. 216).

The Treaty of Ḥarrān constitutes a critical turning point in terms of achieving political unity in the 12th-century Islamic world. The authority vacuum that emerged in the Syria and al-Jazīra region following Nūr al-Dīn Zangī's death in 1174 had led to deep fragmentation among Muslim powers. This situation created a strategic weakness against the Crusader States while also hindering the comprehensive *jihād* movement that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn aimed for. The treaty signed in Ḥarrān served important functions in ending this fragmentation. The Mosul atabegate's recognition of Ayyubid supremacy made political coordination possible across a wide geography extending from Southeast Anatolia to Northern Iraq, while the integration of local authorities into the system rather than their complete elimination created a sustainable unity model. The placement of Mosul's military resources under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's command strengthened the manpower and logistical infrastructure for large-scale campaigns to be organized against the Crusaders. The most important consequence of this treaty in terms of political unity was that it enabled Muslim forces to act in a coordinated manner during the process leading to the Victory of Ḥiṭṭīn.

3.3. Ḥarrān After the Death of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn

When Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who had become exhausted in the wearing wars with the Crusaders led by Richard Lionheart, died in Damascus on 27 Ṣafar 589/4 March 1193, al-Jazīra, Karak, and Shawbak

were in the hands of his brother al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 3, pp. 3-4). Part of al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's possessions east of the Euphrates was centered in Edessa and Ḥarrān, while the other part was centered in Mayyāfāriqīn. Al-ʿĀdil, who resided in Edessa and Ḥarrān during his periods in al-Jazīra, also held dominion over strategic points such as Samosata, Siverek, and al-Muwazzar (Humphreys, 1977, p. 83).

While the Crusaders were besieging Damietta, al-ʿĀdil, who was busy organizing reinforcements to defend Damietta, died at ʿĀliqīn near Damascus on 7 Jumādā al-Ākhira 615/31 August 1218 (Gibb, 1960, p. 198; Chamberlain, 1998, p. 222; O'Neal, 2005, p. 108). When al-ʿĀdil died, the Ayyubid empire was divided among his three major sons. Al-Kāmil Muḥammad ruled in Egypt, al-Muʿaẓẓam ʿĪsā in Palestine, Jordan, and the central regions of Syria, while al-Ashraf Mūsā ruled in Northern Syria and al-Jazīra, which included Ḥarrān. The other rulers, each being the lord of a specific region, continued their existence in some way dependent on one of these three (Humphreys, 1977, p. 161).

Al-Malik al-Kāmil, who stood out among al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's children for his foresight and leadership qualities, had begun his political career in al-Jazīra. In 595/1199, when he was only 19 years old, he commanded the siege of Mardin in place of his father when al-ʿĀdil returned to Damascus. Al-Kāmil, who successfully continued the siege, was about to capture the city when he lost the pitched battle he fought against a combined army consisting of Mosul, Sinjar, and Jazīrat Ibn ʿUmar forces and withdrew to Mayyāfāriqīn, then went to Ḥarrān, his father's capital in al-Jazīra, and ensured its security. On 12 Ṣafar 595/4 December 1199, al-Kāmil, who went to the aid of his father who was besieged in Damascus with 400,000 dinars and reinforcements, played a major role in lifting the siege; when his father went to Egypt, he returned to al-Jazīra at the head of his army (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 3, pp. 102, 105, 108; Humphreys, 1977, pp. 112, 114-115).

In 626/1229, al-Malik al-Kāmil entered Damascus together with his brother al-Malik al-Ashraf, and after taking Damascus from his nephew al-Malik al-Nāṣir, he gave it to his brother al-Ashraf and in return took from him Ḥarrān, al-Raqqa, Ruḥā, Suruç, Raʾs al-ʿAyn, Jumlīn, and al-Muwazzar, which belonged to him in al-Jazīra (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 4, pp. 256-258; Şeşen, 2007, pp. 110-114; Gottschalk, 1978, p. 520). Thus, al-Kāmil's influence increased and his dominion expanded.

Al-Kāmil took his son al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ with him on his Eastern campaign in 629/1232 to conquer Amid. Having left his other son al-ʿĀdil II as regent (*nāʾib al-salṭana*) in Egypt, al-Kāmil captured Amid and its vicinity from the Artuqid lord al-Malik al-Masʿūd on 19 Dhū al-Ḥijja 629/6 October 1232. Following the conquest, he appointed al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ as deputy there and assigned a senior statesman, Shams al-Dīn Sawwāb al-ʿĀdilī, to his side (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, pp. 12, 28, 29; Ibn Khallikān, 1994, vol. 5, pp. 81-82).

When Edessa, Siverek, and Ḥarrān were besieged by the forces of the Seljuk sultan Kayqubād in Dhū al-Ḥijja 632/August 1235, al-Malik al-Kāmil set out from Egypt and headed toward al-Jazīra alongside his brother al-Ashraf and other Ayyubid kings. During the winter of the same year, he recaptured the territories seized by the Seljuks and reaffirmed al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's position as his deputy in the region (Abū al-Fidāʾ, 1907, vol. 3, pp. 192-193; Şeşen, 2007, pp. 137-138).

After the death of Shams al-Dīn Sawwāb in 633, al-Kāmil granted Ḥiṣn Kayfā to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, including all the provisions and goods within the fortress (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 134). Consequently, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ consolidated his rule over Amid, Ḥarrān, al-Raqqa, Ruḥā, Suruj, and Raʾs al-ʿAyn as his father's representative, establishing a significant Ayyubid administrative presence in the region**.**

3.4. The Activities of the Khwārazm-Shāhs in Ḥarrān

After the assassination of Jalāl al-Dīn Khwārazm-Shāh in 628/1230, the Khwārazm-Shāhs, who were left leaderless and scattered, emerged as an important actor in the struggle between the Ayyubids and the Anatolian Seljuks. They tried to escape the Mongol threat by living on lands granted to them as *iqṭāʿ* within the borders of these two states according to the balance of power (Jackson, 1999, p. 87).

The ascension of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II to the throne in 635/1237 and his arrest of Barkakhān (Kayırkhān), the leader of the Khwārazm-Shāhs, constituted a breaking point for the Khwārazm-Shāhs. The other Khwārazmian emirs, fearing to share the same fate as Barkakhān, abandoned their *iqṭāʿ* holdings and fled eastward with their soldiers. They pillaged the places they passed through and crossed to al-Jazīra east of the Euphrates (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 145). At this time, they applied to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, who was residing in Ḥiṣn Kayfā as his father's deputy, wanting to enter his service. Since al-Ṣāliḥ knew the damage that the Khwārazmian soldiers, numbering over fifteen thousand, would cause to his country, he took the Khwārazm-Shāhs into his service after consulting with his father, both to prevent them from causing damage and to benefit from their military strength (al-Maqrīzī, 1997, vol. 1, p. 398). He gave some places in al-Jazīra to the Khwārazm-Shāhs as *iqṭāʿ* (Ibn Aybak al-Dawādārī, 1972, vol. 7, p. 342).

Upon the death of al-Malik al-Kāmil in Damascus on 22 Rajab 635/10 March 1238, the Khwārazm-Shāhs took advantage of al-Ṣāliḥ's unprotected state, which stemmed from the sudden political vacuum and his lack of immediate military support following his father’s passing. Consequently, they rebelled, seeking to capture him (Ibn al-Athīr, 1997, vol. 12, p. 178). Thereupon, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, who was near the Euphrates, fearing to fall prisoner to the Khwārazm-Shāhs, fled to Sinjar, abandoning his treasures and other valuable possessions (Abū al-Fidāʾ, 1907, vol. 3, p. 198).According to the agreement Badr al-Dīn made with the Khwārazm-Shāhs, Ḥarrān and Ruḥā would be given to the Khwārazm-Shāhs as *iqṭāʿ*; the Khwārazm-Shāhs would also return to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's service (Ibn Shaddād, 1994, p. 234).

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ had left his son al-Malik al-Mughīth in Ḥarrān castle out of fear of the Khwārazm-Shāhs. The Khwārazm-Shāhs had followed al-Mughīth and his companions and usurped their goods (al-Nuwayrī, 1923-2002, vol. 27, p. 156). However, Ḍayfa Khātūn politely dismissed him through an envoy she sent, saying, "If Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw requests you from us, we cannot oppose this" (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 189). Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ wanted his son to make an agreement with the Khwārazm-Shāhs and come to his aid against Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ, the lord of Mosul (Ibn al-ʿIbrī, 1890, p. 432).

The Khwārazm-Shāhs, whom al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ settled in Diyār Muḍar, began pillaging activities in the Ayyubid territories in Syria from 638/1240 onward. The Khwārazm-Shāhs, who pillaged the castles of Bālis and Jābar, inflicted a heavy defeat on the Aleppo Ayyubid army in the village of Bīra in the Buzāʿa valley on Thursday, 14 Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 638/3 November 1240 (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 267). They subjected Muslim women to torture and torment that even the Mongols had not done. Moreover, they incited people against al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ by saying that they were doing these things in the name of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ and that they were in his service (al-Maqrīzī, 1997, vol. 1, p. 425).

When he heard what the Khwārazm-Shāhs were doing in Aleppo, he gave up marching against the Crusaders and rushed to Aleppo's aid. He reached Aleppo on 23 Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 638/11 November 1240 (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 278). ʿImād al-Dīn, knowing that the Khwārazm-Shāhs were a great threat to the rule in Damascus, agreed to help Ḍayfa Khātūn and send a military unit (Ibn al-ʿAdīm, 1951-1968, vol. 2, p. 289; Özkara, 2024, p. 475). According to Ibn Bībī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw

also sent his governor in Malatya to Aleppo's aid at the head of an army of 3,000 men (Ibn Bībī, 1956, p. 487).

Finally, on 21 Ramaḍān 638/5 April 1241, al-Manṣūr encountered the Khwārazm-Shāhs near Ruḥā and inflicted a heavy defeat on them (Ibn Wāṣil, 1953-1977, vol. 5, p. 298). They could not provide better service to their new masters than the service they had offered to the Anatolian Seljuks and al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ (Jackson, 1999, p. 156).

After the Battle of Ruḥā, all of Diyār Muḍar was exposed to the invasion of Aleppo forces. The Aleppo army besieged and captured Ḥarrān, Ruḥā, Raʾs al-ʿAyn, al-Raqqa, Suruç, and al-Muwazzar in a short time (Ibn al-Athīr, 1997, vol. 12, p. 287). Thus, the Aleppo Ayyubid principality became the dominant power in the region.

After an unsuccessful campaign organized by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ṭaybars, one of Baybars's commanders, to Ḥarrān in 670/1271, the Mongols moved the settled population and wealth of the city to Mosul and Mardin and turned Ḥarrān into ruins (Bar Hebraeus, 1932, p. 445). After the victory that the Mamluks won against the Mongols in 703/1303, Ḥarrān, which came under Mamluk rule, would not be rebuilt after this and would continue its existence as a village (al-Qalqashandī, 1963, vol. 4, p. 178).

3.5. Social Life in Ḥarrān During the Ayyubid Period

Ḥarrān, established at the intersection of important caravan routes leading to Anatolia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, experienced one of the most brilliant periods in its history in terms of social and cultural activities during the Ayyubid period. The Andalusian traveler Ibn Jubayr (d. 614/1217) and the historian Ibn Shaddād (d. 684/1285) provide important information about the socio-cultural structure of Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period. Both Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Shaddād visited Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period and made direct observations about the city, later recording their observations in their works. Ibn Jubayr visited in Rabīʿ al-Awwal of the year 580 (June 1184), which coincided with the reign of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 234); ʿIzz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, who was sent by al-Nāṣir Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, the Aleppo Ayyubid ruler, to inspect the taxes in Ḥarrān, visited Ḥarrān in 640/1242 (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, p. 167).

Ibn Jubayr, who resided in Ḥarrān for two days, describes in detail from a traveler's perspective the city's climate, the characteristics of the people residing in the city, the city's architectural structure, the Great Mosque, and the Sufis he visited in the city.

Ibn Jubayr describes Ḥarrān as a town deprived of greenery and shade, characterizing the city's air as extremely hot and oppressive (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 235). According to Ibn Jubayr, the people of Ḥarrān, who include many philanthropists among them, are gentle-natured, moderate, and quite generous toward strangers and the poor. Ibn Jubayr, who notes that many ascetics (*zāhid*) and hermits (*munzawī*) live among the local population, also visited Ḥayāt al-Ḥarrānī, one of the four great saints (*awliyāʾ*) believed to possess *taṣarruf* (spiritual influence) after death, and his son ʿUmar (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 236). Ibn Jubayr visited Ḥayāt al-Ḥarrānī in the *zāwiya* he had built in the *qibla* direction of the mosque bearing his name, and after receiving the Sheikh's blessing, he visited his son ʿUmar and spoke highly of him. Later, Ibn Jubayr met with two more Sufis named Sheikh Salama and Bareheaded Salama, who did not cover his head due to his humility before the Almighty. Ibn Jubayr describes Sheikh Salama as a unique ascetic and Bareheaded Salama as a smiling, well-spoken righteous person (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 237).

When Ibn Jubayr provides information about the architectural structures in Ḥarrān, he mentions that the bazaars (*sūq*) surrounding the city from end to end were quite orderly and covered bazaars

roofed with ceilings, and that there was a large dome at the intersection point of these extremely wide bazaars (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 238).

Ibn Jubayr provides his most detailed information about the architectural structures in Ḥarrān concerning the Great Mosque. According to this, the Great Mosque is a renovated ancient structure that is extremely magnificent. The mosque has a large courtyard (*ṣaḥn*) covered by three domes rising on marble columns, while its fourth dome dates from the Roman period and its top is hollow like a solid tower. The mosque, which has quite wide arches, has nineteen doors, nine of which are to the right of the main door and the other nine to the left. The main door is as magnificent and beautiful as city gates (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 239).

Ibn Jubayr, who also provides information about Ḥarrān castle and its walls, states that the castle located to the east of the city is fortified and that the wall made of hewn stones is quite solid (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 240).

When Ibn Jubayr mentions Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri, the lord of Ḥarrān, he notes that he and other rulers in the region were loyal to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, and that these rulers were able to maintain their positions thanks to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's tolerance and generosity (Ibn Jubayr, 1907, p. 241).

ʿIzz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād provides more detailed and technical information about Ḥarrān compared to Ibn Jubayr. Ibn Shaddād, who was sent by al-Malik al-Nāṣir, the Aleppo Ayyubid ruler, to inspect the taxes in Ḥarrān, provides detailed information about Ḥarrān's tax revenues in accordance with the reason for his assignment. According to this, in the year Ibn Shaddād went to inspect Ḥarrān (640/1242), the tax revenue of central Ḥarrān was two million dirhams, while this amount was three million dirhams during al-Malik al-Ashraf's period. Tax revenues gradually decreased as a result of successive Mongol attacks. According to Ibn Shaddād, the tax revenues in Ḥarrān, which gradually decreased following the Mongol attacks, are presented in the table below (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, pp. 168-170).

Table 1

Tax Revenues of Ḥarrān After the Mongol Attacks According to Ibn Shaddād

Revenue Source	Amount (Dirhams)	Revenue Source	Amount (Dirhams)
Irrigation	170,000	Wars	50,000
Suburbs	150,000	Baths	10,000
City's Great Gate	130,000	Cattle	8,000
Dār al-Wikāla	125,000	Prisons	5,000
Cotton	30,000	Crimes (Fines)	40,000
Dyes	30,000	Protections (Ḥimāya)	160,000
Plots of Land	40,000	Inheritances without Heirs	160,000
Jizya	15,000	Land Measurements	100,000
Surplus Waqf Revenues	100,000	Various Revenues	100,000
		Total	**1,423,000**

The fiscal data provided by Ibn Shaddād reveals a significant economic contraction in Ḥarrān, where total tax revenues plummeted by approximately fifty percent compared to the al-Ashraf period. This sharp decline underscores the devastating impact of Mongol incursions on the region's administrative stability and agricultural productivity, signaling the end of Ḥarrān's golden age as a prosperous Ayyubid city.

Ibn Shaddād, who also provides information about the villages attached to the Ḥarrān *ʿāmiliyya* (administrative district), states that the number of villages attached to Ḥarrān was 800, of which 500 were inhabited (*maʿmūr*). The taxes obtained from these villages met the needs of 100 cavalrymen, while the remainder was transferred to the *Bayt al-Māl* (Treasury) (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, p. 171).

Ibn Shaddād, who also provides information about Ḥarrān's physical characteristics, states that the city, established on a flat area before the Mongol invasion, was built of stone and lime, had wide streets, and possessed an extremely durable wall. Its castle, called al-Mudawwar in ancient times, was one of the Sabian temples and had been repaired and renovated by al-Malik al-ʿĀdil, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's brother (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, p. 172).

In Ḥarrān, which had seven gates, all four *madrasas* that were active during the Ayyubid period belonged to the Ḥanbalīs. These *madrasas* were built by the Zangid sultan Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, Shams al-Dīn Shākir, al-Ḥājja Sitt al-Naʿm (the sister-in-law of Sharaf al-Dīn ibn al-ʿAṭṭār), and Shams al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ibn Sallāma ibn al-ʿAṭṭār. There were also two *khānqāhs* in the city, one built by Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd and the other by Jamāl al-Dīn Shādbakht for Arab and Persian poor people, as well as a *bīmāristān* (hospital) built by Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, p. 173).

The Mosque of Abraham the Friend (Masjid Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl) and the mosque containing a rock upon which Prophet Abraham is said to have leaned were two important pilgrimage sites in Ḥarrān. Likewise, there was a large Sabian temple (with idols) in the city. When ʿIyāḍ ibn Ghanm conquered Ḥarrān, he took this temple from them and allocated another place for them in return. The new temple that the Sabians built in the place allocated to them was demolished by Yaḥyā ibn al-Shāṭir, the governor of Ḥarrān under the ʿUqaylid emir Muslim ibn Quraysh (Ibn Shaddād, 1991, p. 174).

In conclusion, the accounts of these two observers provide a comprehensive picture of Ḥarrān: while Ibn Jubayr captures the vibrant social and spiritual atmosphere of the city at its peak, Ibn Shaddād offers a more analytical view of its administrative and economic decline under external pressures.

4. Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations

In the process that began with Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri's allegiance to Sultan Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn in 578/1182, Ḥarrān played a critical role in the political and military history of the Ayyubid State. This research reveals that the city's approximately eighty-year Ayyubid period constituted one of the most brilliant and dynamic eras in Ḥarrān's history. The research findings demonstrate that Gökböri's acceptance of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's authority represented not merely a political transformation for Ḥarrān but also fundamentally altered the city's strategic position. Thanks to its strategic position, Ḥarrān, which served as a connection point between Anatolia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, not only remained a commercial center during this period but also became the base for the Ayyubid army's military operations directed toward the al-Jazīra and Mosul regions, thereby assuming a critical role within regional power dynamics. Beyond its military and political significance, Ḥarrān, established at the intersection of these important caravan routes, experienced one of the most brilliant periods in its history in terms of social and cultural activities during the Ayyubid period.

Discussion

Ḥarrān's most important political contribution during the Ayyubid period was realized through the Treaty of Ḥarrān signed in 581/1186. This treaty played a decisive role in reestablishing the Muslim political unity that had disintegrated after Nūr al-Dīn Zangī's death, ensuring that Southeast Anatolia and Northern Iraq came entirely under Ayyubid dominion. Our findings regarding the significance of the Treaty of Ḥarrān align with Humphreys' (1977) analysis, which emphasizes that this agreement was crucial for consolidating Ayyubid power in the region. However, while Humphreys focuses primarily on the treaty's military implications, our research reveals additional dimensions regarding Ḥarrān's role as a diplomatic center. In contrast to Gibb's (1973) interpretation, which suggests that the Treaty of Ḥarrān was primarily a temporary tactical arrangement, our research demonstrates that it established a long-lasting structural framework for Ayyubid dominance in al-Jazīra. The placement of Mosul's military resources under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's command strengthened the manpower and logistical infrastructure for large-scale campaigns against the Crusaders, ultimately enabling the Victory of Ḥiṭṭīn in 583/1187. This conclusion supports Lyons and Jackson's (1982) view that the treaty was instrumental in preparing the ground for Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's comprehensive jihād movement. However, our research extends their analysis by demonstrating that Ḥarrān itself served not merely as a location for treaty negotiations but as an active military and administrative center throughout this process.

After Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's death, Ḥarrān's position as the center of al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's possessions east of the Euphrates demonstrates the continuation of the city's strategic importance. The noteworthy aspect of this period is Ḥarrān's becoming subject to iqṭāʿ exchanges within the Ayyubid dynasty. Al-Malik al-Ashraf's transfer of these territories, including Ḥarrān, to his brother al-Kāmil in exchange for Damascus at the time of al-Malik al-ʿĀdil's death in 615/1218 is an indicator of the Ayyubid State's evolving territorial organization. Our research reveals that these exchanges, specifically regarding Ḥarrān, were not merely personal power contests but rather efforts to strengthen central authority through control of strategic regions. This interpretation differs from Gottschalk's (1978) view, which characterizes the post-Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn period primarily as one of dynastic fragmentation and decline. Instead, our findings align more closely with Humphreys' (1977) argument that the territorial reorganizations represented rational attempts to balance regional power and maintain dynastic cohesion. During al-Kāmil's period, the city became an important element in the power struggles of the Ayyubid dynasty's second generation, shaping the dynasty's internal dynamics through territorial exchanges and administrative reorganizations. This observation corroborates Chamberlain's (1998) analysis of Ayyubid state structure, which emphasizes the importance of strategic cities as bargaining chips in intra-dynastic negotiations. However, while Chamberlain focuses on Syrian cities, our research demonstrates that al-Jazīra cities, particularly Ḥarrān, played an equally crucial role in these dynamics.

Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's recruitment of approximately fifteen thousand Khwārazmian soldiers into his service in 635/1237 and his granting of Ḥarrān to them as iqṭāʿ led to the emergence of a new power element in the Ayyubid State. This finding makes an important contribution to discussions regarding the role of nomadic warrior groups in medieval Islamic states. Our research demonstrates that the Khwārazm-Shāhs were initially positioned as part of Ayyubid military strategy, a conclusion that supports Jackson's (1999) analysis of Khwārazmian migration patterns following the Mongol conquest of Khwārazm. However, the devastation wrought by the Khwārazm-Shāhs in Syrian territories under Ayyubid control, once they escaped control, frustrated al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's political calculations. The victory won by the Ayyubid alliance forces under al-Malik al-Manṣūr's leadership against the Khwārazm-Shāhs in the Battle of Ruḥā in 638/1241 reshaped the regional balance of power. The passage of Ḥarrān, Ruḥā, Raʾs al-ʿAyn, al-Raqqa, Suruç, and al-Muwazzar into the hands of the Aleppo

Ayyubids after this battle demonstrates the complete liquidation of the Khwārazm-Shāhs as a power element.

The Mongol invasion of 658/1260 and Ḥarrān's peaceful surrender to the Mongols led by Hūlāgū, followed by the city's reduction to ruins and its loss of urban identity, concretely demonstrates the destructive impact of the Mongol invasion on Islamic urban civilization. Ḥarrān never regained its former importance after the Mongol invasion. Our research reveals that the systematic destruction of Ḥarrān by the Mongols was not merely a military strategy but rather a deliberate policy due to the city's strategic position. This conclusion aligns with Morgan's (1986) analysis of Mongol conquest strategies, which emphasizes targeted destruction of key urban centers to prevent future resistance. However, our findings extend this analysis by demonstrating the long-term consequences for Ḥarrān's urban identity.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several promising directions for future scholarly investigation emerge. Comparative urban history studies, particularly comparisons with other important Ayyubid cities such as Aleppo, Damascus, and Mosul, will better illuminate Ḥarrān's distinctiveness and importance within the broader Ayyubid urban network. Such studies would benefit from the methodological framework developed in this research. The role of the Khwārazm-Shāhs in the Ayyubid State should be examined not only from a military perspective but also in terms of their socio-economic impacts. Studies on the interaction of nomadic warrior groups with settled societies will make important contributions to medieval Islamic history and our understanding of state-building processes. Finally, the development of educational and charitable institutions (madrasas, khānqāhs, bīmāristāns) in Ḥarrān during the Ayyubid period deserves detailed investigation, particularly in comparison with similar institutions in other Ayyubid cities, to understand patterns of cultural patronage and social organization.

Bibliography

Abū al-Fidāʾ, I. (1907). *al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbār al-bashar* (M. Z. ʿAzab, Ed.). Dār al-Maʿārif.

Al-Balādhurī, A. Y. (1987). *Futūḥ al-buldān* (A. A. al-Ṭabbāʿ, Ed.). Muʾassasat al-Maʿārif.

Al-Bundarī, F. (2004). *Sanāʾ al-barq al-Shāmī* (R. Şeşen, Ed.). Ircica.

Al-Dawādārī, I. A. (1972). *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmiʿ al-ghurar* (S. A. ʿĀshūr, Ed.). Markaz Wuthūq li-al-Makhṭūṭāt.

Al-Dhahabī, M. (1998). *Tārīkh al-Islām* (A. Tadmurī, Ed.). Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī.

Al-Ḥaznedārī, K. (2005). *Tārīkh majmūʿ al-nawādir* (Ḥ. Ḥayn & M. al-Ḥājirī, Eds.). Dār al-Kutub.

Al-Jāmī, A. (1980). *Nafaḥāt al-uns* (Lamiʿī Çelebī, Trans. & Commentary). İstanbul Matbaası.

Al-Maqrīzī, A. (1997). *al-Sulūk li-maʿrifat duwal al-mulūk* (M. A. ʿAṭā, Ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

Bar Hebraeus, G. (1994). *Tārīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*. Dār al-Rāʾid al-Lubnānī.

Braudel, F. (1980). *On history* (S. Matthews, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.

Chamberlain, M. (1998). The Crusader era and the Ayyūbid dynasty. In C. F. Petry (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of Egypt* (pp. 211-241). Cambridge University.

Demir, A. (2008). *Urfa ve çevresi Eyyûbîler tarihi*. Kent.

Eddé, A.-M. (2007). Ayyubids. *Encyclopaedia of Islam Three*. Brill.

Eddé, A.-M. (2011). *Saladin* (J. M. Todd, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Fehérvári, G. (1986). Ḥarrān. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 227-230). Brill.

Gibb, H. A. R. (1986). Al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ayyūb. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 197-198). Brill.

Gottschalk, H. L. (1997). Al-Malik al-Kāmil. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 520-521). Brill.

Green, A., & Troup, K. (1999). *The houses of history: A critical reader in twentieth-century history and theory*. New York University.

Hillenbrand, C. (2018). The Holy Land in the Crusader and Ayyubid Periods. In R. G. Hoyland (Ed.), *The Oxford illustrated history of the Holy Land* (pp. 179-216). Oxford University Press.

Howell, M., & Prevenier, W. (2001). *From reliable sources: An introduction to historical methods*. Cornell University.

Humphreys, R. S. (1977). *From Saladin to the Mongols: The Ayyubids of Damascus, 1193-1260*. Suny.

Humphreys, R. S. (1991). *Islamic history: A framework for inquiry*. Princeton University.

Ibn Abū Uṣaybiʿa, A. (n.d.). *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbāʾ* (N. Riḍā, Ed.). Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt.

Ibn al-ʿAdīm, K. (1968). *Zubdat al-Ḥalab min tārīkh Ḥalab* (S. al-Dahhān, Ed.). al-Maʿhad al-Faransī bi-Dimashq.

Ibn al-ʿAmīd, M. (n.d.). *Akhbār al-Ayyūbiyyīn*. Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya.

Ibn al-Athīr, A. (2003). *al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh* (M. Y. al-Daqqāq, Ed.). Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya.

Ibn al-Jawzī, S. (2009). *Mirʾāt al-zamān fī tawārīkh al-aʿyān* (I. al-Zaybaq, Ed.). Dār al-Risāla al-ʿĀlamiyya.

Ibn Bībī, Ḥ. (1996). *al-Awāmir al-ʿAlāʾiyya fī al-umūr al-ʿAlāʾiyya* (Trans., M. Öztürk). Kültür Bakanlığı.

Ibn Ḥaldūn, A. (2000). *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* (Ḥ. Shahāda, Ed.). Dār al-Fikr.

Ibn Jubayr, M. (1980). *Riḥlat Ibn Jubayr*. Dār Ṣadr.

Ibn Khallikān, A. (1968). *Wafayāt al-aʿyān wa-anbāʾ abnāʾ al-zamān* (I. ʿAbbās, Ed.). Dār Ṣadr.

Ibn Shaddād, I. (1978). *al-Aʿlāq al-khaṭīra fī dhikr umarāʾ al-Shām wa-al-Jazīra* (Y. ʿAbbāra, Ed.). Dār al-Kutub.

Ibn Wāṣil, J. (1953-2004). *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb* (J. al-Shayyāl, Ḥ. M. Rabīʿ, & Ö. A. Tadmurī, Eds.). Dār al-Kutub wa-al-Wathāʾiq al-Qawmiyya.

Kafesoğlu, İ. (1977). Kök-Böri. *İslâm ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 6, ss. 885-892). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Köprülü, M. F. (1977). Hârizmşahlar. *İslâm ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 5, ss. 290-295). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Küçükaşçı, M. S. (2005). Mudar. *Türkiye Diyanet İslâm ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 30, ss. 358-359). Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Le Goff, J. (1992). *History and memory* (Trans., S. Rendall & E. Claman). Columbia University.

Mājid, A. (1997). *al-Dawla al-Ayyūbiyya fī tārīkh Miṣr al-Islāmiyya*. Dār al-Fikr al-ʿArabī.

O'Neal, M. J. (2005). *The Crusades almanac*. Thomson Gale.

Özkara, G. H. (2024). Eyyûbî nâibesi Melîketü'l-Hâtûn Dayfe Safiyye Sultan (ö. 1242) [Regent of Ayyubid Daifah Safiyya Khâtûn (d. 1242)]. In *World Women Studies Conference-VII proceeding book* (pp. 471-478). IKSAD Publishing House.

Salīm, S. (2000). *al-Atrāk al-Khwārazmiyyūn fī al-sharq al-adnā al-Islāmī (628-644): Al-Anāḍūl, al-Jazīra, al-Shām*. Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya.

Slack, C. K. (2003). *Historical dictionary of the Crusades*. The Scarecrow.

Şeşen, R. (1993). *Harran tarihi*. TDV.

Şeşen, R. (2000). *Selâhaddîn Eyyûbî ve devri*. Isar.

Şeşen, R. (2007). *Selâhaddîn'den Baybars'a Eyyubiler-Memluklar (1193-1260)*. Isar.

Tosh, J. (2015). *The pursuit of history: Aims, methods and new directions in the study of history* (6th ed.). Routledge.