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ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the development of Islamic architecture in Asia Minor (today’s Turkey) throughout the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. It proposes a study of the architecture of medieval Anatolia within the parameters of cross-cultural exchange, and of trans-imperial networks fostered by trade and the general mobility of craftsmen, merchants, and scholars.

These far-reaching economic and cultural networks were facilitated by the span of the Mongol Empire, into which Anatolia was integrated in the second half of the thirteenth century, under the so-called Pax Mongolica. They fostered the exchange of ideas and the formation of fluid styles – Byzantine, Seljuk, Armenian in the case of Anatolia – and identities among different religious (mostly Christian and Muslim) and ethnic groups. Paying close attention to the fluid identities of medieval Anatolia, this dissertation discusses cultural networks within a geographical, rather than a political framework, that serves as the breeding ground for creativity and innovation in architecture as Anatolia progressively developed from a Christian to a Muslim region.

This dissertation questions the exclusive role ascribed to dynastic patronage in the shaping of architectural style, which is especially relevant in a frontier region such as Anatolia, rife with instability and shifting boundaries. Thus, this study argues that in medieval Anatolia, the discrepancy between the levels of politics, patronage, and stylistic developments is particularly acute, even more so with the increasing influence of the Mongol Ilkhanids throughout the second half of the thirteenth century. Political, economic, and cultural factors
shaped the ways in which the potential of Eurasian networks was translated into architecture differently in adjacent regions.

In Anatolia, these dynamics shifted several times within a matter of years, taking the complexity of architecture beyond the correlation between rule, patronage, and style suggested by historiographical categories such as Seljuk or Ilkhanid. Close analysis of selected monuments, paying attention to the details of structure and decoration, are combined with primary sources in order to render both the visual and textual understanding of architecture in thirteenth-century Anatolia.
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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND DATES

In transliterating Arabic, Persian, and Ottoman Turkish, I follow the guidelines suggested in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies (IJMES).*\(^1\)

Terms and place names that are current in English use, such as sultan, Sufi, Baghdad, Konya, are spelled without transliteration. Personal names are fully transliterated (e.g. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī). Mongolian names and terms are rendered in a transliteration corresponding to their use in Persian or Arabic (e.g. Ūljaytū, Ghāzān Khān, yarlığh, tamghā). Except in direct quotations from primary sources, I use anglicized plurals throughout (*madrasas, waqfiyas, madhhabs*, not *madāris, waqfiyāt, madhāhib*).

Names of monuments are given according to the current language in the country that they are located in because the historical names are unknown in most cases. Thus, modern Turkish spelling is used for the names of monuments located in Anatolia (e.g. Şifaiye Medrese rather than Shifāʾīya Madrasa, and Karatay Medrese rather than Qaraṭāy Madrasa).

Dates, where available, are given in according to the Muslim calendar, followed by the Common Era date, e.g. 670/ 1271-72. To improve clarity, centuries are given according to the Common Era only; thus, thirteenth century, rather than 7\(^{th}\)/ 13\(^{th}\) century.

---

\(^1\) The transliteration chart is available at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/ijmes/docs/TransChart.pdf, accessed 19 April 2011.
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Introduction

Dörtnala gelip Uzak Asya’dan
Akdeniz’e bir kısrak başı gibi uzanan
Bu memleket bizim
Nazım Hikmet, Kuvayı Milliye

Unlike the nineteenth-century American idea of Manifest Destiny, frontiers in Hadrami sayyid discourses are not devoid of people but full of them. Newcomers such as the sayyids found places for themselves – as educators – in lands that were already full.2

The architecture of medieval Anatolia, as it was built under Islamic rule from the late eleventh century onwards, has been the object of many studies. The present one will rely on previous work, yet also depart from it in taking a broader chronological and thematic frame than often employed. The monuments built from the late eleventh to the early fourteenth century are generally subsumed under the term “Seljuk” architecture, referring to the dynasty that ruled over changing parts of Anatolia during this period.

According to this narrative, the fragmentation of Anatolia into small principalities (beyliks in Turkish) in the course of the late thirteenth and fourteenth century directly follows two centuries of Seljuk rule. Yet considering the historical context more closely, it is the endpoint of a process that begins earlier, with the weakening of Seljuk rule at the hands of the Mongols in the second half of the thirteenth century. On the level of architecture, the political events do not directly result in changes of style that can be associated with rule. Rather, the processes are more complex, involving changes of rule but even more so the development of cultural networks between Anatolia and surrounding regions, together with the impact of a prevailing mobility that brings craftsmen from various directions. The resulting architecture is as unique and fluid as the context it is generated in, warranting a nuanced approach to its styles. If I

---

continue to use the term “Seljuk architecture” here, it is for reasons of convenience rather than as a way of adopting the dynastic framework of much that has been written on medieval Anatolia.

Diverging from the assumption that architecture and its style are in direct and exclusive correlation with political rule, I will rather use the monuments as sources in their own right, understanding them within a framework defined by the notion of geography of art and cultural exchange. Thus, the term “Lands of Rūm” used to designate Anatolia in the title of this dissertation has a very specific purpose: to root this study in the cultural geography of the region, part Roman by way of Byzantium, and part Islamic by way of the Arabic term for the Byzantines and, by extension, the region at the center of the Byzantine realm. “Rūm” is at once Rome, Byzantium, and Anatolia. The adjective Rūmī can mean “Greek”, “Byzantine”, “Anatolian” or “Ottoman” among many other things.

The two quotes at the beginning of this introduction reflect core concepts that will be present throughout my dissertation: mobility, frontier, and geography. In Nazım Hikmet’s poem, Anatolia is represented as the head of a steed, running from Central Asia to the Mediterranean. Here, this image stands for the eastern connections of a region that throughout history has served as an end-point of westward migration from Inner Asia and Iran. During the period of the Mongol conquests of these regions especially, beginning in the 1220s, Anatolia became a comparatively stable destination – despite its frontier character – that attracted refugees, among

______________________________


them scholars and craftsmen. At the same time, when the Mongols reached Anatolia in the third
decade of their conquering endeavor, the position of the region as endpoint and frontier became
redefined.

The notion of “frontier” and “frontier culture” is essential in any study of medieval
Anatolia, especially since Cemal Kafadar’s influential book on the genesis of the Ottoman
Empire. The inherent instability, fluidity of identities, and mobility are essential in
understanding a region that throughout the Middle Ages appears in constant commotion with
occasional islands of stability. Yet a frontier is not just an empty space that waits to be filled.
Rather, it represents a space in which newcomers, be they conquerors or refugees, and locals
have to negotiate the terms of politics, religion, and culture. Along these lines, Enseng Ho in his
insightful study of the genealogies of sayyid families in medieval and early modern Yemen, and
of the Yemeni diaspora in south-east Asia, evokes the frontier as a concept not of emptiness, but
of cultural exchange. Thus, frontier lands are not terrain vague, devoid of human settlement and
culture, vague in their character as well as in their lack of spatial definition. Rather, the frontier is
frontier only for the culture that enters, whereas for the people(s) already present, it remains what
it always was: their home.

In medieval Anatolia, this notion is perhaps more applicable than anywhere else,
especially because studies on the region have frequently evolved around the concept of “frontier”
in the sense of the ghazā, i.e. the effort of Muslim warriors to secure territories for their own
profit as much as for Islam. In a political as well as cultural sense, this notion of frontier

5 Cemal Kafadar, Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State (Berkeley, 1995).
6 The Arabic term used for families counting themselves among the descendents of the Prophet Muḥammad.
7 Ho, The Graves of Tarim; for another study of frontier contexts in medieval Islamic art and architecture, see: F.
provides an unstable foil full of dangers and possibilities. Borders constantly shift, patronage changes, and craftsmen move from one place to another. The Seljuk court of Konya, as we shall see, provided a few decades of relative stability in which architecture was developed to great technical skill and aesthetic accomplishment. Still, the prevalent frontier culture of the region subtly affected construction: the architecture remained a result of combining and shifting styles, eclectically joining seemingly disparate elements. I propose that in keeping with the frontier character that so inherently defined it, the budding unity of Seljuk rule did not lead to a stylistic unity in direct correlation with Seljuk royal patronage. If such a tendency was visible to some extent in the 1220s, the Mongol takeover cut it short at the benefit of local styles a mere two decades later.

Thus, I do not see architecture as a direct result of the investment of royal power and money, but rather as a product of a larger context that includes geography, culture, and the material possibilities of a given time. Certainly, a focus on patronage has long been an important part of the study of Islamic art, even if it has at times left scholars rather disillusioned with the absence of concrete information, especially in a case such as Seljuk Anatolia where written sources are scarce and a correlation between architecture and rule is not easily made just because of the perilous state of the latter.

Of course, the study of architecture of empire, and of architecture as empire is justified in many cases, especially for the early modern empires of the Islamic world, such as the Ottomans and the Safavids, and earlier the Timurids. For an earlier period, the architecture of Ilkhanid Iran, and Mamluk Egypt and Syria may be seen in these terms. In the case of medieval Anatolia, however, a different premise has proven more fruitful as I proceeded with this project focusing on the visual expression of a context marked by fluid identities and multi-layered instabilities.
Along those lines, I will examine architecture in a time span that marks several points of transition in rule over parts of Anatolia. The initial phase of Muslim rule over the region, beginning in the late eleventh century, has not left an architectural record. Thus, I will begin my study with the mid-twelfth century, a period from which some monuments have been preserved, even though often with later changes. This period brings the rise of Seljuk rule, with this dynasty progressively overcoming rival dynasties in central and eastern Anatolia, while entertaining relatively friendly relations with the remains of the Byzantine Empire, now largely limited to the north-western parts of Asia Minor and Constantinople.

A shared problem of historical and art historical studies of this period is the supposed immediate transition from the Seljuks to a “beylik” period in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, or even directly into the beginning of Ottoman glory.8 This way of dividing the chronology does not take into account the complexity of rule, shifting between various dynasties and never reaching stability until the early sixteenth century. Thus, Kafadar’s suggestion of adopting the term “tawā’if,” commonly used for the divided Muslim principalities of medieval Spain, might be helpful in circumventing the binary narrative of “Seljuk” versus “Ottoman.” This reframing can account for both the only transitional stability of Seljuk rule, and the multiple factors that ultimately led to the rise of the Ottoman Empire.9

In the narrative of architectural history, the rise of the Seljuks comes with the development of a recognizable Seljuk style, directly connected to royal patronage. An analysis of monuments preserved from this period will show that even though a tendency towards stylistic

---

unity seems to appear from the 1220s onwards, the result is not so clear-cut as to warrant the use of the label “Seljuk architecture” without critical qualification.

Moreover, I will show that the Mongol conquest beginning in the 1240s interrupted this quest for centralization, resulting in monuments that drew on local references and styles. The end of royal Seljuk patronage with the advent of Mongol overlords has been observed before, yet the stylistic implications have been seen mostly in the light of a continuing unified Seljuk style, defined by characteristics developed in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

The focus of my discussion lies on monuments built in the 1270s, under increasing Mongol political pressure, as Anatolia progressively became integrated into the Mongol imperial sphere. After the disappearance of Seljuk ‘royal’ patronage, patrons affiliated both with the Mongol rulers and the powerless Seljuk sultan, were active on a high level. More often than not, these patrons were Seljuk amīrs, now active on one or the other side of the divided Seljuk realm under one of the nominally ruling sultans. Patrons from Iran rarely got involved in Anatolia, suggesting that the Mongol interest in the region was one of acquisition of resources, rather than of expanding the central realm. The analysis of monuments, many of them madrasas, built during this period will show that styles depended on local knowledge, including the availability of certain materials, and patrons’ individual taste, more than on a supposed style implying Seljuk rule.

If architecture in Anatolia reflects political changes, it does so most poignantly from the 1290s to the 1330s, when the increased fiscal pressure that the Ilkhanid administration exerted drained the region of resources. Structures that were built during this period tend to be relatively small, and Ilkhanid patronage is absent with few exceptions. Compared to the large-scale foundations of Ilkhanid Iran especially, the monuments of Anatolia at this time are very small. In
this context, viewing Anatolia not as a unity nostalgic of Seljuk heritage, but rather within the larger context of the Ilkhanid realm, shows the place of its architecture within a complex cultural and political landscape that is influenced as much by local architectural culture as by the conditions imposed by the Mongol overlords. Thus, transgressing the lines between studies of ‘Seljuk’ and ‘Ilkhanid’ architecture respectively, drawn (both physically and ideologically) along the lines of the modern day boundary between Turkey and Iran, I achieve a changed perspective on architecture, showing the latter as defined more by its geographical context and subtle cultural and political changes, than by an equation of monument and empire.

Due to its geographical location, Anatolia became a nexus between Central Asia and the eastern Mediterranean. The relative stability of Seljuk rule centered in Konya around 1200 made the region attractive for migrants from neighboring regions, ultimately creating a socio-cultural context in which conceptions of identity and architecture remained fluid. This central position continued even after the Mongol incursions changed the political set up of the region. Even though from a Mongol point of view, the region was peripheral in terms of investments to be made there, it was a central part of cultural and economic networks. This does not mean that Anatolia became a passive recipient of influence from Iran and Central Asia: the agency of local culture, workforce, and cultural heritage actively engaged incoming tendencies, creating new forms and style that in a sense are specifically Anatolian, but not necessarily Seljuk or Turkish. Thus, architecture in medieval Anatolia is inherently an architecture of frontier: volatile yet creative, referring to rule yet adhering to its own parameters.
Methodology and Primary Sources

The written sources are both curse and blessing with their gaps that are striking in comparison to other regions of the Islamic world, and have been a bane to art historians working on medieval Anatolia. Yet the absence of a narrative defined by text may just as well be beneficial to the study of visual, in this case architectural, evidence, allowing for close stylistic observations. In privileging the monuments themselves, I managed if not to fully overcome the limitations of the sources, then certainly to gain a different angle on the architecture. Thus, style as a central concept has proven successful, in allowing me to argue based on formal analysis when the texts failed to provide information.10

In this approach, I rely on photographs of the monuments as well as my own observations. Due to the multiple restorations that many of the monuments have undergone, the photographs that I took are often not the most helpful in the analysis of detail. In order to supplement this material, I have thus collected a wide range of photographs dating from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. Often, the older photographs show details that have since been altered or destroyed, and provide information on secondary usage and additions that were removed in the course of restoration.

I combine attention to the details of decoration and construction with written sources. Most importantly, texts directly related to the monuments are used extensively: inscriptions on the buildings themselves, and foundation documents (waqfiyas) that have been preserved for a few of the examples that I concentrate on. The foundation inscriptions and other texts directly

10 Preliminary results of this aspect of my research were presented as “Reevaluating ‘Seljuk’ Style in Late 13th-Century Anatolia,” Zwischen islamischer und christlicher Kunst: Transfer und Vergleich – Forum für Nachwuchswissenschaftler, Freie Universität Berlin, 26 June 2010, and as: “Seljuk, Ilkhanid or . . . Medieval Madrasas in Central and Eastern Anatolia,” Program in Medieval Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 10 December 2009.
affixed to the buildings are the most immediate source, being part of the building as well as narrating its history. Moreover, the placement of such inscriptions, as well as the form and size of script employed in their writing, have guided me in an exploration of the viewing habits of medieval Anatolia, suggesting trajectories through monuments by virtue of their placement and content. For the study of inscriptions in the buildings, I rely mostly on my own photographs and observations, as well as on the Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe (hereafter, RCEA), and on Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem’s Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum (hereafter, MCIA).  

The waqfīyas are legal documents first and foremost, essential to establish the charitable foundations that provided for the maintenance and running costs of many monuments throughout the Islamic world. These documents are primarily useful to study functions of monuments and building programs; moreover, they allow for an understanding of patronage and economic history than for a study of the architecture itself. Thus, the documents mention properties from the estate or property of patrons that were assigned to a foundation, thereby reflecting available resources in urban real estate, cash, or arable lands. Detailed documents may also mention the location of these properties within a city or in the surrounding countryside, and may allow for a detailed reconstruction of now-lost sites, both in terms of their architecture and layout, and their daily functioning.  

---

11 Etienne Combe, Jean Sauvaget and Gaston Wiet (eds.) Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe (Cairo, 1931-); Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum: Troisième Partie: Asie Mineure (Cairo, 1917).

12 As demonstrated in Birgitt Hoffmann, Waqf im mongolischen Iran – Rašīduddīns Sorge um Nachruhm und Seelenheil (Stuttgart, 2000).
For medieval Anatolia, some waqfiyas have been published, often in a modern Turkish translation together with a printed version of the original Arabic text. At times, only the Turkish translation is published, rendering access to the document that it is based on even more crucial. Since not many endowment documents from thirteenth and fourteenth century Anatolia have been preserved, only few remain unedited. This is the case for some documents relating to small foundations of the early fourteenth century, preserved in the archives of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü in Ankara that I will refer to in my last chapter. In most of these cases, the related buildings are no longer extant. In the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum, a detailed excerpt from the waqfiya is carved inside the building, a nearly unique case in Anatolia as will be shown. In many cases, waqfiyas have survived only in later copies, with dates ranging from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century. Sometimes, these late copies can provide valuable information on monuments, as a recent study has shown. While I have not pursued this approach in studying the waqfiyas included in my dissertation, such textual archaeology is a fruitful venue for future research.


15 All of these copies mention the thirteenth- or fourteenth-century date at which the foundation was originally established. In some cases, the date of the copy is mentioned: the waqfiya of the Gök Medrese in Sivas (VGM 604-67-90) was copied in 1329/ 1914 as noted on the document. Other copies are undated. The waqfiya of the Hasum Bey Zaviyesi in Kayseri (VGM 730-52-27) might be a later copy as the names of several witnesses carry the title “efendi,” which is not very common before the the late fifteenth century, although in Anatolia, it was used around 1300 in the sense of “master” [see: Irène Mélikoff, “Un document Akhî du XIIe siècle.” In: Raoul Curiel and Rika Gyselen (eds.) Itinéraires d’Orient – Hommages à Claude Cahen (Bures-sur-Yvette, 1994), n. 13.] A copy of a nearly identical document pertaining to the same building in Kayseri (VGM 739-329-161) might be even later: the following document in the same defter is dated 1130/ 1717.

The chronicles from medieval Anatolia are few, suggesting that much has either been lost or remains undiscovered in manuscript libraries. Charles Melville has argued that the very nature of Anatolian frontier culture was at first a problematic place for history writing, providing references for a historical narrative only at a later stage, when an identity distinguishing the region from the Persian historiography of Iran became apparent.

One of the earliest Persian chronicles on the Seljuks that clearly shows the importance of Anatolia as the new center of this dynasty is Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Sulaymān al-Rāvandī’s Rāḥat-ūṣ ṣudūr wa-āyat-us-surūr, an account of the history of the Seljuks, focusing on the reign of Rukn al-Dīn Ṭughrīl III (r. 571-90/1175-94), during whose reign the author lived in Iran. The author began to write his work in 599/1202 as stated in the introduction of the manuscript. Writing at the time when the Seljuks in Iran has disappeared, Rāvandī instead travelled to Konya in order to dedicate his work to the Seljuk sultan of Rūm, eventually addressing it to Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Kaykhusraw I (r. 588-593/1192-97 and 601-608/1205-11). The author died after 603/1207.


Among the sources that have been edited and translated, the most well known is Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn Ibn Bībī’s al-Avāmir al-ʻalā’iyya fi ʻl-ʻumūr al-ʻalā’iyya ("The most exalted orders regarding the most sublime affairs"). The work recounts the history of the Seljuks in Anatolia from 584/1188 to 679/1281, with a focus on the reign of ʻAlā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād (r. 616-634/1220-1237). The only full manuscript is available as a facsimile, yet remains unedited. The recent study of Mongol rule in Anatolia by Sara Nur Yildiz is based on the manuscript; therefore, I often rely on her interpretation of historical events when referring to the time that Ibn Bībī wrote about. The text also exists in an abbreviated version, the Mukhtar, more easily accessible and more widely used by scholars before Yildiz.

Furthermore, the Müsâmeretü’l-ahbâr by Karim al-Dīn Maḥmûd b. Muḥammad al-Aqsarāyī, (fl. ca. 1300) is a source on the Mongol administration of Anatolia. The author, who died sometime between 1323 and 1333 CE held a position in the administration of waqf under the Ilkhanid ruler Ghâzān Khân (r. 694-704/1295-1304), as well as a post in Aksaray, a town that takes an important place in the chronicle. At the time of writing, 1323 CE according to the author, Anatolia was fully integrated into the Ilkhanid realm, yet the lack of a clear chronology

within the work makes an understanding of events often difficult. In fact, the author rarely mentions dates, making the narrative intelligible only to a reader who is already familiar with major events, historical figures, and the corresponding dates.

The *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn* of Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī contains the biographies of Mawlawī Sufis active in Anatolia. The author, himself part of this tendency of Sufism, wrote the work for Jalāl al-Dīn al-ʿĀrif, his teacher and a grandson of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Since the author focused biographies of religious figures, akin to lives of saints, rather than on history *per se*, it is often difficult to understand the chronology of the text.

For sources written outside of Anatolia, several Ilkhanid texts are important. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭā Malik al-Juwaynī’s (d. 1283) *Tārīkh-i Jahān-gushā* (*History of the World-Conqueror*) details the Mongol conquests beginning with Genghis Khan, attempting to keep a view that balances between the author’s Mongol overlords and the less favorable view of his Persian compatriots. Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl-allāh Ṭabīb’s (d. 1318) *Jamīʿ al-Tawārikh* contains brief yet important insights on Anatolia. The so-called letters of Rashīd al-Dīn, attributed to the same author, are an extremely problematic source because they may be a later fabrication. Al-Qāshānī’s chronicle of the rule of the Ilkhanid sultan Ūljaytū invites to speculation about

---

Ilkhanid patronage in Anatolia, or the lack thereof.\textsuperscript{32} Mamluk sources, both edited works and ones only available in manuscripts are used in great detail in Reuven Amitai’s studies on the conflict between Mamluks and Ilkhanids, including the place of Anatolia within it.\textsuperscript{33}

In my search for descriptions of and comments on architecture, I have often resorted to travel accounts and geographical literature, ranging from the fourteenth to the twentieth century. One of the classics of travel literature in Arabic, the \textit{Riḥla} recording the travels of its author Shams al-Dīn b. ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh al-Ṭanjī Ibn Baṭṭūta (d. 1377) during the second quarter of the fourteenth century, contains a section on Anatolia, praising the region for its gardens and the hospitality of its Akhī communities, confraternities often connected to particular crafts.\textsuperscript{34} In Ḥamd-Allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī’s \textit{Nuzhat al-qulūb} (ca. 1330 CE), Anatolia appears as one of the least appealing and most impoverished provinces of the Ilkhanid realm.\textsuperscript{35} The roughly contemporary Mamluk writer Ibn Faḍl-allāh al-‘Umarī mostly describes the principalities (beyliks) of western Anatolia, yet does include a detailed description of one thirteenth-century caravanserai in the region of Kayseri.\textsuperscript{36} More detailed than these accounts is


the seventeenth-century Seyâhatnâme of Evliyâ Çelebî, Ottoman traveler *par excellence*. The nineteenth- and twentieth century travel diaries and accounts are too numerous to be named here; they will appear prominently in the historiographical discussion in Chapter One, as well as in relevant places throughout the text.

Armenian sources provide information on the Mongol conquest of the Caucasus, at times including primarily Armenian cities in Anatolia such as Erzurum (Karin in Armenian) geographically speaking part of Greater Armenia. A great number of relevant sources were inaccessible to me as they are only available in Armenian. The chronicle of Grigor of Akanc describes the Mongol conquests. Kirakos Gandzakertsi was a prisoner of the Mongols and gives lists of vocabulary in Mongolian. Galstyan provided extracts from a number of Armenian sources relevant to the Mongol conquest, translating the passages into Russian. Georgian sources are relevant for relations between the Seljuks and the Caucasus, yet are even less frequently accessible in translation than the Armenian ones.

---


38 For a study of relations between the Mongols and Armenia, relying heavily on Armenian and Georgian sources, see: Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog, *The Mongols and the Armenians (1220-1335)*, (Leiden, 2011).


Chapter Outline

After the first chapter on historiography, I chose a largely chronological outline, proceeding from the late eleventh to the early fourteenth century. While the main focus of this dissertation lies on the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, the earlier period is essential as a background for later developments. The choice of examples of monuments is governed by the hazards of preservation, accessibility, and existence of previous studies. Thus, I have chosen not to focus on the much studied Seljuk ‘capital’ of Konya, and rather use its monuments for comparative purposes. The monuments in Sivas, Erzurum, and Kayseri that take important places within this dissertation are less well known, but offer as much material for discussion in both historical and visual terms as their counterparts in Konya.

If many of these examples are religious buildings, the reasons for this are twofold. First, more monuments have survived that have one or another religious function, often retaining it throughout the centuries. Second, an important part of the non-religious monuments that are known are palaces that deserve to be studied in their own right, and have their own specific historiography. These palaces are known primarily through archaeological excavations of the largely ruined palace of Kubādabād, located on an island in Lake Beyşehir. The so-called kiosk in Konya, the only structure that still remained standing at the beginning of the twentieth century


and thus is reflected in photographs, is entirely ruined today. The decoration retrieved at both sites, consisting of glazed tiles, many with figural decoration, woodwork, and stucco panels showing both ornament and courtly motifs such as hunting scenes, seem to be the most pure expression in architecture of Persianate Seljuk court culture, at least within Anatolia. Since extensive previous studies of these palaces, some based on first-hand archaeological experience, have been published, I decided to leave these palatial buildings aside.

The division between secular and sacred is of course a fluid one. Thus, many caravanserais had small mosques attached to them. Madrasas, where prayers could be held and religious texts were taught, also provided food and shelter for students and often the poor. Often, they also contained the mausoleum of the founder, either in a side-chamber undistinguishable from the outside, as in the Karatay Medrese (649/1251-52) in Konya, or attached as a salient structure, as in the Yakutiyey Medrese in Erzurum (710/1310). These burials within larger structures are an important part of this study, while freestanding mausolea are only treated marginally. I have decided to do so in part because these small, yet intriguing structures are often undated and their patrons unknown, in part because detailed studies of their structural and ornamental development already exist. Thus, this study is one of architecture within its socio-cultural context, exploring also the effects of political conditions on patronage. In a frontier region like Anatolia, patronage was not necessarily equivalent with dynastic rule: the agency of

45 See the discussion of early scholarship on this monument in Chapter One.


both patrons and craftsmen developed on multiple levels, often overlapping and combined in many instances.\footnote{48 Alfred Gell, \textit{Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory} (Oxford and New York, 1998). I thank Professor Necipoğlu for this suggestion.}

In Chapter One, I engage the historiography of my topic, beginning with a discussion of early studies on medieval Anatolia, dating to the nineteenth century. French and German art historians and archaeologists worked on the territory of the Ottoman Empire before World War I, contributing to the study of a period that was barely known, and yet of little interest within the late Ottoman Empire. I then proceed to a discussion of the ideological tendencies during the first decades of the Republic of Turkey after its foundation in 1923. At this time, Seljuk history and subsequently art history were ideally suited to support the Turkish identity of the new nation state located mostly in Asia Minor. The equation between Seljuk history and the creation of a national identity for Turkey was complex and evolved over the years, yet the basic historical narrative defined in this process has to a great extent determined approaches to ‘Seljuk’ architecture, as well as the use of the term itself.

In Chapter Two, I move towards architecture dating from the late twelfth to the early thirteenth century, the time of actual if ephemeral Seljuk domination over the region. Focusing on mosques, \textit{madrasas}, and caravanserais, I show that the style of Seljuk “royal” patronage was not in fact as unified as often stated in the literature, and influenced by factors such as locally available materials, and the mobility of craftsmen.

Chapter Three stands at the core of my dissertation. Here, I investigate the consequences of the Mongol conquest of Anatolia at the expense of the Seljuk rulers in the 1240s CE. My findings confirm the observation by earlier scholars that during this period, nobles of the Seljuk court became increasingly dominant as patrons as the power of their rulers declined. I
demonstrate that patronage shifted away from projects establishing infrastructure, such as caravanserais and mosques, towards patrons’ personal preferences. On the stylistic level, my analysis of late medieval madrasas in Sivas and Erzurum shows a syncretic style that seems to reflect the diversity of patrons, and leaves room for local idioms in the absence of a unified imperial style. Despite the absence of direct Mongol patronage, the incorporation of Anatolia into the larger cultural network of the Mongol Empire is reflected in the architecture, which displays distinctly localized elements along with others brought to Anatolia by migrating craftsmen.

This focus on cross-cultural exchange is continued in Chapter Four which addresses the question of size and scale in architecture as they were relevant in the literature and architecture of the Islamic world, the Caucasus, and Byzantium. This discussion is connected to the question of size and scale as a marker of competition between the rivaling Ilkhanid and Mamluk empires, which does not appear to have applied in the buffer zone between them that Anatolia became over the course of the last quarter of the thirteenth century. Rather, in Anatolia decoration took on an important role in shaping the visual effect of buildings, to an extent that allowed for an omission of monumentality to impress viewers.

Chapter Five continues the narrative of Chapter Three, this time focusing on monuments of the early fourteenth century. During this period, the Ilkhanid rulers concentrated their patronage in western Iran, i.e. the region of Tabriz and the new capital of Sultānīye, thus leaving local patrons in Anatolia to develop their own projects. The latter generally were built on a much smaller scale than before and by locally available workers. This had repercussions on the style of the monuments, which now tended to strongly refer to local precedents in the respective cities. The translation of Ilkhanid power into monumental architecture that took place in Iran did not
apply for Anatolia. As I argue, this is due largely to the eastern orientation of the Mongol imperial and cultural sphere, leaving the fluid borderlands of Anatolia largely to their own devices as long as the political situation remained calm. Thus, Anatolia was fully transformed into a frontier: retaining the instability and shifting identities that defined it over centuries, not conforming to an equation between architecture and power. While earlier, this instability made the region a magnet for the Seljuks and other, smaller dynasties, under the imperial Mongol framework Anatolia eventually became a true frontier.
Chapter One

Shaping the Narrative of Seljuk Architecture: Historiography


In this chapter, I outline the development of the study of Seljuk architecture in Anatolia in European and Turkish academia from the late nineteenth century onwards. Here, I will specifically address early studies of Seljuk history and architecture, because this aspect of the historiography of Islamic art history and Near Eastern studies has not yet been discussed in detail. Friedrich Sarre’s work on Konya and its surroundings have not been widely considered from a historiographical point of view, neither in the context of early studies on Seljuk architecture, nor in the general account of the emergence of Islamic art history as a field of scholarship.


50 I have not been able to access an article that was published during the final editing stages of this dissertation: Oya Pancaroğlu, “A Fin-de-Siècle Reconnaissance of Seljuk Architecture in Anatolia: Friedrich Sarre and his Reise in Kleinasien,” in: Zainab Bahrani, Zeynep Çelik, Edhem Eldem (eds.) Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914 (Istanbul, 2011): 399-416.

51 Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum: Troisième Partie: Asie Mineure (Cairo, 1917); Guillaume de Jerphanion, Mélanges d’archéologie anatolienne: monuments prehelléniques, gréco-romains, byzantins et musulmans de Pont, de Cappadoce et de Galatie (Beirut, 1928), a publication based on research done in 1905. On Jerphanion, see: Philippe Luisier (ed.) La Turquie de Guillaume de Jerphanion, S.J.: actes du colloque de Rome (9-10 mai 1997), Mélanges de l’Ecole Francaise de Rome. Moyen Age 110 (1998): 773-970; Vincenzo Ruggieri, Guillaume de Jerphanion et la Turquie de jadis (Soveria Mannelli, 1997);
Moreover, these studies are rarely used in new work on the monuments in question, ignoring the invaluable photographic documentation, as well descriptions of the state of buildings that have often greatly deteriorated over the past century. In an account of studies on Turkish architecture published up to 1971, Howard Crane dismisses such early work for an absence of socio-cultural context in its analyses, a rather harsh judgment even though the author acknowledges the systematic nature of these studies.\(^{52}\)

The first part of this chapter discusses the study of Seljuk history as it emerged in the nineteenth century. During this period, when the Ottoman Empire was still in existence, the study of the earlier, i.e. pre-Ottoman, history of Muslim rule over Anatolia was rather marginal compared with the budding body of scholarship on the ruling dynasty’s past. Scholars such as Josef Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856) and Nicholae Iorga (1871-1940) viewed Seljuk history as a preface to Ottoman expansion, rather than as an intriguing subject of study in its own right. At the same time, within the Ottoman Empire, the study of its own history, and by extension art history, began to attract more and more attention, whereas the medieval period was hardly considered noteworthy.

The second part of this chapter is concerned with early publications on Seljuk architecture that European scholars and travelers created from the 1880s onwards. I will focus on the work of the German art historian Friedrich Sarre, a scholar who is better known for his work on Samarra, and in his role as director of the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin, than for his interest in Seljuk architecture. Yet, Sarre’s work on the Seljuk monuments of Konya is

worthwhile considering within the context of its time, when the German Empire and the Ottoman Empire were in close contact over the construction of the Baghdad railway, and negotiations over cultural artifacts often ended favorably for German museums.

Two French contemporaries of Sarre, Guillaume de Jerphanion and Albert Gabriel, discussed Seljuk architecture in different ways, yet both are crucial to an understanding of the historiography. Jerphanion, like Sarre, emphasized the combination of multiple influences in medieval Anatolia, leading to an architecture that draws from various sources. Gabriel, however, is in some ways part of a different generation of scholars: he began to work in the Ottoman Empire early in his career, yet continued in the Republic of Turkey. Thus, Gabriel’s life and work form the transition to the third part of this chapter, devoted to the study of Seljuk history in Turkey from the 1920s to the 1970s. In this period, after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, Turkish academia was profoundly reshaped within the new parameters of a nation state. In historiographical studies, this period has received considerable attention due to its importance for the shaping of art history and archaeology departments in Turkish universities.

This initial phase, contemporary to the political and ideological formation of the Republic of Turkey under the government of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), the founding father of modern Turkey, had a major impact on the study of the Seljuks in all disciplines. The methodological bases established during the 1920s and 1930s continue to be pertinent for later and even current work. Moreover, the work of historians such as Osman Turan and İbrahim Kafesoğlu had its roots in these earlier studies as well, yet the political tendencies of the 1950s to 1970s, when they wrote many of their books, are the greater influences in their scholarship. The

shift in political tendencies, from an emphasis on Anatolia as a region of high culture (Anatolianism, anadoluculuk), to an approach that insisted on the Turkish and Muslim character emerging with the rule of the Seljuks (Türk-İslam sentesi) profoundly changed attitudes to the period in both politics and scholarship. Art historical studies of Seljuk Anatolia greatly depend on the framework that historical scholarship provided, thus adopting the latter’s inherent limitations. The term “Seljuk”, uniformly applied to much of medieval Anatolia under Muslim rule, emerges as a problematic notion that both fields have in common.

In the fourth part of this chapter, I will analyze how the narratives established in the writing of the history of medieval Anatolia shaped the study of its architecture. The historian Mehmet Fuad Köprülü greatly influenced this development, establishing connections to scholars from outside Turkey, most notably the Austrian art historian Josef Strzygowski. The latter was doubly influential first through his scholarship and second through several of his students who taught in Turkish universities.

Along with these German and Austrian students of Strzygowski, Albert Gabriel wrote influential studies on the medieval architecture of Anatolia, and briefly taught in Istanbul. He was followed by several German-speaking scholars, including Ernst Diez in the 1940s, and Kurt Erdmann in the 1950s. Both scholars taught and researched medieval subjects, and were perhaps not always aware of the political milieu surrounding them, in part due to their lacking knowledge of Turkish. Thus, Diez had leave his post and Turkey after a controversy arose over a text book that he wrote, events that were connected to the political situation. Erdmann left a remarkable
record of his travels throughout Anatolia in a series of unpublished diaries, which describe architecture in minute details, and occasionally refer to the rapid transformation of cities.54

The historiography of Anatolian Seljuk architecture is as relevant for the study of medieval Anatolia in particular as it is for the field of Islamic art history in general, within the tendency to understand and critically discuss the history of their own field that has emerged among historians of Islamic art over the past decade.55 In considering first the nineteenth-century studies of Seljuk history and architecture, this chapter will create a broader historiographical basis to define the limits imposed on current studies of the topic. In comparing these early approaches with those of the 1920s to 1970s, shaped by changing tendencies in Turkish politics, I will establish a historiographical narrative that shows a certain amount of continuity between the two periods. The shift in paradigms due to the transition from a narrative based on the exploration of a multi-cultural Islamic empire, to the internal self-definition of a Turkish nation-state will become evident.

54 The handwritten diaries are preserved in the archives of the Museum für Islamische Kunst in Berlin. I thank Dr. Jens Kröger, curator emeritus, for providing me access to this source.

“Ottomanism” or “Seljukism” in the 19th and early 20th centuries

In the nineteenth century, the writing of medieval Ottoman and Seljuk history began somewhat earlier than the study of the architecture of the period, and provided a framework of inquiry for art historians and archeologists travelling in Anatolia. Therefore, I will here discuss a few specific examples of how the medieval history of Anatolia was conceived, often within the framework of Ottoman history, itself a relatively new field.

One of the earliest western scholars of Ottoman history, Josef von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856) based his works largely on primary sources in Persian, Arabic, and Ottoman Turkish. One of Hammer’s less known works, his two-volume Geschichte der Ilchane (History of the Ilkhans), published in 1842-43, addresses pre-Ottoman Asia Minor, probably one of the first studies to do so. This two-volume work focusing on the Ilkhanids presents a chronological account from the time of Genghis Khan to the 1350s, a few years after the Ilkhanate disintegrated. The account is mainly based on two Persian chronicles, the Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh by Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīʿī (d. 1318) and the Tazjīyat al-amšār va tajzīyat al-aʿšār by Vaṣṣāf (d. 1329). Hammer-Purgstall also edited and translated the latter text. Hammer’s work does not provide a critical assessment of the period, but rather a narrative of the most important figures and events. Mentions of the Anatolian Seljuks are rather brief and limited to major events such as the execution of the pervāne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān and Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī’s

56 On the historiography of early studies on Ottoman history, see also Klaus Kreiser, “Clio’s Poor Relation: Betrachtungen zur osmanischen Historiographie von Hammer-Purgstall bis Stanford Shaw.” In: Gernot Heiss and Grete Klingenstein (eds.) Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1789: Konflikt, Entspannung und Austausch (Munich, 1983), 25-36.
57 Josef von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Ilchane, das ist der Mongolen in Persia (Darmstadt, 1842-1843).
support for the cities of Anatolia after the Mamluk incursions in 675/1277. Overall, the book is
clearly preparing for the narrative of Ottoman glory:

“Great buildings, even in their ruined state, bear witness to the grandeur of the rulers who
erected them, and the famous funerary dome of Ghazan brazenly rose towards the dome
of Heaven; when the on the latter the sun of Mongol rule in Iran was sinking, the rising
moon of the Ottoman Empire already stood to the West.”

Such a perspective is not unique, and as discussed in the introduction, still has a bearing
on the chronological division of the medieval history of Anatolia. In his work on Ottoman
history, Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940) fiercely criticized Hammer-Purgstall for
his use of Turkish chronicles. These, according to Iorga who preserved a Byzantine perspective,
were inherently unreliable sources. A scholar of Byzantine history and literature, Iorga had also
become interested in Ottoman history related to his studies on Byzantine culture after the
Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, or “Byzance après Byzance” (Bucarest, 1935) as
he entitled his most influential study on this topic. In his *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches
(History of the Ottoman Empire)*, published between 1908 and 1913, Iorga laments the fact that
early historians concerned with the topic have neglected the pre-Ottoman period.

In any case, Iorga’s own assessment of Mongol rule in Anatolia is striking, if brief:

“It is legitimate to claim that, while during the time of the Seljuks [here the Great Seljuks
of Iran] and their successors, the Khorezmians [the Khwarezm Shāhs] the Iranian
influence was decisive in all aspects of daily life, only now Turkish language and custom
gained the upper hand thanks to the Mongols who had brought with them a great number

59 Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Ilchane*, I: 300 and I 297-298. The events in question will be relevant in
Chapter Three.

60 “Grosse Bauten geben noch in ihren Ruinen von der Grösse der Herrscher, die sie aufgeführt, Zeugniss, und der
berühmte Grabdom Ghasan’s wölbte sich kühl zum Dome des Himmels auf; als an diesem die Sonne der
mongolischen Herrschaft in Iran unterging, stand im Westen schon der aufgehende Mond des osmanischen

61 Nicolae Iorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches* (Gotha, 1908-1913), vol. 1, v-vi; The critique is directed
primarily towards Josef von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, Grossentheils aus bisher
unbenützten Handschriften und Archiven* (Pest, 1827-1835).
of pure Turkmen from the desert. In Asia Minor, a similar transformation in language and fashion took place: under the great Alaeeddin [the Seljuk sultan ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād] his famous poet Dschelaleddin Rumi [Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī], ‘the Roman,’ wrote exclusively in Persian and Alaeeddin himself who was holding a magnificent court is counted among the great patrons of Persian literature; only under Mongol influence Turkish language became predominant. Thus the Mongols represent true Turkishness much better than the civilized Seljuks who, as it has been shown, carried a new layer of Greek education over the Iranian cultural varnish.\textsuperscript{62}

Here, Iorga appears to judge the Mongols positively at first, yet in fact his emphasis on their Turkishness is rather negative, considering his earlier comments on Hammer’s reliance on “unreliable” Turkish sources. Especially in contrast with the “civilized” Seljuks, deemed so because of their exposure to Greek culture while in Anatolia, this negative judgment becomes obvious. Overall, Iorga is mostly interested in the development of the Turkish tribes from pre-Islamic times in Central Asia, through Seljuk rule in Iran and Anatolia, followed by the fragmentation of rule in the latter region into small principalities. Recounted in the first 147 pages of the first volume of the \textit{Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches}, this account forms the prelude to the emergence of the Ottomans. The broader context, such as the contacts between Mongols and the kings of Little Armenia, i.e. the coastal region of Cilicia, today in south-eastern Turkey, or the impact of the Mamluk incursions into Anatolia in 675/1277 are not mentioned. This creates the impression that Anatolia, after the mid-thirteenth century, was a late and rather

inconsequential relict of the glory of Great Seljuk rule, even though Rūm Seljuk rulers such as ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād are given their share of importance.

This way of narrating the history of Anatolia is fairly typical of early studies and, to some extent, has not been revised until recent years. In art historical studies, the construction of a narrative that proceeds towards the emergence of the Ottomans and their architecture, culminating in the classical style of the sixteenth century, have led to rather generalizing studies of earlier architecture. This is especially striking for the period of political fragmentation under the rule of small principalities (beyliks) in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Many of these problems of the art historical narrative are rooted in the early treatment of this period, or rather to a lack of interest in the medieval Islamic architecture of Anatolia during much of the nineteenth century.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the study of Islamic architecture in Turkey began slowly. At first, the interest was directed towards Ottoman architecture. This is manifest in the Uṣūl-i Miʿmār-i ʿUthmānī, a work published by the Ottoman government in 1873 as a contribution to the Vienna world exhibition. In its effort to present the Ottoman Empire and its architectural legacy as an imperial tradition worthy of comparison with the great European powers, the work is hardly concerned with the pre-Ottoman architecture of its territories, such as that of the Seljuks. The Seljuks appear rather irrelevant to the argument, and

63 Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 67-68.
66 Necipoğlu, “Creation of a National Genius,” 146 and n. 37.
the Mongol Ilkhanids were depicted in utterly negative terms, creating a backdrop that cast an
even more positive light on the emergence of the Ottomans and their architecture.67

A similar emphasis on positive, civilisatory aspects of the Ottoman Empire is apparent in
an album of photographs, created under sultan Abdülhamid II in 1890-93.68 The photographs
gathered in it show mosques built by the Ottoman sultans, mostly of the fifteenth and sixteenth
centuries, and newly constructed military barracks and schools demonstrating the modernity of
the Empire. The medieval history of the Ottoman Empire, and that of the predecessors of the
Ottoman dynasty in Anatolia, had no place in this propagandistic venue that strove to create an
image of the empire as equal to its western peers.69

Just as the history of the region, the medieval monuments of Asia Minor attracted little
interest until the early twentieth century. In an essay entitled “Mimâr-i İslâm,” published in
1906, the architect Mimâr Kemâleddîn (1870-1927) refers to Seljuk architecture.70 In a later
essay, “Bir Türk Akropolü” (A Turkish Acropolis), the same author discussed the citadel of
Konya and its Seljuk monuments, in an effort to attract interest towards their preservation.71 The
discussion of these Seljuk monuments fits in with Mimâr Kemâleddîn’s own work that has been
described as the “first national architecture” (birinci ulusal mimari) and heavily invokes

68 One copy of this album is preserved in the Library of Congress, Washington D.C., LOT 9513, no. 1a. The album
was presented to the library by the sultan in 1893. The images are accessible online: http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/p?pp/ils:@FILREQ%28@FIELD%28CALL%29+@FIELD%28COLLID+coll%29%29::SortBy=DOCID.
69 For an assessment of the album in the context of photography in the late Ottoman Empire, see Wendy Shaw,
“Ottoman Photography of the Late Nineteenth Century: An ‘Innocent’ Modernism?” History of Photography 33.1
(February, 2009): 90-93.
70 Mimâr Kemâleddîn, “Mimârî-î İslâm,” Hüdavendigâr Vilâyeti Sâlnâme-i Resmisi 33. defa, Bursa 1324 [1906]:
142-187, reprinted (in Latin script) in İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin (eds.), Mimar Kemalettin ‘in Yazdiklari (Ankara,
script) in Tekeli and İlkin (eds.), Mimar Kemalettin ’in Yazdiklari, 93-97.
medieval (i.e. Seljuk) rather than Ottoman architecture.\textsuperscript{72} In its appearance, this architecture is strikingly similar to that of the so-called Mamluk Revival, popular in Egypt around the same time.\textsuperscript{73}

Beginning in the early 1930s, this historicist architecture was replaced with a modernist style inspired by general trends developed by Le Corbusier (born Charles Édouard Jeanneret, 1885-1965) and other architects of his generation. With its references to the current architectural trends of Western Europe, this architecture belonged to the refashioning of Turkey as a modern republic, along with endeavors such as reform of dress and education.\textsuperscript{74}

Paradoxically, the decline of interest in the medieval architectural heritage of Anatolia as an inspiration for new monuments occurred at the same time as the surge in studies of its history. The political developments behind this shift will be discussed in the third section of this chapter, yet before this, the studies of medieval architecture that mostly French and German scholars initiated in the late nineteenth century must be considered. A thorough understanding of these studies and of their context within the close diplomatic relations between the Ottoman and the German Empires, from the late nineteenth century to the end of World War I, will offer additional insights into causes for the appropriation of medieval Anatolia for the purposes of the Turkish Republic, and vice versa.


\textsuperscript{74} For a detailed discussion of this development, see: Sibel Bozdoğan, \textit{Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic} (Seattle, 2001).
From Konya to Berlin: The Baghdad Railway and Medieval Architecture

The rise of interest in Islamic art in German academia, along with the development of collections and scholarship on the topic over the course of the late nineteenth century, is connected to the development of close diplomatic ties contacts between the German Kaiserreich and the Ottoman Empire.

The latter topic has drawn the attention of historians, in an effort to understand the somewhat ambiguous character of German ventures into the territories of the Ottoman Empire. If the German advances to the Ottoman Empire did not have direct colonial aims, they were intended to foster political and economic influence in the Middle East. This effort of German foreign politics fostered increasing interest in central Anatolia, causing the construction of the Baghdad railway during the reign of the German emperor Wilhelm II (r. 1888-1918) and the Ottoman sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876-1909).75

In studies of the historiography of art, the discussion of these contacts has been largely limited to the transfer of antiquities to Germany, and to the antiquities laws established under Osman Hamdi Bey (1842-1910). The friendly ties between the two empires enabled German scholars to work and travel within the Ottoman territories, and to receive excavation permits. Carl Humann’s (1839-1896) work in Pergamon (Bergama, Turkey)76 and Ernst Herzfeld’s


76 Suzanne Marchand, Down from Olympos: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970 (Princeton, NJ, 1996), 92-103; Marchand, German Orientalism, 143; Fuhrmann, Der Traum vom deutschen Orient, chapter 2.
(1879-1948) in Samarra (Iraq) are only two of many examples of projects enabled by these diplomatic contacts.77

Both the context of the development of Islamic art as an independent field of study and the political milieu of the period provide a context for the scholarly endeavors of Friedrich Sarre (1865-1945) and his contemporaries.78 A political appointment directly led to an interest in medieval Anatolia in the case of Julius Löytved (1874-1917), German consul in Konya from 1904 to 1907, who published a volume on the medieval Islamic inscriptions of this city.79 This study contains photographs of the monuments, as well as readings of the inscriptions with renderings in Arabic script and in German translation.80
Access to central Anatolia improved gradually with the construction of the Baghdad railway that reached Karaman by 1904. This improvement in transportation facilitated access for art dealers or their associates as well. Thus, the mihrab of the thirteenth-century Bey Hekim Mosque in Konya which was still in situ at the time of Sarre’s second visit to Konya in 1899 and - in a more fragmentary state - even during Löytved’s appointment, appeared on the art market, dismantled into several pieces, in 1908 and 1909. Most of the fragments were bought by the Islamic collection of the Berlin museums. Löytved himself was apparently involved in the acquisition of several carpets and wooden doors from Konya by the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin at the behest of its director Wilhelm von Bode (1845-1929). Within this same context, Friedrich Sarre began his travels in the Ottoman Empire.

Friedrich Sarre and the Study of Seljuk Architecture

Friedrich Sarre (fig. 1) had travelled widely in the Islamic world since the 1890s. From these travels resulted several publications on the Islamic architectural heritage of these regions,


82 The mihrab had to be reconstituted from fragments and was first shown in the museum in 1965: Jens Kröger, Vom Sammeln islamischer Kunst zum Museum für Islamische Kunst.” In: Jens Kröger with Désirée Heiden (eds.) Islamische Kunst in Berliner Sammlungen – 100 Jahre Museum für Islamische Kunst in Berlin (Berlin, 2004), caption to fig. 32; On the history of the mihrab and of wooden doors from the Bey Hekim Mosque that are also on display in the museum, see Volkmar Enderlein, “Der Mihrāb der Bey Hakim Moschee in Konya: Ein Denkmal und seine Geschichte,” Forschungen und Berichte (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz) 17 (1976): 33-40 and plates 1-3. The collection also contains pieces from the Seljuk kiosk in Konya, illustrated in Friedrich Sarre, Der Kiosk von Konia (Berlin, 1936), pl. 5, 6, 7, 9 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18 and Friedrich Sarre, Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst. Band II - Seldschukische Kleinkunst (Berlin, 1909), pl. XIX. The complete provenance of the objects from Konya is exceedingly complex, and often not fully documented, as I learnt while discussing the topic with Filiz Çakır-Philip of the Museum für Islamische Kunst who is currently looking into this issue (personal communication, June 2010).

and much of this material is relevant for the study of Seljuk architecture in Asia Minor. Sarre’s experience with museum work explains his dedication to detailed, contextualizing study of monuments and objects in the publications which concentrated on the Seljuk monuments in Konya.

Sarre was among the early supporters of the study of Islamic art in Germany, and began to establish his private collection early on. The Islamic department of the Berlin museums that he and Wilhelm von Bode founded in 1904 would later benefit from this activity. In 1903, the façade of the Umayyad palace of Mshattā’ (Jordan), which the Ottoman sultan Abdülhamid II had offered to the German Kaiser Wilhelm II, had finally arrived in Berlin. Osman Hamdi Bey’s resistance to exporting the important monument against the stipulations of Ottoman antiquities laws that he was responsible for had failed. Overruled by the sultan, Osman Hamdi Bey had to relent and grant permission to export the façade under exceptional conditions.

---


86 Only two years after the much discussed transfer of the façade, the Ottoman antiquities law was revised to place the same restrictions on the exportation of Islamic antiquities that had been in place for classical antiquities since 1884: Wendy Shaw, “Islamic Arts in the Ottoman Imperial Museum, 1889-1923,” *Ars Orientalis* 30 (2000): 63; The text of the law issued in 1906 gives a detailed explanation as to what types of objects may not be exported in order to include the greatest number possible and clearly includes any historical object beyond the Greco-Roman ones included in the earlier versions of the law. Nevertheless, it remained largely ineffective due to diplomatic complaints and large finds such as the market gate of Miletus, today in the Pergamonmuseum in Berlin, were exported as late as 1908: Shaw, *Possessors and Possessed*, 126-130.

87 Marchand, *Down from Olympos*, 203-206; Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 398, 404 (suggesting, but not expanding on, Strzygowski’s role in the acquisition); Kröger, “Vom Sammeln islamischer Kunst,” 39. The most detailed account of the acquisition of the façade based on archival documents preserved in Berlin, can be found in Enderlein, “Die Erwerbung der Fassade von Mschatta,” *Forschungen und Berichte* (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz) 26 (1987): 81-90. This article shows clearly that only the personal connection between Wilhelm II and Abdülhamid II could lead to the final and exceptional decision to permit the exportation of the façade: “Nachdem in dieser Angelegenheit dem Ministerium zugegangenen Reskript des Großvesirs vom 29.II. d.M. hatte der Ministerrat, vorbehaltlich der Ksl. Sanktion, beschlossen, daß, in Anbetracht der zwischen beiden Reichen bestehenden Beziehungen aufrichtiger Freundschaft, ein Teil der mit Tiergestalten und Blattwerk p. p. bedeckten Steine der Ruine (d. h. der beiden Fassaden) insoweit sie keine auf den Islam bezüglichen Inschriften
arrived in Berlin during the last stages of construction of the museum and was not part of the initial plan, it had to be installed at the last minute, even delaying the opening of the museum.88

This massive piece should form the core of the collection and opened a heated controversy over its origin that involved important scholars such as Ernst Herzfeld and Josef Strzygowski.89

An avid collector of Islamic art, Sarre contributed to the creation of the Islamic collection together with Bode. The latter donated his collection of carpets to the museum to be integrated into the new Islamic department that had yet to develop a representative selection of objects from different regions of the Islamic world.90 In the first volume of a planned catalogue of his collection, Sarre pointed out that many of the objects in his possession had been acquired during extensive travels in Anatolia, Central Asia, and Iran.91 Among the 203 objects listed in the catalogue, many were bought during Sarre’s travels in the Muslim world; objects came from Cairo, Tehran, and Istanbul, and even from a church in Lake Ereğli near Akşehir.92 Others were purchased on the European art market, showing the great variety of objects that were available for sale. Since Sarre later turned away from the idea of publishing a full catalogue of his

90 Herzfeld, “Friedrich Sarre,” 211-212; Gisela Helmecke, “Historisches zu Sammlern und Vermittlern islamischer Kunst in Berlin.” In: Jens Kröger with Désirée Heiden (eds.) Islamische Kunst in Berliner Sammlungen – 100 Jahre Museum für Islamische Kunst in Berlin (Berlin, 2004), 18. Sarre’s private collection was for the most part lost in the final days of World War II when Sarre’s house was looted just days after his death. Sarre and von Bode also helped the Kunstgewerbemuseum acquire objects of Islamic art, in part due to the connection that Sarre had after an internship in 1894: Gisela Helmecke, “Das Kunstgewerbemuseum und der Orient.” In: Jens Kröger with Désirée Heiden (eds.) Islamische Kunst in Berliner Sammlungen – 100 Jahre Museum für Islamische Kunst in Berlin (Berlin, 2004), 209.
92 ibid., cat. 146-151.
collection, a better impression of its contents can be gained from the exhibition of an exhibition of 425 selected objects at the Städelisches Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt am Main in 1932. The collection included ancient Iranian, Egyptian, Byzantine, and Sasanian in addition to Islamic objects, and even paintings of the Italian Renaissance. Large parts of the collection were on loan to the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum since 1904; in 1922, one year after he became the director of the Islamic department, Sarre gave 683 Islamic, Sasanian, and Parthian objects to the museum.

Sarre’s interest in Islamic art is further manifest in the Munich exhibition in 1910, one of the first museum presentations entirely devoted to the arts of the Islamic world. Sarre organized the show together with F.R. Martin and Ernst Kühnel, and even though it was not as great a success with the public as they had hoped, all three scholars persisted in their commitment to the study of Islamic art. From 1921 until 1931, Sarre served as the director of the Islamic department of the Berlin museums. During his appointment, Sarre gave large parts of his

---

93 *Sammlung F. u. M. Sarre – Katalog der Ausstellung im Städelschen Kunstinstitut* (Frankfurt, 1932). Parts of the collection, along with Sarre’s entire library and his personal notes were destroyed when, a few days after Sarre’s death the family mansion was cleared out in preparation for the Potsdam conference. Many others were sold by Sarre’s widow after the war; Jens Kröger, “Die Sammlung des Orientalisten, Archäologen und Kunsthistorikers Friedrich Sarre (1865-1945).” In: *Privates und öffentliches Sammeln in Potsdam – 100 Jahre »Kunst ohne König«* (Berlin, 2009), 120-121. Joachim Gierlichs (Berlin) is currently working on reconstructing the collection and tracing the current whereabouts of the dispersed objects. A large part of the collection, about 750 objects, went to the collection of the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin. Dr. Gierlichs presented a paper on the topic, entitled “Friedrich Sarre (1865 - 1945): The reconstruction of his collection of Islamic art” at the Historians of Islamic Art Association’s Second Biennial Symposium in Washington D.C., 21-23 October 2010. For the program, see: http://www.historiansofislamicart.org/portal/default.asp?cat=sym.


collection of Islamic art to the institution.\textsuperscript{96} For his sixtieth birthday in 1925, colleagues and collectors made a large donation to the museum which further contributed to the expansion of the collection.\textsuperscript{97} Sarre died on May 31\textsuperscript{98} or June 1\textsuperscript{99}, 1945 after a long career in museum and fieldwork that is recorded in publications ranging from a study of the ceramics of Samarra to his travel accounts of Iran and Anatolia.

In the 1890s, Sarre was one of the first western art historians to undertake travels in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{100} This first journey led to the publication of \textit{Reise in Kleinasien (Journey through Asia Minor)} in 1896, an account of the geography and the Seljuk monuments that he recorded while travelling from Istanbul to Konya and Akşehir. In addition to the descriptions of Seljuk caravanserais and mosques encountered on the way that are strewn throughout the text, two chapters of the book are entirely devoted to Seljuk art and architecture. In chapter four, Sarre describes selected monuments in Konya, including the kiosk originally connected to the walls of this city that was to become the subject of an independent publication in 1936, towards the end of Sarre’s career.\textsuperscript{101} In the fifth chapter of the book, entitled “Seldjukische Kunst” (Seljuk Art), Sarre ventures into an analysis of this little known period of Islamic art based on the monuments that were described in the previous chapter, relying on a thorough discussion of the building techniques employed in their construction. Sarre proceeds to say that Seljuk art and architecture

\textsuperscript{96} It has been suggested that Sarre took the post of director when he was obliged to ask for a salary after having lost his fortune due to the monetary inflation after World War I and donated his collection to the museum in return: Brisch, “Wilhelm von Bode,” 43; Kröger, “Ernst Herzfeld and Friedrich Sarre,” 59.

\textsuperscript{97} Helmecke, “Historisches,” 19-21; Kröger, “Vom Sammeln,” 41.

\textsuperscript{98} Kühnel, “Friedrich Sarre,” 191.


\textsuperscript{100} Sarre studied in Leipzig and received his doctorate in 1890 for a thesis on terracotta sculpture at the princely court of Wismar. Kröger, “Vom Sammeln,” 33.

\textsuperscript{101} Sarre, \textit{Reise in Kleinasien}, 43-46; see infra for a discussion of Sarre, \textit{Der Kiosk von Konia}.
are essentially a combination of the Hellenistic and Byzantine heritage of Anatolia with Persian art imported by the Seljuk conquerors.\textsuperscript{102}

The archaeological interest of the publication is clear in the drawings, photographs and careful descriptions of the present state of the monuments. In a detailed description of the Karatay Medrese (649/1251-52) in Konya for instance, Sarre points out the intricacies of the vegetal carving on the portal columns, the careful execution of the varied borders delineating fields, and especially the extent to which some of the carving attains a “filigree effect” on parts of the façade.\textsuperscript{103} The plates are carefully photographed and enable the reader to appreciate a great deal of the detail described in the text (fig. 2).

The initial purpose of the journey across Anatolia is apparent throughout the text: the publication resulted from Sarre’s intention to start his own excavation after having worked in the Berlin museums for three years, a degree of experience that he apparently deemed sufficient to venture into the field.\textsuperscript{104} During his visit to Anatolia in 1895, Sarre met his future wife Maria Humann, the daughter of the excavator of Pergamon Carl Humann who then lived in İzmir; the couple got married in Berlin in 1900.\textsuperscript{105}

As the first journey did not result in an excavation for Sarre, further travels followed: in 1897-98 and in 1899-1900, he travelled to Iran and Central Asia. These two journeys resulted in the publication of \textit{Denkmäler persischer Baukunst (Monuments of Persian Architecture)} in seven

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{102} Sarre, \textit{Reise in Kleinasien}, 68-70.
\textsuperscript{103} “Originell sind drei durchbrochene, wie aus Filigran gearbeitete Knöpfe, welche halbkugelförmig aus dem oberen Theile hervorragen.” Sarre, \textit{Reise in Kleinasien}, 49; ibid. 48-50 for the full description of the building.
\textsuperscript{104} Kröger, “Vom Sammeln,” 36.
\textsuperscript{105} Kröger, “Die Sammlung … Sarre,” 119; Radt, “Carl Humann and Osman Hamdi Bey,” 505 mentions Maria Humann’s marriage, referring to Sarre by his middle name “Paul”. Maria Sarre’s house became a salon favored by many Berlin intellectuals including Ernst Herzfeld who was apparently to some degree infatuated by her. They remained friends for life and continued to correspond until Herzfeld’s death in 1948: Kröger, “Ernst Herzfeld und Friedrich Sarre,” 48-50.
installments of plates between 1901 and 1910, with the text volume being issued last. In one volume of text and two volumes of large-format plates, once bound together after the last installment was delivered, Persian Islamic architecture is presented, including the Seljuk monuments of Konya (fig. 3), the Safavid ancestral shrine in Ardabīl, the mausoleum of Bayezid al-Bistāmī, and the monuments of Isfahan.106 Throughout his career, Sarre placed the Seljuk monuments of Konya (he never wrote on other Anatolian cities) within the framework of Persianate art. As I will show below, the issue of Turkishness, so important in the 1920s and 1930s, had not yet emerged in the context of art history.

Already in 1899, Sarre exhibited parts of the material collected during his travels, including photographs, drawings made by Bruno Schulz in Iran, later published in the Denkmäler persischer Baukunst, and objects from his collection of Islamic art, in the Martin-Gropius Bau in Berlin, at that time the location of the Kunstgewerbemuseum (Museum of Applied Arts).107

In 1907-08, Sarre and Ernst Herzfeld travelled to Northern Syria and Mesopotamia in the search of an Islamic site suitable for excavation. Starting out from Istanbul, they travelled to Ereğli via Konya and Karaman by train, exploiting this new means of transportation to facilitate their journey considerably compared to Sarre’s first venture into Anatolia in 1895. From there, the two travelers continued to Mesopotamia, where after extensive visits to sites such as Bālis,

106 Kröger, “Vom Sammeln,” 36. Two sections of the publication were later reprinted as individual volumes: Sarre, Konia: Seldschukische Baudenkmäler in 1921 and Friedrich Sarre, Ardabil: Grabmoschee des Schech Sāfī: Denkmäler persischer Baukunst Teil II (Berlin, 1924).

Raqqa, and Mosul, the choice fell on Samarra near Baghdad, a site that has become famous for the Abbasid palace city that Herzfeld partially excavated between 1911 and 1913.\textsuperscript{108}

During World War I, Sarre was one of many German experts of the Middle East who were posted to the region. He arrived in Istanbul in February 1915 and spent most of the war in the border region between Iran and Iraq in order to survey German intelligence in Iran and Afghanistan, an appointment that should not remain without consequences for Sarre’s later work in the region.\textsuperscript{109} Due to his appointment, Sarre had the opportunity to visit Samarra in 1916 and control the storage of finds that Herzfeld had left there in 1913.\textsuperscript{110} After the war, Sarre was added to a blacklist that prevented him from travelling to Iran for ten years. The ban fortunately was soon reversed, enabling Sarre to engage in new projects in the region, often in collaboration with Herzfeld.\textsuperscript{111}

Despite the work on Samarra, where Sarre was responsible for the publication of the recovered ceramics and his involvement in the Berlin Museum, Sarre’s interest in Seljuk

\textsuperscript{108} Herzfeld, “Friedrich Sarre,” 210-211; Kröger, “Ernst Herzfeld and Friedrich Sarre,” 52-55. The permit for the excavation, given by the relatively newly established Ottoman antiquities department under Osman Hamdi Bey was a direct result of the good relations between the German and Ottoman Empires in the context of the construction of the Baghdad railway. For a detailed account of Sarre’s and Herzfeld’s travels in search of a site, see: Kröger, “Erforschung der Dschazira” and Leisten, \textit{Excavation of Samarra}.


\textsuperscript{111} Kröger, “Ernst Herzfeld and Friedrich Sarre,” 60-61; Marchand, \textit{German Orientalism}, 449. Both scholars refer to Sarre’s introduction to \textit{Die Kunst des alten Persien} (Berlin, 1922). Only Kröger points out that the ban was in place only until 1921; thereafter Sarre and Herzfeld engaged in new plans for archaeological projects.
Anatolia did not abate. Sarre published a monograph on a Seljuk kiosk in Konya, based on his research conducted three decades earlier, and a last visit to the almost completely destroyed monument in 1930. In this publication, entitled Der Kiosk von Konia, Sarre describes in detail what remained of a Seljuk pavilion on the walls of the citadel of Konya, when he first visited the city in 1895 (fig. 4). The pavilion also attracted the interest of Löytved, who published the inscriptions and photographs in his account of the Seljuk inscriptions in Konya. Even Josef Strzygowski published a short article on the monument in 1907, without actually having seen it, as he admits, and focusing on photographs taken between the last attempt to save the structure in 1905 and its complete collapse on April 5, 1907 (fig. 5). To this date, Sarre’s work based on direct observation, his own and later photographs, and a study of tile and stucco fragments from the kiosk in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, is the most detailed account on the now entirely ruined building.

As Sarre noted in the introduction, the building was already badly ruined at the time of his first visit in 1895, with the roof missing and long cracks appearing on the façade. Over the following decades, the remaining brick structure further eroded due to climatic influences, so that today only an unsightly mound, albeit protected by a concrete roof, remains. Thus, Sarre’s publication is a major testimony of the state of the building at the end of the nineteenth century,
and gives a record of the only Seljuk residential structure within Konya that is known to date.\footnote{The palaces of Kubādabād have been excavated on an island in Lake Beyşehir: see Rüçhan Arik, “Recent Developments in Kubad-Abad Excavations 1980-1995,” in: \textit{Art turc – Turkish Art, actes du 10\textsuperscript{e} congrès international d’art turc du 17 au 23 septembre 1995} (Geneva, 1999), 75-86; Katharina Otto-Dorn and Mehmet Önder, “Bericht über die Grabung in Kubadabad (Oktober 1965),” \textit{Archäologischer Anzeiger} 81 (1966): 170-183; Katharina Otto-Dorn, “Bericht über die Grabung in Kubadabad(Oktober 1965),” \textit{Archäologischer Anzeiger} 84 (1969): 438-506. For smaller residential structures found in Seljuk hunting gardens throughout Anatolia, see: Scott Redford, \textit{Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia – Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya, Turkey} (Oxford, 2000). Some of the structures discussed by Redford were published in Kurt Erdmann, “Seraybauten des dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhunderts in Anatolien,” \textit{Ars Orientalis} 3 (1959): 77-94.}
The book contains photographs of the building, showing its state at the time of Sarre’s visit and the subsequent deterioration.

Based on the photographs of the building, Sarre tried to reconstruct the location of fragments of decoration that were recovered from the ruins. Many fragments of stucco decoration showing vegetal motifs, humans engaged in princely pastimes such as hunting and listening to music, and various animals, tiles, and even a stone lion can today be found in museum collections in Konya, Istanbul, and Berlin (fig. 6). Sarre illustrated the book with photographs of many of these fragments, supplemented with drawings reconstructing the possible arrangement of the tiles inside the building.\footnote{Sarre, \textit{Der Kiosk von Konia}, pl. 6, 7 and fig. 16}

In his discussion of the decoration, Sarre was interested in the architectural context of the fragments rather than in their decorative or ornamental effect. Even though he presented examples of ornament as isolated drawings, the monographic study of the buildings prevented Sarre from producing entirely ornamental plates, such as those in Owen Jones’s \textit{Grammar of Ornament} (London, 1856) or Jules Bourgoin’s \textit{Les éléments de l’art arabe} (Paris, 1879). While these works represented ornament devoid of its architectural context, intended for the study and reproduction of these forms by artisans and artists, Sarre’s purpose is entirely of an art historical and archaeological nature. Sarre especially emphasized the interest that appears in Seljuk art for
a wide variety of decorative motifs, including human and animal representations rooted in the classical heritage of Anatolia, which had an impact on the artistic vocabulary employed under the Muslim conquerors:

“This appreciation for antique art, and sculpture in particular was combined in the Seljuks in an unique phenomenon in Islam, that is a sculptural practice which in relief carving did not refrain from the representation of the human figure.” 120

A similar assessment of Seljuk cultural production had appeared already in 1909, when Sarre published a catalog of Seljuk objects ranging from stone to stucco, wood work, and carpets chosen from museum collections in Istanbul, Konya, and Berlin. 121 Unlike many contemporary scholars of Islamic art, Sarre did not reduce the discussion to the arabesque or ornament as the expression of a culture supposedly devoid of creativity. Rather, interested in the local and historical context of Seljuk Anatolia, he attempted to understand how the creation of an artistic vocabulary employing such a wide range of motifs and techniques came about. This involves a formalist discussion of many of the motifs that appear in the decoration, and a quest for comparative material that might be of interest in explaining the origin of a certain element of decoration. Thus, the representations in stucco of animals on a scroll background of which several examples have been recovered from the kiosk, prompted Sarre to compare them to a panel from an Armenian museum, showing a similar arrangement:

“Some examples may point to the purely formal parallels that appear in Konia and on roughly contemporary Armenian monuments. Thus, the motif of animal figures on a

120 “Mit dieser Wertschätzung der antiken Kunst und im besonderen der Skulptur vereinigte sich bei den Seldschuken eine im Islam wiederum einzigartige Erscheinung, eine eigene bildhauerische Betätigung, die in der Reliefplastik auch vor der Wiedergabe der menschlichen Figur nicht zurückschreckte.” Sarre, Der Kiosk von Konia, 7. The English translation is my own.

121 As Sarre notes in the introduction to this volume, is continued the publication of Islamic metalwork from his own collection in 1906. The addition of objects from museum is due to the fact that Sarre concentrated on expanding the Islamic collection in the Kaiser Friedrich-Museum rather than his own and desired to give a more complete picture: Sarre, Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst. Band II - Seldschukische Kleinkunst, v.
scroll background that appears on the stucco decoration of the cornice of the kiosk frequently can be observed on the filler of the squinches of a three-lobed niche or an arched opening on Armenian monuments. A fragment, probably made of stucco, in the museum of Etschmiadsin (Abb. 34), that material and provenance of which are not mentioned in its publication, corresponds formally and stylistically, in the scroll background and in the drawing of the heraldically placed sirens, to the composition of the niche frieze in Konya.”

In this passage, the methodology and line of thought hark back to a study that Josef Strzygowski devoted to Armenian architecture, evoking this tradition as major influence on medieval, especially Romanesque, architecture in Europe. In this book, Strzygowski evoked the Middle East, particularly Iran but also Anatolia to a lesser extent as the region through which forms were transmitted. Sarre, in his discussion of the Seljuk kiosk in Konya, did not create the same grand narrative of transmission and the emergence of cultures that characterizes Strzygowski’s work. The nature of Sarre’s study, focused on understanding a specific building and its context, does not entail the same ideological claim that characterizes Strzygowki’s work, and thus remains more sober in its discussion of influence and origin.

Sarre, however, shared an interest in Iranian, or Persian art as the source of the artistic and architectural development of Anatolia. Thus, Sarre suggested that the basis of Seljuk architecture was Persian, yet that in Anatolia other influences transformed the underlying

---


123 ”Man sieht, Teile dieser für die islamische Kunst üblichen Form, in dem sie beginnt, eigene Stützen herzustellen (d.h. sie nicht wie im weiteren Mittelmeere aus Kirchen zu rauben), weisen die gleichen Züge auf wie die armenischen Gestalten. Zwischen den beiden Kunstkreisen aber vermittelt ein dritter: weder die armenischen noch die islamischen sind selbständige Schöpfungen, beide gehen vielmehr zurück auf den iranischen Kreis, wie sich in diesem Falle mit Sicherheit nachweisen lässt.” Josef Strzygowksi, Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa (Vienna, 1918), 2: 439.
tradition. Sarre especially pointed out the importance of Armenian influences, but also acknowledged the impact that the presence of late antique and Byzantine architecture must have had.124

In an earlier publication, Sarre evoked the underlying Persian tradition of Anatolian Seljuk architecture even more strongly. Within the larger context of Die Denkmäler persischer Baukunst (Monuments of Persian Architecture), Seljuk monuments appear in the context of Persianate Islamic architecture, dating from the eleventh to the seventeenth century presented in a geographically arranged survey.125 In 1921, Sarre republished the section on Konya as an independent book, justifying his choice of this material with the statement that although the Persian elements in the city’s Seljuk architecture were strong, this architecture formed a closed ensemble strongly influenced by local traditions.126 In the main text, however, reprinted from the first edition, the Persianate aspect was given precedence.127

In the last section of the text, Max Deri (1878-1938) discussed the question of Seljuk ornament.128 By training a historian of western art, this was Deri’s only publication on an Islamic topic. Deri’s dissertation on ornament in sixteenth and seventeenth century German art, defended in Halle in 1905, might have triggered his interest in the subject, and have informed the essay

124 Sarre, Der Kiosk von Konia, 36.
125 The regions and cities considered in the text volume and illustrations are Azerbaijan, Iraq, Tabaristan, Konya, and Samarqand. In the introduction to the text volume, published in 1910, Sarre justifies the geographical rather than chronological arrangement with the large number of extant monuments that made a complete survey impossible. Moreover, the purpose of the publication is to document the monuments before they decay further, rather than suggesting an evolutionary narrative of Persian architecture. Sarre, Denkmäler persischer Baukunst, vol. 3: new introduction, 4-5. The pagination can be rather confusing since the text volume also contains the original introduction published with the first installment in 1901 and the brief descriptions that accompanied the plates published in seven installments.
126 Sarre, Konia: Seldschukische Baudenkmäler, 1.
127 Sarre, Denkmäler persischer Baukunst, vol. 3: 120.
that he wrote for Sarre’s book. In the essay on Seljuk ornament, Deri’s prime interest lay in attributing the Seljuk decoration of Anatolia to Persian rather than to local culture, and even less to a contribution of the Seljuks themselves. Deri tended to see the latter as a Turkic nomadic tribe that did not have an architectural tradition prior to its move from Central Asia to Iran in the eleventh century, as responsible for the cruder, less refined elements of decoration. Thus, he evoked an increase of such rough elements in the architecture of the late thirteenth century:

“[…] even if it might be somewhat daring to attribute anything rough in the ornament of the first half of the thirteenth century to Seljuk influence, it should be pointed out that this has always been noted in the description of the monuments. And if on the other hand after the thirteenth century allusions to such rough and clumsy patterns have appeared, it may be permitted for now, as unclear the lines of development of Persian architecture still are, to see in these forms a continuous impact of Seljuk blood and thus a more crude and coarse sentiment on the substance of old and high Iranian art.”

This line of thought, attributing the development of art and architecture to ethnic characteristics reflects the influence of Alois Riegl and Josef Strzygowski who, even though their argument is diametrically opposed, worked along very similar lines in presenting creativity as a matter of a people’s character. In an essay-length book on Seljuk architecture in Anatolia, published in 1923, Heinrich Glück (1889-1930) a student and later assistant of Strzygowski,

\[\text{129 For biographical data on Deri: Ulrike Wendland, }\text{Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil: Leben und Werk der unter dem Nationalsozialismus verfolgten und vertriebenen Wissenschaftler (Munich, 1999), I: 121-123. Deri’s dissertation is available on Google Books: http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.FIG:004999439; In the secondary literature I have not found any references to the relationship between Sarre and Deri, and the fact that Sarre’s correspondence was largely lost together with his library and personal papers leaves little room for further research.}\]

\[\text{130 Sarre, }\text{Konia: Seldschukische Baudenkmäler, 28.}\]

went in a similar direction.\textsuperscript{132} In the essay, entitled Die Kunst der Seldschuken in Kleinasien und Armenien (The Art of the Seljuks in Asia Minor and Armenia) even though the approach remains the same as Deri’s in focusing on the ethnic character that is taken to shape artistic production, Glück’s argument differs in that it recognizes an original character in the art of Seljuk Anatolia and appreciates the synthesis of different styles and traditions that it is composed of. An important factor in Glück’s argument is the geographical location that can change the development of an artistic tradition at the same time as the people that inhabit it, without, however, being capable of transforming its innate character.\textsuperscript{133}

Even though Sarre’s and Glück’s books were published during or after the demise of the Ottoman (and the German) Empire, they stem from the same intellectual tradition that had encouraged scholars to venture to the Ottoman lands since the late nineteenth century. The interest in the local languages and cultural production, paired with the proto-colonial aspirations of the German Kaiserreich, fostered deep connections resulting in scholarship that is still relevant today. Especially precious is the documentation, in photographs, descriptions, and copies of inscriptions, of monuments that have today disappeared or are badly deteriorated.

In the aftermath of World War I, the character of German scholarship on the Middle East changed profoundly. The political upheaval at the end of the war, which brought the demise of the German Empire in 1918 and the fragmentation and dissolution of the Ottoman Empire over

\textsuperscript{132} Oya Pancaroğlu has pointed out that Glück’s work had an impact in Turkey, especially through an article on “The status of Turkish Art in the World” [“Türk San’atının Dünyadaki Mevkii,” Türkîyat Mecmuası 3 (1926-33): 119-28] in which he focused on the Turkish elements much rather than on the diverse influences present in Seljuk architecture, perhaps in order to please the Turkish public. This aspect of Glück’s work on Turkish art, and its position in relation to that of his teacher Strzygowski are discussed in detail in Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 74-75. For Glück’s biography, see Öktay Aslanapa, Türkiye’de Avusturyalı Sanat Tarihçileri ve Sanatkârları – Österreichische Kunsthistoriker und Künstler in der Türkei (Istanbul, 1993), 86-87.

the following years played a central role in this transformation.\textsuperscript{134} Journeys such as those of Sarre and Herzfeld who, with permission of the Ottoman government, could travel and work anywhere from Istanbul to Konya to Mesopotamia were no longer possible, or at least made significantly more difficult by the need to obtain visas and permits from different governments or mandate powers. With the demise of the German Empire, the aspirations that had enabled many art historians and archaeologists working on both classical and Islamic sites to obtain official support and funding, disappeared. The troubled political situation of Germany, shifting from Empire to the Weimar Republic and the later dictatorship of Adolf Hitler in less than two decades did little to support such efforts.\textsuperscript{135}

The disappearance of the Ottoman Empire in 1923, accompanied by the fragmentation of its former territories between new nation states and regions under French or British mandate further discouraged wide-ranging travels. The connections between the two governments in transition were troubled and at times suspended in the immediate aftermath of the war.\textsuperscript{136} This reflected in the cultural relations, which needed to be reframed according to the new political realities and in the 1920s and 1930s never reached their former extent before the new disaster of World War II interrupted them again.\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{134} For the engagement of scholars in efforts related to the war, see Marchand, \textit{German Orientalism}, 436-454. Marchand sees 1918 as a “critical juncture” in German scholarship on the east in general: Marchand, \textit{German Orientalism}, 474.
\bibitem{135} Marchand, \textit{German Orientalism}, 474-498 provides an overview of the development of Near Eastern studies in Germany up to 1945.
\bibitem{136} Guillemarre-Acet, \textit{Impérialisme et nationalisme}, 207-236.
\bibitem{137} Guillemarre-Acet, \textit{Impérialisme et nationalisme}, chapter XI.
\end{thebibliography}
Guillaume de Jerphanion (1877-1948): A French Contemporary

For the documentation of the Seljuk monuments of Sivas and Tokat, but also for the cave churches of Cappadocia, the work of a little known French contemporary of Sarre is essential.\textsuperscript{138} A Jesuit priest, Guillaume de Jerphanion (fig. 7) was active in Anatolia in the early twentieth century and published parts of his observations in 1928. His volume, \textit{Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne} contains Hellenistic, Byzantine, and Islamic monuments. For the study of Seljuk architecture it is significant for its account, including photographs, of Sivas and Tokat, two cities that Sarre never visited.\textsuperscript{139}

Jerphanion came first to Turkey in 1903 when he was appointed by his order to Tokat, as a teacher at a school for local Armenian Christians, one of several that the Jesuits had established in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{140} After studying theology in France from 1907 to 1910, Jerphanion returned to Turkey in 1911 for several months to explore the cave churches of Cappadocia. The results of this research make up most of his 1928 publication, complete with colored drawings of the wall paintings. Jerphanion spent World War I as an officer and translator in the Dardanelles, Marseilles, Port Said (Egypt), and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{141} Since 1918 he taught archaeology at the Pontificio Istituto Orientale in Rome, an occupation interrupted by travels to Turkey, at times for research

\textsuperscript{138} I thank Alessandra Ricci, Koç University, Istanbul, for first introducing me to Jerphanion’s work.
\textsuperscript{139} The only other early publication on Sivas is Max van Berchem’s and Halil Edhem’s account of the Arabic inscriptions in Sivas and in Divriği: Van Berchem and Halil Edhem, \textit{MCIA}.
\textsuperscript{141} Vincenzo Ruggieri, “Guillaume de Jerphanion (1877-1948) as Jesuit and Scholar in Turkey.” In Scott Redford and Nina Ergin (eds.) \textit{Perceptions of the past in the Turkish Republic: Classical and Byzantine periods} (Leuven and Walpole, MA, 2010), 104. In an earlier publication, Ruggieri suggested that Jerphanion spent the war in Turkey: Ruggeri, \textit{Jerphanion}, 15.
and at others on orders of the Jesuit superiors.\textsuperscript{142} Jerphanion returned to Turkey for the last time in 1926 when the Jesuit schools were dissolved. During World War II, Jerphanion went to live with his relatives in France, only to rejoin the institute in Rome after the war, where he died in 1948.\textsuperscript{143}

Seljuk architecture does not stand at the center of Jerphanion’s work; much rather, his focus was on the paintings in the cave churches of Cappadocia to which he devoted much of his efforts. Moreover, Jerphanion was not trained as an art historian, which may explain why his work has not been widely used in studies on Islamic architecture.\textsuperscript{144} Nevertheless, even though Jerphanion did not systematically explore Seljuk architecture, his descriptions show a keen attention towards the monuments that he happened to see while working in the region, especially in Tokat and Sivas. To each of these cities, Jerphanion devoted a chapter in \textit{Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne}, published in 1928. The photographs in the book, as Jerphanion states himself, were largely taken in 1904 since the images taken in 1926 in preparation for the publication of the book were for the most part damaged due to technical difficulties with the glass plates.\textsuperscript{145}

Based on the comparative observation of monuments, Jerphanion shared some insights about the monuments, yet unlike his contemporary Max van Berchem, he did not concentrate on the historical context related in the inscriptions of the monuments. Rather, Jerphanion’s analysis focuses on stylistic observations:

\textsuperscript{142} The Pontificio Istituto Orientale today holds a large number of Jerphanion’s photographs. I thank Professor Vincenzo Ruggieri, S.J. for granting me access to these holdings despite ongoing cataloging work.

\textsuperscript{143} Ruggieri, \textit{Jerphanion et la Turquie de jadis}, 13-17.

\textsuperscript{144} Gabriel referred to Jerphanion: \textit{Monuments turcs}, vol. 1: 27, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{145} Jerphanion, \textit{Mélanges d’archéologie anatolienne}, 77.
“On the contrary, the traces of far eastern influence appear to be specific to the Seljuk monuments of Sivas. At least they are more frequent and more visible there than in the monuments of Konya and Cappadocia. It is not easy to clarify how they were transmitted. One may guess that the establishment of the Mongol Empire in Persia did have a part in it. In fact, the monuments in which these influences are most visible are dated 1270, a period at which the Seljuks of Asia Minor were reduced to be the vassals of their powerful ‘Hulaguid’ [Ilkhanid] neighbors. Nevertheless, political troubles do not fully explain artistic borrowings: commercial relations are more influential. The models could be brought from China and India through the caravan roads, which as we know were so heavily frequented in the thirteenth century. There, however, one does grasp one of the links through which a contact between the art of the Far East and that of the Mediterranean is established throughout the Middle Ages.”146

Overall, Jerphanion’s work is important for its insightful photographic documentation.

On the historiographical level, Jerphanion remained somewhat outside the grand narrative since he did not teach in Turkey, nor was he an art historian by training. Thus, the impact of his conclusions has been limited, but the photographs that he took are a historical document in their own right, considering the profound changes that the cities he visited underwent throughout the twentieth century.

Albert Gabriel (1883-1972)

The French archaeologist and architect Albert Gabriel (fig. 8) conducted research on the monuments of Anatolia, partly at the same time as his compatriot Jerphanion. Best known for his large volumes on Bursa, and on the cities of central Anatolia, Gabriel began his career as an

146 “Au contraire, les traces d’influences extrêmes orientales paraissent particulières aux monuments seldjoukides de Sivas. Du moins, y sont-elles plus visibles et plus nombreuses que dans les monuments de Qonia ou de Cappadoce. Il n’est pas facile de préciser comment elles se sont transmises. On devine que l’établissement de l’empire mongol en Perse n’y fut pas indifférent. De fait, les édifices où ces influences se remarquent le mieux datent de 1270, une époque où les Seldjoukides d’Asie Mineure n’étaient plus que des vassaux de leurs puissants voisins Houlagoudes. Cependant, les vicissitudes politiques ne suffisent pas à expliquer les emprunts artistiques: les relations commerciales ont plus d’influence. C’est par la voie des caravanes, si fréquentée, on le sait, au XIIIe siècle, que des modèles ont pu être apportés de Chine ou des Indes. Quoi qu’il en soit, on sait là un de ces aneaux par lesquels s’établit, au Moyen âge, un contact entre l’art extrême-oriental et celui du monde méditerranéen.”Jerphanion, Mélanges d’archéologie anatolienne, 77-78. The English translation is mine.
architect and archaeologist.\textsuperscript{147} Gabriel was active in Turkey in the 1920s and 1930s. During this time, he travelled widely in Anatolia and published several books, most importantly \textit{Monuments turcs d’Anatolie} (\textit{Turkish Monuments of Anatolia}) a large two-volume work of text and plates that is concerned almost exclusively with Seljuk monuments. Gabriel’s work is particularly significant because it bridges the perceived gap between the traveler-scholars of the late nineteenth century, and those academics involved in the development of art history in Turkish academia in the 1920s and 1930s.

Unlike most scholars working on medieval Anatolia at that time, Gabriel was trained in architecture rather than in art history and/or oriental languages. He attended the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris from 1900 to 1906. An appointment at the École Française in Athens changed Gabriel’s career path towards archaeology as he worked on excavations, preparing architectural surveys over the following years. In 1911, Gabriel worked in Anatolia for the first time, developing a passion for the region that was to continue throughout his life. He spent most of World War I in Rhodes, and after the war went on to excavate in Cairo, on the site of al-Fustāṭ. Over the next few years, having defended a dissertation on the fortifications of Rhodes in 1921, Gabriel continued to travel widely around the eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{148}

In 1926, Gabriel was offered a position teaching archaeology and art history at Istanbul University. This appointment, held until 1930, was the starting point for Gabriel’s intensive work on the historical architecture of Turkey that led to an important number of publications. Gabriel

\textsuperscript{147} All information presented here on Albert Gabriel has to rely on previously published material since the family archives are not open to researchers. Email from Catherine Gublin, director of the Médiathèque Albert Gabriel in the French archaeologist’s birthplace Bar-sur-Aube, 11 February 2009. Professor Pierre Pinon, École d’architecture Paris-Belleville, part of the team preparing the exhibition on Gabriel shown in Paris and Istanbul in 2006, could do so only under exceeding difficulties and was unable to complete a project intending to scan the glass-plates of Gabriel’s photographs; email communication from Pierre Pinon, 26 April 2009. Thanks are due to the late Professor Oleg Grabar for inquiring about these issues with Professor Pinon on my behalf.

lived in Turkey until 1941, when he was appointed professor at the Collège de France, where he would teach until 1953 while still living in Turkey and continuing research for part of the year. He died in Bar-sur-Aube on December 23, 1972.149

Gabriel’s preoccupation with the medieval heritage of Anatolia in his books is clear, both in the Monuments turcs and in Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale (Paris, 1940), the result of the scholar’s travels in south-eastern Anatolia. Early-modern Ottoman monuments are listed occasionally in both publications, but not treated in as much detail as medieval buildings, no matter if the latter are Seljuk, Ilkhanid,150 Ottoman, or Artuqid. Thus, the preoccupation with the medieval heritage of Anatolia may rather be seen as an effort to catch up with the more advanced scholarship on classical Greek and Roman sites, and to establish a ground for further research and historic preservation.

The Turkish identity of the monuments, even though stated in the title of the Monuments turcs d’Anatolie, is not reflected in the text. Rather than trying to construct a Turkish past for Anatolia through its architecture, Gabriel records the monuments in their current state, providing photographs, plans, and detailed reconstruction drawings that can serve as a basis for further study of a neglected area, just as the author states in his introduction.151 Gabriel’s training as an architect and archaeologist made him especially aware of the needs of the preservation of monuments: in the introduction to the second volume of Monuments turcs d’Anatolie, he praises

150 While Gabriel does not use the term “Ilkhanid,” he includes buildings built by Mongol patrons and by those of vassals of the Ilkhanids who gained independence in the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Use of the term “Seljuk” is mostly limited to monuments built by patrons affiliated with the Seljuk sultans, and Gabriel does not propose a definition of a Seljuk style.
151 “L’objet principal de cette publication est des fournir aux historiens de l’art islamique des documents aussi complets que possible sur les monuments turcs de l’Anatolie.” Gabriel, Monuments turcs, I: i.
the increased effort of the Turkish government in this direction, and attributes part of this success to his criticism in the first volume.152

Gabriel’s publication on the medieval architecture of Anatolia is intrinsically connected to the internal development of Turkish academia after the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923. In the following section, I will discuss these developments, considering Gabriel’s scholarship as well as the relationship between the study of Seljuk history and that of the art of this period, throughout the ideological and political establishment of the Republic of Turkey. Even the title of his two-volume book, *Monuments turcs d’Anatolie*, that is: ‘Turkish monuments of Anatolia’153 announces a shift in parameters. If Sarre and Jerphanion saw a Persianate architecture influenced by the classical and Byzantine heritage of Anatolia, the initial premise of Gabriel’s work was to document the Turkish monuments of the region, mostly but not exclusively, medieval ones.

**In the Name of Turkish Nationalism? Studying the Seljuks**

In a historiographical context, it is essential to consider the studies on Seljuk architecture that were written from the 1930s onwards in relation to the work done in the nineteenth century. The transition from the nineteenth-century studies to those that emerged in the context of republican Turkey, however, is far from straightforward. The new studies did not necessarily rely on the earlier work, and the political context in which they were generated was fundamentally different from that of the late Ottoman Empire. The process of ideologically establishing the Republic of Turkey generated historical narratives that differed greatly from those of the

153 The emphasis is mine.
Ottoman Empire. Moreover, scholars within Turkey now became increasingly interested in medieval Anatolia, while in the earlier period, most studies were conducted by French and German scholars.

With the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in the wake of World War I, and especially with the foundation of the Republic of Turkey under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938) in 1923, the ideological framework entirely changed. The new nation-state needed to be defined in terms of its territory, much reduced from that of the extensive Ottoman Empire to which it succeeded. Anatolia became the homeland of the new Turkish state, since it took up the largest part of its surface, and the national narrative had to be shaped to fit these new territorial conditions. With the arrival of Muslims – but not necessarily ethnic Turks – from former Ottoman territories, the need for reshaping identity according to Anatolian parameters increased even more. This process had begun in the late nineteenth century, when Muslims from the Caucasus migrated to Anatolia, and been accentuated by the arrival of refugees after Balkan wars in 1905-07. The population exchange (mübadele) between Greece and Turkey initiated after the Congress of Lausanne in 1922 in particular created tensions that needed to be addressed as part of the new national narrative, once the Republic of Turkey was founded.

The development of the study of history, and subsequently archaeology and art history in Turkish academia is intrinsically connected with the creation of this national narrative. Scott Redford and Oya Pancaroğlu have recently published studies that shed light on the development of art history and archaeology in Turkish universities in the early years of the republic. The focus of these two articles lies on the study of Seljuk art and architecture within this context, yet

---


155 Redford, “What have you done for Anatolia Today?”; Pancaroğlu, “Formalism”.
other recent studies have shown similar dynamics in the study of classical archaeology and Byzantine art and architecture.¹⁵⁶

The debate is centered on the correlation between nationalist ideology, historical scholarship, and the effect of these two tendencies on the study of the art history and archaeology of Anatolia within Turkish academia. The connections between these three aspects of the issue are multilayered, and complicated by the fact that several political tendencies took part in their shaping. Moreover, the development of these narratives varies considerably from the early phase of the Turkish Republic (1920-1950) to the so-called Democratic Era (1950-1980), after the end of one-party rule, because of shifting ideological tendencies.

For an understanding of the historical side of this development, Michael Strohmeier’s study of Turkish scholarship on Seljuk history in the twentieth century provides an introduction to the different ideological tendencies that shaped scholarship from the late nineteenth century to the early 1970s.¹⁵⁷ In his account, Strohmeier is careful to recognize the merits of individual scholars, while critically evaluating the political and ideological points of view that govern their attitude towards Seljuk history and its relationship to the Kemalist Turkey of their own time. Recently, Aziz Başan has criticized Strohmeier for emphasizing too much the political aspect of the historiography, and failing to address its nineteenth-century roots.¹⁵⁸ Başan then suggests that

¹⁵⁶ Scott Redford and Nina Ergin (eds.) Perceptions of the past in the Turkish Republic: Classical and Byzantine periods (Leuven and Walpole, MA, 2010). The editors address conceptual similarities with the “Lands of Rûm” conference in which Scott Redford participated. The proceedings of “Lands of Rûm” were published in Muqarnas 24 (2007), edited by Sibel Bozdoğan and Gülru Necipoğlu.

¹⁵⁷ Martin Strohmeier, Seldschukische Geschichte und türkische Geschichtswissenschaft – Die Seldschuken im Urteil moderner türkischer Historiker (Berlin, 1984).

late Ottoman scholarship, as well as diverse nationalist tendencies that developed during this period, were largely responsible for shaping later narratives of Seljuk history.\footnote{Başan, \textit{The Great Seljuqs}, 3-5.}

**Mehmet Fuad Köprülü and his Contemporaries**

Common to all studies cited above is an emphasis on the historian Mehmet Fuad Köprülü (fig. 9) as the founding father of Seljuk (and early Ottoman) history in the context of Turkish academia. Köprülü began studying towards a law degree, but in 1908 shifted towards writing poetry and working on French literature. His first appointment, beginning in 1913, was as professor of Turkish literature at the Dâr ül-fünûn. At this time, Köprülü began working on medieval Anatolia and in 1919 published a study of Sufism in Turkish literature.\footnote{Mehmet Fuad Köprülü, \textit{Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar} (Istanbul, 1919).} After the foundation of the Türkiyat Enstitüsü (Institute of Turkish Studies) in Istanbul in 1924, Köprülü became an influential figure in organizing scholarship that was eventually to be part of the formation of republican ideology.\footnote{Etienne Copeaux, \textit{Espaces et temps de la nation turque – Analyse d’une historiographie nationaliste 1931-1993} (Paris, 1997), 48.} While continuing to be active as a scholar, Köprülü was also a member of parliament from 1935 to 1950, first for the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People’s Party), then for the newly founded Demokrat Parti (Democratic Party). From 1950 to 1956, Köprülü’s political career peaked during his appointment as minister of foreign affairs. Equally successful as a scholar, he became professor of medieval Turkish history at Ankara University in 1946.\footnote{Strohmeier, \textit{Seldschukische Geschichte}, 76-79.}
Köprülü’s role in training major scholars such as Faruk Sümer, Mehmet Köymen, İbrahim Kafesoğlu, and Osman Turan has led to his stylization as the major figure responsible for forming the narrative of Seljuk history. This focus has led to a dearth in historiographical studies on other historians who were working on medieval Islamic history during the same period as Köprülü. Especially striking is the absence of İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı (1888-1977) and İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı (1896-1984) from the historiographical narrative. Both historians prolifically published on the Ottoman and Seljuk history of Anatolia, as well as on the monuments and inscriptions that were preserved from this period.

Uzunçarşılı (fig. 10) taught history at Istanbul University from 1932 to 1938 and from 1927 to 1950, while also serving as a member of parliament. His publications ranged from local histories including both monuments and historical facts, to a major work on Ottoman history in several volumes. Even though he did not write on Seljuk history, Uzunçarşılı’s work on the beyliks of the fourteenth and fifteenth century covers parts of the same period. With his political and academic involvement, Uzunçarşılı may well have taken a place as important as that of Köprülü, even though the latter has attracted more scholarly attention.

Konyalı (fig. 11) is best described as a local historian, even though his books on the history and monuments of cities in Anatolia cover much more than one location or region. In his works on Konya, Erzurum, and Aksaray, Konyalı covers the history of these cities based on

---

163 For such a course of explanation, see: Strohmeier, Seltschkische Geschichte, 76-90; Kafesoglu, tr. Leiser, 10-11; Başan, The Great Seljuqs, 7-9.
166 At least since the publication of Halil Berktay, Cumhuriyet ideolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü (Istanbul, 1983).
chronicles, archival documents, and inscriptions.¹⁶⁷ Much of the documentation used in the writing of the books is also printed in the books themselves that include a great number of photographs of monuments and documents, many of which have by now been lost.¹⁶⁸ The reasons why these two figures were excluded from the historiographical narrative remain in the dark. Even though Konyalı’s and Uzunçarşılı’s books are fairly well known, biographical information about them is scarce. A historiographical assessment has yet to be written despite the appreciation of especially Uzunçarşılı in Turkish academia, and despite the wide use made of Konyalı’s book as works of reference for local history and historical material.

The focus in studies on the historiography of Seljuk history during the 1930s and 1940s on Köprülü may to some extent have distorted the picture, and have led to an overly uniform image of the field and the debates at stake at the time. Köprülü’s contemporary Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (1898-1961) is considered alongside his colleague, yet does not receive the same amount of attention. Bearing these limitations of the historiography written so far in mind, it must be noted that the history of medieval Anatolia was subject to several approaches connected to distinct ideological trends; thus, there was not one single official line. Rather, the shaping of a national identity for Turkey was a process that, especially in the 1920s and 1930s, had not yet taken a predefined course.

---

¹⁶⁷ İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, Abideleri ve kitabeleri ile Erzurum tarihi (İstanbul, 1960); idem, Abideleri ve kitabeleri ile Konya tarihi (Konya, 1964); idem, Abideleri ve kitabeleri ile Niğde Aksaray tarihi (İstanbul, 1974-1975).

¹⁶⁸ Some of Konyalı’s papers, including letters, photographs and newspaper clippings, are preserved in the İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı Kütüphanesi in Üsküdar, Istanbul. Most of the material is related to research on Aksaray.
Anatolianism (Anadoluculuk)

Thus, neither “Turkishness” nor the Seljuks (as a Turkic dynasty) were at the center of the historical debate in its initial stages. Rather, the focus lay on Anatolia as a center of high culture, with the aim of legitimizing the reduced territory as a basis for an independent state. The mindset created by the fact of a vastly reduced territory marked the generation of historians who began to be interested in Seljuk history. Once a focus on Turkishness emerged, a discourse arguing that Turks were a “white” rather than a “yellow” (Mongolian) race was encouraged.169

Two major, if intertwined, ideological currents prevailed in the 1920s and 1930s: Anatolianism (anadoluculuk) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, an emphasis on the Turkishness of the Seljuks as a dynasty that ruled over the Asia Minor before the Ottomans created a multi-national empire. The notion of Anatolian unity and superiority of Anatolian culture could also take other forms, such as the fascination with Hittite170 and other early cultures that led to the establishment of the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi (Museum of Anatolian Civilizations) in Ankara.171

Within the framework of anadoluculuk, coined by Yinanç, the emphasis lay on Asia Minor as a geographical and political unit, continuous throughout history. Thus, the identity of the region was defined by its rich cultural heritage over millennia. In this approach, a wide range of cultures that had at some point or another left a mark on Anatolia were appreciated: the Hittites, Greeks and Romans, Seljuk, even Byzantines. At the core of this argument stood the inclusion of pre-Islamic Anatolia into the narrative of the Turkish Republic, embracing this

169 Redford, “What have you done,” 243.
170 The emblem selected for the new capital, Ankara, showing a Hittite motif is just one aspect of this attitude. The recent creation of a new, “Islamic” version showing a monumental mosque is representative of the current mayor’s different orientation.
171 Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 73.
heritage rather than focusing on a nationalistic framework centered on ethnicity. In this approach, Islamization was not a crucial factor for the inclusion of a given period into the creation of a national identity. This latter factor was to change later: from the 1950s onwards, a focus on Turkish and, at the same time, Muslim peoples, became apparent. During the 1930s, however, the multi-ethnic composition of the Ottoman Empire was not necessarily cast in a negative light. Even Köprülü, supposedly the doyen of Seljuk history, wrote on the Ottoman period and by no means in negative terms.172

The emphasis on the Seljuks was, however, ideally suited to emphasize the Turkish character of the new nation state, an aspect that appeared desirable to some scholars in response to the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire.173 Nevertheless, the notion of a pan-Turkic identity reaching beyond Anatolia was never entirely successful. Notably, Josef Strzygowski’s suggestion to create a museum devoted to the cultural heritage of the Turkish peoples in Central Asia and Anatolia was never realized.174 Rather, the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations (Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi) was established in Ankara. Although founded in 1921, the museum was redefined and moved to its present location between 1938 and 1943, as a museum dedicated to the cultures of Anatolia from prehistoric to Roman times.175 The focus of the collection clearly shows the ‘Anatolianist’ tendency of the 1930s and 1940s: it does not contain

173 “In the new Republic of Turkey, whose nationalism was so different from that of the Ottoman empire, twentieth-century Turkish historians, such as Köprülü, Köymen, Kafesoğlu and Turan, to name but a few, could leap back over the multi-cultural complexities of the Ottoman period to focus with piercing concentration on the original conquerors of Anatolia, the Seljuqs. A number of twentieth-century Turkish scholars were attracted to the Seljuqs, and especially the Seljuqs of Anatolia (the Rum Seljuqs), since they felt justified on territorial grounds in viewing this polity as being the predecessor of the modern Turkish Republic.” Carole Hillenbrand, Turkish Myth and Muslim Symbol – The Battle of Manzikert (Edinburgh, 2007), 201.
174 Redford, “What have you done,” 244.
Seljuk or Ottoman objects. These pieces, including medieval woodwork, were placed in the Ethnography Museum (Etnografya Müzesi), founded in Ankara in 1925, where they are still on display today.

The tendencies of the early republican era emphasized either the multi-cultural history of Anatolia, or the overall importance of Turkish peoples as carriers of culture. These were joined by studies focusing on the Seljuks as a Turkish (and Muslim, even though this factor was not initially central) dynasty. The Seljuks increasingly moved to the center of the historical discourse, and became the subject of numerous studies.

Osman Turan and Türk-İslam sentezi

Osman Turan (1914-1978; fig. 12), a student of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü edited sources on Seljuk history beginning in the 1940s.\(^{176}\) Turan’s career began with a doctorate under the supervision of Köprülü in 1941. He became an assistant professor in Ankara in 1944, and was promoted to full professor in 1951. Three years later, he became a member of parliament for the Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti). This political involvement would ultimately cost Turan his academic career: in 1960 he was arrested with other members of his party when the government under Prime Minister Adnan Menderes (1899-1961) was deposed, and its leader later executed. Following his release from prison, Turan was barred from returning to a teaching position, and

expelled from the Türk Tarih Kurumu. He did, however, serve a second term in parliament, for the Justice Party in 1965.177

Turan’s most substantial publications appeared after the end of his political career. During the 1960s and 1970s, he wrote several seminal accounts of Seljuk history, ranging from Iran to Anatolia.178 His approach, known under the term Türk-İslam sentezi (Turko-Islamic synthesis) regarded westernization as a problematic rejection of Islam, and tended to criticize the radical laicism of Turkey. Turan’s presentation of Byzantine history is that of a story of decline beginning in the sixth century.179 This aspect of Turan’s narrative is similar to that of the historian Speros Vryonis, even though it stands in diametrical opposition to the latter in its positive evaluation of Turkish presence in Anatolia.180

Turan’s career was marked by a controversy with İbrahim Kafesoğlu over the latter’s article on the Seljuks in İslam Ansiklopedisi, published in 1964. Having submitted a draft of the same article that was not published, Turan accused Kafesoğlu of plagiarizing his work. The ensuing dispute between Turan, Kafesoğlu, and Ahmed Ateş, the editor of the İslam Ansiklopedisi at the time, was conducted in a series of rather venomous articles and reviews published in the historical journal Belleten.181 In the end, the controversy could not be resolved,

177 Kafesoglu, tr. Leiser 137-139.
179 Strohmeier, Seldschukische Geschichte, 152-159.
180 Strohmeier, Seldschukische Geschichte, 209-210; Speros Vryonis, The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century (Berkeley, 1971).
181 The controversy is discussed in detail in Gary Leiser’s introduction to the English translation of the book-length article “Selçuklar” in İslam Ansiklopedisi: İbrahim Kafesoğlu, A History of the Seljuks: İbrahim Kafesoğlu’s Interpretation and the Resulting Controversy, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser (Carbondale IL, 1988). This volume also contains English translations of Turan’s accusation against Kafesoğlu, and Ateş’s and Kafesoğlu’s refutations thereof. The controversy took place in Belleten 29 (1965) and 30 (1966).
and scholars appear to have guarded themselves from taking positions against one or the other of these respected historians.182

An emphasis on Turkishness is apparent in the work of Turan’s contemporary, Mehmet Altay Köymen (1916-1993), whose work focused on the Great Seljuks in Iran and by extension their impact in Anatolia as part of the same Turkish continuity. Unlike Turan, he emphasized the Turkish rather than the Muslim aspect of Seljuk rule.183

Turan, Kafesoğlu, and Köymen were active in the 1960s and 1970s, when the 900 year anniversary of the battle of Manzikert, the decisive victory of the Seljuks over the Byzantine Empire in 463/1071, further spurred interest in a nationalist brand of Seljuk history that was not necessarily ideologically connected to the events of the early Republic.184 Much of the scholarship written during this specific period lacks the quality of earlier studies, and relies on rather blunt arguments to emphasize the greatness of the Turkish nation as reflected in the medieval Seljuk rulers.

To some extent, Turan was the most influential of the historians working on Seljuk Iran and Anatolia: his books are still published in reprints, and his narrative of the centralizing nature of the Seljuks based in Konya is, even if in simplified form, at the base of many standard accounts of the period.185 The historical introductions of art historical studies on Seljuk art and architecture almost invariably reproduce a version of his narrative, attributing the initial conquest of Asia Minor in the eleventh century to a weakness of the Byzantine Empire, emphasizing a quest for centralization under the rule of the Seljuk sultans culminating with the rule of ʿAlāʾ al-

182 Thus Leiser’s comment in Kafesoğlu, A History of the Seljuks, 183-184.
184 On the stylization of this battle around the anniversary, see: Hillenbrand, Turkish Myth, chapter 7.
Dīn Kayqubād, and suggest a final fading out among the rise of the beyliks (and the Ottomans in particular) in the early fourteenth century. Other aspects of the period, especially the influence of the Mongols (and later Ilkhanids) remain marginalized.

The Seljuks in National Narratives for Art History

The historiography of Seljuk history, discussed above, is the basis for an art historical narrative that began to emerge around the same time, and was intrinsically connected to the study of history as it defined approaches to medieval Anatolia. It is, however, worthwhile to consider that many art historians who taught in Turkey in the 1930s to 1950s came from France, Germany, and Austria. Not all of them had sufficient knowledge of Turkish to follow scholarly and political debates, and their involvement in shaping the discourse may not have been always central. Many of these scholars, including Ernst Diez and Kurt Erdmann, had to rely on translations of publications, and even their lectures were often translated simultaneously.186

Köprülü and Albert Gabriel

Beyond his role as a historian and later as a politician, Köprülü played a crucial role in connecting the study of Seljuk history with that of art history. The close association between him and Albert Gabriel led to the publication of Les monuments turcs d’Anatolie with the support of the Turkish authorities.187 Considering the ideological implications of Gabriel’s work, it is

186 The lectures of Ernst Diez for instance were translated simultaneously into Turkish by his assistant Oktay Aslanapa: Burcu Dogramaci, Kulturtransfer und nationale Identität – Deutschsprachige Architekten, Stadtplaner und Bildhauer in der Türkei nach 1927 (Berlin, 2008), 331.

important to point out that he did not include the term “Seljuk” in the title of his books. The *Monuments turcs* also include beylik and Ottoman monuments in the regions that Gabriel studied. This adds an additional perspective to the notion that the Turkishness of Anatolia was to be emphasized through medieval monuments alone, and shows that the correlation between art history, history, and nationalism was not always direct. If the Turkish government at the time had wished to exclusively set the Turkish and Islamic heritage of Anatolia at the center of the argument, a book commissioned to Gabriel might have looked rather different.

Scott Redford has argued that Gabriel was part of the project of “mapping a Turkish material culture” through his affiliation with Istanbul University beginning in 1926, and through the funds that the Turkish Ministry of Education provided for research trips in Anatolia. The question remains whether Gabriel was in fact interested in the “Turkish” identity of Anatolia: throughout his book, this issue does not emerge as part of Gabriel’s to collect information on the medieval and early modern Islamic monuments of the region. Moreover, Gabriel includes monuments sponsored by Mongol and post-Mongol patrons, thus reaching beyond the framework of ethnically Turkish patrons that the title suggests. Perhaps, needing the funds for his research and understanding the wishes of his sponsors, Gabriel was only too happy to adopt a specific title for his book, and pursue his research according to his own ideas. Still, the geographical framework of the book remained within the modern borders of Turkey, or rather the regions to which Gabriel, as a foreigner, was given access.

d’Albert Gabriel,” 28, it is unclear whether Gabriel or the Turkish government suggested the beginning of the research that led to the publication of the two volumes. From the introduction of Gabriel’s work it does, however, emerge that he received significant material and logistic support for his research from the Ministry of Education: Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, I: i-iv.

188 Redford, “What have you done,” 244.
Seen in this light, Gabriel’s work may fit in with the “Anatolianist” tendency of emphasizing the cultures of Anatolia, regardless of their ethnic and religious background. Thus, despite the collaboration with Köprülü, and the financing that the Turkish Ministry of Education provided for his research, Gabriel did not take on an ideologically charged position. Rather, he pursued his archaeological interest, and his passion for attracting attention (and funds) to monuments that desperately needed to be restored.

Köprülü, Strzygowski, and his Students

Gabriel’s approach is quite unlike the scholarship that resulted from Köprülü’s other main effort to invite European art historians to reflect on the cultural heritage of Turkey. At the invitation of Köprülü, Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941; fig. 13), wrote an article on the Central Asian origins of Turkish art. The piece was published in a Turkish translation in 1933 and heavily relied on Strzygowski’s earlier work on the definition of art through ethnicity, an argument that was at the center of Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung (Altay-Iran and Migration Period), published in 1917.

Strzygowski argues for the unchanging character of Turkish art since its conception in Central Asia, i.e. that the Byzantine, Armenian, and other influences present in Anatolia did not

---

189 It appears to be unclear where the connection between Strzygowski and Köprülü originated. Redford notes that Köprülü was responsible, since 1935, for inviting foreign scholars with appropriate interests to write on Turkish history and culture. Redford, “What have you done,” n. 5.

have an impact on it. The emphasis on people and race, and the inherent Turkishness of the art in question made his arguments especially appealing in the political milieu of early republican Turkey with its search for a national identity.

The argument focusing on pan-Turkic culture connects to Strzygowski’s earlier work because it posits an eastern, rather than classical origin of a high culture. This is in tune with the tone of Strzygowski’s earlier work *Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa* where Iran takes on the role of cultural cradle and transmitter of form and language. This in turn continues Strzygowski’s glorification of the East in *Orient oder Rom* (Leipzig 1901), the main cause and place for his conflict with Alois Riegl (1858-1905). The latter, a colleague of Strzygowski’s at Vienna, argued for the classical Greco-Roman origin of western art and culture, as expressed in *Stilfragen: Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik* (Berlin 1893). The two scholars never agreed on this major point; only Riegl’s premature death ended the controversy.

Strzygowski’s article on the origins of Turkish art provides a direct link between the Austrian scholar and Turkish scholarship through the commission suggested by Köprülü. Indirectly, Strzygowski was influential in Turkish academia through the work of several of his students. His assistant Heinrich Glück (1889-1930) wrote an essay the question of a *Turkish* art that implies notions of race and origin of art as they are familiar from Strzygowski’s writings. Oya Pancaroğlu has demonstrated how Glück provided a pan-Turkic approach that connected Muslim rulers of Central Asian origin in all regions and periods of the Islamic world. In many ways, this reflected Strzygowski’s approach to Late Antique and Early Christian art, putting an

---

191 For a detailed discussion of the article with its ideological and methodological implications, see Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 72-75.
192 Dogramaci, *Kulturtransfer*, 323-324.
193 This conflict also had an impact on the career of Strzygowski’s student Ernst Diez, who would later teach in Turkey: Dogramaci, *Kulturtransfer*, 327-329.
emphasis on the eastern rather than on the Greco-Roman heritage.¹⁹⁴ Unlike his earlier essay, discussed above for its overlap with Sarre’s opinion on the multiple influences on the architecture of medieval Anatolia, Glück’s later work is thus part of an intellectual reorientation that agreed more with his teacher (and presumably the zeitgeist).

The focus on racial aspects in the transmission of art is especially present in Strzygowski’s work on the great migration, in which he posits the Central Asian and Aryan origin of culture. For him, Seljuk and Ottoman art were merely a late stage in the cultural achievements of Turkic nomads moving from Central Asia to the Near East.¹⁹⁵ It is this emphasis on the primacy of Turks in the creation of material culture that made Strzygowski’s work appealing for art historians in the early days of republican Turkey, who sought ways of writing the history of Turkish culture reaching back into pre-Islamic times. Moreover, Strzygowski influenced art history in Turkey through two of his students who taught there in the 1940s to 1960s.

Ernst Diez, who had received his doctorate in 1902 when Strzygowski was still a professor in at the University of Graz (Austria), taught at Istanbul University from 1943 until 1949.¹⁹⁶ Diez’s experience with Islamic art, which ultimately qualified him to teach in Istanbul where the curriculum was to include the cultural heritage of Western Europe as well as Turkey, went back to working in the Berlin Museums between 1908 and 1911. During this time, Diez worked in different collections, including that of Islamic art where Friedrich Sarre was employed at the time. While working as Strzygowski’s assistant in Vienna from 1911 to 1916, Diez had the chance to travel to Cairo, his initial first-hand encounter with Islamic architecture. In 1912, 

¹⁹⁵ Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 68-71.
¹⁹⁶ Dogramaci, Kulturtransfer, 332.
he travelled to Iran, Iraq, India, Sri Lanka, Egypt and Asia Minor with Oskar von Niedermayer.\textsuperscript{197} The observations on architecture that Diez made in Iran were published in 1918 at the encouragement of the Swiss epigrapher Max van Berchem.\textsuperscript{198}

After his Habilitation in 1919, Diez continued to teach at Vienna and in 1924 received the title of “außerordentlicher Universitätsprofessor” (professor without chair). From 1926 to 1939 Diez lived in the United States, teaching mostly at Bryn Mawr College near Philadelphia and intermittently at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. During this time, Diez became increasingly interested in East Asian art, along with continuous work on the Islamic art of India.\textsuperscript{199}

In 1943, Diez received an invitation to teach art history at Istanbul University. He has been credited with the creation of a department of art history, and its expansion.\textsuperscript{200} Diez’s work there was interrupted in 1945, when he was interned along with other citizens of the German Reich, first in Istanbul, then in Kirşehir in central Anatolia. Diez had to stay in Kirşehir from August 7 to December 18, 1945.\textsuperscript{201} During this time, Diez studied the medieval monuments in the city, and recorded his observations and drawings in a notebook mentioned in his diaries, but

\textsuperscript{197} Typescript of resume written by Diez around 1955, Sammlung Ernst Diez, Paul Sacher Stiftung Basel, microfilm 244.1-1429 to 244.1-1432, pp. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{198} Ernst Diez, Churasanische Baudenkmäler, mit einem Beitrage von Max van Berchem (Berlin, 1918).
\textsuperscript{199} Typescript of resume written by Diez around 1955, Sammlung Ernst Diez, Paul Sacher Stiftung Basel, microfilm 244.1-1429 to 244.1-1432, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{200} Obituary by Haldun Taner, Vatan 4 August 1961, German translation by Michael Meinecke, Sammlung Ernst Diez, Paul Sacher Stiftung Basel, microfilm 244.1-1033 to 244.1-1036.
\textsuperscript{201} Diez describes his time in Kirşehir in his diary for the period in question: Ernst Diez, Tagebuch 1945 bis 1960, Sammlung Ernst Diez, Paul Sacher Stiftung Basel, microfilm 244.1-1370 to 244.1-1393.
apparently not preserved.\footnote{Ernst Diez, Tagebuch 1945 bis 1960, 424.1393. The notebook (“Skizzenbuch”) is not among the papers from Diez’s estate that are preserved in Basel.} Once released, he returned to Istanbul and resumed teaching art history at the university.

Diez left his position and Turkey in 1949 after a controversy arose over the publication of his book Türk Sanatı (Istanbul, 1946) that was widely criticized. The main points of critique were directed towards Diez’s discussion of connections between Turkish, Byzantine, and Armenian architecture, points that were emphasized in newspaper comments, possibly exacerbated by the fact that the book for intended for use in the art history curriculum at Istanbul University.\footnote{For a detailed explanation of the critique, including quotes, see: Burcu Dogramaci, “Kunstgeschichte in Istanbul. Die Begründung der Disziplin durch den Wiener Kunsthistoriker Ernst Diez.” In: Ruth Heftrig, Olaf Peters, Barbara Schellewald (eds.) Kunstgeschichte im “Dritten Reich”. Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken (Berlin, 2008), 123-129.} Only a new edition revised by Diez’s student Oktay Aslanapa, published in 1955, was finally accepted and remained in use as a textbook for a long time.\footnote{Dogramaci, Kulturtransfer, 334-340.} The argument for which Diez was criticized was not new – in fact, Sarre and other scholars argued similarly earlier – suggesting that a change in political climate ended Diez’s academic career.

Also a student of Strzygowski, Katharina Otto-Dorn taught at Ankara University from 1954 to 1964, before she left for Heidelberg and then the United States, where she became the first professor of Islamic Art at the University of California, Los Angeles. Several of her Turkish students became scholars focusing on Seljuk architecture and archaeology, including Gönül Öney, and Rüçhan and Mehmet Oluş Arık who are still active today.\footnote{Pancaroğlu, “Formalism,” 74-76; Dogramaci, Kulturtransfer, 343-348.}

Thus, the tradition established by the connection between Strzygowski and Köprülü was perpetuated in Turkish academia, a fact that shows especially in methodological terms where strict formalism is often still adhered to. On the ideological level, Strzygowski’s influence was
certainly less extensive than that of history writing shaped by early Turkish nationalism. The tendencies of emphasizing Anatolia first and foremost, and the Seljuks within this region over other dynasties, were clearly integrated into the standard narrative of art history, often used but hardly ever questioned. The impact of this early phase of art history in Turkish academia is pervasive, as the following chapters of this dissertation will show.

Kurt Erdmann (1901-1964)

Within the field of art history, the legacy of Strzygowski is supplemented by that of Kurt Erdmann, a German scholar and specialist for carpets but with a keen interest in medieval architecture. Erdmann took over Diez’s position in 1951, and continued the tradition of training students who later became professors of art history in Turkish universities. Erdmann (fig. 14) was not included in recent studies of German Orientalism, probably because of his lack of training in the relevant languages. In studies of the history of Islamic art, his colleagues Friedrich Sarre, Ernst Herzfeld, and Ernst Kühnel have been given precedence. For the study of scholarship in Turkey, the emphasis has been placed on the line represented by Strzygowski and the tradition established by his students, since it appears to be dominant and lends itself to a discussion of the ideological implications of academic work in the early years of the Turkish Republic. Erdmann’s presence in Turkey is, however, as crucial as that of Diez and Otto-Dorn due to the students he trained.

---


207 These students are at times mentioned in Erdmann’s diaries that are preserved in the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin along with over 10,000 negatives of photographs taken in Turkey between 1951 and 1959, mostly by Erdmann’s wife Hanna, and countless small notes on monuments and photographs that Erdmann acquired elsewhere. A collection of the Erdmann’s slides, including mostly Anatolia, but also Istanbul and Egypt, is
Erdmann was trained as an art historian first in Marburg and as Erwin Panofsky’s student in Hamburg, where he benefitted from the possibility to work in the Warburg library before its forced relocation to London in 1933. After completing his dissertation on an architectural topic in 1927, Erdmann joined the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, working first as a guide through the painting galleries without pay. During these years, Erdmann developed an interest in two topics that he continued to work on: Sasanian art and Oriental carpets. Finally, in 1932, Erdmann was hired by the Islamic department, just before the collection was moved to the recently completed Pergamon Museum.

Over the next years, Erdmann travelled extensively in order to do research and acquire new objects for the museum, for instance during a tenure as guest professor in Cairo in the winter of 1938. While the Berlin museums were closed during World War II, Erdmann continued to work until he was called to military service in fall 1944. He became a prisoner of war and had to take up residency in his home town Hamburg, rather than in Berlin, after the end of the war. In the process, Erdmann lost his library that had remained in Berlin as the contents of his residence there were confiscated. While Erdmann was teaching in Bonn in 1949 he received an invitation from Istanbul University to replace Ernst Diez as professor of Islamic art. Following this call, he moved to Istanbul in 1951 with his wife Hanna Erdmann and two daughters. He remained on this position until he was appointed director of the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin in 1958, and during his years of teaching greatly influenced a generation of Turkish scholars through his courses and the fieldtrips in Anatolia that they undertook together. Back in Berlin, Erdmann

---


directed the Museum of Islamic Art, and lectured at Hamburg University once a week. After a brief illness, he died on September 30, 1964.  

During his appointment as professor of Islamic Art at Istanbul University, Kurt Erdmann was the teacher of later scholars such as Nurhan Atasoy and Semra Ögel. Oktay Aslanapa worked as Erdmann’s assistant, just as he did under Diez. They all at some point took part in his excursions, as he called the extensive fieldtrips throughout Anatolia, that were undertaken usually in the spring and summer months. Always accompanied by Erdmann’s wife Hanna, who took photographs and drew sketches of the monuments visited, Erdmann and his students spent days documenting and measuring the medieval monuments of Anatolia.

The published result of this research is the three-volume work *Das anatolische Karavanserai des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Several short articles show other aspects of the research, e.g. on the twelfth-century mosques of Anatolia or on Seljuk palace structures. Erdmann also showed an interest in the chronicle of Ibn Bībī, a major source on Seljuk history, written in the late thirteenth century. Based on Duda’s German translation of an abbreviated version of this text, Erdmann discussed the chronicle’s relevance as a source for art historical studies, with mixed results. Overall, the study of Seljuk architecture makes up only a small part of

---

Erdmann’s prolific scholarly record: out of 365 titles listed in a bibliography published after his death, only thirteenth are concerned with related topics.215

Documenting all fieldtrips that Erdmann accomplished between 1951 and 1958, his diaries record the monuments in their state at the time in extensive descriptions and sketches that complement the photographic documentation, and give a quite personal picture of Erdmann as a scholar and teacher.216 The diaries are written in school note books (okul defter) with the entries carefully dated and labeled with the cities and monuments visited on a given day. The pages are numbered consecutively throughout all thirty-six volumes, totaling nearly four-thousand pages. A few examples of entries in the diaries will show the scope of Erdmann’s record keeping, ranging from the frustrations of travel to minute details on the monuments that he and his students visited. In the following passage, Erdmann describes his first visit to Sivas in September 1951:

“September 30, [1951] 11 am to Sivas by bus. Ate in Sarkışla, over mountain pass with fantastic rocks, colored dark red, purple, over to Sivas, modern bridge across the Kızıl Irmak. Checkpoint shortly before Sivas. City modern, much new construction, much not yet completed. No bus to Divriği. To the Sivas Palas Oteli. Sivas must have experienced considerable growth since [Albert] Gabriel’s visit. Large industrial suburbs. In the center high-rises, in between the typical bustling of ragged people, many horse carriages, hardly any cars. The old city really only consists of the ruins of Seljuk monuments. First tour from 5 to 7:30 pm.”217

_________________________
Three years later, Erdmann again visited Sivas, this time for a more detailed study of its monuments together with several of his students:

“Sivas, May 27, 1954. I am already giving up on essential parts of the excursion. [Tire?] change shortly before Sivas. No rain has fallen, sky is clearing. 3:15 pm – 2 carriages, we end up in the teachers’ seminary. Sezer is handier than I thought. We are being expected. The director makes a terribly energetic (Americanized, was in Florida [?]) impression. One hour wait in this room. A pedagogue professor, who speaks German, has 15 sons, and addresses Barbara as “my little one” fills in for him. Go upstairs around 5pm. I (with Oktay [Aslanapa] & Erichsen who haven’t arrived yet) in a tailoring or fashion-design room. The Erteshs [turkish for “women”] in the music room. Washroom where? I put on a clean shirt. Wash with eau de cologne; find the toilet in the music room. Since I couldn’t find them, passed by the Çifte Minareli Medrese and went off to the post office. Got rid of the letters, but all goes by regular mail. Poste réstante closed. Short tour - imaret groups, kale [Turkish for citadel], Gök Medr. – Ulu Cami – it seems easily enough for two days of work. Surprising, how differently I see things again now. Back then, I really didn’t know anything, only from books and even that inadequately.”

In the passages that describe buildings, Erdmann displays the same meticulous attention for detail that characterizes his publication of the caravanserais. He includes the medieval monuments that he encountered during his visits, often looking at them several times during one stay and returning at several years interval. It is highly regrettable that Erdmann never published his observations. Possibly plans for further publications were cut short by his premature death: 

Das anatolische Karavansaray was barely completed when Erdmann died, and the last volume


219 In one of his articles, Erdmann lamented the fact that he had not yet managed to record the contents of his diaries on index cards: Kurt Erdmann, “Vorosmanische Medresen und Imarest vom Medresentyp in Anatolien.” In: Studies in Islamic Art and Architecture in Honour of Professor K. A. C. Creswell (Cairo, 1965), 49-62.
was published posthumously under the auspices of his widow, Hanna Erdmann. Since in the catalog volume of Das anatolische Karavansaray Erdmann systematically refers to the diaries, it is likely that he might have done the same in further work on other topics.220

Just one short passage shows how valuable Erdmann’s observations are for a study of the other monuments, such as the madrasas in Sivas that will be discussed in Chapter Three:

“5th [in the series of buildings surveyed that day] Gök Medrese (today museum). Room to the right of the entrance türbe [Turkish for mausoleum]. Remains (upper third) of a good [?] mihrāb, turquoise-black without plaster backing. Very good dome with squinches with faience mosaic. Brick mosaic dark brown, on the drum very good calligraphic frieze, turquoise with arabesques, black letters, with background. Courtyard badly damaged. Back wall with large īwān not preserved. Many reused Seljuk spolia as back wall. The entire courtyard appears piece-meal. The two small īwāns to the North and South are intact. The ogival vault identical in both: interlace of narrow turquoise bands between two bricks, the turquoise stars are embedded further. Moreover plastically salient star-shaped knobs in turquoise. At the apex of the ceiling a circular ornament, which is in discordance with the geometrical shapes.”221

Here, Erdmann described the courtyard of the Gök Medrese in Sivas (670/ 1271-72) as it was visible at the time of his visit. This is extremely valuable since the building has gone through multiple restorations that have certainly altered some aspects of Erdmann’s observations. In Das anatolische Karavansaray, Erdmann’s primary intent was to document existing buildings, their state of preservation – many of them being already in ruins and threatened by the progress of urbanization throughout Anatolia that had just begun in the 1950s. At times, the diaries refer to


the rapidly changing character of cities in Anatolia, with apartment buildings replacing the old city centers, while in other locations, the villages as Erdmann describes them remained visibly poor and without modern amenities. In this sense, in addition to being a source on the monuments, the diaries also reflect the beginning increase of migration from rural areas to cities that transformed Turkey in the 1950s and 1960s. Erdmann’s observations, even though not connected to a discussion of the political changes mentioned earlier, show glimpses of this process. These changes, through the removal of old dwellings, and reshaping of cities also profoundly affect the ways in which monuments, including the ones at the center of the present study, can be approached today.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have established the historiographical background of the study of Anatolian Seljuk architecture with a double perspective: on the one hand, I have described the first explorations of the period in the nineteenth century, and, on the other hand, I traced the early twentieth-century integration of Seljuk history into the national narrative of Turkey. Both aspects have had repercussions on the study of Seljuk art and architecture as it stands today, yet arguably the influence of Turkish historical scholarship from the 1920s onwards has been greater. Thus, the standard historical narrative behind many studies of Seljuk architecture is based on the work of eminent historians, especially of Osman Turan. The perspective of Anatolia as a center for a Turko-Islamic civilization, in combination with a downplaying of Mongol-Ilkhanid involvement in Anatolia has created a framework ideally suited to the definition of a uniform Seljuk style directly associated with Seljuk rule.
The nineteenth-century historiography, however, has not have had the same effect. To some extent, it may even have been forgotten, and only selected studies were frequently used by later scholars. Thus, in the case of Friedrich Sarre, his *Kiosk von Konya* and *Reise in Kleinasien* are by far the most well-known and most widely cited works. The publication and photographs of Guillaume de Jerphanion are more present in the minds of scholars of the Byzantine wall-paintings of Cappadocia, than in studies on Islamic architecture. Albert Gabriel, even though he began travelling to Anatolia in the early twentieth century, conducted his influential research on medieval Islamic architecture in the late 1920s, and in part with the support of the Turkish state. Thus, he becomes part of the context of the early Turkish Republic, much more than of the earlier historiography. Other scholars, such as Ernst Diez and Kurt Erdmann, had an important impact in training students who continued in Turkish academia, yet in part due to their lacking language skills, neither scholar ever became fully part of the discussion that linked Seljuk history and art to the ideological reshaping of the Turkish state. The story of Diez’s dismissal from his position at Istanbul University reflects a shift in political tendencies. Part of the criticism was directed at Diez’s discussion of Byzantine and Armenian connection in the Islamic architecture of Turkey, even though his partly summary treatment of examples was also considered problematic. 222 Thus, points that Sarre had made without attracting critique now incited ideologically charged reactions reflecting the changed political climate.

When Erdmann took up his chair in Istanbul as the successor of Diez, he may have been acutely aware of the reasons for the latter’s dismissal, yet if it concerned him, this does not emerge from his publications. The historical introduction of Das anatolische Karavansaray is limited to

---

the basic narrative of Seljuk decline after the Mongol invasions. Throughout the text, Erdmann presents detailed information on the monuments, creates a typology of ornament and plans, and offers rich documentation to be use in further research. He does not, however, make an argument how these monuments emerge in the form they took, and thus remains outside the ideologically charged realm of Turkish vs. Islamic vs. Anatolian architecture.

The observations in this chapter, apart from the historiographical discussion, point to an essential aspect of the study of medieval Anatolia, namely the impact of the multiple restorations that many of the monuments underwent over the course of the twentieth century. Thus, the present state of the monuments is often far from what might be considered the original substance. Nevertheless, many of the restorations were carefully executed and documented. Together with earlier photographs such as those taken by van Berchem, de Jerphanion, and Gabriel, such publications are often more valuable than the present state of the building itself. This is especially true when ongoing projects prohibit access, and in the sad cases of restorations that transformed a monument beyond recognition.

Beyond the aspect of individual monuments, the historical photographs and notes are essential for an understanding of the urban context prior to the changes of the second half of the twentieth century. Erdmann records certain aspects of these urban transformations that had just begun in the 1950s when he visited central Anatolian cities such as Sivas and Kayseri. These changes were part of the modernization project of the Turkish government that had its roots in the early years of the new republic founded in 1923. Soon after the establishment of a new government under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the transformation of Ankara into the nation’s new

---

223 Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavasaray*, Teil I: 15-17.
capital began, following the trends of modernism in architecture.\textsuperscript{224} The connection between modernism and a civilizing mission that included a reform of, and wider access to, education and western-oriented changes such as the shift from the Arabic to the Latin alphabet in 1928, continued over several decades. Beginning in the 1930s, this movement reached also the cities of central Anatolia, even though construction was at first limited to individual buildings such as schools. In the 1950s, the need for more housing in urban centers due to increased migration into the cities, accentuated the transformation of cities with the construction of apartment buildings, often regardless of the historical urban setting while preserving major monuments. This is not the place to fully discuss the notion of modernity behind such projects, yet it is important throughout the following chapters to be aware of the limitations to the study of medieval monuments imposed by these transformations.

\textsuperscript{224} On the architecture in question and the ideological currents behind this development, see: Bozdoğan, \textit{Modernism and Nation Building}. 
Chapter Two

Towards a Classical Style: The Rise of Seljuk Architecture (1180-1240s)

“Les Seldjoukides ont, comme partout ailleurs, détruit systématiquement les constructions des leurs prédécesseurs, païens ou chrétiens, mais l’élégance des édifices qu’ils ont élevés fait excuser ce vandalisme. Le marbre blanc des temples et des basiliques a servi aux sculpteurs médiévaux pour y creuser les fines alvéoles et y ciseler les gracieuses arabesques de l’architecture musulmane.”225

Before I engage in a discussion of transformations in the architectural culture in Anatolia under increasing Mongol influence since the 1240s, the basic paradigms of architecture and patronage, as they are deemed to be valid for the early thirteenth century, need to be reevaluated. Thus, in this chapter, I examine the development of Islamic architecture in Anatolia from the late twelfth century, the period to which the earliest extant monuments date, until the beginning of the Mongol conquest.

In this analysis, I question the standard narrative of style-defining royal patronage that has dominated much of the literature on the subject, and is rooted in the historiography outlined in Chapter One. Focusing on mosques, madrasas, and caravanserais, I will show that the Islamic architecture emerging in the frontier milieu of medieval Anatolia is inherently connected to an environment in which mobility and fluid identities are crucial. Rule is a factor within this multi-layered context, yet, it is not a unifying element in terms of architectural style, nor does it define a uniform narrative. As I will show, such a narrative has defined the study of the architecture of the period in more narrow terms than its complexity warrants.

This chapter will show how the construction of public buildings proceeded from the initial stages of Muslim rule in Anatolia until 639/ 1242, when Mongol forces invading the

_______________________________

region changed its political and cultural balance. The dynamics of proto-states, imperial aspirations, and the patronage that sprung from them will be examined based on an analysis of the types of monuments involved, without assuming an automatic correlation between rule and style.

The initial conquest of Asia Minor, by Turkic forces arriving from Iran, began under the command of the Great Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan (r. 455-465/1063-1073). When Alp Arslan’s forces began to push into Anatolia, the Byzantine Emperors had been struggling to hold the eastern parts of the region for a century. Yet, the defeat of Romanos IV Diogenes (r. 1068-1071) at Manzikert (Malazgirt) and his captivity came as a shock, even though recent research suggests that it may have been just the culmination of the slow loss of Byzantine control over much of Anatolia which had begun as early as the 1040s. These conquests caused considerable disruption due to constant back and forth between the Seljuks and the Byzantines, but also among these Turkic groups themselves. Even though a fragile peace was at times upheld, the battle of Myriokephalon in 571/1176 brought the final loss of central Anatolia to the Seljuks as Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143-1180) was defeated and had to give up these territories.

---

226 As discussed in the introduction, the construction of palaces will not be included here since it presents its own set of problems and dynamics, and a historiography of its own. See Introduction, notes 43, 44, and 46 for relevant bibliography.


228 Andrew C. S. Peacock, *Early Seljûq History – A new interpretation* (London and New York, 2010), 5; On the treatment of the battle in medieval Arabic, Persian, and Greek sources see Carole Hillenbrand, *Turkish Myth*, chapters 1 to 6. On Hillenbrand’s view of the role that the battle took on in the shaping of Turkish nationalism (chapter 7 of the book), see my discussion of the connection between nationalism and Turkish academia in the 1920s and 1930s in chapter 1.
Over the following decades, military leaders who had initially come to the region with the Great Seljuk armies progressively conquered large parts of eastern and central Anatolia, and began to establish their own proto-states (map 1). Among those who established their autonomy at the head of independent proto-states, the Seljuks and the Danishmendids turned out to be the most successful ones. The Danishmendids held Sivas since the late eleventh century, and took over Malatya in 496/1103, and even concluded alliances with Crusader forces against the Seljuks. After it was weakened by a division of the realm into three parts in 559/1164, the Danishmendid principality progressively lost its lands to the Seljuks until its last stronghold Malatya fell in 573/1178. In Erzurum, the Saltuqids were the local rulers 465/1072 to 598/1202, a time during which they were in conflict with both the neighboring Danishmendids, and the kingdom of Georgia. Eventually, they too were vanquished by the Seljuks. The Mengücekids in Divriği persisted until the mid-thirteenth century, even though acknowledging Seljuk sovereignty. They probably disappeared as a result of the Mongol conquests, in a context that is not quite clear, yet possibly not until the 1250s.

Since the first extant buildings, constructed in Anatolia under Muslim patronage, date to the late twelfth century, the analysis will begin at this point in time and extend over the following sixty years (map 4). As the discussion will show, this initial period was dominated by rivalries

229 The relationship between the Great Seljuk dynasty and the Turkmen tribes was not necessarily and easy one. Recent scholarship has suggested more complex interactions between the two sides than previously thought, going beyond an opposition between dynasty pretense and somewhat disorderly tribal warfare: Peacock, *Early Seljūq History*, 4 and 72-98.


between different local rulers, establishing the basic infrastructure of a Muslim proto-state in their respective regions. The Danishmendids in the region of Tokat and Sivas, the Saltukids in the region of Erzurum and Erzincan, and the Rūm Seljuks in the region of Konya each started construction projects aiming at establishing such an infrastructure. At this stage, local styles and customs of building persisted even though features appropriate for mosques, such as prayer niches and minarets, and certain forms of decoration were imported, probably through the migration of craftsmen from Iran and Syria. The question of persisting building traditions will be part of the discussion, even though the small number of extant Byzantine monuments in these regions often does not allow for clear-cut conclusions.

From the start, mobility was a crucial factor in shaping the architecture of Anatolia’s new rulers: craftsmen from surrounding regions were active here, as stylistic connections and occasional signatures, discussed below, will show. As the Seljuks in Konya began to expand their rule, they progressively took over the territories of the Danishmendids, Saltukids, and other smaller rivals (map 2). Newly conquered cities were first secured with the construction of military structures such as walls and citadels financed by the Seljuk sultans and, at times, their amīrs. After the conquest of Sinop in 611/1214, inscriptions referring to the victorious sultan, as well as to the amīrs involved in the construction project, were placed on newly built towers.

---

234 The construction of fortifications will not be discussed in detail, mostly due to the fact that none of them were built in the second half of the thirteenth century, the main period of interest of subsequent chapters. Nothing remains of the fortifications of Sivas, except for the fact that they were one of only two projects of sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs in this city. He commissioned the walls in 618/1221: Andrew C. S. Peacock, “The Saljūq Campaign against the Crimea and the Expansionist Policy of the Early Reign of ‘Alā al-Dīn Kayqubād,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 3rd series 16.2 (2006):136; for the fortifications of Konya, razed in the early 19th century: Scott Redford, “The Seljuqs of Rum and the Antique,” *Muqarnas* 10 (1993): 148-156; the fortifications of Kayseri are discussed in Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, I: 19-30.
and walls to mark Seljuk rule. After the second conquest of Antalya in 613/1216, the fortifications were repaired and marked with elaborate narrative inscriptions celebrating the conquest.

Once the Seljuks had removed most of their rivals, and investments could be made in relative security, patronage was expanded: a dense network of caravanserais along trade routes was established, and mosques and madrasas were either rebuilt or newly founded. Over the first quarter of the thirteenth century, as I will argue, a style connected to Seljuk patronage slowly emerged, yet imperial architecture was never fully realized. The inherent fluidity of the cultural milieu, along with the mobility of participating craftsmen certainly had a part in this ephemeral, yet never completely settled stability. The Mongol invasions in 639/1242, followed by the progressive integration of Anatolia into the Mongol realm broke off this development of a Seljuk royal style. As I will show in Chapter Three, the dynamics of rule and patronage changed at this point, in a first phase in favor of the amīrs. Royal patronage disappeared, and while certain stylistic elements prevailed, the tendency towards a unified style did not become realized. Patronage remained with the amīrs while the sultans entirely disappeared from the domain of public architecture, in keeping with their loss of authority.

The geographical concentration of Seljuk patronage until the Mongol conquest shows that the sultans operated comfortably only within a confined zone (map 4). This area was primarily limited to the region southwest of the river Kızıl Irmak, with a particular concentration in Konya. This city was the closest semblance to a capital, even though the sultan had residences


236 For the particular attention that was paid to formulating the Seljuk claim on Antalya in inscriptions, after its second conquest by the Seljuks following four years of independency, see: Scott Redford and Gary Leiser, *Victory Inscribed - The Seljuk Fetihname on the Citadel Walls of Antalya, Turkey* (Antalya, 2008), 89-106.
in other locations as well. To the south, the Taurus Mountains formed a further natural boundary that was not easily crossed. The conquests of the port cities of Sinop and Antalya provided the Seljuks with access to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, a significant boost to trade. In the eastern regions of Anatolia, however, Seljuk hold always proved to be less stable. The richest foundations, in terms of the wealth of the architecture and of the related waqfs, are located within the geographically defined zone just described, as examples below will show. I will argue that the sultans and their amirs preferred to invest in a region that was secure, at least by the volatile standards of medieval Anatolia.

In the period of highest stability of Seljuk rule in Anatolia, between 1200 and 1243, the region of Konya became a center of artistic production that attracted architects and craftsmen. Seemingly disparate stylistic vocabularies from Iran, Syria, and Armenia were combined in new construction with an extent of creativity that often defies categorization, yet shows how the patronage of the Seljuk court attracted the most skillful craftsmen.

Thus, at this specific moment in time, and in this specific location, the conditions of patronage, in keeping with the imperial aspirations of the Seljuk sultans, fostered exceeding creativity in architecture that had yet to find its peer. As the following discussion will show, this development of architecture did not necessarily lead towards the formation of a style directly associated with Seljuk rule. While certain tendencies and preferences were clear in patronage, architecture fell in place according to the dynamics of artistic creativity and structural possibilities, without being stifled by mechanisms of imperial control and ideology.
From Conquest to Cultural Transformation

The transition from Christian to Muslim rule in Anatolia is a story extending from the late eleventh to the early fourteenth century. The historical context has been outlined above, yet on the cultural level, many details remain yet to be understood. Thus, the interaction between Christians and Muslims, and conversion from Christianity to Islam among the local population, is often difficult to trace precisely.\(^{237}\) In the absence of demographic records, it is unclear at what rate the population converted to Islam.\(^{238}\) Considering the important number of non-Muslims recorded in Ottoman documents from the fifteenth century and later, however, the proportion of converted Christians may have been relatively small in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Islamization, especially at first, was concentrated in the urban centers, and only slowly expanded into rural areas. There, the hold of the administration had been looser, particularly over nomadic segments of the population. In terms of the locations where the construction of mosques and madrasas was most prominent, this is certainly a valid observation. Apart from conversion, the institution of waqf was crucial in reshaping Anatolia; lands that had formerly belonged to the church could thus be absorbed into charitable endowments for the benefit of Muslims and their institutions.\(^{239}\)


The mixed culture of medieval Anatolia emerges as an essential part of the prevalent frontier milieu. Conceptually, this culturally mixed milieu offers a connection to the notion of *convivencia*, the coexistence of Muslims, Jews, and Christians in medieval Spain. The cultural synthesis springing from this environment, at least until the Christian *reconquista* was accomplished in 1492 with the conquest of Granada, rings familiar with the issues present in medieval Anatolia.\(^{240}\) As noted before, Cemal Kafadar has suggested that, on the historical level, Anatolia compares well with the principalities (*ṭawāʾif*) of Spain after the breakdown of Umayyad rule.\(^{241}\)

This is not the place to further explore the complexities of coexistence among the various ethnic and religious communities in medieval Anatolia, yet their presence, and continued activity as craftsmen and merchants, must be considered when discussing the development of architectural styles. Little is known about the practicalities of such collaboration, yet barriers between the various languages spoken in medieval Anatolia may have been a challenge.

**Language in Daily Use and Inscriptions**

Unfortunately, the written sources do not refer to problems of communication, or to the issue of translating between, say Greek, Armenia, Arabic, Persian and various Turkic dialects.\(^{242}\) This renders an understanding of the relation of languages, especially on the popular level, rather difficult. In the countryside, local languages (especially Greek and Armenian, depending on the region) are likely to have been used continuously. The Turkmen nomads roaming parts of


\(^{242}\) On the parallel use of Greek and various local languages during the Hellenization of Asia Minor, see: Peter Charanis, “Cultural Diversity and the Breakdown of Byzantine Power in Asia Minor,” *DOP* 19 (1975): 9-12.
Anatolia used Turkic dialects. In the seventeenth century, Evliyâ Çelebî gives an indication of the practical linguistic difficulties posed by travelling when, upon reaching the region of Sivas, he feels compelled to give a list of essential words in Armenian, a language frequently spoken where he went. This shows how late local languages prevailed.

At the Seljuk court, Arabic was reserved for religion, and related to scholarship, while Persian was the language of choice for poetry and literature. Turkish was probably used among the sultans, their relatives, and close associates, but not as a literary language. In the Seljuk court, a direct Greek influence was present in the form of Christian women, such as the mother of Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw I (r. 588-593/1192-97 and 601-608/1205-11). When faced with a succession dispute in the late 1190s, this prince fled to Constantinople and placed himself under the protection of Alexius III. Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusraw I married among the Byzantine elite, and his son ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Kayqubâd had a Greek mother. These connections between the Byzantine and Turkic elites show that there was no clear-cut separation based on cultural or religious qualms. Marriage alliances were frequent also between the Seljuks and the ruling house of Georgia, especially in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

The cities of Anatolia saw a considerable influx of Persian-speaking scholars and bureaucrats from Central Asia and Iran. This migration increased with the beginning Mongol


conquest of these regions in the early thirteenth century. While in Central Asia and Iran, centers of Islamic culture were devastated by these incursions, they only began to flourish in Anatolia with the arrival of refugees from Samarqand, Bukhara, and Balkh.\textsuperscript{248} In the cities, Persian dominated at least on the administrative level, perpetuating the Persianate court culture of the Great Seljuks in Iran. In the religious realm, Arabic remained the language of Islam and thus of prayer, preaching, law, and \textit{madrasa} instruction. Not until the fourteenth century, and then only with the progressive rise of the Ottomans in western Anatolia, became Turkish relevant on the cultural and political level.\textsuperscript{249} These questions of language connect directly to identity and its formation within such a context. The prevalent fluidity of identity within the frontier milieu of medieval Anatolia emerges once more, this time reflecting the fact that communication was not a given between different levels of the population. Translation must have had a significant role, even though we have not come to an understanding of its place in this context.

On the level of architecture, the presence of inscriptions is inherently connected to the multiple languages of medieval Anatolia. With few exceptions, foundation inscriptions were written in Arabic, and occasionally poetic or literary quotes in Persian were added, as we shall see below. The understanding of these inscriptions, highly formulaic and in languages that were not generally spoken among the population, as well as their legibility given the calligraphic scripts that they are written in, may have been considerable obstacles here.\textsuperscript{250} Yet, considering that oral transmission probably played a major role in a society where large parts of the

\textsuperscript{248} Carole Hillenbrand, “Rāvandī, the Seljuk court at Konya,” 158-159 and 162-164.

\textsuperscript{249} Carole Hillenbrand, “Rāvandī, the Seljuk court at Konya,”169.

population never learned to read, this does not necessarily mean that the content of these texts was inaccessible.

A few multi-lingual monumental inscriptions may point to a concern by patrons to connect to different segments of the population, or to display multiple identities. These inscriptions are, relatively, rare; nevertheless, they are pertinent examples of the negotiation on the cultural and linguistic level that must have been part of life in medieval Anatolia.

In the Hekim Han (615/1218), located along the road between Sivas and Malatya, the patron chose to have the foundation inscription written in Arabic, Armenian, and Syriac (fig. 15). The inscription reads:

“During the days of the rule of the victorious great sultan, the greatest king of kings, the owner of the necks of the peoples, the lord of the sultans of the world, exalted of the noble religion, king of the continent and the sea, the glory of the world and of religion, the victory of Islam and of the Muslims, the crown of kings and sultans, the pleasure of the house of Seljuk, Abū ’l-Faṭḥ Kaykāwūṣ b. Kaykhusraw bin Qilij Arslān, proof of the ruler of the faithful may God exalt his victories, ordered the construction of this blessed khan the weak slave needy of God’s grace, Abū Sālim b. Abī Ḥasan the deacon and doctor from Malatya, at the date of the months of the year 615 [1218].”

Its patron, Abū Sālim b. Abī Ḥasan, as his name appears in the Arabic text, may have been a local physician; nothing in the inscription suggests the reasons for the patron’s choice of three languages. The epigraphic conventions of each language are followed, perhaps in order to establish a record of his patronage accessible to the greatest number of merchants and travelers.

251 A photograph of the inscription by Erdmann (Sammlung Erdmann, Museum für islamische Kunst, Berlin, E.A. 4516) shows the three different scripts but is too blurred to allow a new reading. In more recent image (fig. 15), the stone is restored, yet appears to be quite deteriorated after a cleaning.

possible. The three languages are arranged in adjacent columns on one single inscription plaque, possibly intentionally so that no idiom takes precedent over the other.\(^{253}\)

A bilingual inscription on the city walls of Sinop approaches this same issue in a quite different way. When the Seljuks conquered Sinop, they placed inscriptions in Arabic and Greek on the newly reconstructed city walls in order to mark the conquest, as well as Persian poetry referring to the victory of sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs.\(^{254}\) The message of the inscriptions in Arabic was clear, stating that the city was conquered, and that several Seljuk amīrs from different regions of the realm were responsible for the reconstruction of the fortifications.\(^{255}\) At least one of these inscriptions is bilingual, with a smaller Greek inscription being placed below the Arabic text on one rectangular slab of stone.\(^{256}\)

The Greek text contains some inaccuracies of grammar and spelling, and struggles with the rendering of Arabic names in Greek script. The name Abū Bakr, for instance, becomes ‘Opu Pakis,’ while sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs becomes ‘Azatini.’\(^{257}\) In conjunction with the Arabic text above it, it becomes clear that the Greek text was an attempt to render the content, and to some extent, the epigraphic conventions of the Arabic foundation inscription.\(^{258}\) The attempt at translating the formal Arabic of the primary – from the point of view of size – inscription may


\(^{255}\) *RCEA* nos. 3761 to 3774.

\(^{256}\) Redford, “The Seljuqs and the Antique,” fig. 7; Redford, “Sinop,” 138 and fig. 7.

\(^{257}\) For the Greek text, see: Nikos A. Bees, *Die Inschriftenaufzeichnung des Kodex Sinaiticus Graecus 508 (976) und die Maria-Spillaiotissa-Klosterkirche bei Sille (Lykaonien), mit Exkursen zur Geschichte der Seldschukiden-Türken* (Berlin-Wilmersdorf, 1922), 53-54.

\(^{258}\) Nikos A. Bees, *Die Inschriftenaufzeichnung des Kodex Sinaiticus Graecus*, 53-54. I thank Dr. Maria Cristina Carile for reading the Greek text for me and providing the following translation that shows to what extent the inscription is problematic: “On […] 1st, on Saturday, Sinop of Caucasus left the castle to Azatini [‘Izz al-Dīn] the great sultan, I, Opu Pakis [Abū Bakr?] servant of the Great Sultan built a tower and walls and [works] were started in April… and taken to completion on September 1st of the same year 6724.”
not have been entirely successful, yet the intention shows a keen awareness of languages, and their levels of style. The appropriation of a script and language associated with Byzantine rule was an additional means of expressing the Seljuk takeover, complementing the use of Arabic inscriptions. In this case, the inscriptions probably served not so much to communicate the conquest of the city, which the population certainly had noticed, than to establish markers of Seljuk rule in an important port on the Black Sea.

In Konya, the city walls had the required formal inscriptions in Arabic, recording the patronage and rule of the sultans. These standard markers of powers were supplemented by quotations from the *Shāhnāme* in Persian, pointing to the Seljuks’ adherence to Persianate ideals of kingship, which was reflected in names such as ‘Kaykāwūs’ and ‘Kayqubād’, adopted from the eleventh century epic poem praising the prowess of Iranian kings. These instances of monumental inscriptions in Persian, as poetic additions rather than main foundation texts, further indicate the Persianisation of the urban and literary milieus. Still, foundation inscriptions continued to be written in Arabic, indicating that in certain cases, conventions prevailed over the conveniences of daily use. Since scribes associated with the court composed these inscriptions, their language naturally sprung from an urban intellectual milieu.

This meager record of the linguistic plurality of medieval Anatolia reflects our lack of knowledge about the daily dealings of multi-cultural life. Even the term ‘multi-cultural’ may not be entirely appropriate with the notion of uncritical cohabitation that it suggests. The notion of hybrid culture only explains the situation to a certain extent, in suggesting vague boundaries, and organic mixing. The use of different languages for specific, and often distinct, purposes shows,


even with the limited number of examples available, a cultural milieu that was apprehensive of linguistic nuances and implications for the shaping of identities, and aware of the implications that each language carried.

The term ‘hybrid,’ even though widely used in art historical studies of culturally diverse regions such as Norman Sicily, twelfth-century Northern India, or medieval Anatolia, can be somewhat problematic if taken too literally. After all, the biological metaphor inherent in the term carries the implication of organic and thus somewhat unmediated growth, to some extent beyond human control. Yet, in Anatolia as much as in the other regions just mentioned, human agency is a crucial factor in the shaping of culture. In architecture, this is especially crucial as the participating patrons, craftsmen, and architects shape it, rather than influences out-of-hand. Thus, fluid identities, their formation and interaction are traceable beyond the level of language, in the architecture and its stylistic variants.

Relating to Byzantium

In this context, I will now discuss the architectural landscape of Anatolia before the emergence of Muslim rule, and its incorporation into the new monuments serving the faith of the conquerors. The place of Byzantium within the study of Seljuk architecture and especially that of eastern Anatolia in the late thirteenth century is indirect and subtle, and thus not easy to trace. This reflects the notion of a shared court culture around the Mediterranean, fostered by the exchange of diplomatic gifts and trade with luxury objects, especially ivories, jewelry, and

261 Thanks are due to Professor Slobodan Ćurčić and to Professor Charalambos Bakirtzis for reminding me to keep my eyes open for “pre-Seljuk” Anatolia.
textiles. This argument is certainly compelling and many examples in ceramics, metalwork, textiles and other materials could be evoked to demonstrate it. In architecture, the impact of such objects is more difficult to assess since it involves an additional step from a small scale object to the application on a monument, and potentially the transition from two- to three-dimensional, whether and additional step of a paper model was involved or not.

Sources most commonly refer to the exchanges at a court level discussed earlier, yet a rare reference to architecture is contained in a text that the Byzantine historian Nicolas Mesarites wrote around 1200. The author described the Mouchroutas, a domed room in the Great Palace of Constantinople, as decorated with Persian motifs. The structure in question, probably built in the mid-eleventh century, and part of the imperial palace according to the description, has not been found in excavations. Apart from its architectural description, the passage is also noteworthy for its reference to stylistic labels, based on ethnic and geographical notions:

“The Mouchroutas is an enormous building adjacent to the Chrysotriklinos, lying as it does on the west of the latter. The steps leading up to it are made of baked brick, lime and marble; the staircase, which is serrated [?] on either side and turns into a circle, is colored blue, deep red, green and purple by means of a medley of cut, painted tiles of cruciform shape. This building is the work not of a Roman, nor a Sicilian, nor a Celt-Iberian, nor a Sybaritic, nor a Cypriot, nor a Cilician hand, but of a Persian hand, by virtue of which it contains images of Persians in their different costumes. The canopy of the roof, consisting of hemispheres joined to the heaven-like ceiling, offers a variegated spectacle; closely packed angles project inward and outward; the beauty of the carving is


266 Sybaritic may be used in its historical meaning, referring to a 6th century BCE Greek city on the Gulf of Taranto or, more likely, in its figurative meaning of luxurious. I thank Professor Leisten for pointing this out to me.
extraordinary, and wonderful is the appearance of the cavities which, overlaid with gold, produce the effect of a rainbow more colorful than the one in the clouds. There is insatiable enjoyment here – not hidden, but on the surface. Not only those who direct their gaze to these things for the first time, but those who have often done so, are struck with wonder and astonishment. Indeed, this Persian building is more delightful than the Laconian ones of Menelaus."267

The terms related to labeling architectural styles that appear in the passage are related to geography and culture, including also the notion of historicity: ‘Roman’ may be meant as a historical reference. Sicilian, Celt-Iberian, Cypriot, Cilician, and Persian might refer to contemporary entities, culturally and geographically distinct from Constantinople, if not Byzantium as a whole.

The tiles268 that Mesarites describes in the text evoke early examples of tile-work in Seljuk monuments in Anatolia, such as those found in the ruins of the kiosk in Konya, probably built during the reign of sultan ʿIzz al-Dīn Qilij Arslān II (r. 551-88/ 1156-92).269 Based on the description in the text, Asutay-Effenberger has suggested that the tiles are, just as those found in the kiosk in Konya, made in the so-called mināʾī technique, with bright red, blue, and green motifs of a white background.270 Moreover, sultan ʿIzz al-Dīn Qilij Arslān II’s visit to Constantinople in 1161 CE provides a direct connection between the realms of Seljuk and Byzantine court culture.271 The nearly immediate adaptation in Constantinople of the latest fashion in Seljuk architecture, through the intermediary of an architect of workshop who might


268 The term ‘οστράκων’ used in the text may refer also to pieces or shards of pottery. In the interpretation, however, there is a consensus on interpreting it as referring to tiles that are set next to each other. In addition to Walker’s article, see: Neslihan Asutay-Effenberger, “‘Muchrutas’ – Der seldschukische Schaupavillon im Grossen Palast von Konstantinopel,” *Byzantion* 74.2 (2004): 321-323.

269 Asutay-Effenberger, “‘Muchrutas’,” 320-321; Walker, “Middle Byzantine Aesthetics of Power,” 80

270 Asutay-Effenberger, “‘Muchrutas’,” 321.

have travelled to the Byzantine capital with the Seljuk ruler, this becomes a plausible reflection
of the intertwined relations between the two courts.

The aesthetic appreciation of architectural beauty, as seen here in the praise lavished on a
Persian, probably Seljuk, architect who was responsible for the tiles and the *muqarnas* dome, is
combined with the recognition of geographical origin and cultural roots.\(^{272}\) Thus, the notion of
the foreign is present in the description, pointing not towards uncritical exoticism,\(^{273}\) but rather
purposeful appropriation of aesthetically pleasing architectural features.\(^{274}\) The notion of
appropriation is crucial here, as well as in the transition from Byzantine to Seljuk architecture in
central Anatolia, for its capability to represent the active involvement of both sides.\(^{275}\) In the
instance of medieval Anatolia, the actors of the transformation were multiple, including Seljuk
patrons, local craftsmen and architects and their colleagues who immigrated from Iran and
Northern Syria. They all left their mark on the monuments that they helped building, even

\(^{272}\) The elements perhaps derived from Seljuk architecture, and their precedents in locations around
the Mediterranean, including Sicily, are discussed in detail in Walker, “Middle Byzantine Aesthetics of Power,” 80-85.

\(^{273}\) See Elizabeth S. Ettinghausen, “The Phenomenon of ‘Foreign’ in Oriental Art.” In: Annette Hagedorn (ed.) *The

\(^{274}\) In her analysis of the description of the Moukhroutas within the broader context of Mesarites’s work, Alicia
Walker points out that the passage should not be viewed as an ekphrasis in its own right, but rather as part of a
critical view of John the Fat (d. 1200), an usurper to the Byzantine throne. Thus, the Islamicate architecture of the
Moukhroutas becomes a metaphor of the false emperor’s decadence, in its incapability to live up to the spiritual
color of Byzantine art: Walker, “Middle Byzantine Aesthetics of Power,” 85-86 and 89-91. The crucial
paragraph leading to Walker’s interpretation of Islamic architecture as a negative metaphor is not given in Mango’s
translation, and immediately follows the description of the hall: “This Persian stage – the work of the hand of John’s
kinsman from his grandfather’s family – framed the actor John. Although crowned, he was not dressed royally,
sitting on the ground, a symbol of the suffering that had seized the wretch, and of the unbearable nobleness of his
misfortune. He was gulping his drink quickly and court favor with the Persians painted on the chamber and
drinking to them. Running with sweat, he sometimes wiped the sweat with a towel, sometimes flicked the sweat
away with his crooked finger; already he was passing into a very deep sleep.” Translation in Walker, “Middle
Byzantine Aesthetics of Power,” 94.

(second edition, Chicago, 2003), 162.
though the precise modalities of the architectural transformation are often not understood.276 Thus, a one-directional notion of agency limited to the act of patronage is not sufficient in order to explain the formation of Seljuk architecture in Anatolia. Rather, multiple participants were involved, although the exact relationship between these actors, as well as the modalities of construction often remains unknown. The same limitations apply for much of Byzantine architecture, and it is perhaps here that the connection is most obvious.277

In the architectural production of Seljuk Anatolia, the most striking feature is the absence of clear references to Byzantine monuments. Compared to the actions of other Muslim dynasties who conquered formerly Byzantine lands, the Seljuks acted differently, absorbing the architecture of their defeated opponent more directly. Thus, under the Umayyads in the seventh and early eighth centuries, and the Ottomans from the late thirteenth century onwards, imperial styles emerged that included references to Byzantine architecture.

Umayyad architecture entered in competition with that of the Byzantine Empire, creating an imperial style that was to surpass that of the Christian rivals, yet uses techniques such as gold mosaic that were developed to their peak before. Carefully planned architectural campaigns fostered by imperial aspirations provided the incentive to push these references further, and to develop a new Umayyad visual idiom.278 The Ottomans took on this double heritage. Early Ottoman architecture referred to the Byzantine monuments of Bithynia, the western Anatolian

276 As Nelson poignantly points out: “Like a radioactive isotope, appropriation or myth breaks down over time, either fading away or mutating into a new myth. Because appropriations, like jokes, are contextual and historical, they do not travel well, being suppressed or altered by new contexts and histories.” Nelson, “Appropriation,” 163.


278 On the establishment of an Umayyad visual culture through the reshaping of Damascus, see: Finbarr B. Flood, The Great Mosque of Damascus: studies on the makings of an Ummayad visual culture (Boston, 2001).
region that was at the center of the early realm. After the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the Byzantine churches of the city, Hagia Sophia especially, served as the basis for a truly imperial Ottoman style, which culminated in the work of the architect Sinan in the sixteenth century. The mosque complexes of Mehmed the Conqueror (867-875/1463-1470, mosque rebuilt 1180-1185/1766-1771) and of Süleyman the Magnificent (955-966/1548-59) emulated the Hagia Sophia, while pushing its architectural achievement further, a quest in which the architect Sinan ultimately succeeded to perfection.

At the same time, sultan Süleyman the Magnificent’s initiative to restore the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, one of the most prominent Umayyad monuments, engages also with this earlier Islamic past. Executed during the restoration of the monument in the mid-sixteenth century, the addition of distinctly new Iznik tiles to the exterior of the Dome of the Rock, covering or replacing the original mosaics, this campaign left a distinctively Ottoman stamp on the building. In both cases, the Umayyad and the Ottoman one, architecture and imperial aspirations came into a close agreement, reflecting each other in the public eye.

Seljuk patronage, however, appears to have related to the past in a different way. In all three cases, the equation of architecture and politics is extremely complex, yet perhaps the least well understood for the Seljuks. The combination of the creativity and potential of artists and architects who were attracted to the commissions of the Seljuk court is manifest in the architecture. Ideological concerns may have played a role in architecture, yet in the architectural


evidence, they do take second place after the agency of participating craftsmen, who appear to have taken the absence of a requirement for distinctly Byzantine architecture as an opportunity to experiment.

Generally, the architecture commissioned by the Sultans and their amīrs does not hark back to the heritage of the region that they conquered. Local construction techniques (brick in the region of Konya, primarily stone farther east) were still used, probably due to material constraints, and the availability of workers trained in the respective techniques. In terms of structure, however, the new architecture referred rather to the Islamic monuments of Syria; the absence of large scale Byzantine monuments in the region that formed the Seljuk heartland is likely to have had a major impact here. Unlike the Umayyad conquest of Jerusalem, or the Ottoman takeover of Constantinople, the Seljuk conquest of Anatolia did not have the immediate point of permanence. Even when the Seljuks had defeated most of their rivals, their rule was relatively unstable, and in constant threat from insurgencies.

A fundamental problem in fully assessing the impact of Byzantine architecture on patronage under the Seljuks is the lack of preserved Byzantine buildings in central and eastern Anatolia. In the region of Erzurum, this is more easily explained because the Byzantine hold over this region had been weak since the late tenth century. Moreover, the destruction waged by later conquerors, such as the Mongols in the thirteenth century, and the Russians in the early nineteenth century, had a further strong impact on the preservation of monuments.282 These later changes, combined with the little-understood impact of the Seljuk settling of Anatolia, in many cases considerably changed urban layouts. In Sivas, the level of urban transformation went so

282 For the impact of the Russian military presence in Erzurum, see the diary of the Russian writer Pushkin who participated in the campaign in 1829: Aleksandr Sergiievitch Pushkin, Puteshestvie v Arzrum vo vremia pokhoda 1829 goda (Paris, 1935).
far that the location of the city of Sebaste, the Byzantine settlement at the origin of this important trade center, remains unknown.\textsuperscript{283} Neither in Kayseri nor Tokat are traces of the Byzantine settlements visible.

The Gök Medrese Mosque in Amasya (fig. 16) has been referred to, without certain references, as a Byzantine church that was later taken over by Muslims and transformed first into a madrasa and later into a mosque.\textsuperscript{284} If so, a building comprised of three naves (fig. 17) would have been transformed by the addition of a mausoleum covered with a conical, star-shaped brick dome akin to that of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs in the Şifaiye Medrese in Sivas (614/ 1216-17). The lack of a thorough technical survey and archaeological investigation of the building make an assessment of this theory difficult, and the white paint slathered all over the interior of the monument does not help.\textsuperscript{285} In Konya, the Eflatun Mescidi, a Byzantine church transformed into a mosque, survived on the citadel hill until the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{286}

The cave churches in Cappadocia are somewhat difficult to place. The settlements attached to them have traditionally been interpreted as monasteries, yet recent scholarship has

\textsuperscript{283} "Sīvās," İslam Ansiklopedisi; van Berchem and Halil Edhem, MCIA, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{284} Wolper, “Portal Patterns” 66 with reference to Cumont and Cumont, Voyage d’exploration archéologique dans le Pont. Cumont and Cumont do not refer to the monument in question at all. Generally, the lack of evidence for converted churches in central Anatolia during the Middle Ages is quite striking. A historical explanation for this may be at hand: “Cl. Cahen goes on to say that the appearance of mosques testifies to the «progress and officialization of Islam». This judgment can be challenged for a number of reasons. Firstly, if there had been wide-scale appropriation of Christian buildings by the incoming Turks, then there would have been evidence for this. Moreover, any invaders, not being sure of their reception, would surely wait a while before utilising the monuments of the predominant faith of the newly conquered area for their own cult. It is much more probable in frontier territory, which Anatolia undoubtedly was, that the first Turkish Muslim worship in Anatolian towns would have taken place in simple enclosures or in structures made of wood.” Carole Hillenbrand, “Rāvandī, the Seljuk court at Konya,” 167. Hillenbrand’s explanation does not account for the difference, stated in Islamic law and generally applied during conquests, that in places conquered by treaty (ṣulḥ), non-Muslim monotheist places of worship could be preserved, whereas in cities conquered by the sword (sayf), they would be destroyed or transformed into mosques: “Ṣulḥ,” Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition

\textsuperscript{285} A photograph taken by Theodor Menzel in 1932 show parts of the interior structure of the roof: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Istanbul, Fotothek, Inv. 93.545.

shifted towards suggesting a secular identity for these sites.\textsuperscript{287} The monuments have been dated mostly on the base of a comparison of their paintings with dated examples in Constantinople and the suggestion that in the provinces, corresponding styles should be dated somewhat later.\textsuperscript{288} The resulting dates range from the tenth to the fourteenth century, well into a time when the region was under Seljuk rule, or at least Kayseri, its central city, was firmly under Muslim hold, even if the rural areas may have remained Christian for a longer period of time. The persistence of these monastic (or, according to some scholars secular) Christian communities under Muslim rule for several centuries is often not addressed. It has, however, been suggested that after a hiatus caused by the initial conquest, construction picked up again in the late thirteenth century. This revival may have had to do with a vacuum in control during the beginning Mongol invasions.\textsuperscript{289} This puts the destructive character of the Mongol conquests of Anatolia into perspective, analogously to Armenia, where the reconstruction of churches and monasteries resurfaced under Ilkhanid rule around 1300.\textsuperscript{290} In architectural terms, due to their specific technique, the cave churches may not be relevant for the study of Seljuk monuments, yet in terms of religious and political identities they certainly are. Unfortunately, the study of Seljuk Anatolia and of the cave monasteries of Cappadocia are mostly treated as mutually exclusive; given the context of medieval Anatolia, a

\textsuperscript{287} Veronica Kalas, “Challenging the sacred landscape of Byzantine Cappadocia.” In: Alicia Walker and Amanda Lyuster (eds.) Negotiating Secular and Sacred in Medieval Art: Christian, Islamic, and Buddhist (Farnham, 2009), n. 1-3 for the relevant literature in both approaches.

\textsuperscript{288} Kalas, “Challenging the sacred landscape,” 150-151.

\textsuperscript{289} Nicole Thierry, La Cappadoce de l’antiquité au Moyen Âge (Turnhout, 2002), 214-216.

narrative connecting Islamic and Christian architecture in the region, rather than positing them as contradictory, would be desirable.\textsuperscript{291}

The Islamic architecture of the region refers to earlier monuments in the use of spolia and, at least so it seems from the limited evidence, in the continuation of construction techniques. In eastern and central Anatolia, the emphasis on the use of stone is notable. Some features were probably imported from Iran, most notably the tall brick minarets that were used either freestanding such as the one of the Great Mosque of Sivas (probably 609/1213; fig. 18)\textsuperscript{292} or in a pair on top of the portal such as in the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum (fig. 50).

**Spoils and Classical References: Survival or Revival?**

The most readily apparent traces of Byzantine architecture in Seljuk monuments are spolia that were at times used in these new structures. The use of spolia shows that architectural pieces were available and appreciated for reuse throughout the thirteenth century. The inclusion of spolia in the city walls of Konya has been studied in detail, including the ideological implications of their use along with Arabic and Persian inscriptions to stylize the power of the Seljuk rulers.\textsuperscript{293} The same is true for the pieces included into the outer side of the courtyard wall of the Alaeddin Mosque in the same city (617/1220-21) although they are of Byzantine origin, and thus carry somewhat different implications.\textsuperscript{294} Overall, the use of spolia in buildings

\textsuperscript{291} For instances of common use of sacred sites, see: Oya Pancaroğu, “Caves, borderland and configurations of sacred topography in medieval Anatolia,” Mésogeios 25-26 (2005): 249-281.

\textsuperscript{292} Oktay Aslanapa, Turkish Art and Architecture (London, 1971), 100.


\textsuperscript{294} Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 57-58.
commissioned by the Seljuk sultans in Konya displays a concern with the evocation of memories of the glory of past rulers.295

This usage was not limited to the height of Seljuk power, but continued long after the Mongol takeover: two sarcophagi were used as the base of the portal of the mosque, mausoleum, and khānqāh complex (656/1258) of Şâhib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī in Konya (fig. 19). These pieces are both prominently displayed and weaved into a façade otherwise composed of newly carved stone, brick and tile decoration. The question is tempting whether the patron had specific intentions with this use. Structural reasons are of course compelling, yet the (today badly deteriorated) Medusas on the sarcophagus to the right of the entrance may point to an apotropaic function.296

As late as 749/1348, a Greek inscription plaque, turned sideways, was used in the same position on the portal of the Hatuniye Medrese in Karaman (fig. 20). There, the plaque may have come from the nearby Byzantine site of Binbir Kilise, the dating of which scholars have variously placed between the fifth and twelfth centuries.297 This site houses some of the rare Byzantine monuments that are extant in the region, maybe because it is far away from a larger urban center. Nearby Karaman gained importance only in the second quarter of the fourteenth century when local rulers began to challenge Ilkhanid rule.298

Other examples may be less ideologically charged, such as the spoliated columns forming the arcades to both sides of the courtyard of the Buruciye Medrese in Sivas (670/1271-72), and

297 Semavi Eyice, Karadağ (Binbirkilise) ve Karaman çevresinde arkeolojik incelemeler (Istanbul, 1971).
their varying heights and capitals are brought to equal levels by the addition of impost blocks. Rather than a specific quest for meaning, an aesthetic arrangement born out of practical concerns appears likely.

The use of spolia is at times supplemented by newly carved pieces that replicate classical architectural pieces. Thus, on the portals of the Alaeddin Mosque (617/1220-21; fig. 21) and the Karatay Medrese (1220s and 649/1250-51; fig. 22) in Konya, classical capitals are replicated and placed at the top of engaged colonettes. In the Evdir Han near Antalya (612-616/1215-19) the molding below the mugharnas niche on the portal evokes a classical pediment (fig. 23). In the Sahib Ata Hani in Ishaklı near Afyon (647-48/1249-50), a lintel in the small kiosk-mosque in the courtyard is carved with a replica of a classical vegetal motif (fig. 24).299

This phenomenon is not a feature unique to Seljuk Anatolia. In fact, it is more current in northern Syria in the eleventh and twelfth century, where it has been linked with the Sunni revival.300 This phenomenon is connected to the revival of Sunni Islam that began in Northern Syria under the influence of the Great Seljuks in Iran in the late eleventh century, and expanded in the twelfth century, especially under the rule of Nūr al-Dīn Zengī (r. 541-569/1147-1174) who made Aleppo a center of this movement.301 In the context of northern Syria, the use of classical pieces as an inspiration for new carving in connection with this Sunni revival has found opposite interpretations in scholarly literature. Yasser Tabbaa and Julian Raby suggest that it was

____________________

301 Yasser Tabbaa, The Transformation of Islamic art during the Sunni Revival (Seattle, 2001); idem, Constructions of Power and Piety in Medieval Aleppo (University Park, PA, 2007).
the survival of classical architecture in the region that inspired carvers, whereas Terry Allen and J. Michael Rogers argued in favor of a classical revival of these forms.\textsuperscript{302}

The construction of some monuments, such as the Madrasa al-Shuʿaybīya (fig. 25)\textsuperscript{303} in the last years of Nūr al-Dīn Zengī’s rule, and the transformation of a Shiʿite mosque (and former church) into the Madrasa Hallawīya in 543/1122 were most likely part of an anti-Shiite polemic.\textsuperscript{304} In the Māristān Nūrī in Damascus, a classical tympanum was integrated into the doorframe, serving as the lintel in an architecture that is otherwise inspired by monuments in Iraq (fig. 26).\textsuperscript{305} The references to classical architecture have been considered specific to this moment in time, and disappeared with the shift of rule from the Zengids to the Ayyubids. \textit{Muqarnas} niches became a dominant form under Ayyubid rule in the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{306}

\begin{flushright}

303 Today only a section of the building, known as Qaṣṭal al-Shuʿaybiyya, remains. For a full discussion of the monument and its initial form, see Raby, “Nur al-Din,” 297-300.


305 “The Maristan of Nur al-Din in Damascus may be a rare instance in which an antique element was used to evoke a sense of place rather than of time. The reference to Syria enfolded its Greco-Roman past, but in a generalized rather than a specific way. The Qastal al-Shu'aybiyya, by contrast, was intended to evoke a sense of time, in this case the earliest decades of Islam, not a pagan past. In neither instance, though, was a Greco-Roman referent used per se.” Raby, “Nur al-Din,” 305.

306 Allen, \textit{Classical revival}, ix, posits a direct connection is made between changes in rule and those in architecture; For the religious and political background of the passage from Zengid to Ayyubid rule, see: Daniella Talmon-Heller, \textit{Islamic piety in medieval Syria: mosques, cemeteries and sermons under the Zangids and Ayyūbids} (1146-1260) (Leiden and Boston, 2007).

“[…] after the third quarter of the twelfth century, the continuous molding and other archaizing features are generally absent, most likely because after 1170, Aleppo was the capital for an important branch of the Ayyubid dynasty and as such closely related to Damascus, Cairo, and the rest of the Islamic world. Its new architecture was no longer restricted to the local tradition, but could draw on all the forms and images that had begun to define medieval Islamic architecture.” Tabbaa, “Survivals and Archaisms,” 38.
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Examples of this use of classically inspired pieces are concentrated in Aleppo, and remain locally rooted in both style and technique. These local roots have led art historians to consider the style in question provincial in rather negative terms.307

The use of newly carved pieces inspired by classical models in Anatolia fits into this context. In Anatolia, the carving of pieces resembling classical ones has not been remarked upon as a special feature that might have its own theoretical implications. The actual classical pieces reused in Konya, however, have been understood as a reference to the past of the city, specifically referring to ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād’s role as the ruler of Rūm.308 The chronological gap of roughly half a century warrants caution in assuming a direct transfer of the interpretation from Zengid Syria to Seljuk Anatolia, yet it deserves consideration with respect to the notions of memory and historical awareness. The strong reference to, and replication of classical models is not recorded in the written sources. Given how little attention is paid to architecture in medieval sources on Anatolia this is far from surprising. Perhaps, the integration of spolia was such a trivial part of architectural practice that it did not attract specific attention. The city walls of Konya are probably the exception rather than the rule with their extensive program including a multitude of references. More common seem to have been the use of occasional pieces, such capitals and columns that were difficult to find, or the reuse of marble blocks that could be considered a rare material. In these contexts, the transmission of a memory of place or time may

307 “Why the architects of Palestine, Syria, and the Jazīrah should have remained so resistant to foreign influences, even to the architectural styles of Baghdad, the Abbasid capital, is another matter. There is something to be said for the continued separation of brick and stone architectural traditions in Syria and Iraq as a reason for such provincialism; classicism is an example of this separate regional development that particularly strikes the eye.” Allen, Classical Revival, 103. Approaching the issue with a somewhat more positive undertone, Tabbaa suggests that the disconnection between northern Syria and the center in Baghdad between the early ninth and the early eleventh centuries contributed to an independent, if archaizing, development of its architecture: Tabbaa, “Survivals and Archaisms,” 30-33.
308 Raby, “Nur Al-Din,” 305.
have been a factor as well, yet the practical concerns of craftsmen and architects certainly played an important role. Perhaps, the idea of re-carving classical pieces came from northern Syria with one of the moving stone carvers, thus reflecting a memory of artistic agency rather than one of imperial past.

Given the creativity that architects and sculptors used, the inspiration might also quite simply have come from locally found antique pieces, and been copied without necessarily being of any ideological purpose. The wide chronological range of the examples above, as well as their isolated nature, suggests that such a solution is not all that unlikely.

Put in perspective with the use of actual spolia, the copying of pre-Islamic architectural pieces is nevertheless intriguing. The references in copied pieces are to classical rather than Byzantine architecture, maybe for aesthetic purposes. In the use of spolia, however, both Byzantine and classical pieces were reused, suggesting that both references (if they were distinguished at all) had their uses. Perhaps, the classical heritage of Anatolia was of more interest to the Seljuk elite than the Byzantine one, yet on the architectural level, it is unclear whether this preference was political or aesthetic. Combined with the absence of clear references to Byzantine monuments in the shaping of the new Islamic architecture of Anatolia, the intricacies of using or imitating spolia may suggest rather an aesthetic preference.

Along a similar line, the notion of a Sunni revival may not be quite appropriate in thirteenth century Anatolia. At that time, the region was still in the progress of Islamization, with a significant Christian population, and Muslims whose religious practice may not always have fitted exactly into the categories of Sunni or Shi’i. Thus, the religious setting of Anatolia was significantly different from Syria, a region that had been under Muslim rule since the mid-seventh century, and where the revival of Sunnism was a crucial political movement in the
eleventh and twelfth centuries. The notion of ghazā that drove the initial conquest of Anatolia, and persisted for a long time afterwards, had perhaps ideological underpinnings similar to those of the Sunni revival, yet in the end the frontier mentality of the region prevailed, leading to a religious milieu much more diverse than that in Zengid and subsequently Ayyubid Syria.

**Shaping a Seljuk Style?**

Scholars have long argued that the imperial aspirations of the Seljuks in the early thirteenth century translated into architecture. The political and military pursuit to tie Anatolia together more efficiently as a centralized realm went hand in hand with the establishment of infrastructure across the region, reaching from Beyşehir west of Konya to their easternmost stronghold in Erzurum. At the same time, it is implied in the term ‘Seljuk architecture’ that the monuments built over the course of this period were strongly connected to Seljuk rule, a fact that was reflected in their style. This notion of a unified Seljuk style, indicative of imperial aspirations and Seljuk royal patronage, will be under scrutiny in this section. The following analysis of Seljuk patronage, both by the ruling family and by the amīrs affiliated with it, will show that in the complex political and cultural milieu of Anatolia, the agency of craftsmen and architects reached far. Thus, I will argue that in the fluid context of Anatolia, style could develop independently from imperial aspirations.

The frontier milieu of Anatolia is essential in order to understand how the equation between politics and architecture became complicated in the extreme. The presence of various competing groups, including Turkmen nomads, Sufis, and sedentary populations that were in part Muslim, while others remained Christian, created a milieu immune to fixed definitions and
explanations. A central factor that generated this milieu was mobility – on many levels, the impact of people travelling from one place to the other, even across regions, was crucial. As early as the 1220s, many refugees from Central Asia and Iran reached Anatolia as they fled the Mongol advance on their places of origin.\(^{309}\)

Large numbers of scholars were forced to emigrate from Central Asia, and many had to find a new home in Anatolia. The construction of *madrasas* in this region throughout the thirteenth century is quite certainly due to this arrival of highly qualified immigrants who could contribute to the development of Muslim scholarship in Anatolia. This is true for scholars, such as Bahā’ al-Dīn Walad, the father of the Sufi master Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, who established themselves in Anatolia, but also in all likelihood for craftsmen and architects who brought their knowledge with them as they came to a new safe haven. In tracing the trajectories of craftsmen, the lack of pertinent information in written sources is problematic. Thus, the style of monuments and their decoration often is the only point of connection for an analysis of such movements.

**Religious Foundations: Mosques and Madrasas**

The need for monuments – mosques especially, but also *madrasas* – to serve the growing Muslim community created a basic level of construction projects that could accommodate local as well as immigrated craftsmen, and the relative stability and wealth of the region may have been an additional factor of attraction.

Such buildings had probably been built across Anatolia since the initial conquests of the late eleventh century, before the Seljuks established their capital in Konya and expanded their

---

rule, even though the earliest extant examples date to the late twelfth century. Other Muslim
dynasties, including the Saltukids and the Danishmendids, had already created a basic network of
religious buildings such as mosques and madrasas that were required as markers of the extension
of the rule of Islam over the region.

In central and eastern Anatolia, no buildings associated with Muslim patronage remain
from the eleventh or the first half of the twelfth century, maybe because the conquest of Anatolia
at first took the form of raids, rather than of a large scale conquest destined to capture lands and
firmly establish Muslim rule. Only in the region that is today southeastern Turkey, but which
geographically and historically speaking is more closely associated with northern Syria, the
Great Mosque of Diyarbakır (484/1091-92) remains from this period, albeit with later
alterations.310

The earliest surviving mosques in central and eastern Anatolia are the Kale Camii in
Erzurum (late twelfth century; fig. 27) and the Great Mosque in Sivas (593/1197; fig. 18). The
first was probably built under Saltukid patronage, as was the minaret (later transformed into a
clock tower) that stands close by, at the corner of the fortress.311 The Great Mosque in Sivas was
attributed to Danishmendid patronage, until two inscriptions found in 1955 showed that the
patrons of the first (593/1197) and second phases (609/1203) of construction were affiliated
with the Seljuks.312 The Great Mosque in Erzurum is likely to be a Saltukid foundation.313 The
Great Mosque of Niksar may be based on a Danishmendid foundation even though very little of

310 In the same region, the mosques of Siirt (late 11th century?), Bitlis (restored in 455/1150), and Mardin (12th
century) might have earlier elements: Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 93-98.
311 Aslanapa, *Turkish Art*, 100 and 102; Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, *Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville
312 Aslanapa, *Turkish Art*, 100.
this phase has been preserved. The Kölük Mosque in Kayseri was possibly founded by the Danishmendid amīr Yağıbasan (r. 537-559/ 1142-64). The earliest dated inscription on the monument, however, refers to a restoration executed by his grand-daughter Atsız Elti in 607/ 1210, after the city had come under the rule of the Seljuks.

Under the Seljuks of Rūm the network of mosques that was established during the first century of Muslim rule was expanded, both through commissions of new monuments and restorations or transforming existing ones. A major project was the transformation of the Great Mosque of Konya, today known as Alaeddin Mosque (fig. 28). This monument was first built during the twelfth century, possibly at the same date (550/ 1155) as the carved wooden mihrāb that has survived the many transformations of the monument. Sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 616-634/ 1220-1237) during whose rule Seljuk power was at its height, undertook the reconstruction that shaped the building as it stands today.

The mausoleum of ʿIzz al-Dīn Qilidj Arslān II (r. 551-581/ 1156-1185) stands in the courtyard of the mosque, along with another anonymous structure of the same type (fig. 29). An analysis of the foundation inscriptions in the monument shows that the majority of what is preserved today dates to the rules of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs I (r. 608-616/ 1211-1220) and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I. Scott Redford suggested, without pursuing the issue further, that the reconstruction and remodeling began under ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs and was left to be completed
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316 Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 56. Redford suggests that the mosque was initially built in the 1080s on the site of or adjacent a fifth-century Byzantine church, which entirely collapsed along with parts of the mosque in an earthquake in 1202. This lead to a reconstruction of the mosque using a large number of architectural pieces from this church and other Byzantine buildings: Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 60 and 69.
317 An assumption that widely stands even though it has attracted some critique based on recent re-examination of the relevant narrative sources and their bias: Peacock, “Saljūq Campaign,” 133.
under the rule of his successor. Possibly, a more extensive plan to reshape the capital existed, but
remained largely incomplete.\textsuperscript{319} Within the mosque itself, the redecoration of the mausoleum in
which several Seljuk sultans are buried, appears to have been a key element of this project.\textsuperscript{320}
The initial patron of this transformation, ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs, is, however, not buried here.\textsuperscript{321}

I would question that the evidence for the creation of a specifically Seljuk “high style”
as part of this process is really as intentionally steeped in dynastic ideology as Redford suggests.

Some stylistic elements of the Alaeddin Mosque appear also in other monuments of the period:
the bi-chrome stonework (ablaq) appears on the portal of the Karatay Medrese (dated 649/ 1251; fig. 30). Possibly, a portal built as part of the same project as the reconstruction of the mosque,
was later reused in the construction of the madrasa (fig. 31).\textsuperscript{322} This is important in beginning to
understand the association of patronage and rule with style, because it appears that even if the portal was earlier, it was still attractive in the mid-thirteenth century, to a powerful patron, Jalāl
al-Dīn Qaraṭāy, who could certainly have afforded a new portal if he wished to. Still, the portal
may have been constructed newly; as the comparison below will show, the carving is rather more
subtle than on the mosque, and the closest indication of reuse is the rather awkward lettering of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{319} The one piece of evidence cited for this is the fact that the portal of the Karatay Medrese (dated 649/ 1251)
located at the foot of the citadel hill stylistically belongs with the now walled up former main entrance on the west
wall of the Alaeddin Camii, and therefore should have been part of this initial larger urban project, and was later
reused in the construction of the madrasa. Beyond the stylistic analogy, the façade is structurally disconnected from
the mid-thirteenth century body of the madrasa and that the foundation inscription on the portal, despite its date,
may have been tampered with as Redford suggests: Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 69.
\textsuperscript{320} Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 70.
\textsuperscript{321} This ruler’s tomb is located in the hospital that he founded in Sivas in 613/ 1216, today known as the Şifaiye
Medrese. As Redford notes, this burial was most likely an afterthought. The second mausoleum in the courtyard of
the Alaeddin Camii, probably destined for ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs’s tomb, was not ready when the ruler died, and was
subsequently not completed by his brother and successor, who may have intentionally barred his predecessor from
being buried in the capital in retaliation for ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs illegitimate takeover of rule twenty years earlier:
\textsuperscript{322} Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 69-71. Max van Berchem suggest that the inscription was added to an earlier
monument: Max van Berchem and Edmond Fatio, Voyage en Syrie, vol. 1, Mémoires publiés par les membres de
l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire  vol. 37 (Cairo, 1914), 220-221.
\end{flushleft}
the foundation inscription. Overall, the composition of the Karatay Medrese portal is more balanced, forming a rectangular bloc that is neatly delineated by a band of geometric decoration. The west portal (now closed off) of the Alaeddin Mosque lacks such delineation, letting the ornament of the portal merge with the wall. Two parts are nearly identical in both portals: first, the bi-colored stone interlace over the door that has often been remarked upon for its affinity with northern Syrian work of the same period. Second, the molded rectangular doorframe in both monuments is surrounded with a strip of small pointed panels inscribed with phrases in Arabic. On both portals, a lintel in bi-colored stonework forms the transition between the actual doorframe and the ornamental one with the small panels.

The similarities go this far: a detail of the ablaq work is different in the two monuments. In the Karatay Medrese, three half-globes carved in filigree with floral motifs are placed in the middle of the central knot at the apex of the arch, and in the spandrels formed by the arch and the straight lines in black leading away from it. In the zone between the bi-colored stone work and the door frame, the Alaeddin Mosque shows the foundation inscription and a carved pattern of star-interlace. On the Karatay Medrese, the same space is filled with five rows of muqarnas that end in a straight line, rather than in the more common point of a triangle, possibly to accommodate the muqarnas cells in the shallow four-centered arch below the interlace.

In the Alaeddin Mosque, the engaged colonnettes that are placed to the sides of the doorframe are marked with a zigzag pattern. On the Karatay Medrese, these same colonnettes show a spiral motif, and the capitals are carefully carved replicas of classical pieces. Despite their decorative function, these colonnettes appear as if they support the Qur’anic inscription that runs between the outer geometric frame and the base of the section of the ablaq interlace that
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323 The text in the small panels consists of short-hand references to hadith. Usually two panels together form a key passage that refers to a longer quote: Mehmet Eminoğlu, Karatay Medresesi yazı incileri (Konya, 1999), 10-41.
forms the central arch. Between colonettes, inscription, and outer frame, panels of chevron pattern tie the composition together. At the top of the portal, above the ablaq, runs the foundation inscription which, in its rather clumsy calligraphy has led to the issue of changes applied to it being raised.324

The fact that a very similar portal was used on two different types of monuments, a mosque and a madrasa, is to some extent illustrative of the diversity of architecture in this earlier period. Even though certain elements such as muqarnas were widely used, standardization had not set in. Thus, a similar portal could be used on monuments of different purpose, yet at the same time, the function of a monument did not determine its decoration. This is apparent in the construction of madrasas throughout of the first half of the thirteenth century.

As soon as Muslim Turkic rulers began to take hold in Anatolia, they commissioned madrasas along with mosques; few early examples have survived.325 The Yağı-basan Medrese, also known as Çukur Medrese, in Tokat (fig. 32) and the eponymous monument in Niksar were both built between 1140 and 1160 by Malik Yağı-basan b. Amīr Ghāzī Gümüşhtigin (r. 537-559/1142-1164), the Danishmendid ruler of the region.326 The madrasa in Tokat is now heavily restored, but the wide stone dome with an open oculus in the center remains. The shape of the dome precedes that of later examples in brick, such as the Karatay Medrese (649/1251) and the İnce Minareli Medrese (ca. 1250) in Konya. In structure, they are different in that the transition from the square base to the circle of the dome is executed with so-called Turkish triangles in the

examples in Konya, whereas in the Yağı-basan Medrese, squinches take this place. The Yağı-basan Medrese in Niksar is in ruins, yet appears to have been similar in plan and elevation. The only other fragment of an eleventh-century madrasa may be at the back wall of the Gök Medrese in Tokat, a monument otherwise constructed in the thirteenth century.327 There a few fragments of what appears to be stucco (fig. 33), in a style that in Iran would be associated with the late eleventh century, that are visible in the back wall of the main īwān.

The identification of Seljuk patronage with championship for Sunni Islam is based on early twentieth-century studies of the formation of madrasa architecture in Iran beginning in the eleventh century. There, this development is generally attributed to the defenses that the Great Seljuks built up against Ismailism, most notably against the Būyid viziers who had all but taken over the caliphate, and whom Ṭughril Beg defeated with the conquest of Baghdad in 447/1055.328 As discussed before, the bearing of the Sunni revival on architecture in Anatolia is far less clear than in Syria, yet the number of madrasas built throughout the first half of the thirteenth century may be a further indication of the relevance of this question. The Seljuks of Rūm, as a dynasty harking back to the Great Seljuk rulers, have been automatically assumed to have taken on their predecessors’ role as champions of Sunnism, on the level of both institutional and architectural patronage. Even for the architectural references to Northern Syria that were used on Seljuk monuments in Anatolia, a conscious evocation of the region where the Sunni revival was especially strong has been suggested.329 At first sight, the great number – over 40 –

327 ibrahim Numan and ışık aksulu do not mention this, but suggests that a hospital was located adjacent to the tomb chamber: İbrahim Numan and ışık aksulu, “Tokat Gök Medrese Darü’-s-Sülehası’nın Restitüsyonu.” In: Çiğdem Kafescioğlu and Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (eds.) Aptullah Kuran için yazilar (İstanbul, 1999), 43-53.
328 peacock, early seljuk history, 119-121.
329 “It was not, then, the exuberance of Iranian stucco work translated into stone, nor Iranian Seljuk styles in tie and brickwork that were chosen by the Rum Seljuks. Instead, the pious architecture of Sunni Syria served as the model for this style.” Redford, “The Alaeddin Mosque,” 71.
of thirteenth-century madrasas that have survived in Anatolia suggest that this was actually the case, yet closer investigation shows that clear conclusions are difficult to draw because of diverse patronage.

Upon closer inspection, only few of the surviving madrasas were sponsored by a Seljuk sultan. The Şifaiye Medrese in Sivas (fig. 34) built in 614/1216-17, was founded as a hospital (dār al-shifā’). Even though medicine may have been taught there, the building was not reassigned to the teaching of Islamic law and theology until the sixteenth century. The waqfiya, dated 617/1220 defines the function of the monument as medical, referring to it as ma ’wā ‘l-mardā, a shelter of the sick. In terms of its architecture, the structure is alike to that of several extant madrasas, with four īwāns arranged around an open courtyard, and a salient portal with muqarnas and surrounding frames with geometric decoration. Only the mausoleum of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs, built into one of the īwāns and marked by a star-shaped brick dome decorated with tiles distinguishes the monument from such teaching institutions.

330 In the report of an excavation conducted in 1937, Sedat Çetintaş suggests that a madrasa, now destroyed, was connected to the north side of the monument: Sedat Çetintaş, Sivas Darüşşifası (Istanbul, 1953), 69-71, and plan sketch in fig. 27. This suggestion, if substantiated, would make the monument a double madrasa and hospital foundation akin to the Çifte Medrese in Kayseri, founded in 609/1205. In 1938, Çetintaş attempted to get funding from the Turkish Ministry of Culture in order to substantiate his theory while working on the restoration of other monuments in Sivas (among them the Gök Medrese). He was given a small amount of money (100 lira) and proceeded to do a sondage, yet was unable to conduct a full excavation due to lack of funding. Çetintaş, Sivas Darüşşifası, 72-95 for letters submitted to the Ministry of Culture in order to obtain more funding, and the results of the sondage conducted in 1938 (esp. Plans on pp. 82-83 and elevation on p. 84, photographs of the excavation on pp. 86-93). No further archaeological work has been published to my knowledge, and the fact that at the hand of the Sivas municipal administration, the area around the Şifaiye Medrese and the neighboring Çifte Minareli Medrese and Buruciye Medrese (both dated 670/1271-72) has recently (between 2008 and 2010) turned into a park paved-over with stone slabs makes further investigation unlikely. The restoration of the Şifaiye Medrese was ongoing during my last visit in July 2010 and access to the monument impossible.

331 “Sivas,” İslam Ansiklopedisi. Çetintaş suggests that the madrasa was destroyed in the eighteenth century and the hospital converted into a madrasa (used as such until 1332/1914): Çetintaş, Sivas Darüşşifası, 108-110.

Only two extant madrasas were founded by Seljuk sultans or members of their family. The Çifte Medrese in Kayseri (602/1205) is the older one (fig. 35). This double building consisting of madrasa and hospital was founded from the estate of Gawhar Nasība Sultān, a sister of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw I, as is evident in the foundation inscription:

“During the days of the great sultan Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn Kaykhusraw b. Qilij Arslān the construction of this hospital was decided in the testament of the queen Ḥaymat al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn Gawhar Naṣība, daughter of Qilij Arslān, may God please them, in the year 602.”

The patron named in the inscription may have been responsible only for the hospital section, cited in the inscription, while her brother may have commissioned the madrasa. This attribution is based on a local tradition that refers to the madrasa section of the monument as ‘Ghiyāthīya’. The madrasa section does not have its own foundation inscription, and the connecting walls suggest that both parts were built at or around the same time.

The Huand Hatun Medrese in Kayseri (633-35/1236-38) is part of a complex (fig. 36) including a mosque, the tomb of the founder, and bath, commissioned by Māhperī Sultān Khātūn, the mother of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II. The madrasa, today used as a cultural center, is connected to the mosque by a small enclosure that contains the tomb of the founder (fig. 37). The decoration of the madrasa portal is rather simple, with a muqarnas hood under a segmental arch accentuated with narrow bands of vegetal motifs (fig. 38). A broad geometric frame, now badly deteriorated, forms a rectangular frame around the salient part of the portal,

---

337 Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, II: 39-41; For the foundation inscription, see: *RCEA*, No. 4146.
and is flanked by engaged columns on the corners. Overall, the architecture and decoration of the complex are designed as an ensemble; even today, as it is located on a busy thoroughfare across Kayseri, the unified impression of the façade remains.

All other extant madrasas that were built in Anatolia in the thirteenth century (both in its first and second half) were the result of non-royal patronage, often involving high-ranking amīrs of the Seljuk court. It has been suggested that the sultans exploited the wealth available to their amīrs by ordering them to carry out large-scale construction projects that the treasury could not afford. The instance in which complaints are documented concerns the reconstruction of city walls, yet similar processes of order and construction may have been in place for other types of buildings. This does not leave much room for pious patronage by the Seljuk rulers, especially since the number of madrasas that were built before 639/1243, the date after which royal patronage apparently ceased, is limited. The examples that have survived are: the Battal Gazi Medrese in Seyyitgazi (after 604/1207-08), the Boyalıköy Medrese in Sincarlı near Afyon (607/1210?), the Ertokuş Medrese near İsparta (621/1224?), the Saraceddin Medrese in Kayseri (636/1238), and the Sırçalı Medrese in Konya (639/1242-43; fig. 39).

The waqfıyas of several madrasas have been preserved, and the foundations of the amīrs took provisions for descendants, appointing them mutawallī (overseer, administrator) of the waqf and stipulating what was to happen in the event one line of the family died out. The

338 Such involvement of the amīrs at the order of the ruler is recorded for the construction of city walls. At times, the cost of the project exceeded even their means, leading to a refusal to carry out such construction: Howard Crane, “Notes on Saljūq Architectural Patronage in 13th century Anatolia,” JESHO 36.1 (1993): 8-11.
339 The number of madrasas that were founded surged after the Mongol incursions; the reasons for this and the patrons in question will be discussed in chapter 3.
340 For a detailed study of this monument with its later uses and transformations, see: Zeynep Yürekli, “Legend and Architecture in the Ottoman Empire - The Shrines of Seyyid Gazi and Hacı Bektas,” PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2005, esp. chapters 2 and 3.
341 Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, map between pp. 147 and 148.
sultans, on the other hand, do not seem to have founded *waqf ahlī*, endowments for the benefit of the family of the founder. In legal terms, this would have been permissible, if one supposes that the Seljuk sultans adhered to the Ḥanafī *madhhab* (school of law). Considering relevant sources for the Great Seljuks in Iran, it is likely that the same *madhhab* prevailed among their Anatolian descendents. The only sources relevant to this issue are precisely the *waqfiyas* of *madrasas*, in which a preference for the *madhhab* that the *mudarris* should adhere to is at times expressed. In known examples, the *madhhab* named is Ḥanafī. Thus, the *waqfiya* of the Karatay Medrese in Konya (649/1251) in Konya states:

“And he [the founder] stipulated that the *mudarris* should be Ḥanafī, knowledgeable in the arts of the sciences of *sharʿiya* (Islamic law) and *ḥadīth* (traditions of the Prophet) and exegesis, and theoretical and applied law and disputation.”

This statement is close to the condition that the founder of the Āltūn Aba Medrese in Konya (598/1202) stated that fifty years earlier:

“[the founder stipulated that] the *mudarris* in this above-mentioned *madrasa* may not be admitted to teaching unless he is of the Ḥanafī *madhhab*, and equally the *imām* who prays with the community in the abovementioned *madrasa*.”

---

342 “One striking exception [to the absence of *waqf ahlī* endowed by sultans] seems appears to be hospitals, doubtless on the original inspiration of Nūr al-Dīn’s re-foundation or re-endowment of the Aleppo Hospital (569/1174) or the even more famous Māristān al-Nūrī at Damascus (549/1154), notably that of Kaykāʾūs I at Sivas (614/1217-18) and that of Aḥmad Shāh at Divriği (626/1228 onwards), though this latter was built well before the absorption of the Mangǔjükid principality by the Seljuks. Kayqubād I also restored or rebuilt the Citadel Mosque [probably referring to Konya, but the lack of references for this passage leaves it unclear], though whether this was because it was already the royal cemetery, or because he determined that it should be, or for some undisclosed reason remains to be decided. Madrasas and the like, other hospitals, khānqāhs and other foundations were left to their emirs or their viziers; carelessness rather than policy, at least in the light of the evidence to date.” J. Michael Rogers, “Royal Caravansarays and Royal Inscriptions in Seljuk Anatolia,” Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi – In Memoriam Prof. Albert Louis Gabriel (1978): 405-406.


Just as the Mongols began to take hold of Anatolia, the foundation inscription of the Sirçalı Medrese in Konya states that the scholars to be employed in it should be of the Ḥanafī madhhab:

“The Sultanic! Badr al-Dīn Muṣliḥ, may God extend his prosperity, pining for the grace of his lord, ordered the construction of this blessed madrasa during the rule of the greatest sultan, the shadow of God in the world Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn, highest of Islam and of the Muslims, the father of conquest Kaykusraw b. Kayqubād, associate of the prince of believers. He [the patron] endowed it [the madrasa] for the scholars and students of law among the followers of Abū Ḥanīfa ‘l-Nuʿmān [the founder of the Ḥanafī madhhab] may God be pleased with him, in the year 640 [1243].”

Such mentions of a single madhhab to be admitted in a madrasa were the usual way of stating a preference in medieval Anatolia. Only in one case, reflecting the period discussed in Chapter Three, the mudarris could be a Shāfiʿī if no qualified Ḥanafī scholar was present in the city at the time of appointment. In the light of the evidence discussed above, it is fair to state that the construction of madrasas was far from being a priority for the Seljuk sultans. Even the most prolific patron among the Seljuk sultans, ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I, did not sponsor any known madrasa. Thus, the main interest of imperial patronage must have lain elsewhere.


347 In the Gök Medrese in Sivas (waqfiya dated 679/1280), Bayram and Karabacak, “Sahip Ata Fahrūddin Ali’nin Konya İmaret ve Sivas Gök Medrese Vakfiyeleri,” 53. For details on the document, VGM 604-67-90, see Chapter Three.
Consolidating Trade: Caravanserais

As the discussion of religious foundations above has shown, these structures were not a direct priority of Seljuk patronage. Another type of monument, however, was of central interest: caravanserais, connected to securing trade routes and thus access to economic resources, were systematically built in the early thirteenth century. The largest enterprise in terms of establishing infrastructure throughout the first half of the thirteenth century was the construction of a network of caravanserais in order to facilitate trade overland across Anatolia. From the 1220s to the 1240s, a large number of these structures, designed to accommodate merchants and their caravans on the way from Iran to western Anatolia, were commissioned. Networks for trade and travel were established early on as part of the creation of an infrastructure to connect Anatolia to Iran and to regions further east. Two major trade routes crossed Anatolia. The first one started out in Samsun and Sinop on the Black Sea, continued through Amasya and Tokat to the central Anatolian cities of Sivas and Kayseri, finally reaching Konya. The second route provided a connection with Iran, through Erzurum and Erzincan to Sivas, where the two routes crossed. These routes persisted under Mongol rule, and were even expanded.348 The Mongols, once they had firmly established their hold on Iran, emphasized routes focusing on Tabriz, especially the one leading from Ayas on the Cilician coast in southern Turkey to Kayseri, Sivas, Erzurum, and then to Azerbaijan (via Khuy, Erçis, Malazgirt).349

As suggested before, a clear preference for a certain region, mostly in the orbit of Konya, Kayseri, and on the Mediterranean in Alanya and Antalya, is visible in the patronage of the Seljuk sultans. The same is true for the locations of caravanserais. The construction of

caravanserais peaked in the early thirteenth century when the Seljuk sultans purposefully
sponsored these way stations along the main trade routes in order to foster commerce with
surrounding regions. Yet, the notion that the Seljuk sultans consciously aimed at establishing a
network of trade all over Anatolia has not remained uncontested: J. Michael Rogers has pointed
out that the foundations sponsored by the sultans are for the most part located close to Konya,
and that royal intervention in the creation of this network should not be overestimated. In
extending the chronological perspective across the thirteenth century, Rogers certainly makes a
valid point. If one is, however, to concentrate on the period before the Mongol invasions, the
picture certainly changes in favor of direct intervention by the Seljuk rulers, at least relatively
speaking compared to the limited patronage of mosques and madrasas.

In these caravanserais, the beginning formation of what may have been intended to
become a uniform Seljuk style expressing imperial aspirations can be detected. This is arguably
the most visibly “imperial” architectural enterprise that the Seljuks undertook, since it unified
Anatolia as a region for trade, facilitated travel, and in times of conflict could serve as defensive
structures. In visual terms, these structures with their prominent portals, limited to a few types
that were often used, are the closest that the Seljuks came to the definition of a stylistic idiom
closely associated with imperial connotations. A discussion of specific examples will analyze the
connection between the construction of caravanserais, Seljuk “royal” patronage, and the
beginning emergence of an “imperial” style.

Indeed, one may argue that the very definition of Seljuk style is based on these buildings
rather than on the more varied mosques and madrasas. Since hardly any madrasas that were
built before 639/1243 remain standing – the Sırçalı Medrese, built that same year, being an

350 Rogers, “Royal Caravansarays,” 400-401.
exception – they do not offer the material needed for such a discussion. For caravanserais, however, earlier examples survive, thus presenting the perfect case study for an account that aims at constructing a parallel between the rise of the Seljuks, an establishment of infrastructure, and the creation of a uniform style reflective of rule. The conclusion that tendencies towards a unified stylistic idiom may be observed in the caravanserais warrants some caution. If we consider only those caravanserais that were certainly built under royal patronage, and before the Mongol invasion of 639/1243, some points may be emphasized that support such an argument. Since the present line of investigation is to pursue the possible establishment of a unified Seljuk royal or imperial style, I will consider this category of monuments before expanding towards a comparative approach that includes foundations by non-royal patrons.

In Erdmann’s list of surviving caravanserais, eight of those constructed before 639/1243 were built by Seljuk sultans; this appears to be a small proportion of the 48 buildings of this type that survive from this period. Considering, moreover, that the patrons of nineteen of the monuments in question are not known, there remains ample room for an effort by the Seljuk sultans to establish an infrastructure for trade. Such an endeavor became especially important once the port cities of Antalya and Sinop had become part of the realm. The caravanserais with inscriptions indicating a Seljuk sultan as the patron are few. The Evdir Han near Antalya, was built under the patronage of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs I in 611-616/1215-19 according to an

---


352 Erdmann, Das anatolische Karavansaray, vol. II-III: 204-205; Rogers suggests that the epithet “al-sulṭānī” used in the inscriptions of several monuments, among them five caravanserais, dated between 620/1223-24 and 640/1242 may point to their status as part of an official network, even though their patrons were non-royal. Rogers, perhaps excessively so, cautions further that the evidence is not entirely conclusive, and not sufficient to presume the existence of a state-sponsored system of caravanserais: Rogers, “Royal Caravansarays,” 398-401.
inscription that is now lost. Under the rule of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 616-633/1219-1236) were built: Sultan Han near Aksaray (626/1229), the Alara Han between Antalya and Alanya (629/1231), and the Sultan Han near Kayseri (ca. 1232-1236 CE). The İncir Han near İsparta (636/1238-39) was built under the patronage of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II (r. 634-644/1237-1246). The same sultan may also have been responsible for the construction of the roughly contemporary Kırkgöz Han. The Hatun Han in Pazar near Tokat (fig. 40) was built in 636/1238-39 by Māhperī Sultan Khātūn, a wife of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I and the mother of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II. The inscription clearly states her patronage:

“This day the greatest sultan [and great khāqān, the shadow of God in the world, Ghiyāth al-Dunyā] waʾl-Dīn, the father of conquest, Kaykhusraw son of the felicitous sultan Kayqubād, associate of the prince of believers, the queen of good, the purity of world and religion, the mother of the sultan Māhberī Khātūn ordered the construction of this blessed khān in the year 636.”

A further six caravanserais can be attributed to this patron, although not all of them with certainty. Beginning with an analysis of the portals, an architectural feature has often been at


[354] Erdmann attributes the building to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II: Erdmann, Das anatolische Karavansaray, Teil I – Text, cat. 29, p. 110. Branning cautions against this attribution on the grounds that the foundation inscription is fragmentary, and may simply refer to the fact that the building was constructed during the rule of this sultan: http://www.turkishhan.org/kirkgoz.htm, accessed 16 November 2010. Redford provides a new reading of the foundation inscription that identifies ʿIṣmat al-Dunyā waʾl-Dīn, a wife of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād, as the patron: Redford, “The Inscription of the Kırkgöz Hani,” 352-356.


[357] According to Erdmann, Mahperī Khātūn may have sponsored the following caravanserais: the Cimcimli (or Çiçenli) Sultan Han (1239-40?), the Çekereksu Han (1239-40?), the Tahtoba Han (1238-46?), the İbibsa Han (1238-46?), the Çiftlik Han (1238-40?) and the Ezinepazar Han (1238-40?): Erdmann, Das anatolische Karavansaray, II-III: 205 with references to the catalog numbers in vol. I. Out of these buildings, only the Cimcimli (or Çiçenli) Sultan Han (1239/40) is directly connected to Mahperī Sultan Khātūn through fragments of a foundation inscription in her name in a nearby mosque that might have belonged to the caravanserais: Erdmann, Das anatolische Karavansaray, Teil I – Text, cat. 37, p. 141-142.
the center of reflections on the style of Seljuk architecture, several points are notable. Not all of these royal foundations display the salient portal block with a doorway surmounted by muqarnas at the center that has been deemed typical of Seljuk architecture. The Sultan Han near Aksaray (fig. 41) and its namesake near Kayseri (fig. 42) both have this feature, the latter example even on the portal to the courtyard and that to the hall. This is a rare instance because in many buildings the interior portal leading to the covered section of the caravanserai or to a second courtyard is decorated in a different and often simpler way. The earlier examples, namely the Alay Han and the Evdir Han both have muqarnas portals; at the Alay Han, however, only the portal that led into the covered hall has been preserved, while the portal of the courtyard along with the rest of this section is no longer extant.

The other examples have different solutions for the portal. In the Alara Han (fig. 43), a simple inscription panel is placed under a horseshoe arch, whereas otherwise the façade with its fortified aspect, including crenellations, is devoid of ornament. In the Hatun Han (fig. 40) the doorway is at the center of a salient portal block, and placed under a pointed arch. Only few fragments of frames with geometric ornament, and a few rows of muqarnas to the sides of the portal niche can be made out in the previously ruined, but now restored monument. The İncir Han (fig. 44) presents a unique solution in which the arch that provides an outer framing device for the doorway is scalloped, and to each side, a sculpted lion with a sun above his back, an astrological motif frequently used in Persianate art, is lurking towards the entrance.

The evidence presented above shows that at least in the most monumental ones among the caravanserais founded by the Seljuk sultans, the use of muqarnas on portals prevailed. The presence of other alternatives, and the small number of preserved monuments, make a firm conclusion difficult, but overall, the connection that has been made between such portals and
royal Seljuk patronage may have sprung from an observation of caravanserais rather than other types of monuments. The use of this type of portal first and foremost on larger, wealthier foundations – among them those sponsored by the sultans or their relatives – may have resulted from the expense involved in its construction. The difficulty of the carving of *muqarnas*, and the resulting cost for hiring craftsmen skilled in this technique was considerable, explaining perhaps why it was limited to such buildings. The hierarchy between patrons, however, was certainly another factor in the decision to choose a type of portal: thus, a low-ranking amīr could not easily aspire to use the same type of monumental and intricately decorated portal as the sultan, yet some of the most influential officials at court could, if not build on the same scale, reach quite closely. Moreover, distance to the capital, both in hierarchical and logistical terms, can explain why the foundations in relative vicinity of Konya were generally constructed with more elaborate portals.

In contrast to the lavish royal foundations, many of the smaller caravanserais built by non-royal patrons, are utilitarian in appearance, often built of uncut stone for the most part, and with very little decoration. In the Çakallı Han (ca. 1237-44) in the region of Samsun, for instance, only a narrow band of zigzag carving adorns the doorframe (fig. 45).

The Karatay Han (fig. 46) in the region of Kayseri illustrates the point just made on the expense of constructing *muqarnas* portals. Construction of the caravanserai was begun either by or under the rule of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (616-633/ 1219-1236). During this initial phase of construction, the covered section was built. After the death of the sultan, construction was possibly interrupted for a few years until the project was revived by Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy, a powerful vizier of the Seljuk court, in 638/ 1241. Under his patronage, the courtyard was added to the foundation and a mausoleum was constructed; the latter is heavily decorated with tiles and
a carved frieze showing animals (fig. 47). Only the outside portal presents a salient portal block with frames that surround a *muqarnas* hood placed over the actual doorway. The ornament on the frames is mostly geometric. The portal of the covered section is again salient, yet with a simple pointed arch creating the frame for the doorway.

The size and wealth of the foundation were not lost on medieval observers. Writing about the campaign that the Mamluk sultan Baybars (r. 658-675/1260-1277) undertook into Anatolia in 676/1277, the Syrian chronicler Ibn Faḍl-allāh al-ʿUmarī (d. 740/1349) described the monument:

“[…] then we arrived at a *khān* that there is known by [the name of] Qaraṭāy, pointing to the merit of the high-mindedness of its builder; he sought the merit of God the Almighty, and it [the *khān*] is among the greatest buildings in its wealth and size, and the most beautiful of [buildings] by its form and location. The entire building is [built] of carved and polished red stone, namely marble (*rukhām*), and on the exterior of its walls and columns [are] designs (*nuqūsh*), the semblance of which cannot be drawn by pen. Outside its door it [the *khān*] has a kind of courtyard (*rabāḍ*) with two doors, fortified walls, and a tiled floor, [surrounded by] shops (*ḥawānīt*). The doors of the *khān* are of the best iron and inside it [offers] shelter for summer and places and stables for winter. Man is not capable of describing it [adequately], and all that is in it refreshes the traveler in summer or winter. [The *khān*] contains bath, hospital, medications, beds and shelter; hospitality [is available] for every traveler to according to his rank. [The *khān*] extended hospitality to the sultan when he passed by. So many people accrued, that [the offers of hospitality] reached neither all of them, nor him [the sultan]. [The *khān*] has huge endowments (*awqāf*) and many landed estates around it and in other regions; it has account books (*dawāwīn*) and scribes, and ‘managers’ (*mubāshirūn*) who administer the spending and disbursement of its possessions. The Mongols (*al-tatār*) did not undertake the destruction of its vestiges and left it untouched to the benefits of praise. The people of Rūm went to great lengths in deference to its builder – may God have mercy upon him – and in his glorification.”

---

358 The addition of a mausoleum to a caravanserai is unique. Erdmann notes that the room contains a cenotaph, and suggests that the founder was buried here: Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansary*, I: 121-122 and 124. More likely, Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy was buried in the mausoleum in his *madrasa* in Konya, built in 649/1251: Turan, “Selçuklu devri vakfiyeleri III - Celâleddîn Karatay,” 42-43.

This admiring description of the Karatay Han is a quite rare instance in which a medieval
writer actually comments in detail on the features of a monument. Clearly, the monumentality
of the architecture, but also the carefully planned arrangement of its infrastructure impressed al-
ʿUmarī, or rather his source. This report also shows respect for the achievement of a patron well-
known for his charity and, not surprisingly for a writer living in Mamluk lands, wariness with
regard to the Mongols.

The latter, as the following chapters will show, increasingly took over rule over Anatolia
since 1240s, and with their involvement contributed to a transformation of the architectural
landscape. Most notably, the arrival of the Mongols rendered the Seljuk sultans nearly powerless
and ended their role as architectural patrons. This change may, however, have been less
traumatic than often stated, since the overview of mosque, madrasas, and caravanserais built up
to 1240 shows how little was sponsored by the rulers themselves. Moreover, it has become clear
that the architecture was quite varied in general, both among those monuments that resulted from
royal commissions and those who were constructed in the name of affiliates to the court. This
rich vocabulary of style that came together was to some extent an early consequence of the
Mongol conquest, even though rather of that of Central Asia and Iran, leading craftsmen to flee
to safer lands, than that, three decades later, of Anatolia.

an yuʿabbira ʿanhā bi-kayfin wa-mā minhā illā mā yujaddidu ʿl-musāfira (riḥlata ʿl-shitāʾi wa-l-ṣayfi) wa-fihī ʿl-
ḥamāmu wa-l-maristānu wa-l-adwiyatu wa-l-farashu wa-l-īwānī wa-l-ḍiyāfatu li-kulli tāriqīn alā qadrihi wa-
ḥamala ilā ʿl-sulṭāni [min diyāfatihi] lamā marra ʿalayhi wa-kathara ʿl-nāsu fa-mā wasala aḥadun ilayhā wa-lā
ilayhi wa- ʿalayhi awqāfun ṣāḥbatun wa-ḍiyāʾun kathīratun ḥawlahu wa-fī ghayrihi mina ʿl-bilādi wa-lahū
dawāwīnun wa-mubāshiruna yataballūna istikhrāja amwālihi wa-l-infāqi fihi wa- lam tataʿarrad ʿl-
tatāru lā iḥṭāli shayʿ in min rusūmihi wa-abqūhu ʿalā ʿawāʾidi takrīmihi wa-ahu l-rūmi yubālighūna fi tabjīli bānīhi
raḥimahī ʿl-lāhu wa-taʿẓīmihi.” My transcription and translation after Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-
A German translation, based on an earlier Turkish translation, can be found in Erdmann, Das anatolische
Karavansaray, I: 117-118.
These movements were crucial in the creation of much of the architecture that is the subject of the following chapters, and deserves attention equally for its place in the fluid milieu of frontier culture that shaped the period. The trade-networks that connected Anatolia to surrounding regions and the relative security of caravanserais as way-stations on overland journeys may have enabled artisans and workmen to reach Asia Minor more easily than ever before. This mobility was beneficial to patrons in Anatolia, despite the difficulties of added population pressure.

Architectural evidence in Konya shows that workmen trained in northern Syria participated on the construction of the Alaeddin Mosque and of the portal of the Karatay Medrese in the 1220s. The prosperity of the city in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, and the possibilities for employment that its patrons offered, was certainly attractive to craftsmen from neighboring regions. This corroborates Michael Meinecke’s observation that craftsmen travelled to those regions where wealthy patrons interested in their services were present and willing to extend new commissions. The economic need for well-paid commissions would lead individual craftsmen or even entire workshops to move far from their place of origin, seek out wealthy courts that dispensed patronage, and to move on – back to their home or even farther on to new patrons – if shifts in power or economic affected the market.³⁶⁰

The movement during this period is likely to have been one-directional, from east to west, since the western regions of Asia were both safer, and offered new opportunities for patronage in the form of the Seljuks, Artuqids, and Ayyubids. After the initial shock of the Mongol conquests, the relative peace of the so-called Pax Mongolica ultimately provided better conditions for travel. The impact of this aspect of Mongol imperial culture on Anatolia, however,

might have been rather marginal due to the peripheral position of the region within the imperial Mongol system, as Chapter Five will show.

Thus, style becomes associated to a great extent with the movements of craftsmen and workshops, the exchange along trade routes, and only in second line with the intentions of a patron or dynasty. A discussion of ‘Seljuk’ style based on the monuments discussed in this chapter will further illustrate this point. The monuments discussed so far show that a diverse range of features and types was used in terms of plans, façade features, and decoration. Considering the main entrance of monuments, this observation goes to a certain extent counter to the current assumption that Seljuk architecture was primarily associated with a specific type of portal.361

It has been argued that the architectural style established under Seljuk rule, especially the use of high, projecting portals with inscriptions and ornamental frames, and muqarnas above the doorway, remained in place even after Seljuk power had begun to decline.362 Thus, the new post-Seljuk patrons would have adopted the same style in their buildings, possibly for its established reference to the dynasty in place, thereby adhering to what Wolper refers to as the “shared topos of the Seljuk portal”.363 The implied assumption of a unified style directly associated with Seljuk dynastic aspirations is striking in the following definition of a typical portal:

“The most common style of portal found on Anatolian buildings in the thirteenth and early fourteenth century is known as the Seljuk style portal. Typically, Seljuk style portals are rectangular shaped. They project from the building facade and have a recessed doorway surmounted by a pointed hood made of stalactite niches (muqarnas). Lateral niches, engaged piers, and acanthus flowers often frame the molding of the portal. Inscriptions are placed in the rectangular space between the doorway arch and the muqarnas hood. Variations on this basic composition take a number of forms. Sometimes there is molding between the muqarnas hood and the square portal while, at other times, there is an unmediated transition between the muqarnas hood and the top of the portal. Other deviations within this pattern are building material, script style, and the articulation of the outer doorway frame.”\(^{364}\)

This uniform definition somewhat contradicts Wolper’s earlier assertion that portals, even though the most prominent feature of monuments built under Seljuk patronage, can be varied in shape.\(^{365}\) While compelling in its quest to find an interpretative approach to Seljuk architecture beyond the standard typologies of building plans and portals that have been established, the connection between façade structure and rule is somewhat less convincing. Even assuming that the population could have identified the semantic vocabulary of the portals with Seljuk rule, it is not quite clear what precisely would have allowed for this if not the inscriptions on the portals themselves.

As the discussion of a range of monuments in this chapter has shown, however, there is no direct connection between the rank of the patron of a monument and the shape and style of its portal. Certain features do appear on many caravanserais, such as the fortified aspect of the facades, and of the building in general. This military appearance may be due to the often isolated locations of these monuments destined to offer safe lodgings for travelers between on the road between cities. The round corner buttresses, and the decorative rather than functional half-towers, that structure the lateral facades were part of this same scheme.

\(^{365}\) Wolper, “Portal Patterns,” 66.
Beyond these common features, the architecture of medieval Anatolia is diverse, yet in discussions of ‘the Seljuk portal’ a certain type is privileged, even though as the preceding discussion has shown, it by no means dominates other types. The scheme in questions involves a salient block at the center of one façade, forming the portal. The doorway is usually relatively low compared to the total height of the portal block and walls. Over the doorway, a triangle adorned with *muqarnas* cells rises upwards along the central axis of the façade. The remainder of the portal block is decorated with carved bands that frame the doorway and accentuate the salient part of the façade. The decoration on the frames varies, although in the first half of the thirteenth century, the emphasis is on geometric patterns whereas vegetal motifs are relatively rare.

This type of portal was used only in few caravanserais of the first half of the thirteenth century, including the Sultan Han near Aksaray (fig. 41), its namesake near Kayseri (fig. 42), and the Karatay Han (fig. 46). The same motifs are used to accentuate certain features in the interior, such as the mosque-kiosk in the courtyard of the Sultan Han near Aksaray (fig. 48).

It may appear somewhat puzzling why a move towards a unified aspect would have taken place on these buildings, rather than on ones with a religious function. The conversion of the population of Anatolia to Islam was not, however, a central issue of Seljuk politics. Possibly, the promotion of trade, safe travel, and the security of roads seemed like a more effective means to tie together the realm. As the preceding discussion has shown, the construction of portals is not at all as unified as we have been led to believe.
Conclusion

If the course of history had not taken a different turn, the Seljuks might have further developed their architectural style towards a unified expression of imperial rule. As the architectural evidence stands, however, they were still far from achieving such an imperial vocabulary when aspirations were cut short by the invading Mongols.

I would argue that rather than redefining architecture, changes in rule led to small nuances in style. Those were connected to the movements of new craftsmen attracted by wealthy patrons. In large parts, the stylistic choices as such were governed by aesthetic rather than political motives, even in the decisions of patrons that influenced construction. The correlation between changes of rule and movements of craftsmen that Meinecke suggested are part of such an arrangement, yet the patrons still played a role in choosing who would work on their construction sites, and prescribing elements of the construction. Thus, the agency of both patrons and craftsmen ultimately affected architectural style. Such an argument admits the possibility of variants within the ‘Seljuk style,’ taking a step away from the monolithic presentation that can often be observed in scholarship on the architecture of medieval Anatolia. The latter may be rooted historiographically, in the desire to present the Seljuks of Rûm as a Turkic dynasty with imperial aspirations expressed in architecture. In reaching beyond this nationalist historiography, it is most important to emphasize the heterogeneous character of medieval Anatolia, apparent in its architecture that defies classification along the lines of a uniform dynastic style. In this context, the assumption of a connection between rule and style should be avoided since it imposes a framework according to which artistic agency and mobility are marginalized.
Perhaps more striking than the absence of a narrowly defined unified style established under Seljuk rule is the geographical distribution of monuments. The Seljuk sultans had a geographically well defined zone of political stability, in which they were more prolific as patrons while in other zones of Anatolia, where rule was less stable and investments were threatened with destruction, they were not active at all.

The major factor in the architecture that Seljuk patronage fostered in the region of Konya was precisely due to a combination of the wealth available, and the role of Anatolia as a last station on the way westwards from Central Asia and Iran. This geographically conditioned role of Anatolia was emphasized when refugees escaping from the Mongol invasions of those regions arrived. Yet this had begun even earlier, when mobility and the search for work led architects and craftsmen to travel. Stylistic elements that can be traced back to Iran, Northern Syria, and Armenia are combined in varied ways. The ‘Iranian’ elements are brick and tile, stucco work, and some of the motifs that find their way from stucco to stone; the Syrian features include elements such as ablaq and muqarnas, whereas the Armenian connection is mostly prominent in precisely carved ashlar masonry. Such attributions of elements to set places of origins can of course be problematic to some extent and should not be seen as absolute labels. Rather, they are based on a combined observation of building materials prevailing in a certain region, and instances of signatures pointing to movements of craftsmen to Anatolia.

The way in which these elements are combined, both in decoration and structure of monuments suggests a high level of independent agency on the part of architects and craftsmen, even though the patrons did play an important part. The Seljuk sultans are known to have intervened in the construction of city-walls366 – as have other rulers across the medieval Islamic

world, and thus the question of the topos related to ideal rule must be raised – yet in the construction itself, the first and foremost responsibility, that is that of creating a building that is at the same time technically viable and aesthetically pleasing lay with the specialists. Thus, the style that resulted from this effort, with its combination of elements of different origin, was ultimately also the consequence of the expertise of architects, stone carvers, tile and brick makers who each used their skill in the most productive way, in order to please their patrons and to be able to continue to benefit from the wealth that was available from construction projects in the region.
Chapter Three

Shifting Paradigms: The Age of the Amīrs (1240-1277)


367

This chapter examines the development of architecture and patronage from the initial Mongol conquest of Anatolia in the early 1240s (map 3), to the imposition of direct administrative control four decades later. In 676/1277, the Mamluks entering the region from Syria invaded Anatolia, defeated the Ilkhanid army in battle, and temporarily occupied Kayseri. These events led the Ilkhanid rulers to tighten control over Anatolia, and changed the political and cultural landscape in a way that will be discussed in Chapter Five. The present chapter will be concerned with the phase that led from full Seljuk control over large parts of Anatolia, to increasing Mongol control and Seljuk dependency. Politically speaking, this period initiates the slow decline of Seljuk authority, at first shifting it from the Seljuk sultans to powerful amīrs who did not lose their power during this initial phase. In architectural terms, changes in rule lead to a diversification of patronage. The pursuit, however fleeting, of an imperial Seljuk style that slowly became apparent in the 1220s, was interrupted at this point.

367 Walter Bachmann, Kirchen und Moscheen in Armenien und Kurdistan (Leipzig, 1913), 7.
The first part of this chapter addresses the question of disruption of construction at the time of the initial Mongol conquest. Written sources offer little concrete information on this subject, yet the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum is often cited as an example of such disruption. This undated monument will serve as a case study for the impact that the Mongol attacks of the 1240s may have had on the architectural production of Anatolia.

The second part of this chapter is concerned with the changes in patronage that emerged with the decline of Seljuk power (map 5). Several scholars have argued that the dominant patrons in this period were the amīrs of the Seljuk court, whereas patronage by the sultans and their relatives virtually disappears. Figures such as Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy in the 1240s, and the pervāne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān and Şāhīb ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī in the 1260s to 1270s were exceedingly active and established extensive waqfs (charitable foundations) for the benefit of certain institutions and their own descendants.

The third part of this chapter presents a case study that shows these shifts in patronage: the construction of three madrasas in Sivas in 670/1271-72 by patrons of different backgrounds. The patron of the Gök Medrese was Şāhīb ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī, directly connected to the Seljuk court of Konya. The Çifte Minareli Medrese was built by the Ilkhanid șāhib al-dīwān (minister of finance) Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī, and constituted probably the only ‘Ilkhanid’ foundation of the time in Anatolia. Little is known about the patron of the third monument, Hibāt-Allāh al-Barūjirdī. The inscriptions on the Buruciye Medrese, the monument that he commissioned, are the only known source about this patron’s life. An analysis of these

368 For studies that include a discussion of shifts in patronage due to the Mongol conquest, see: Ülkü Bates, “The impact of the Mongol invasion on Turkish architecture,” IJMES XV (1978): 23-32; Rogers, Patronage; Crane, “Notes on Saljūq Architectural Patronage”; Wolper, Cities and Saints.
three monuments will provide room for a detailed discussion of the relationship between local and outside patronage, of ‘Anatolian’ and imported styles and workforce.

Following the discussion of three major madrasas in Sivas constructed in the same year, the fourth part of this chapter addresses the question of why this type of building saw such a surge in a specific location, and how this relates to the rising importance of Sufism throughout Anatolia in this same period. This discussion will provide a new perspective on the argument that Sufism was a major factor in urban change from the late thirteenth century onwards, and that the construction of madrasas was diametrically opposed to the needs of these communities.369

Thus, this chapter will show how the beginning of Mongol rule over Anatolia precipitated a shift in architectural paradigms, from a budding imperial style towards more locally connected idioms. This development was even more apparent from the 1290s onwards, when large scale patronage disappeared and workshops work on a smaller local scale, as will be discussed in Chapter Five.

369 Ethel Sara Wolper has repeatedly argued for an opposition between the educated “elites” of the madrasas and the Sufi communities: Wolper, Cities and Saints, 9, 21-24, 68-69.
Conquest and Destruction – The Effect on Architecture

In the late 1230s, the Mongol armies, on their advance from Central Asia into Iran and further into the Middle East, reached Anatolia. The incursions were at first limited to occasional attacks, complemented by diplomatic contacts asking the Seljuks to submit to Mongol rule and to pay tribute. These diplomatic efforts came to an end with the death of the Great Khan Ögödei in 1241, when succession struggles among the Mongols hindered a continuation of negotiations. 370

Under the rule of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II (r. 634-644/1237-1246) the Seljuk realm appeared weakened, thus giving the Mongol armies ample opportunity for more targeted attacks, now aimed at conquest rather than raiding. 371 The city of Erzurum was the first to be attacked and conquered in 639/1242, in what sources refer to as a violent and destructive onslaught. The Seljuk chronicler Ibn Bībī describes the conquest in the darkest terms, suggesting that a large part of the population was led into slavery or killed, and that parts of the city were destroyed, yet without giving particulars of buildings or areas that were affected. 372 Writing from a later perspective, in the 1280s, Ibn Bībī may have used topoi on the destructive nature of the Mongol conquests, yet contemporary Armenian sources describe the event in similarly negative terms, suggesting a common perception of these events as traumatic. 373


371 Yıldız, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” 160 ff. for a detailed analysis of this period that cannot be reiterated in full here.

372 Ibn Bībī, tr. Duda, 222-224.

373 See for instance the description in Kirakos Gandsakezi, Istorija Armenii, tr. [into Russian] by L. A. Khanlarian, 175-176. The author, whose name is transcribed into English as Kirakos of Ganjak, was a contemporary of the event who composed his text the same year that Erzurum (Theodosiopolis in Greek, Karin in Armenian) was conquered, and who had spent several years in Mongol captivity: John Andrew Boyle, “Kirakos of Ganjak on the Mongols,” 199-200.
In the summer of 640/1243, the army of the Seljuk sultan was defeated at the battle of Kösedağ, a site located between Sivas and Erzincan.\textsuperscript{374} From then on Anatolia was under the authority of the Mongols, and the Seljuks were required to pay tribute to the Mongol Great Khan even though the sultan in Konya nominally remained in place.

The Mongols then moved on to Sivas, a city that only narrowly escaped destruction. The qāḍī of the city, Najm al-Dīn of Kırşehir, had in his youth encountered the Mongol Khan in Khwarezm and received a paize (passport shaped like a shield) and yarligh, an edict conferring an authorization by the Mongol Great Khan on the bearer. As the army under Baiju Noyan advanced towards the city, the qāḍī went to encounter him and presented his documents. The Mongol general agreed to plunder only one section of the city, ordering his soldiers to stop after three days.\textsuperscript{375} The Mongols then proceeded to Kayseri, conquering and burning down the city after a siege. Afterwards, the destruction continued in southeastern Anatolia, and into northern Syria, and the Seljuks were no longer able to resist.\textsuperscript{376}

Internal troubles accentuated the political instability created by the Mongol attacks. The succession struggles after the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II in 644/1246 extended over years and ultimately decided much of the fate of Anatolia under Mongol rule. In 655/1257, internal conflicts between 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II and Rukn al-Dīn Kilij Arslān led the Mongols to favor the latter and install him as the sultan in Konya, while his brother sought refuge in Nicaea (İz尼克).

\textsuperscript{374} Yildiz, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” 181-183 for the battle and its immediate aftermath.

\textsuperscript{375} Ibn Bībī, tr. Duda, 229-230; Ibn Bībī, tr. Yinanç, 178. Bar Hebraeus similarly indicates that Sivas surrendered and was only slightly damaged, whereas Kayseri resisted and was subsequently sacked: Bar Hebraeus, The chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj, the son of Aaron, the Hebrew physician, commonly known as Bar Hebraeus; being the first part of his political history of the world, tr. from the Syriac by Ernest A. Wallis Budge (London, 1932), II: 407.

\textsuperscript{376} Yildiz, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” 185-186.
At this time, the newly appointed *pervāne* Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān began his ascent to be one of the most powerful men of the realm. While Rukn al-Dīn Kilij Arslān travelled to Iran in 1257 in order to attend the court of the Ilkhan Hülegū (r. 654-663/ 1256-1265), his brother seized Konya, and upon his return to Anatolia in 1258, the former sultan learned of his deposition. After prolonged fighting between the two brothers, Ilkhanid forces called in by the *pervāne* divided the Seljuk realm into two sections. The river Kızıl Irmak served as a natural boundary between the territories of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II to the West, and Rukn al-Dīn Kilij Arslān IV to the East. The first retained Konya, whereas the latter chose Tokat, the stronghold of the *pervāne*, as his capital. The agreement was orchestrated by the ṭughrāʾī Shams al-Dīn Maḥmūd on the side of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II, and the *pervāne* Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān on that of Rukn al-Dīn Kilij Arslān.  

The effect of these political troubles on individual monuments is hard to assess since the sources reporting the events rarely name specific buildings that were destroyed. A possible exception is the case of the city walls of Konya that were partially razed in 655/ 1257 before Rukn al-Dīn Kilij Arslān was allowed to return to the city. The destructions of Sivas and Kayseri mentioned earlier must have resulted in the loss of monuments, yet buildings from the period prior to the Mongol conquest did survive. In Kayseri, the Çifte Medrese (602/ 1205), the Great Mosque, and the Huand Hatun Complex (634/ 1236-37) are still standing. It is not

---


380 The Great Mosque (Ulu Cami in Turkish) was probably founded in the early twelfth century. The earliest surviving inscription on the monument refers to a restoration carried out in 602/ 1205: Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, I: 35.
known whether they were damaged and then restored, or simply got spared in the attacks.\textsuperscript{381} In Sivas, the Great Mosque and the Hospital of ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs I (614/ 1216-17) survived the Mongol attack. Other monuments may have been destroyed either then or in later invasions, such as the conquest of Kayseri by the Mamluks in 675/ 1277, and the attack on Sivas under Timur in 802/ 1400, in which the city walls were destroyed, but few records of them survive.\textsuperscript{382}

In both cities, no building activity is known for the period immediately after the Mongol conquest. In fact, the first surviving monument to be built in Kayseri was the Sahibiye Medrese erected in 667/ 1269 (fig. 49). In Sivas, construction received a singular surge with the foundation of three madrasas in 670/ 1271-72 that will be discussed below.

The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum: A Case Study in Disruption?

The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum (fig. 50) may serve as an example of the extent to which the Mongol conquests caused a disruption in construction. It has been suggested that the Mongol attack on the city in 639/ 1242 stopped the completion of this madrasa. On an architectural level, only the absence of a few details in the carving of the portal (fig. 51)\textsuperscript{383} and the lack of a foundation inscription indicates that the building was not completed. The absence of

\textsuperscript{381} Gabriel, Monuments turcs, I: 10, n. 3.

\textsuperscript{382} A possible record for buildings in Sivas that were destroyed sometime after 670/ 1271-72, are the detailed descriptions of properties that were allocated to the waqf of the Gök Medrese. The document mentions a series of markets and madrasas that cannot be identified with any extant building, but that were clearly standing at the time of the redaction of the waqfiya of the foundation in 678/ 1279 since they are used as points of reference in order to locate the relevant properties within the city. An early twentieth-century copy of the Arabic document is preserved in Ankara, VGM 604-67-90. A Turkish translation and images of the copy are published in Sadi Bayram and Ahmet Karabacak, “Sahip Ata Fahrieddin Ali’nin Konya İmaret ve Sivas Gök Medrese Vakfiyeleri,” Vakıflar Dergisi 13 (1981): 31-69.

\textsuperscript{383} Parts of the decorative motifs on the façade of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, especially the inner detailing of the three topmost pairs of leaves in the “palm-tree” in the lower left section of the portal are not completed.
a foundation inscription is the crucial point in the discussion of the monument since it means that the date of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, as well as the name of its founder, is unknown. Therefore, the time of the construction of the monument has been controversially discussed, and scholars have placed it anytime between the 1220s and the 1320s.

In structural terms, the Çifte Minareli Medrese is complete. The original purpose of the monument as a madrasa has been deduced from is rectangular plan with four ĭwāns in the cardinal directions, and small rooms to the sides of the first floor and on the second floor, that would have been used as residences for students (fig 52). This plan is so typical for madrasas in thirteenth-century Anatolia that it appears to leave little doubt about the intended function of the monument.

In one of the earliest sources to mention it, Evliyâ Çelebî’s Seyâhatnâme, the monument is referred to as a mosque, even though the name contains reference to its (perhaps former) function as a madrasa:

“And attached wall-to-wall to this mosque [the Great Mosque] is the Old Mosque Madrasa {they also call it Çifte Minareli}. Some say that it is a building of the Akçakoyunlu rulers, [some relate that it is a building of Sultan Uzun Hasan,] and it is close to the Kurşumlu Mosque [an unidentified building].

This passage is the earliest of many instances that indicate the unclear nature of the patronage of the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Due to the complex nature of the discussion of the date of the monument and the presumed circumstances of its construction, a review of the literature so

384 A few lines of the text are missing in the most recent edition of the Seyâhatnâme (ed. Y. Dağlı, R. Dankoff et al., 9 vols., Istanbul 1999-2005). Since there is no indication made of these lines missing in the manuscript, an editorial error seems likely. The section in brackets is here quoted after the slightly modernized rendering in İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, Abide ve kitabeleri ile Erzurum tarihi (Istanbul, 1960), 350.

far available will be useful before proceeding, since scholars have previously suggested dates based on both historical and stylistic evidence. The double minarets, placed on top of the portal, will be part of this discussion. The use of multiple minarets is usually associated with high-ranking and often royal patrons, a point that will be important here.386

An early publication on the Çifte Minareli Medrese appeared in François Belin’s account of his travels from Istanbul to Erzurum.387 Belin was a *dragoman* (translator) to the French consul in Erzurum in 1843-44, before moving on to Thessaloniki. The article probably recounts his travels on the way to his first appointment in diplomatic service.388 Belin refers to the monument as “Tchifté Ménârè”, obviously a French rendering of the modern name, and of the one it was known by locally at the time of his visit. It seems that the building still retained its function as a *madrasa*.

Belin indicates the date of the monument as 351/962.389 This date can be excluded because in the late tenth century, Erzurum was still under Byzantine rule and known under its Greek name Theodosiospolis. 390 Subsequently, Belin describes an inscription in Persian that extends over the bases of the two minarets.391 This text is problematic in many ways, first of all


390 Between 33/653 and 338/949 the city changed hands between Byzantines and Arabs several times. From 338/949 until the 473/1080, it remained under Byzantine ruler, and was then captured by the Saltukids. “Erzurum,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition.

because on the bases of the minarets, the only inscriptions are formulaic phrases in Arabic. The supposed inscription is also crucial in much of the scholarly discussion concerning the date of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, as I will show below.

The Persian inscription has been dismissed as a fabrication on the grounds that its language, in letting the patron speak in the first person singular, does not correspond to the protocol of Islamic foundation inscriptions. Moreover, for the period in question the use of Persian in a foundation inscription would be highly usual. Recently, Bernard O’Kane has shown instances of the use of Persian on monumental inscriptions in Anatolia beginning in the early thirteenth century, which are usually of poetic or literary content – such as the passages from the Shāhnāme quoted on the city walls of Konya built in the 1220s – rather than the those concerned with the praise of the patron and the date of the building. Thus, in terms of dates, titles of the patrons used in it, and language, the text rendered by Belin poses too many problems to be accepted in the absence of the actual inscription. It is unclear when the inscription is supposed

392 The center reads “allāh” (God) and may be surrounded by the names “ʿAlī” and “Muḥammad” in highly stylized kufic script.
393 J. Michael Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas: A Contribution to the History of Style in the Seljuk Architecture of 13th Century Turkey,” Anatolian Studies 15 (1965): 84-85. This statement needs to be taken cum grano salis since three inscriptions in the domed room of the Masjid-i Jāmiʿ in Qazvīn (Iran) have the patron of the monument state the conditions of the waqf connected to it in the first person singular. One of these inscriptions is dated 509/ 1116. The same patron, Khumārtāsh b. ʿAbdallāh, used a similar inscription in the Masjid-i Ḥaydarīya, also in Qazvīn: Janine Sourdel-Thomine, “Inscriptions seljoukides et salles à coupoles de Qazwin en Iran,” Revue des Études Islamiques 42 (1974): 3-43.
394 O’Kane, The Appearance of Persian on Islamic Art, 35-42. O’Kane notes the following on the use of Persian for inscriptions in Anatolia: “Although Turkey and the expanded territories of the Ottomans was one of the earliest areas to use Persian in monumental inscriptions, it was never used with quite the same enthusiasm as in other centers remote from the Iranian heartland, such as Hindustan, for instance. However, the continued use of Persian as the main literary language of the court meant that examples of Persian in monumental epigraphy were be [sic!] relatively common until the 15th century. With the increasing confidence of the Ottoman state as it colonized successive Arab lands from the early 16th century onwards, the use of Turkish increases dramatically, and Persian correspondingly declines.” O’Kane, The Appearance of Persian on Islamic Art, 149.
395 For a detailed discussion of the inscription and the historical as well as linguistic problems that it poses, see: Rogers, “The date of the Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum,” Kunst des Orients 8, no. 1-2 (1972): 86-91. The authenticity of the inscription and the problem of understanding who the “Malik Shah” mentioned in the text may be in conjunction with the date given as 351/ 962 appear in earlier literature, to my knowledge first in Bachmann,
to have disappeared, if it ever existed in the form in which it was represented to Belin prior to 1852.

Walter Bachmann, a German traveler writing in 1913, already refers to the inscription as lost and gives the references to an Armenian travel account that I have not been able to locate.\(^{396}\) Thus, Rogers might be right in suggesting a local fabrication for the purpose of impressing a visitor from abroad.\(^{397}\) Belin, having studied with Sylvestre de Sacy and Étienne Quatremère in Paris, did, however, know Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, and acknowledges in a footnote that the transcription of the inscription given in his article is not his own, and that he did not have time to check on the original.\(^{398}\) If Belin had gone to check on the text at the base of the minarets, he would possibly have understood the deception.

Leaving this unreliable inscription aside, written documentation on the Çifte Minareli Medrese is limited. As is so often the case for Anatolia, the medieval written sources do not mention the monument. Once the alleged foundation inscription is dismissed, the building is devoid of historical epigraphy; a discussion of its date remains largely on the stylistic level.\(^{399}\)

---

\(^{396}\) Bachmann, *Kirchen und Moscheen in Armenien und Kurdistan*, 77-79. Bachmann suggests an error in the date, considering the possibility of 551/1156, a year in which according to him a Malik Shah ruled over Anatolia. This is not correct however, since at this time Rûm was under the authority of Qilij Arslan II (r. 551/1156 – 581/1185), who was preceded by Mas'ūd I b. Qilij Arslan in Konya and Malik Shāh in Malatya: Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties - A chronological and genealogical manual* (New York and London, 1996), 213.

\(^{397}\) Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum,” 84.


\(^{399}\) Abdurrahim Şerif Beygu, *Erzurum tarihi, anıtları, kitabeleri* (Istanbul, 1936), 120-121 and fig. 22 notes a Qur’anic inscription on one of the window frames in the “bahçe” (garden) of the madrasa, making it difficult to localize this lost inscription. According to Konyalı, a fragment of an Ilkhanid inscription was found in the mausoleum. Since the text read “thalathūn dirham [...] taqabbala ‘llāhu ta‘ālā” (thirty dirham [...] may God accept” Konyalı assumed that the fragment belonged to a *waqf* inscription akin to that in the Yakutiyeye Medrese (710/1310) nearby: Konyalı, *Erzurum tarihi*, 357. The fragment apparently having been lost, I was unable to verify this piece of information.
review of selected publications that discuss the building, which either accept or refute Belin’s inscription and/or the date supposedly recorded in it, will be helpful in understanding the complex discussion of this monument in scholarly literature.

In 1936, Abdurrahim Beygu published a book on the historical monuments of Erzurum in which a chapter is devoted to the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Beygu discusses the Persian inscription based on Bachmann’s work (referring to the author as Bahman), and on Belin’s article. He also states that an inscription belonging to the madrasa and dated 651 A.H. is listed in van Berchem’s work, without giving a precise reference.

Based on Ottoman documents that in his opinion refer to the madrasa, Beygu then suggests that the patron of the madrasa may have been Mahperī Khwānd Khātūn, the patron of the caravanserai in Pazar near Tokat and of the Huand Hatun complex in Kayseri, even though variants in the name appear to pose some problems. Furthermore, Beygu refers to a waqf document that is dated 1265 / 1824. This document does not appear in any of the later studies. Its main importance, if it really is related to the Çifte Minareli Medrese as Beygu

400 Beygu, Erzurum tarihi, 116-136.
401 Beygu, Erzurum tarihi, 125 and 126. Considering that the only volume on the inscriptions of Anatolia in the Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionorum Arabicarum that ever appeared is limited to Sivas and Divriği, this reference is likely to be apocryphal.
402 Beygu, Erzurum tarihi 127-128. For these monuments and their patron, Mahperī Khwānd Khātūn, the mother of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw, see chapter 2.
403 Beygu, Erzurum tarihi, fig. 25.
404 Rogers’s untraceable reference (even he lost track to it) in an article published in 1965 to a document supposedly dated 1265 CE might arise from reading Beygu: J. Michael Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum,” 84 (without reference to the location of the document). In an article published in 1972, Rogers concedes that he had never seen this document himself and could no longer locate the reference for his source: Rogers, “The date of the Çifte Minare Medrese,” 78, n. 2.
claims without pertinent proof, lies in listing villages in the surroundings of Erzurum that belonged to the *waqf* in question.\(^{405}\)

İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı in *Abideleri ve kitabeleri ile Erzurum tarihi*, published in 1960, also uses Ottoman archival documents in search of information on the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Konyalı discovered a reference in a *defter* dated 947/1540-41, referring to a bath that was part of the endowment of a *madrasa* in Erzurum.\(^{406}\) According to Konyalı, the document further mentions the endowment of the *mâlikâne* of the villages of Kân and of Keyghavor to the *madrasa*.\(^{407}\) The identification with the Çifte Minareli Medrese is assumed on the grounds that the monument was at times locally referred as Hatuniye Medrese [The Lady’s Madrasa].\(^{408}\)

---

\(^{405}\)The two quotations in this note are rendered in the spelling used by Beygu. The line numbers are mine, rendering the way the passages are given in the book. “(1) Medresei şerif handen hatun der Erzurum der ferman Esseyid Mehmet Emin bey ve Abdullah efendi mutasarrıf tedrisi ulûm ber vakﬁ mezbuz ruyeti mühasebine 1265 muharrem (2) hasılatı bedeli icar vakﬁ mezbur (3) 6280 bedeli icar kariyeye Kân kazai Erzurum (4) 1605 [bedeli icar kariyeye] Salasur [kazai] Erzurum (5) 1850 [bedeli icar kariyeye] Kevahur [kazai] Erzurum (6) 2500 [bedeli icar kariyeye] Tivnik [kazai] Erzurum (6) 12235 [sum of the amounts above] (7) Muhasip masarifat (8) 6117 vazifei tedrisi ulûm derühdei Mehmet Emin bey (9) 6117 [vazifei tedrisi ulûm derühdei] Abdullah Efendi (10) 12234,” Beygu, *Erzurum tarihi*, 130. From Beygu’s rendering, it is unclear whether the following passage comes immediately after the first one in the defter: “(1) Medresei şerif hanende Sultan derdahil sur Erzurum der ferman Esseyid Abdullah ve Seyid Abdullah ve Seyid Kâmil ve Seyid Mehmet Resid mûderris ve mütêvelliyanı vakﬁ muşarileyeh ruyet mühasebine ıla gayeti muharrem 1265 (2) 6210 berat bedeli icar kariyeye Evreni derkazaı Erzurum (3) Masarifat (4) 4290 Vazifei tedrisi ulûm bermucibi şart vakﬁ (5) maşq muharrer evkafı hümayun (6) 100 Harci mubahese hazine (7) 4496 [sum of the amounts above] (8) 1800 Fazlai vakﬁ muşarileyeh der mütêvelliyan mumaileyeh (9) 6290 [sum of the amounts above??]” Beygu, *Erzurum tarihi*, 130-131.


\(^{407}\)The term “*mâlikâne*” as used here poses the problem of legal status of “*mâlikâne*” in the classical sense, in which it could not be endowed as *waqf* property. The term also appears in later, possibly 18th-century translations into Ottoman Turkish of medieval waqfīyas, for instance in a document for a Haşım Bey zâwiya in Kayseri, VGM 739-329-161. The waqf was established in 677/1278, but the document in question is written in Ottoman Turkish, and placed in a defter just before a document dates 1130/1717 suggesting that it is a late copy. The term “*mâlikâne*” might thus reflect later usage, yet it is not discussed in the authoritative study of waqf in the 18th-century Ottoman Empire: Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, *Institution du vaqf au XVIIIe siècle en Turquie: étude socio-historique* (Ankara, 1985).

\(^{408}\)Another document in the same archive refers to a Hand Hatun Medrese, and names the *mâlikâne* of the several villages (Kan, Tivnik, Salahor, and Keyghavor) endowed by the Ottoman sultan Süleyman the Magnificent: Konyalı, *Erzurum tarihi*, 338. A document in the *Ḳuyûd-i Ḋâdîme* in Ankara gives the same information: Konyalı, *Erzurum tarihi*, 340.
After excluding a number of Seljuk princesses as patrons of the Çifte Minareli/ Hatuniye Medrese, Konyalı suggests that an Ilkhanid lady is likely to have commissioned the building, namely: Khwānd Pādishāh Khātūn, the wife of the Ilkhan Gaykhātū (r. 690-694/ 1291-95). The attribution is, however, problematic from the start: even though Pādishāh Khātūn lived in Anatolia for a few years until her final departure in 690/ 1291, it is not clear in which city she stayed. This suggestion of an Ilkhanid princess as the founder of the Çifte Minareli Medrese subsequently attracted critique, first in J. Michael Rogers’s article in Anatolian Studies in 1965, which relies on a stylistic comparison of the monument in Erzurum with the Gök Medrese in Sivas, dated 670/ 1271-72.

In his book on the medieval Islamic monuments on Erzurum, Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal suggests a late thirteenth-century date for the Çifte Minareli Medrese based on stylistic observations. Like Rogers, he considers the inscription given by Belin as a fabrication.

Aptullah Kuran suggests that the madrasa is composed of the remains of a twelfth-century Saltukid foundation, preserved only in the main īwān, which were incorporated into a later construction. After a discussion of the problematic Persian inscription and of earlier literature on the subject, Kuran concludes that based on stylistic evidence a late thirteenth-century date may be plausible and considers that the hypothesis of Pādishāh Khātūn as a patron

409 Konyalı, Erzurum tarihi, 347-348; Konyalı adds that some think that Pādishāh Khātūn was identical with Bulughān Hatun, a wife of the Ilkhan Abaqa (r. 663-681/ 1265-82) but refutes this claim. this Bulughan Hatun is not to be confounded with a wife of Ghazan Khan with the same name, who appears along with her husband on two inscriptions in the Yakutiye Medrese (710/ 1310) in Erzurum, as the founder’s overlords; see: RCEA Nos. 5276 and 5277, and chapter 5 of this dissertation.


411 Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas,” esp. 64-66 and 82-85. The discussion of the literature concerning the date of the monument appears to be a preliminary version of what Rogers published in the article in 1972.

412 Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, Monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d’Erzurum, chapter 7.
might be valid. Kuran, Metin Sözen agrees on a late thirteenth-century date, and also suggests that Konyalı’s identification of Pādishāh Khâtūn as the patron of the monument should be taken seriously.

Karamağaralı argues, following Konyalı, that the Çifte Minareli Medrese was built by Pādishāh Khâtūn while she lived in Erzurum. Following the death of her husband, the Ilkhan Gaykhâtū, she supposedly left Erzurum in hurry and the building remained unfinished, the mausoleum unoccupied. In addition to Konyalı, Karamağaralı refers to a passage in Aflâkî’s Manâkib al-ʿĀrifīn for the princess’s connection to Erzurum. Upon inspection however, the only similar reference in this source is to a Pāshā Khâtūn, wife of Gaykhâtū, who died in Erzurum at a date not mentioned in the text.

Rogers published a second article about the monument in 1972, entitled “The date of the Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum.” In this article, Rogers discusses at length Karamağaralı’s argument that the madrasa was founded by an Ilkhanid princess. Rogers considers the references to a Hatuniye Medrese in the Ottoman documents mentioned by Konyalı, on which Karamağaralı’s argument is largely based, as too vague to be identified with the Çifte Minare Medrese. Rogers returns to the inscription published by Belin, and suggests that if authentic it might be based on Armenian foundation inscriptions, arguing that this could be an explanation for the discrepancies between the text and epigraphic conventions. Nevertheless, Rogers still thinks that the inscription is probably a fabrication, possibly produced in the sixteenth century.

---

413 Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, 116-124.
417 Rogers, “The the date of the Çifte Minare,” 81-82.
Dismissing the inscription means that the direct connection between the monument and the Hatuniye Medrese mentioned in the documents discussed by Konyalı disappears, and only late references remain.418

Rogers extensively discusses the life of Pādishāh Khātūn as the wife of Gaykhâtū, and as semi-independent ruler of Kirmān after she was widowed in 693/1294.419 The identification of this princess with the founder of the Sünbül Baba Zaviyesi in Tokat suggested by Karamağaralı can be directly dismissed, since the latter is clearly named as the daughter of the Pervâne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān in the foundation inscription of that building.420 Generally, Rogers thinks that although the most likely known candidate as founder of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, Pādishāh Khātūn is far from ideal. In terms of financing the construction, the evidence is inconclusive, but Rogers thinks it rather strange that Pādishāh Khātūn would have abandoned the foundation so shortly before it was completed.421

Then, Rogers proceeds to a discussion of the architecture in which he concludes based on stylistic evidence that the building should be dated before the Gök Medrese in Sivas (670/1271-72), and after the Great Mosque and Hospital in Divriği (626/1228-29). In terms of the internal chronology of the building, Rogers suggests that the main part of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, the mausoleum, and the passage between the two, constitute three distinct phases in construction, ranging from the remains of a twelfth-century Saltukid construction to the addition of the

418 Rogers, “The the date of the Çifte Minare,” 86-91.
419 Rogers’s reference is to Karamağaralı rather than the source. I have not yet been able to locate the primary source, Nāṣir al-Dīn Munshī Kırmānī, Simt ‘l-ūlā lil-hazret ‘l- ʿulyā, indicated in Karamağaralı’s article to argue for the Ilkhanid lady’s stay in Anatolia with Gaykhâtū from 1284 to 1291, when she was supposedly based in Erzurum, at least for part of these seven years.
420 See chapter 5 for a discussion of this building.
421 Rogers, “The the date of the Çifte Minare,” 93-97.
mausoleum in the late thirteenth century. Rogers insists that the scheme and decoration of the façade of the Gök Medrese in Sivas must have been deduced from that of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum, thus giving chronological priority to the latter monument and placing its date sometime around 1250. In the final paragraph of his article, Rogers entirely rejects the identification of the Çifte Minareli Medrese with the Hatuniye Medrese of the documents first cited by Konyali, suggesting that the search for a female patron had better be abandoned.

Michael Meinecke, in *Fayencedekorationen Seldschukischer Sakralbauten in Kleinasien*, produces a detailed overview and discussion of the relevant literature on the Çifte Minareli Medrese up to 1971. Meinecke dates the monument ca. 1250, again on stylistic grounds. He mentions the inscription recorded by Belin (1852) and Bachmann (1913), and several fragments of Qur’anic inscriptions mentioned by Konyali. All these inscriptions are now lost. Meinecke considers that the inscription recorded by Belin might have been authentic, but copied with some mistakes. He also discusses, and dismisses, attempts by Beygu (1935) and Kuran (1969) to correct the date recorded in it to 651/1253 and 551/1156-57, respectively. However, unlike Rogers, Meinecke does accept Konyali’s attribution of the sixteenth-century documents mentioned before to the monument. Discussing the identification of the patron named in the three documents cited by Konyali, Meinecke concludes that the person in question could be a daughter of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād I (r. 616-634/1219-37) or of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād II (r. 646-672/1248-73).

423 Rogers, “The date of the Çifte Minare,” 114.
424 Rogers, “The date of the Çifte Minare,” 119.
426 Konyali, *Erzurum tarihi*, 357.
427 These pieces might now be in the storage rooms of the local archaeological museum. The museum was in the Çifte Minareli Medrese during Meinecke’s visit, but has since been moved to a new building outside the old center.
thinking that the first is more likely.\textsuperscript{428} According to the unedited chronicle of Qādī Aḥmad of Niğde, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykūbād II was buried in a madrasa in Erzurum with his mother, a Georgian princess.\textsuperscript{429}

In terms of the structure, Meinecke suggests that the mausoleum was built a little while before the madrasa, thus reversing the chronology supported by Rogers and Karamağaralı. Some parts of the masonry and the carving are not finished, suggesting that the construction was interrupted, maybe when the Mongols conquered Erzurum in 639/1242. According to Meinecke, both the plan and the pair of minarets do, however, suggest a date in the second half of the thirteenth century based on similar examples that are dated. The closest connection in stylistic terms is the Gök Medrese in Sivas (670/1271-72), but several elements suggest that the building in Erzurum is earlier, according to Meinecke. For example, ornamental motifs resemble those in Divriği, especially the patterns stretching over the pillars in the courtyard. Thus Meinecke, like Rogers, sets the dates of the Great Mosque of Divriği (626/1228-29) and of the Gök Medrese in Sivas (670/1271-72) as chronological limits for the construction of the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Meinecke also considers the possibility that the mausoleum (fig. 53) was added to an eleventh- or twelfth-century building around 1200, and that the rest of the madrasa was subsequently rebuilt sometime between 626/1228-29 and 670/1271-72.\textsuperscript{430}

In the quest for a patron, Meinecke rejects the idea that an Ilkhanid princess was responsible for the construction. The initial problem, according to Meinecke, lay in the “identification or not” of the female patron named in the sixteenth-century documents cited by

\textsuperscript{428} Meinecke, \textit{Fayencedekorationen}, vol. 2, 139-140.


\textsuperscript{430} Meinecke, \textit{Fayencedekorationen}, vol. 2, 137-139.
Beygu and Konyalı with Mahperī Khwānd Khātūn, the patron of the Huand Hatun complex in Kayseri (634/1236-37) and of the caravanserai in Pazar (636/1239) since on her the tombstone in Kayseri, this Seljuk princess is named as the wife of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I, whereas the documents refer to her as this sultan’s daughter.431

The conclusions that scholars have thus far drawn on the date and patron of the Çifte Minareli Medrese are thus provisional, and two main opinions remain. First, the suggestion, supported by Meinecke and Rogers, remains valid that the construction date of the Çifte Minareli Medrese lies between the Great Mosque of Divriği (626/1228-29) and the Gök Medrese in Sivas (670/1271-72). Second, the argument of a late thirteenth or early fourteenth-century date for the major parts of the structure, a date that is still supported in a relatively recent publication on the monument, should be taken seriously.432

Both hypotheses have some factors that speak for them. The first one, especially when combined with the assumption that the Mongol attack on Erzurum in 639/1242 halted construction, is compelling. Even so, the violence of the attack – if we are to believe the contemporary sources – could easily have led to the destruction of a monument that is located as close to the city wall, now destroyed, as the Çifte Minareli Medrese.433 The Saltukid Great Mosque, located just next to the Çifte Minareli Medrese, and the Kale Cami on the nearby citadel, did, however, survive the attack in question. Thus, the onslaught might not have been too violent in this section of the city – the location of the main attack is unknown – or it might have been violent towards the inhabitants of the city but not necessarily destructive of monuments.

433 See the reconstruction drawing in Ünal, Monuments, fig. 37.
The second hypothesis is compelling due to the close location of Erzurum to the Ilkhanid center in western Iran, inviting perhaps the suggestion that in this region, the Ilkhanid elite was more active than in central Anatolia. The construction of two madrasas in Erzurum at the time of the region’s closest integration into the Ilkhanid realm, the Yakutiye Medrese in 710/1310 and the – now destroyed – Ahmadiye Medrese in 714/1314, may be an indication in that direction, as will be discussed in chapter 5.

Moreover, the suggestion of a later date is supported by the presence of a pair of minarets on the façade, a feature that does not appear in Anatolia before the Mongol invasions. The earliest dated examples, the portal of the Sahib Ata Complex in Konya (656/1258) and the two madrasas built in Sivas in 670/1271-72, the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Gök Medrese, suggest that this architectural element was a way to establish a renewed connection with Iran, in a way that even the Rûm Seljuk sultans had not used. It also indicates a high-ranking patron, of the standing that in the late thirteenth-century would have required a direct connection to the Ilkhanid court.

In terms of an architectural and stylistic comparison, the Yakutiye Medrese is a helpful point of reference for the dating of the Çifte Minareli Medrese. The decoration of the façade of this early fourteenth-century monument, with its muqarnas portal and the carved decoration on the portal, makes the Yakutiye appear as a smaller copy of the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Thus, the Çifte Minareli Medrese was likely built first, and indeed its large scale would appear to be unusual in Anatolia in the early fourteenth century.434

434 At 30m x 45m, the Çifte Minareli Medrese is larger than most madrasas built in medieval Anatolia. Roughly contemporary buildings such as the Sirçalı Medrese and the Karatay Medrese, both in Konya, measure about 25m x 30m. On the one hand, the large size may be a reference to the Ilkhanid tendency towards monumental construction that is so obvious in monuments in Iran, such as the mausoleum of Sultan Üljaytū in Sulṭānīye near Tabriz (Iran). On the other hand, assuming a late date for the structure is problematic just because of its very size since beginning
In the details of the composition, the differences are marked, again suggesting that the two monuments were constructed a few decades apart and by different workshops. The frontal view of the portal block of the Yakutiye Medrese is dominated by the varied motifs of the frames that decorate the salient section around the doorway. In the Çifte Minareli Medrese, the dominant elements are the large palm motifs, springing from a pair of dragon heads at the bottom of the façade (fig. 54). The thick moldings that form a frame over this motif further take precedence over the floral patterns of the central frames. In the Yakutiye, the palm-and-animal motif, featuring lions at the base of the palms, whereas in the Çifte Minareli Medrese dragons are shown, appears on the sides of the portal block (fig. 55) rather than on its front. The structuring of the façade, unlike in the Çifte Minareli Medrese, does not extend beyond the central portal.

The minarets of both monuments pose a curious problem: while the minaret pair placed over the portal of the Çifte Minareli Medrese has been attributed to Iranian influence, the single minaret on the corner of the Yakutiye has at times been interpreted as the remaining one of a pair.\footnote{Rahmi Hüseyin Ünal, \textit{Erzurum Yakutiye Medresesi} (Ankara, 1992), 45.}

Another crucial point in the dating of the Çifte Minareli Medrese is the alignment of the mausoleum with the axis of the main īwān. Sheila Blair has suggested in her study of the endowment of the Ilkhanid vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīb (d. 718/1318) that this configuration is particular to Ilkhanid architecture.\footnote{Sheila S. Blair, “Ilkhanid architecture and society: an analysis of the endowment deed of the Rabʾ-ī Rashīdī,” \textit{Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies} 22 (1984), 77.} It has been suggested that the mausoleum of the Çifte Minareli Medrese was an afterthought, a hypothesis that may indeed corroborate a late around 1300, the tendency is toward much smaller structures such as türbes and khāniqāhs. At this point of the discussion, I cannot reach a clear conclusion concerning the problem of the date of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, yet I will return to it in the discussion of size and scale in chapter 4, and in the discussion of the move towards smaller foundations after 1300 in chapter 5.
thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century date for this part of the monument. In the Yakutiye Medrese, the mausoleum was clearly part of the initial project since the foundation inscription refers to the building as madfan (place of burial) rather than as madrasa. Nevertheless, it is likely that the architect of the monument referred to the Çifte Minareli Medrese as it stands today, rather than that the addition to the latter building was made after the Yakutiye Medrese was built. This hypothesis is corroborated by a further local reference in the Yakutiye Medrese: the shallow muqarnas dome at the center of the courtyard, a feature that may have been derived from the covering of the courtyard of the Great Mosque of Erzurum, a Saltukid construction. Thus, the builder (or the patron) of the Yakutiye Medrese clearly showed a taste for local connections. This fits well with the tendency towards regional styles within Anatolia from the second half of the thirteenth century onwards. Moreover, it shows a sense of appreciation for local history among the builders of medieval Erzurum, even if the driving forces behind it remain yet unknown.

Thus, the Çifte Minareli Medrese is most likely not a very near contemporary to the Yakutiye Medrese; the mid-thirteenth century date that Rogers and Meinecke suggest on stylistic grounds may be quite adequate even though the scarce written sources do not reveal a potential patron. The peripheral role of Erzurum in the Rûm Seljuk realm, and the preference for building in the region of Konya throughout the first half of the thirteenth century provide a


438 Even so, the absolute statement of the chronological precedence of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum over the Gök Medrese in Sivas is not entirely convincing, in part because it insists on an evolutionary model in which the forms shaped in the Çifte Minareli Medrese would have then developed into the—maybe more accomplished—motifs of the Gök Medrese. The connection to Divriği is easily explained on a local level (and readily apparent in the three madrasas built in Sivas in 670/1271-72 discussed below), but in Erzurum it may be somewhat far-fetched, especially considering that certain elements such as the patterns on the pillars that Rogers and Meinecke connect to Divriği, are more easily explained with—geographically closer—Armenian monuments.
terminus post quem, even though a rather wide one. A construction after the closer integration of Anatolia into the Ilkhanid realm in 675/1277 is possible, yet after 1290 such a monumental construction is unlikely due to the fiscal pressure that the Ilkhanids exerted on the region.

**New Patterns in Patronage after 1240**

As a consequence of the Mongol takeover of Anatolia, architectural patronage shifted from the Seljuk sultans to their *amīrs* at the same rate as did actual political power. As this section will show, this development became especially accentuated in the 1250s and 1260s, extending into the 1270s. At the same time, the Seljuk sultans and their relatives entirely lost their hold as patrons, and were not responsible for a single monument constructed after 639/1242.

The involvement of the *amīrs* in constructing monuments was not a new feature, as the earlier *amīrs* had been active patrons as well. These foundations took a rather large scale throughout the first half of the thirteenth century, as the *waqfiya* (dated 25 Jumāda I 651/23 July 1253) of Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy demonstrates. The Karatay Madrasa in Konya (649/1251) and the caravanserai (ca. 1234-40) of the same founder, located 30 miles west of Kayseri, are the architectural testimony to this high-level patronage. The large foundation pertaining to the madrasa was not established until 649/1251-52, maybe pointing to an increase in scale of patronage on an individual basis as the fortunes of the sultans began to decline.

Despite its considerable extent, patronage by *amīrs* did not surpass that of the Seljuk rulers themselves until after the Mongol takeover. As the previous chapter has shown, the focus

439 The document is published in Turan, “Selçuklu devri vakfiyeleri III.”
of patronage was, however, different from that of the ruler and at times, the *amīrs* built on the order of the sultan, for instance when building fortifications. The rulers in turn were mainly responsible for the construction of caravanserais and the restoration of mosques, even though they did not have exclusive claims to any of these types of buildings.

Once the division of the Seljuk realm became established, the new men at the top of the ruling elite, who were directly responsible to their Mongol overlords, expanded their patronage while that of the sultans contracted into oblivion. Both the number and nature of the foundations changed: during the 1240s, few caravanserais were added to the existing network, and those that were built adhere to the scheme established in the 1220s in stylistic terms. By the 1250s, such foundations were rare, and in the 1260s only isolated examples were established. “Royal” foundations had ceased by 1250.

This shows that patronage was no longer directed at establishing an infrastructure for Seljuk rule over Anatolia in accordance with the needs of the increasing Muslim population. Rather, construction became a personal enterprise of the founders, both in an attempt to secure wealth for their descendants, and to demonstrate charity through the establishment of *madrasas* that provided education, and often also included provisions for the poor in their *waqfiyyas*. Only a few mosques were built in the second half of the thirteenth century, possibly because a sufficient number of places of worship for the existing Muslim population were available. In turn, the increasing number of *madrasas* may have provided opportunities for scholars who had immigrated to Anatolia from Iran and Central Asia.

The *amīrs* invested in large scale foundations under their own name, including mosques, *madrasas*, and their own mausolea. In the 1260s and 1270s, the pattern established by Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy repeated itself and the two most powerful men in Anatolia were also the most
prolific patrons of the time: the *pervâne* Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān (executed in 676/1277)\(^{440}\) and Ṣāḥib `Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn `Alī (d. 683/1284). During their lifetimes, they both commissioned a multitude of buildings, many of which are still preserved while others are known from their *waqfiyas*, such as that of Ṣāḥib `Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn `Alī.\(^{441}\) Patrons attached to the Ilkhanid elite, on the other hand, were not yet active patrons in Anatolia. (Even after 676/1277, instances are rare as chapter 5 will show.) The *pervâne*, to the extent that his office was reframed such as to be entirely representative of Ilkhanid interests, and controlling the region almost fully, came closest to such direct involvement in the first three decades of Mongol rule in Anatolia.\(^{442}\) Thus, the construction of the Çifte Minerali Medrese in Sivas by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī appears as the exception to the rule.

Not much is known of *pervâne* Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān’s foundations. Monuments that carry foundation inscriptions in his name have been preserved in Sinop, Samsun, and Merzifon, the area where his descendants ruled over an independent principality for a few years.\(^{443}\) The Gök Medrese in Tokat, a monument without any historical inscriptions, has at times been attributed to the patronage of the *pervâne* without much substantial evidence.\(^{444}\) This attribution

---


\(^{441}\) So far, no *waqfiyas* in the name of Pervâne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān have been discovered. For Ṣāḥib `Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn `Alī, the *waqfiyas* of the Sahip Ata complex in Konya (VGM 592-101-91) and of the Gök Medrese in Sivas (VGM 604-67-90) have been preserved in later copies. For a Turkish translation of both documents, see: Bayram and Karabacak, “Sahip Ata Fahrüddin Ali”.


is mainly based on the commission of the Sünbül Baba zāwiya in the same city by a daughter of the pervāne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān in 691/1292.\textsuperscript{445}

Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī’s foundations have survived in greater number, and all the examples have been collected and studied in detail.\textsuperscript{446} In Konya, he founded a complex comprising a mosque, khānqāh, mausoleum, and a bath, located across the street from the rest of the complex, in 656/1258.\textsuperscript{447} The monumental gate to the complex, crowned with the remaining one of two minarets, still stands today. The mosque itself was rebuilt after a fire in the nineteenth century and only the original qibla wall with parts of the tiled miḥrāb decoration are preserved.\textsuperscript{448} Just behind the qibla wall and not visible from the outside is the mausoleum of the founder and of his family (fig. 56). Access was not possible from the mosque, but rather from the khānqāh which has been recently restored (fig. 57). The khānqāh is built on a four-īwān-plan with a courtyard covered by a large brick dome (fig. 58). The same scheme was used in Konya for the Karatay Medrese (649/1251-52) and for the İnce Minareli Medrese (ca. 1265).

The decoration of the mausoleum of Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī, with its and cenotaphs covered in blue and turquoise tile, equally evokes these two madrasas. The same is true for the brick-and-tile pattern in the mausoleum and in the interior of the dome, which is nearly identical in the khānqāh and the İnce Minareli Medrese. The same technique is used for the gate of the


\textsuperscript{446} For monuments founded by this patron and his descendants, see: M. Ferit and M. Mesut, Selçuk veziri Sahip Ata ile oğullarının hayat ve eserleri (Istanbul, 1934).

\textsuperscript{447} The Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü restored the complex (rather heavily) in 2007. The khānqāh and mausoleum are now open to the public as a museum, and a series of “before and after” photographs in the entrance hallway are illustrative of the extent of the restoration. Detailed photographic documentation of the state of the monument before the restoration can be found in the Michael Meinecke collection in the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin, with images taken between 1963 and 1965 as part of Meinecke’s dissertation research.

\textsuperscript{448} Meinecke, Fayencedekorationen, vol. 2: 304-313.
complex, especially on the minaret which shows a small pattern in turquoise tile inserted into the brick. Two late-antique marble sarcophagi at the base of the gate of the complex constitute one of the few examples of reuse of earlier material that go beyond the retrieval of capitals and columns (fig. 19). The use of marble is repeated higher up on the gate, in two newly carved panels that form a pointed window with an intricately interlaced frame. The central section on the gate harks back to the standard pattern established earlier: the *muqarnas* niche over the doorway is framed by an inscription band; the freestanding position of the gate, however, prevents repetition of its placement at the center of a wall. The portal on the *khānqāh*, on the other hand, offers a simpler version on the theme, with a salient portal block that surpasses the wall in height, and the doorway framed with a larger pointed arch, and devoid of *muqarnas*. The space between them only carries a small inscription panel rather than elaborate stone carving.

It has been suggested that the patron (or his architects) created a personal version of the style of Konya that was then spread to other locations in Anatolia, most notably to Sivas. In the Sahibiye Medrese in Kayseri, however, founded by the same patron in 665/1267, this transposition of a personal style based on the monuments of Konya did not take place (fig. 49). Rather than reflecting an imported style, this monument is modeled on other local monuments, most notably the Huand Hatun complex (634/1236-37), with its minimal carved decoration and exclusive use of stone for construction (figs. 36, 37, 38). This is a first hint at the persistence of local styles throughout the thirteenth century, in which some attempts at a stylistic unification were made, and their reemergence immediately after the decline of central rule began.

Most of the foundations sponsored by Şâhib ‘Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī were located in the Konya-Karaman-Kayseri triangle. One important exception is the Gök Medrese in Sivas, founded in 670/1271-72. In terms of its central portal block, this building connects to the style
established in Konya, and especially to the gate of the Sahib Ata complex in this city. The monument will be discussed in full in the following section of this chapter.

Whereas building activity in Konya was at a low point during the 1270s, Sivas received more attention than it ever had under Seljuk rule. In the same year as the Gök Medrese, two other large madrasas were built. The joint construction of these three major foundations introduces the issue of the direct artistic impact of the Mongol conquest, and will be the subject of the following section.

Sivas in 670/1271-72 – Three Madrasas and their Context

In the same year, 670/1271-72, three new madrasas were built in the central Anatolian city of Sivas. The city had long been a center of commerce due to its location at the crossing of important trade routes from Iran to Konya, and from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. With the construction of these three madrasas, the Buruciye Medrese, the Çifte Minareli Medrese, and the Gök Medrese, Sivas also increased its status as a center of scholarship, even though the names of the scholars who were initially appointed as teachers in these buildings are not known. This section investigates the reasons for the construction of these madrasas, as

---


450 Rogers suggests that Sivas did not become really important until the mid-13th century, when Genoese trade, first documented in the 1270s, increased: Rogers, Patronage, 267-268. The preferred overland trade route for the Genoese since the establishment of a commercial representation in Sivas in 1276, led from Ayas to Sivas, Erzincan, Erzurum, and Tabriz: A. Z. V. Togan, “Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period,” tr. Gary Leiser, Annales islamologiques XXV (1991): 218.

451 The absence of references to medieval Anatolia in biographical dictionaries poses a great difficulty for the study of its scholarly networks. Thus, studies of the ulamā’ as they exist for Cairo, Damascus or Baghdad are nearly impossible. For comparison, see the sources used in: Jonathan Porter Berkey, The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo: a social history of Islamic education (Princeton, NJ, 1992); Michael Milton Chamberlain,
well as the characteristics and style of their architecture, in an effort to understand this specific moment in the architectural history of Anatolia.

As a center of scholarship, Sivas may not have become as important as Konya, where the presence of the Seljuk court guaranteed patronage and attracted scholars as well as Sufi masters of the standing of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Thus, seven madrasas were built in Konya between 1200 and 1260, creating the most important concentration of such buildings in Anatolia during the thirteenth century. Only Kayseri paralleled this development, with the foundation of seven madrasas in the thirteenth century. At a regional level, the surge in institutions of learning in Sivas may have considerably changed the urban and social fabric, even though the sources are vague on this point. It is also significant that the madrasas in Sivas were built in 670/1271-72, at a point in time when patronage for such institutions had practically ceased in Konya and Kayseri.454

At this point, the historical background of the construction of the three madrasas in Sivas needs further consideration. It happened concurrently with the slow decline of the Seljuks.455

---

452 The Altun Aba Medrese (599/1202), the Tac ʾul-Vezir Medrese (637/1239), the Sırçalı Medrese (640/1242), the Ali Gav Medrese (first half of 13th century?), the Karatay Medrese (649/1251-52), the Kemāliye Medrese (651/1253), and the İnce Minareli Medrese (undated, attributed to Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī, active 1258-79 CE). All these madrasas were built under Seljuk patronage. For the distribution of eleventh- to fourteenth-century madrasas in Anatolia see Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, fold-out map between p. 160 and plates.

453 The situation in Kayseri is similar: the Küluğ Medrese (607/1210), the Çifte Medrese (602/1205), the Afgunu Medresesi (early 13th century), the Huand Hatun Medrese (around 1240 CE), the Saraceddin Medrese (636/1238), the Hacı Kılıç Medrese (13th century), and the Sahibiye Medrese (666/1267) have patrons connected to the Seljuks.

454 The latest Seljuk foundations in both Konya and Kayseri were connected to Fakhr al-Dīn Șâhîb ’Aṭā, a Seljuk amīr who was active especially in the region of Konya, but was also responsible for the construction of one of the madrasas in Sivas, the Gök Medrese, discussed later in this chapter.

Ilkhanid influence never permanently took hold in Konya, yet the eastern parts of Anatolia, including Sivas, came under their influence, especially from the 1270s onwards. A central event in this development was the capture of Kayseri by the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria in 675/1277 after a victory over Mongol armies at Abūlustayn (Elbistan). Only difficulties in providing food for the soldiers and fodder for the horses led the Mamluk sultan Baybars I (r. 658-676/1260-1277) to withdraw from Anatolia after a few months. Faced with this real threat to their power in Iran, and over doubts regarding the loyalty of some Seljuk amirs, most notably the pervāne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān, the Ilkhanids imposed direct control over Anatolia. The measures that were taken included the appointment of governors, the shifting of the capital from Konya to Sivas, and the application of direct taxation. The political situation in Anatolia was additionally complicated by countless rebellions of local rulers, such as that of the Karamanids, who managed to take over Konya for six months in 675/1277.

The impact of this moment in history on architectural patronage is still full of unresolved questions, and the construction of three madrasas in Sivas at a time when the Ilkhanids had begun to show closer attention for Anatolia is among them. Most importantly, the impact of these constructions on the city on the urban and institutional level is unclear. Not a single

456 After the Mongols under Baiju again defeated the Seljuk forces near Aksaray in 1256, the fortifications of Konya were, however, partly destroyed before the Seljuk sultan was allowed to return to his capital. Yıldız, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” 283.
457 For a detailed account of the conflict based mostly on Mamluk sources, see: Amitai, Mongols and Mamluks. Specifically for the impact on Anatolia: Yıldız, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” chapter VI.
458 Amitai, Mongols and Mamluks, 157-178.
madrasa survives that was built before the Mongol invasion of Anatolia.\textsuperscript{460} Today known as Şifaiye Medrese, the dār al-shifā’ of sultan ‘Izz al-Dīn Kaykāvūs, built in 614/ 1217 functioned as a hospital throughout the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{461} The contemporary name reflects the transformation of the building into a madrasa that occurred in the sixteenth century under Ottoman rule.\textsuperscript{462} The waqfiya of the Gök Medrese contains a detailed description of the location of real estate within the city that was assigned to the upkeep of the building and its function. In these descriptions, the names of several madrasas appear that are otherwise unrecorded.\textsuperscript{463}

Thus, there appears to be a correlation between the construction of scholarly institutions in Sivas and the imposition of direct Ilkhanid rule; upon closer observation, this proves to be a tempting suggestion that warrants caution. First, the construction of the madrasas in 670/ 1271-72 took place just before the Ilkhanids imposed more rigid control over Anatolia. Second, the fact that only one of the three patrons who were involved in the construction was certainly connected to the Ilkhanids shows how heterogeneous Anatolia was at this time. In this context, architectural patronage was probably not directly correlated with political domination. Nevertheless, a connection between the heightened political and military Ilkhanid interest in Anatolia and the ephemeral surge in patronage cannot be disregarded. In his study of waqf as a factor in the Islamization of Anatolia, Gary Leiser suggests that the reference to “infidels” in the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{460} A distortion of this image due to the destruction of monuments is of course possible. The Danishmendids, who were responsible for the construction of the Ulu Cami in Sivas, built madrasas in other Anatolian cities in the twelfth century: Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, 11-20.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{461} In the foundation inscription, the monument is referred to as “dār al-şiḥfa” (house of health), RCEA No. 3809.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{462} “Sīwāṣ,” Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition; Yinanç, “Sivas Abideleri ve Vakıfları,” Vakıflar Dergisi XXII (1991): 18-19; for a more detailed discussion of this monument see chapter 2.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
introduction of the Gök Medrese waqfīya was a statement against Mongol advance. This might be a somewhat problematic suggestion since the Mongols (i.e. the Ilkhanids) were the official overlords of the region during the period in question, and such a statement could have been considered rather bold. It should be considered, however, that this might simply be a topos used in waqfīyas, especially those related to madrasas where an emphasis on the teaching of Islamic law, and thus establishing the right way in religious terms, was important.

Patronage for particular scholars drawn to Sivas might be a crucial element. It is, however, unclear who they were and if they were present before the construction of the three madrasas. They might have been, for instance refugees from Central Asia who came to Anatolia in the 1220s, or they might have been invited by the patrons of the new foundations. Given the impact of immigrants from Iran and Central Asia and the shifts they caused in the cultural, intellectual, and economic life of Anatolia, the latter option seems more likely.

Historical and Topographical Context within Sivas

It has been suggested that the Seljuks somewhat neglected Sivas compared to the attention and patronage devoted to Konya, and that it rose under Ilkhanid patronage. The patronage of Ilkhanid officials has been considered as the reason for an architectural revival in

---

464 Leiser, “The Waqf as an Instrument,” 19. On a cautionary note, a similar stipulation is also part of the Karatay waqfīya, dated 649/ 1251, and thus belonging to a time at which the Mongol presence may not have been perceived as quite so threatening. In the latter document, the passage reads: “[…] wa qaṭaʿa dābira ‘l-kufri wa-atfaʿa nārahū wa-kabbara [one word missing] ‘l-shirka […].” My transcription after Turan, “Selçuklu devri vakfiyeleri III,” 129, lines 9-10 of the main text. In English: […] and cut the root of infidelity and extinguish its fire and increase [one word missing] (of?) polytheism.” My translation.

465 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, The Seljuks of Anatolia: their history and culture according to local Muslim sources, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City, 1992), 5-6.
the city and in Central Anatolia, after a gap caused by unrest after the first Mongol incursions in
the 1240s.466

On a cautionary note, the destruction of the city at the hands of Timur in 802/ 1400
might distort the picture considerably; the walls of the city were destroyed and not rebuilt until
the mid-fifteenth century.467 This comes in addition to damage caused by the first Mongol
intrusion in 629/ 1231-32, when the neighborhoods extra muros especially suffered, and after the
battle of Kösedağ ten years later.468

After the defeat of the Mongol forces against the Mamluk armies of Baybars at
Abūlustayn/ Elbistan in 675/ 1277, the Ilkhanid ruler Abaqa Khān was apparently so enraged
that he ordered his troops to lay Anatolia to waste. Only the intervention of the šāhīb dīwān
Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī, who offered to buy out certain cities, could deter this
order; the cities in question are not mentioned in the source with the exception of “half of Sivas,”
suggesting that some damage may have been incurred at this point.469

In addition to the lack of information on architecture in the written sources, the modern
names of the three madrasa in Sivas are not necessarily those that they carried at the time of
construction. The Buruciye Medrese is today named after its patron, Muẓaffar al-Dīn al-
Barujirdī, and this may have been the designation known to the medieval residents of the city.
The historicity of the other two names, Gök Medrese and Çifte Minareli Medrese, is questionable

466 Rogers, Patronage, 263-272.
468 Ibn Bībī, tr. Duda, 229-230.
III: 90-91 of the Russian translation; Rashīd al-Dīn, Jamiʿ uʿt-tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles, tr. Thackston,
vol. 3: 537. The passage has been evoked without reference in Jean Aubin, Emirs mongols et vizirs persans dans les
remous de l'acculturation (Paris, 1995), 24 and with references to Rashīd al-Dīn and similar accounts in Mamluk
sources in Amitai, Mongols and Mamluks, 176-177.
since they both are generic. “Gök” in Ottoman Turkish means ‘sky blue’ or ‘light green’. Accordingly, the Gök or Blue Medrese has a great extent of sky-blue tile on its façade, especially at the base of its minarets, and some in the interior. The name is repeated for medieval buildings equipped with blue tiles in Amasya and Tokat. (In the case of Amasya, the name of the Gök Medrese is documented in the waqfīya of Torumtay, the Ilkhanid governor of the city, dated 665/1267). The Çifte Minareli, or Double/ Paired Minaret Medrese’s most striking feature are its two tall minarets, today fragmentary yet still imposing, placed over the portal, just like in the undated monument in Erzurum discussed earlier. In its waqfīya, the Gök Medrese is referred to as the madrasa al-ṣāḥibīya al-fakhrīya, after its patron Şâhib ʿAtâ Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlî. In the seventeenth-century travel account of Evliyâ Çelebî, a madrasa in Sivas, possibly the Gök Medrese is described in a way that would make it the “Red” rather than “Blue” madrasa.

The location of the three madrasas needs to be addressed as part of a discussion of their construction history (fig. 59). Two of the madrasas, the Buruciye Medrese and the Çifte Minareli Medrese, were built within the perimeter of the Inner or Lower citadel. The Çifte Minareli Medrese is located opposite the hospital of ʿIz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs. Together with the earlier building, it forms a relatively narrow alley that almost forces entry into its monumental portal.

471 The Gök Medrese in Amasya (c. 1270) has blue tiles on the outside of the brick dome of an attached mausoleum. The Gök Medrese in Tokat (c. 1260-1280) has an inscription composed of tile mosaic framing its main īwān (fig. 47).  
474 Evliyâ Çelebî, Seyâhatnâme, III: 122; Van Berchem, MCIA, 25-26 refers to this passage and suggests that it describes the Gök Medrese due to the mention of marble on the portal.  
475 For a plan, see Robert H. Hewsen, “Armenia on the Halys River: Lesser Armenia and Sebastea.” In: Richard G. Hovannisian (ed.) Armenian Sebastea/Sivas and Lesser Armenia (Costa Mesa, CA, 2003), 61; Erdmann Archive Berlin (unnumbered document in file drawer); Evliyâ Çelebi refers to the two zones as iç kale [inner citadel] and yukari kale [upper citadel]; Evliyâ Çelebi, Seyâhatnâme III: 122.
This placement does, however, make the viewing of its façade more difficult; the architects may have made up for this in the choice and distribution of the decoration. The alley between the two buildings ran from the South Gate to the North Gate of the Lower Citadel. Located just a few hundred meters northwest of these buildings is the Buruciye Medrese, now opposite the Mehmed Paşa Camii (988/1580).

This walled section of the city center, located within the larger perimeter of the outer wall, served as the administrative hub of the city into early modern times. Its walls have today disappeared, but an approximate reconstruction is possible based on written sources such as Evliyâ Çelebi’s account. Even visual testimony has been preserved: the walls and the main buildings of Sivas are recognizable on a sixteenth-century depiction of the city. The painting is part of Matrakçî Nasuh’s Beyân-i menâzil-i sefer-i ‘Irâkeyn-i Sulṭân Süleymân Hân, an illustrated description of the Ottoman sultan Süleyman the Magnificent’s campaign to Iran and Iraq against the Safavids in 939-943/1533-36 (fig. 60). The same illustration also shows the Gök Medrese, located outside the inner walls at the foot of the Upper Citadel. The Great Mosque of Sivas, built in 609/1212-13 and equipped with a tall brick minaret, stands in the vicinity.

---

476 Evliya Çelebi, Seyahatnâme III: 122.
477 Matrakçî Nasuh, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, TY 5964, fol. 20a; published in Matrakçî Nasuh, ed. Hüseyin G. Yurdaydın; on Matrakçî Nasuh’s illustrations of historical works, see: J. Michael Rogers, “Itineraries and Townviews in Ottoman Histories.” In: John Brian Harley and David Woodward (eds.) The History of Cartography, II, book 1 – Cartography in the traditional Islamic and South Asian societies (Chicago, 1987), 235-245.
The Çifte Minareli Medrese

Today, the Çifte Minareli Medrese (fig. 61) marks the center of Sivas even though only its portal façade with parts of the minarets has been preserved. The minarets tower over the area of the Inner Citadel, currently a park-like preserve for the medieval monuments, across the major thoroughfare of the İnönü Bulvarı from the Atatürk Congress and Ethnographical Museum.

The patron of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, the șahb-dīwān (minister of finance) of the İkhanid sultan, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī (d. 683/1284) was a member of an Iranian family that rose to ephemeral prominence under Mongol rule in the 1260s. His brother was ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Atā Malik Juwaynī (d. 682/1283), governor of ‘Irāq al-‘Arab and Khuzistan for more than 20 years. The latter is better known as the author of the Tārīḵ-i Jahān-gūšā (History of the World Conqueror), a chronicle covering Mongol reign from the conquests of Genghis Khan to the defeat of the Ismailis by Hülegü.

Both brothers were highly successful members of the Persianate Muslim elite that took on the task of serving the İkhanid administration after the conquest of Iran and Iraq and the

478 Meinecke, Fayencedekorationen, II, cat. 111.
479 The park was established between my visits to Sivas in July 2008 and July 2010. In addition to the paving, the plan of the Çifte Minareli Medrese was recreated with blocks of masonry, and the area between the walls paved over. This probably eliminates every hope of further excavation in the near future. The façade of the Çifte Minareli Medrese was heavily restored during the same period. The restoration of the Şifaiye Medrese was in progress during both visits.
deposition of the Abbasid caliph in 656/1258. The fortunes of the clan turned in the late 1270s after the brothers were suspected of conspiring with the Mamluks, the archrivals of the Ilkhanids. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad could escape the accusations, but ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik, even though eventually released, was imprisoned and tortured. When he was again accused of treason in 682/1283, the by then elderly vizier could not bear the news and died of a stroke.

Not much is known about Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī as a patron outside Baghdad, where the family had been centered since ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik became governor in 657/1259. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī is not known to have commissioned monuments in Anatolia apart from the madrasa in Sivas. His involvement in Anatolia was connected to attempts to strengthen Mongol rule over the region in the 1270s, and especially in 675/1277, several years after the construction of the madrasa. Sara Nur Yildiz notes that Ibn Bībī, the main chronicler of Seljuk rule in Anatolia, highly praised the Juwaynīs, probably largely because ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik had commissioned his work. Nevertheless, the fact that a Juwaynī commissioned a history of the Seljuks, focusing on the reign of ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kaykubād I. (r.616-633/1219-1236) is significant in displaying interest in Anatolia, and a wish to understand its history. Ibn Bībī’s attitude towards the Mongols throughout his work is rather ambiguous, describing the horrors of conquest as well as the presents received by Seljuk emissaries at the Ilkhanid court. In this respect, he displays an attitude similar to that of this patron who, in his History of the World Conqueror (Tārīkh-i Jahān-gushā), tries to negotiate a

483 “Il-Khanids,” Encyclopedia Iranica, 651; Aubin, Emirs mongols et vizirs persans.
485 Rogers generally does not take the Juwaynīs for great builders: Rogers, Patronage, 233.
position between his Mongol employers and the Muslims of his native Persia, shaken by the destructive force of the conquest.

In a context where the Ilkhanids strove for military control over a restive area, the foundation of an important madrasa in a Central Anatolian city of the commercial and administrative significance of Sivas is too striking to be a mere coincidence. An investigation into the lives of scholars present in the city at that time may give an indication for Juwaynī’s motifs, such as the presence of a scholar adhering to the same school of law, yet, as noted before the sources offer preciously little material for such a study.

Given Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī’s position within the Ilkhanid administration, political factors are likely to have played a major role in the decision to build the madrasa. The foundation inscription (fig. 62) on the portal of the Çifte Minareli Medrese betrays the political intentions of the patron: against custom, it does not mention the name of a ruler, neither that of his Ilkhanid overlord, nor that of the Seljuk sultan who used to rule in Sivas.

The inscription over the portal states: “The construction of this blessed madrasa was ordered by the great statesman, the king of the viziers (ministers) of the world, Shams al-Dīn wa-l-dunyā Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, the šāḥib dīwān, may God perpetuate his rule, in the year 670.”

487 For the importance of the four schools of law in Islam and their distribution in Anatolia in the Middle Ages, see infra.

488 RCEA No. 4644. Moreover, the mention of the ruler’s name on inscriptions was not – unlike his mention on coins (sikka) and in Friday prayers (khuṭba) – an absolute privilege: Korn, Ayyubidische Architektur, I: 165

In this inscription, Juwaynī used titles that were generally reserved for the Seljuk sultan. This was first interpreted as a sign of sovereignty in Sīvās şehrī, a history and architectural history published by Rızvân Nāfīd [Edgüer] and İsmâ’il Hakki [Uzunçarşılı] in 1928. In the absence of the nisba in the patron’s titles given in the inscription, the two historians also suggest the identification of the patron with Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī, which has since been accepted.490

The absence of the name of the Seljuk sultan points out the shift in rule, and the loss of actual power that the Seljuks experienced. Since the patron, Juwaynī, was a high official of the Ilkhanid rulers, his choice was perhaps an obvious one, especially considering that his overlords were not yet Muslim, and thus could not appropriately be named in the inscription.491 A comparison with the foundation inscription on the façade of the Buruciye Medrese (fig. 63) shows the impact of the rank of the patron on these choices. In the Buruciye Medrese, the foundation inscription reads:

“This madrasa was built in the days of the rule of the great sultan Ghiyāth al-dunya wa-l-dīn Abū ‘l-Fatḥ Kaykhusraw b. Kilîj Arslân – may God perpetuate his rule – by the weak slave, who is in need of the mercy of his forgiving Lord, al-Muẓaffar b. Hībātallāh al-Barūjirdī – may God forgive him and his parents and all Muslims – in the months of the year 670.”492

By inserting the name of the ruling Seljuk sultan, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (r. 662-682/1264-1283), the patron of the Buruciye Medrese acknowledges a higher authority that had effectively become defunct at the time. The standard protocol of foundation inscriptions is

490 Rızvân Nāfīd [Edgüer] and İsmâ’il Hakki [Uzunçarşılı], Sīvās şehrī (İstanbul, 1346 [1928]), 114-115.
followed, whereas in Juwaynī’s case, the text makes a statement of sovereignty, likely for the patron as proxy of the Ilkhanids, rather than in his own name. A similarly ambitious inscription appears on the Gök Medrese, yet its patron, Şāhīb ’Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī was careful to have it placed in the courtyards rather than in plain view on the exterior of the building.493

Juwaynī’s use of royal titles on the façade defies all the rules of epigraphic protocol in Seljuk Anatolia. Rather than hiding such an ambitious inscription in the courtyard of the building, as Şāhīb ’Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī did in the Gök Medrese, Juwaynī displayed it on the façade.494 Maybe this was an indication that he did not have anything to fear in doing so, certainly not from the largely powerless Seljuk sultans, and not even from the Ilkhanid ruler, since the interest in Anatolia and control of the local dealings of the elite might have been rather marginal before 1277. Moreover, Ilkhanid rulers (perhaps quite naturally) are not named in foundation inscriptions in Anatolia before the conversion of Ghazan Khān (r.694-703/ 1295-1304) to Islam just preceding his accession to the Ilkhanate.495

The Çifte Minareli Medrese, in addition to its location within the inner ring of walls, towers over the hospital (dār al-shifā’) of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs. The founder of this building was of one of the more successful sultans among the Seljuks of Rūm. Since he is praised in the

493 Rogers, Patronage, 167-168. RCEA No. 4641: “The foundation of this blessed madrasa was ordered, in order to get closer to God, by the great statesman, the exalted minister, the master of the masters of the Arabs and Persians […] the traces of generosity (?) the stability of the victorious empire, the order of the flourishing community, Abū ’l-khayrātī wa-l-tāʾ āti wa-l-ḥasanātī Fakhr al-Dawlatī wa-l-Dīnī ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, may God ease his demise, on the first of Muḥarram in the year 670.” Arabic text: (1) Amara bi-insāʾi hādhihi ‘l-madrasati ‘l-mubārakati taqarrubān ilā ‘l-lāhī taʿlā [given in shorthand in the RCEA Arabic] ‘l-ṣāḥibī ‘l-a ẓāmu ‘l-dustūru ‘l-muʿāẓamu mawlā mawālī ‘l-ʿar[abi wa-l-ʿajamī… un mot] rusūm al-karami (?) (2) qawwāmu ‘l-dawlatī ‘l-qāhirati wa-niẓāmu ‘l-millati ‘l-zāhirati Abū l-khayrātī wa-l-tāʾ āti wa-l-ḥasanātī Fakhrī ‘l-dawlatī wa-l-dīnī ’Alī bni ‘l-Ḥusayn aḥsana ‘l-lāhu ʿaqabatahū fī ghurrati muḥarramī sana ta ʿina wa-sittamāʾ ia.”

494 Rogers, Patronage, 242.

495 “Ghāzān, Mahmūd,” Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd edition, for this ruler and his rather ambiguous attitude towards Islam. For Ilkhanid architecture in Iran, the standard work remains Wilber, The Architecture of Islamic Iran - the Il-Khanid Period in which the earliest preserved monuments date to the time after Ghāzān Khān’s conversion. For a discussion of Ilkhanid patronage in Anatolia after the conversion of the sultans to Islam see chapter 5.
chronicle of Ibn Bībī, written in the 1280s, his reputation may still have been known when the Çifte Minareli Medrese was built fifty years after his death.\textsuperscript{496} Thus, the lot opposite his hospital may have been especially appropriate for construction in the eyes of an Ilkhanid patron in order to enter into a direct competition with the Seljuk ruler.\textsuperscript{497} In this respect, the construction of the madrasa opposite the hospital might express the same interest in Seljuk heritage as the commission of the chronicle of Ibn Bībī by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭā Malik al-Juwaynī a decade later.

The Çifte Minareli Medrese has been ruined for some time and the structure of the rooms is no longer visible. The remains of the building were torn down in 1882, with the exception of the portal façade that still stands today, in order to make way for a hospital that was later transformed into a school. Only at that point was the final decision made to keep the façade in place, after its destruction had been under consideration.\textsuperscript{498} Max van Berchem earlier stated that the building was destroyed in order to accommodate a military school on the lot.\textsuperscript{499} Aptullah Kuran corroborates this information to the extent that he indicates the construction of a hospital in 1882.\textsuperscript{500} In fact, early photographs such as those that the French Jesuit Guillaume de

\textsuperscript{496} Ibn Bībī’s \textit{al-Avāmir al-`alā’īyya fi ‘l-`umūr al-`alā’īyya (“The most exalted orders regarding the most sublime affairs”) is the most complete near-contemporary source of the Seljuks of Rūm until 1282. Although connected to the Seljuk court as a scribe, Ibn Bībī also received the patronage of the Ilkhanid official ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Juwaynī (as discussed above). Both positions obviously influenced his presentation of the historical event; yet the praise for Juwaynī at the end of his work make it clear that he admired his patron perhaps as much as sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kaykubād, on whose reign the chronicle places a focus. A complete discussion of Ibn Bībī’s work, based on thorough investigation of the Persian text, as well as the historiographical debate surrounding it is the subject of Sara Nur Yildiz’s dissertation. For a critical discussion of the life and work of the author, see especially Yildiz, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” ch. 6 and 7.

\textsuperscript{497} Without sources on the question, this can remain only a suggestion, yet the similar desire to juxtapose new constructions with famed older monuments in the sixteenth and seventeenth century gives a suggestion in this direction. On the early modern uses of such references, see: Necipoğlu, “Challenging the Past,”177-178.

\textsuperscript{498} Rızvân Nāfiḏ [Edgüer] and İsmâʿīl Hakki [Uzuncaşşılı], \textit{Sivâs şehri}, 113.

\textsuperscript{499} Van Berchem, \textit{MCIA}, 5.

\textsuperscript{500} Kuran, \textit{Anadolu medreseleri}, 115; the plan on p. 116 shows only the façade. Halûk Karamağaralı excavated the destroyed part and presented paper at the Uluslararası III. Türk Sanatları Kongresi (3\textsuperscript{rd} International Congress of Turkish Art), showing a reconstruction of the plan that Kuran refers to: “[…] yapılılardan güney tarafındakiinin imaret, mukabilindekinin hamam olduğunu yolunda izler mevcuttur. Yine Karamağaralı’nın açıklamasından
Jerphanion took around 1905, show parts of this new construction through the portal of the madrasa (fig. 64). The modern apartment buildings surrounding the former site of the Inner Citadel on three sides and the major thoroughfare passing to the northwest of it render an understanding of the size of the compound rather difficult on the terrain.

The portal does not project as far into the street from the wall-line of the façade as it does in many other thirteenth-century buildings in Anatolia. This may have been due to the narrow space available for construction. The lateral sections of the façade, especially the corner buttresses, are less well preserved; on the east side, most of the buttress and the height of the wall remain intact, with the exception of the cornice. On the west side, the buttress remains at approximately one quarter of the original height. This state is already apparent in the photographs taken by Jerphanion, probably in 1905, and Max van Berchem in the late 1890s (fig. 65). One of Jerphanion’s pictures shows low residential buildings attached to the ruins of the madrasa.\textsuperscript{501} They are not yet present in van Berchem’s picture which does however show a large mass of debris, now removed, behind the eastern part of the façade.\textsuperscript{502} Constructions similar to those in Jerphanion’s pictures are still visible in the photographs that Albert Gabriel took in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{503}

\textsuperscript{501} Jerphanion, \textit{Mélanges d’archéologie anatolienne}, pl. XXVIII.

\textsuperscript{502} Van Berchem, \textit{MCIA}, pl. XXVI.

\textsuperscript{503} Gabriel, \textit{Monuments turcs}, II, pl. XXXIX.
The scheme of the façade, elongated with a decorated portal block in the center, is close to that of buildings of the first half of the thirteenth century. However, these buildings are not *madrasas*, but rather caravanserais, the way-stations providing accommodation along the major trade routes, such as the Sultan Han near Aksaray, built in 626/1229, and the Hekim Han near Malatya, first built in 615/1218.\(^{504}\) The tall brick minarets towering over the portal are the most striking feature that clearly distinguishes the façade from the pattern established in many early thirteenth-century caravanserais, that is a straight façade with a salient portal block at the center. The minaret pair is thought to be based on the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum, even though the controversy about the date of the latter building leaves room for discussion.\(^{505}\) The minarets show traces of tile decoration on the outsides of their bases (fig. 66). In the zone at the bottom of the shaft, twelve blind arches on each minaret were probably completely covered with tile mosaic. The shafts of the minarets still show turquoise and purple glazed tiles. More tile decoration was placed at the back of the minarets where they join the façade: only the imprints of tiles, probably *kufic* writing geometrically inserted into a square, are visible today, possibly the remains of a much larger decorative program.\(^{506}\)

\(^{504}\) http://www.turkishhan.org/sultanaksaray.htm, accessed 28 November 2009; the website contains descriptions and recent photographs (2001-2005) of a selection of caravanserais in Anatolia. The pictures, when available, offer a good comparison to Erdmann’s photographs taken in 1951-58. On a cautionary note, the Hekim Han was restored in the seventeenth century, possibly quite heavily. I thank Robin Wimmel, Technische Universität Berlin, for pointing this out to me.

\(^{505}\) On the disputed date of this building, with suggestions ranging from the 1220s to the early 14th century, see the discussion at the beginning of this chapter. Moreover, Michael Meinecke points out that in Ilkhanid Iran, from where the paired minaret type has also been thought to have been imported, similar examples have not been preserved to a large extent. Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen*, vol. 1: 79.

\(^{506}\) Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen*, II, 452. A well preserved example of this technique can be found in the Sahip Ata Türbe in Konya (fig. 18). The interior of the *madrasa* must have been richly decorated with tiles as well: “Der Dekorrest am Eingangsīwān zeigt, daß die Fayencedekoration dieser Medrese ursprünglich sehr reich gewesen sein muß. Die Grabungen von H. Karamağralı (sic!) haben dies bestätigt. 1964 waren die meisten ergrabenen Fragmente zur Untersuchung in Ankara (Üniversite: İlahiyat Fakültesi, Türk ve İslâm Sanatları Tarihi Enstitüsü), wo ich sie noch im selben Jahr flüchtig gesehen habe. Es handelt sich um Fayencemosaikfragmente in Aubergine, Kobaltblau und Türkis, teilweise auch um Stücke mit dunkelblauem Sgraffito.” Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen*, vol. 2: 452.
To both sides of the portal, a framed niche is placed slightly above the present street level. On the right side, the space between this niche and the fragmentary corner tower is taken up by two decorative shallow niches one of them adorned with a *muqarnas* hood in a rectangular frame scheme. The other one (fig. 67) is decorated with a knotted motive carrying an inscription similar to the monumental version on the portal of the İnce Minareli Medrese in Konya, built in the 1260s (fig. 68). The inscription on the band is illegible in photographs.

On the left side of the façade, a *muqarnas* niche is inserted into the center of the wall at a considerable height, just below the frieze that closes off the wall in its present state; the cornice is no longer extant. Between the larger niche and the corner buttress, possible fragments of two niches smaller than those on the right side are visible.

The portal itself (fig. 64) is composed of a doorway set deep into the wall, and surrounded by a series of rectangular frames that embellish the structure of the wall, making the decorative frames rather than the door itself the focus of attention. These frames are decorated with different types of motifs – vegetal, geometric, and inscriptions. On both outer sides, towards the flat wall surface, this series of frames is closed off by a rope molding, interrupted by leaves and columns, only to continue around the corners and on the upper part of the portal.

Three highly plastic floral motifs (fig. 69) - even though not as strikingly salient as those on the Great Mosque and Hospital in Divriği - project from the façade below a stilted arch that separates the rectangular frames from the *muqarnas* hood over the doorway, a four-centered

---

507 For details, see Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, II, pl. XLIII.

508 In a conversation with me in July 2010, Oya Pancaroğlu observed that only one of the bands in the knot on the Çifte Minareli Medrese has an inscription. Due to the current restoration project on both the Şifaiye Medrese and the Çifte Minareli Medrese, I was unable to approach sufficiently to examine them in detail during my visits in June 2008 and July 2010. Sara Ethel Wolper suggests that this niche represents the façade of the İnce Minareli Medrese, thus integrating a reference to an earlier building as a demonstration of power. Wolper also suggests that a second decorative niche represents the portal of the Sahib Ata Complex in Konya: Ethel Sara Wolper, “Understanding the public face of piety: philanthropy and architecture in late Seljuk Anatolia,” *Mésogeios* 25-26 (2005), 332-333.
arch. The three motifs are connected with an angled band, more flatly decorated with another continuing floral motif. The spandrels between arch and muqarnas are filled with a dense vegetal pattern. Employing different levels of relief, ranging from fine incisions carved into the stone to the plastic motifs at the upper center of the façade, the stonemasons engaged in a game of light and shadow and that in some ways is more subtle than the exuberant forms in the Great Mosque and Hospital in Divriği (626/1228-29).

The foundation inscription (fig. 62) runs along all three sides of the portal niche, just below the muqarnas field. The latter rises upwards in ten rows, slanting forward so that its apex reaches the level of the façade rather than staying in the recess of the doorway. In the lowest row of muqarnas, the cells intersect, in the center, with a projecting half-globe decorated with geometric netting, but placed on a background of palmettes. There is a highly plastic floral motif on each side, and towards the corners two blind arches filled with scrolls and palmettes.

The muqarnas hood is surrounded by a stilted arched molding that springs from the capitals of the plan corner columns (fig. 70). The capitals show traces of several vegetal motifs, sculpted jutting out from the surface, and arranged in rows. The spandrels between muqarnas and molding are decorated with intricately carved floral motifs. It is in the field above these spandrels and below the innermost of the rectangular frames that one of the most striking motifs on the façade appears.

A plain muqarnas niche surrounded by a rectangular frame with kufesque decoration is inserted into the inner faces of the portal on both sides (figs. 71, 72). The niche begins above a low bench on the side of the portal and reaches up to the height of the springing of the doorway arch. Its sides are closed off by engaged colonettes with two-tiered vegetal capitals. As in the portal, a stilted arch, this time without a molding, runs around the muqarnas hood and the spaces
between the two are decorated with geometric motifs. Above the *muqarnas*, below the continuing frame, we find two small stilted arched panels, one decorated with a kufic inscription (*al-mulk li-llāh*), the other one with a vegetal motif. A thin rope motif surrounds both panels. A tiny *fleur-de-lys* fills the triangular space between their apexes. Above the inscription frame and a plain rounded molding lies an Arabic inscription panel in cursive script with knotted lengths, a motif usually reserved for kufic script.

The niches placed in the façade to both sides of the portal are composed according to a similar scheme as the ones on its inner faces. The niche to the left of the portal is placed in a slightly pointed arch decorated with finely carved medallions of vegetal motifs; they enclose both niche and *muqarnas* hood. The spandrels between *muqarnas* and arch are decorated with a geometric medallion, carved rather flatly, to each side. The following band, decorated with highly plastic vegetal motifs is closed off to both sides with a plain molding that slants inwards. The next frame is composed of an inscription in foliate kufic script, placed inside one last frame with a flatly carved vegetal motif.

A niche on the right of the portal is closed off by a narrow vegetal band that is badly preserved in the top part (fig. 73). On the left side of the niche, towards the portal, the same band continues interlaced vertically between the niche and the portal, and then runs parallel to the portal frame at some distance. It reaches up to about three quarters of the height of the portal, where it may have turned around the corner and been part of the cornice that is no longer extant. On the left side of the façade, a similar band runs around the frames of the niche (fig. 74), upwards parallel to the portals, then around the corner and to the left until reaching the inner edge of the corner buttress, and down along its side. The band, when the façade was complete, appeared to tie it together, integrating the focal point of the portal into the entity of the façade; it
suggests symmetry where none is actually present and in hinting at regularity, the emphasis on free combination of motifs is even more apparent. Here the, solution is more successful in creating a coherent façade than a similar device used in the Gök Medrese, the visual effect of which the German art historian Kurt Erdmann deemed fragmented in his evocative description:

[Gök Medrese] “Facade and lateral parts disconnected. Lateral parts close to Çifte Min. (the placement of the friezes, corner towers, niches, continuation of the friezes around the niches). The portal is without connection to the sides due to the change of materials and the strong salience. In contrast with the Çifte Min., the proportions are unsatisfying. The portal is fragmented into three vertical axes, portal and tower-like basis of the minarets. The mortising of the rectangular brick bases of the minarets into the marble substructure [is] clumsy. Moreover, the base [is] too narrow for the shaft of the minaret. The torus ornament without proportion to the portal decoration, but also to its own inscriptions and to the fanned palmette. The extension of the two lateral portal friezes into the side construcion, where they continue up to the wall, does not create a convincing connection of the sides to the center. The portal would be better without the lateral parts. The molding strongly moved, the ornaments strong.”

Moving away from the portal to the far ends of the façade of the Gök Medrese, we observe that the corner buttresses are complexly decorated, on the left beginning with a triangle-covered zone rising up from the foundations (fig. 75). Above the triangles, there is a band with vegetal decoration. The zone above that reaches up to the middle of the small windows in the façade, it is decorated with rather shallow muqarnas niches, the cells of which are carved with vegetal motifs. The following section, roughly equal in height, is fluted with some applied bulbous vegetal motifs. The last section that today runs to the same height as the rest of the

---

façade but appears to be broken off at the top, is decorated with interlaced angled bands. The corner buttress on the right (fig. 76) has the same decoration on the base as the one on the left. However, the fluted zone begins directly above it, without the interposition of a *mugarnas* zone. It is more heavily decorated, with the projecting parts being entirely covered with vegetal motifs and interlacing according to the same scheme as the uppermost zone of the left buttress.

Overall, the façade is noteworthy for the creative way in which familiar motifs are repeated, newly combined, and juxtaposed with new patterns, especially the highly plastic vegetal forms. Moreover, the larger size compared to early thirteenth-century monuments and the increased use of tile decoration, are noteworthy innovations. This combination of the stonework typical for Anatolia, with the brick and tile decoration more common in Iran, creates a renewed connection with the latter region, the center of the Ilkhanids. This combination of local and imported elements it not new: already the Seljuks of Rûm in the early thirteenth century used such mixing, and adopted Iranian names and associations of kingship, in order to create a specific sense of place that is particular to Anatolia, where the conscious evocation of Iranian references had strong precedent in the early monuments that the Seljuk sultans built.

Despite this originality, the façade has usually been discussed in the framework of thirteenth-century Seljuk architecture without much attention to such details. Kurt Erdmann’s unpublished diaries, which contain detailed descriptions and observations and evoke possible

---

510 The corner buttresses on the Gök Medrese in Sivas are decorated and structured in the same way. It might be possible that the same workshop was employed for certain parts of the two monuments.

511 The integration of these buttresses into the decorative scheme of the façade seems to be a new feature in the second half of the 13th century, beginning with the Sahibiye Medrese in Kayseri: Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese,” 69.

connections between the Çifte Minareli Medrese and a local tradition of stone carving and decoration, are an exception to this rule.  

Since the plan of the Çifte Minareli Medrese is not preserved, the discussion of its architecture, including the tradition that it may be placed in, has taken place on the level of decoration. Three views have been expressed: first, that the madrasa belongs to a continuous “Seljuk” style in the tradition of the early thirteenth century; second, that it reflects predominantly local connections to Divriği; and third, that it suggests Iranian influence through its patron. This last possibility rests in part on the suggestion that workmen were brought from Iran at the orders of the Ilkhanid patron, implying that the building presents a departure from the style(s) of Seljuk Anatolia. However, in many ways, the building is profoundly connected to these local architectural idioms.

The classification within the local context is focused on connections to the Great Mosque and Hospital in nearby Divriği, built in 626/1228-29 (fig. 77). This small and today rather sleepy town lies in the region of Sivas, today about a one-hour dolmuş (minibus) ride away from the city. In the first half of the thirteenth century, Divriği was the center of the Mengücekids, a local Turkic dynasty that was eventually subdued by the Seljuks of Rūm in Konya. The ruler of

---

513 Erdmann, Tagebücher, I: 56; XII: 1153, 1181-1184, 1204-1206.

514 An exception here is Michael Meinecke who remarks that the Iranian origin of the patron may explain certain elements of the decoration untypical for Anatolia that could point to workmen brought to Sivas especially for the construction of this building, Meinecke, Fayencedekorationen, vol. 2: 451. To some extent, J. Michael Rogers has hinted at the existence of eastern influence, e.g. in fourteenth-century monuments in Niğde. Even though he takes back the suggestion in his 1971 dissertation, possibly due to lack of evidence, the author earlier displays interest in a Mongol connection, commenting on the poor preservation of Ilkhanid monuments in Iran: “The monuments in Eastern Anatolia which can be ascribed to the latter part of the 13th century acquire, therefore, importance as evidence for Mongol civilization, quite apart from their intrinsic importance as Seljuk creations.” Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese,” 64.

the Mengücekids, Husām al-Dīn Aḥmadshāh b. Sulaymānshāh and Tūrān Malik, often assumed to be the ruler’s wife, founded the complex in 626/1228-29. The building is notable for the decoration of its three portals, sculpted into the soft yellowish limestone of the region: the portals are surrounded by plastic vegetal motifs, with leaves sculpted nearly in the round jutting out from the façade. Two portals leading into the mosque (figs. 78, 79) as well as the portal of the hospital (fig. 80), display oversized and highly plastic leaves and vegetal scrolls. From a visual point of view, a connection between the monuments of Sivas and the portals in Divriği is, in my opinion, compelling both considering the quality of the stone carving and the use of highly plastic motifs; yet the forty-year hiatus between the projects raises the question of transmission and continuity of specialized knowledge.

It has been argued that the decoration of the Buruciye Medrese and that of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas were derived from that of the building in Divriği by a direct connection of workshop tradition. Due to the short distance between the two locations, manageable even in a time when travel had to rely on horse riding or walking, the comparison is quite compelling. Moreover, the existence of now destroyed buildings in the region that filled this gap and created a true continuity should not be excluded. Making the connection does, however, beg some qualification in order to be sufficient for our understanding of the monuments in Sivas. A major difference between the Great Mosque in Divriği, and the later monuments in Sivas and Erzurum, is the use of glazed tiles and brickwork. While in Divriği, tiles

---

516 Pancaroğlu discusses how the inscription do not explicitly refer to Tūrān Malik as the wife of the Mengücekid ruler: Pancaroğlu, “The Mosque-Hospital Complex at Divriği,” 172-173

517 Rogers, Patroseg, chapter 2.
were not used at all, the monuments in Sivas and Erzurum reached a new form of hybridity that was unprecedented in eastern Anatolia.  

The chronological hiatus makes the connection to one single workshop somewhat problematic, especially looking at the low life expectancy in medieval times. In this light, I propose to see both Divriği and Sivas within the context of a larger local tradition rather than as the fruit of one single workshop that developed over time. Close observation of the decoration in all three buildings adds a visual element to this point of caution: It is true that the plastic elements on the façades of the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Buruciye Medrese evoke the portals of Divriği, so readily that Kurt Erdmann referred to them as “Divrikblüten” (Divriği flowers). This is certainly a compelling analogy, but Erdmann is also careful to limit it to the highly plastic elements that appear in much smaller numbers in Sivas than in Divriği, and are combined with more flatly carved geometrical and floral patterns.

Apart from these salient flowers and leaves, especially the ones on the portal of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, on the band high above the doorway, the portals in Sivas respond to a different aesthetic sensibility. Even the flowers themselves, as evocative as they are, have an entirely different effect here: rather than being an overwhelming maze of plastic forms, the alternation between flat and plastic parts accentuates the emerging forms. In terms of aesthetic sensibilities, Divriği is the full-blown version of a mode of decoration and a display of skill that has not found its equal. In Sivas, some of the same principles are used, especially the skill of

518 I thank Professor Necipoğlu for this suggestion.
519 In the context of trans-regional connections, it may be relevant to point out the existence of what appear to be preparatory sketches carved into stone that appear in similar shape in Divriği and Ani. Ömür Bakırer, “The Story of Three Graffiti,” Muqarnas 16 (1999): 42-69.
having large and highly plastic motifs jut out from the façade and at the same time stay safely in place.

The way in which these motifs are placed does point to a change in aesthetic understanding or taste. No longer are these motifs the dominant feature used all over the portal as in Divriği. Much rather, they are part of a scheme of decoration that plays with high plasticity, including relief in different heights down to motifs that appear as though they were etched into the stone, and floral and geometric motifs and inscriptions executed in these different ways. This interplay is very subtle, to the point that changes of motifs within one surface are often nearly imperceptible without careful attention. The plastic motifs, on the contrary, are placed very consciously in the spots that would earn them, and the skillful master who carved them, full attention.

These subtle differing levels of relief are absent in Divriği, where the decoration impresses with its plasticity and volume but does not rely on alternation of high and low in order to tease the viewer’s eye. Something clearly changed in the taste of time that would have governed both the patron’s demand and the ways in which workmen conceived a building. The decoration of Divriği, and by extension that of the monuments in Sivas, has been connected to fourteenth-century stucco decoration in Iran, which in turn has its roots in examples going back as far as the twelfth century.521 The connections between the motifs are indeed compelling,

521 One of Rogers’s fourteenth-century examples, the Gunbad-i ‘Alawiyân in Ḥamadan, has been convincingly placed by Raya Shani in the context of the late twelfth century. Moreover, Rogers cautions that the presence of obvious Armenian influence on the decoration of Divriği renders an evaluation of the Iranian connection much more difficult and even problematic. Rogers furthermore makes a connection to Armenian manuscript illumination that I had difficulty following since the plates are invisible in the reproduction of the dissertation that I have been able to obtain: Rogers, Patronage, 135-139. On Ḥamadan, see: Raya Shani, A Monumental Manifestation of the Shi‘ite Faith in Late Twelfth-Century Iran: The Case of the Gunbad-i ‘Alawiyân, Hamadan (Oxford, 1996). The connection to Iran is also referred to in: Doğan Kuban, Selçuklu Çağında Anadolu Sanati (İstanbul, 2002), 123.
especially for the shapes of leaves of palmettes, as well as some of the internal decoration of the leaves, filled with small geometric patterns cut deeply into the stone.

The connection to Iran, compelling in my opinion, is not uncontested. Oya Pancaroğlu has argued for a connection to the region of Ahlat in south-eastern Anatolia with its tradition of stone carving, preserved especially in funerary steles. A connection between Divriği is given in the signature of Khurramshāh b. Mughīth al-Khilāṭī (from Ahlat) which appears in the interior of the monument. The stone carving tradition of overlapping floral motifs, which appear on the tomb stelae in the Muslim cemeteries of Ahlat, dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, could have made its way to Divriği through the work of Khurramshāh. This transmission would have taken place through the use of paper models that could be used in any medium, rather than in a direct adaptation from stucco to stone.522 While the argument of paper cartons to be used in transmitting motifs is certainly convincing, I would not exclude a connection to Iran, even if Ahlat may have played a part in it.

Likewise, I would not exclude a connection between Divriği and Sivas, despite the chronological gap between the monuments. Even though some of the design principals are different, the connections to Iranian stucco are also visible in the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Buruciye Medrese in Sivas. While some of the leaf shapes are also present, it is the use of scrolls and palmettes that is more strikingly similar, especially when the different decorative systems are used overlaying each other, to some degree intertwined but still easily distinguished. The intermingling of motifs that remain distinct resembles stucco examples in Iran, a parallel that raises the question of modes of transmission and adaptation of motifs. This is more difficult to assess because even within Iran, our knowledge of the formation of and connection between

522 Pancaroğlu, “The Mosque-Hospital Complex at Divriği,” 184-188.
workshops has to remain on a hypothetical level, based on an obviously modern evaluation of stylistic connections. Rogers suggests that the distribution of the decoration on the portals of Divriği corresponds neither to Anatolian Seljuk nor to Iranian models. This conclusion is hard to evaluate, yet it may be more useful to consider the motifs of Divriği as having passed into a regional vocabulary by the time they were used in Sivas, thus being part of a flexible repertoire rather than the product of a specific, continuous workshop tradition. Furthermore, a different aesthetic stance becomes apparent upon closer observation.

The details of the decoration of the monuments in Sivas call to mind Iranian stucco work of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. This is especially evident in fleshy vegetal motifs that project from the façade at intervals, and from the way in which several ornamental systems are overlaid to form one system without, however, being lost in each other. Similar forms of stucco decoration were employed in Ilkhanid Iran into the fourteenth century, such as at the mausoleum of Pîr-i Bakrān near Isfahān, built between 698/ 1299 and 712/ 1312 (fig. 81).

A similar way of using systems of decoration is apparent on the buttresses of the Çifte Minareli Medrese and, even more clearly, on the façade of the Buruciye Medrese (see discussion below). Thus, the question of the origin and training of the workmen involved in the project is

---

523 For the region of Kashan in Iran, in which several examples of stucco decoration of the 11th and 12th centuries survive, see Raya Shani, “On the Stylistic Idiosyncrasies of a Saljuq Stucco Workshop from the Region of Kashan,” Iran 27(1989), 67-74.

524 Rogers, Patronage, 136.

525 According to Laor-Sirak, local traditions in architecture persisted in Anatolia throughout the Middle Ages. Thus, the presence of Armenian masons accounts for similarities and strong technical connections: Sharon Laor-Sirak, “The Role of Armenians in Eastern Anatolian Muslim Architecture (1071-1300).” PhD dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2008 [in Hebrew with English summary] 173-174. I thank Mika Natif for providing me with an outline of the argument. On the problem of contextualizing the monument in Divriği and its decoration, see: Pancaroğlu, “The Mosque-Hospital Complex at Divriği”.

pertinent. The architecture points to local labor in the quality of the stone construction and carving, and to influence from Iran in the motifs employed on the decoration. The origin of this influence, through migrating craftsmen, transmission of (hypothetical) drawings, or portable objects, is near impossible to solve in the absence of written sources concerning the matter.527

Before I discuss the context of the workmen present in Sivas, an analysis of the Buruciye Medrese, followed by the Gök Medrese, will allow me to draw clearer conclusions based on stylistic elements and use of motifs in these monuments.

The Buruciye Medrese

The Buruciye Medrese (fig. 82) is named after its patron, Muẓaffār al-Dīn Hibāt-ALLĀH al-Barūjīrdī. The patron is only known from the foundation inscription on this building, as he goes unmentioned in the written sources.528 The founder’s nisba, al-Barūjīrdī, refers to the town of Barūjird, located about 100 km south-southeast of Hamadan in Iran, suggesting that he might have been an Ilkhanid official, or that his family emigrated from Iran to Anatolia in the wake of the Mongol conquests of the 1220s. The mention of the Seljuk sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (r. 662-682/1264-1283) in the foundation inscription, however, suggests a Seljuk rather than Ilkhanid connection.529 The inscriptions do not give more detailed information

527 In the sense that no drawings from this period has been preserved, yet the fifteenth-century Topkapı Scroll which contains complex drawings probably used as models for construction suggests that an earlier tradition existed: Gülru Necipoğlu, The Topkapı Scroll: Geometry and Ornament in Islamic Architecture: Topkapı Palace Museum Library MS H. 1956 (Santa Monica, CA, 1995), 3-6.
528 Meinecke, Fayencedekorationen, vol. 2, cat. 110. The foundation inscription (RCEA No. 4643) gives the name of Barūjīrdī’s grandfather as ‘Abdallāh. This might be an indication of the recent conversion of the family to Islam since “Ibn ‘Abdallāh” was often employed as a patronymic by converts to Islam: Annemarie Schimmel, Islamic Names (Edinburgh, 1989), 8.
529 For the full inscription see supra, p. 176.
about the patron, yet a short passage from the building’s *waqfiya* that was carved onto the monument reveals some of his intentions in the foundation of the *madrasa*. Today, these medallions are dislocated from their original position and placed in niches in the two lateral walls of the main *iwan*, with the addition of a forth one on which the script has deteriorated beyond legibility (Fig. 83).\(^{530}\) Unfortunately, I have not been able to reconstruct the original location of these medallions. It may be that they have been displaced for quite some time, possibly since the early twentieth century. The reading of the inscription as it appears in the *Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe* does not explain the location of the *waqfiya* medallions. The rendering of the content of the inscription is based on that in the *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptiorum arabicarum (MCIA)*. The images of the medallions in *MCIA* (pl. XLII, no. 20) are photographs of squeezes of three medallions. This poses the question whether Edhem and van Berchem managed to get up a scaffold in order to take the squeezes or, conversely, whether the blocs were already displaced from their original location. The text of all medallions combined reads as follows:

> “And the founder stipulated one *mudarris*, three preceptors, thirty scholars of Islamic law, four reciters of the Qur’an, one *imām*, a muezzin and a treasurer for the treasury of books; among all which the founder – may God have mercy with him – endowed to this blessed *madrasa* is the village of Iskī in the region of Ilbiklu.”\(^{531}\)

A restoration was carried out in 1956, including the replacement of fallen stone blocks at the top of the main *iwan*.\(^{532}\) A further restoration was in progress during Meinecke’s visits in

---


\(^{532}\) Akok, “Sivas’ta Buruciye”. 

---
From 1967 until 1981, the Buruciye served as the museum of Sivas. At the time of my first visit in summer 2008, the building housed a café and small stores selling the products of local crafts.

The Buruciye Medrese, located in the vicinity of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, does not give the towering impression of its neighbor, since it does not have the tall brick minarets that make the latter building stand out against the sky. The decoration of the portal façade, however, is carefully and intricately carved, displaying floral and geometrical motifs surrounding the *muqarnas* calotte that is located above the doorway (fig. 84). Medallions and large fleshy floral motifs stand out from the otherwise rather flatly carved low relief. The effect is similar to that of the façade of the Çifte Minareli Medrese. On both sides of the portal section, a fragmentary possibly Qur’anic inscription, runs just below the cornice (fig. 85), tying the portal block to the façade in not quite as delicate a way as the band of decoration in the Çifte Minareli Medrese.537

The portal, through an entrance *īwān* that is vaulted with a shallow dome, gives access to a small courtyard (fig. 86). Opposite the entrance another *īwān* closes off the courtyard to the east. Arcades run along the sides of the building, from the portal to the east *īwān*. In the center of

534 Kâhya notes that the museum was transferred to the Buruciye from the Gök Medrese: Kâhya “Sivas Gökmedrese üzerine yeni bir değerlendirme,” 443.
535 Visibility of the façade was obscured during my first in 2008 by ongoing excavations in front of the building that revealed clay water pipes. So far I have been unable to locate a publication of this work. The work had been completed at my most recent visit in July 2010, allowing me to observe that many details of the carving are no longer visible due to damage caused by air pollution.
536 Gabriel, *Monuments turcs*, II, pl. XLVIII.
both the north and south side of the building, a smaller īwān is inserted which is also reflected in the wider span and slightly higher apex of the central arch on each side.

The interior of the Buruciye Medrese is connected to other, roughly contemporary examples, for instance the Gök Medrese in Tokat, an undated building thought to have been constructed between 1260 and 1280 (fig. 87). If the carved decoration of the Buruciye Medrese was essentially a local product of Sivas, inherently connected to the nearby Çifte Minareli Medrese, and to the earlier monuments in Divriği, its structure and tile decoration find parallels in a wider region. In both the Buruciye Medrese and the Gök Medrese in Tokat, a similar arrangement of arcades built of spolia (columns and capitals), running towards a larger īwān, was used. The plan of both buildings is based on the four-īwān type, but in Tokat, a second story was built over the arcades, providing an upper level gallery with access to rooms for students (fig. 88). In the Buruciye Medrese, such structures may have been located in annex buildings that are not preserved. In the Buruciye, side chambers to the right and left of the portal served as mosque and mausoleum of the founder, respectively (fig. 89). In Tokat’s Gök Medrese, a mausoleum containing several anonymous burials is located in the right corner close to the main west īwān. The mosque is located in a chamber to the left of the same īwān.

Another difference between the two buildings lies in the nature of the decoration. In Tokat, a Qur’anic inscription composed of tile mosaic in nearly black manganese purple, turquoise, and dark blue, accompanied by a geometric and a floral back of decoration, runs around the frame of the īwān (fig. 90).


539 Meinecke, *Fayencedekorationen*, vol. 2: 447. The mausoleum is still preserved, but the mosque serves as the kitchen for the café that is located in the building.

540 Qur’an II: 255, the so called throne verse, a very common passage in monumental inscriptions.
In the Buruciye, on the other hand, the decoration of the īwān is entirely carved in stone (fig. 91). Tiles are limited to the interior of the mausoleum chamber, where an inscription runs around the square based of the dome, and a row of small muqarnas cells covered in blue and black tile follows above it (fig. 92). The inscription is written in black cursive script on a background of turquoise scrolls and white surface. It refers to the burial of the founder, invoking God’s forgiveness and charity upon him. The squinches in the corners are covered with a geometrical pattern of turquoise bands and black stars. At the center of each side of the square, a pointed arched panel was also decorated with similar patterns, but all these examples are badly preserved. Fragments of tile can be distinguished throughout the brick dome. Below the inscription, the walls are covered with hexagonal turquoise tiles, and are whitewashed in the area where the tile has not been preserved. The three cenotaphs in the mausoleum are covered with cloth, so that decoration on them is not visible.

The exterior aspect of the two buildings is different as well: while the façade of the Buruciye Medrese is dominated by plastic carved motifs, the Gök Medrese is most notable for the use of two colors of stone on the façade (fig. 93), creating the striped look known as ablaq, prevalent in southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria. Whereas this technique is quite rare in

---


542 “[Basmalah] My God, I do not have a course of action to approach you, nor a good deed to show to you other than my poverty, my neediness, my lowliness and my loneliness. Relieve my exile and be my close friend in my grave. I have taken refuge with you and relied on you, you are the most noble of benefactors [ (parts of Qurʾān, LXVI, 8; LX, 4) This is the mausoleum of the weak, strange, and lonely slave, Muṣaffār bin Hibātallāh Muṣaffāḍalī al-Barūjirīḥ, may God forgive him and his parents and all Muslims, and may He bless him with paradise and with felicity in the afterlife. May God keep him company in his solitude and may He have mercy on his tomb. Whoever changes my tomb and alters my burial, you are His opponent, and may the wrath of God, the angles, and all people fall upon him.” My translation after RCEA No. 4650.
central Anatolia, it does occasionally appear on monuments in Tokat, for instance in the mausoleum of Nūr al-Dīn b. Sentimūr (713/1313).

Despite the absence of tiles on the decoration of the qibla īwān of the Buruciye Medrese, the result is nonetheless sumptuous. The carving over the īwān is even more intricate than that above the portal. A decoration composed of floral and geometric motifs, arranged in two closely connected, yet visually separate layers extends over the spandrel between the arch and the slightly higher upper line of the center of the façade. The inscription that frames the īwān almost disappears in its background of palmettes and scrolls, and seemingly is grown together with the decoration of the spandrels. From the latter, half globes emerge. They are also decorated, but the motifs are hard to distinguish due to the poor degree of preservation of the stone. 543 A further Qur’anic inscription in cursive script with few palmettes in the background runs around the three walls of the main īwān just below the springing of the vault (fig. 94).

In some ways, the Buruciye is a Çifte Minareli Medrese en miniature without the minarets, at least in terms of façade decoration.544 The hierarchy between the patrons plays an important role here: whereas the patron of the Çifte Minareli Medrese was one of the viziers of the Ilkhanids, the patron of the Buruciye Medrese was probably a lesser official, connected to either the Seljuks or the Ilkhanids, but in either case the latter’s vassal. Thus, even if he was able to hire the same workshops after the Çifte Minareli Medrese was completed, Barūjīrdī would not have had the same financial resources, nor would he have been allowed to commission a monument that could equal or out-do the madrasa of Juwaynī. Thus, the hierarchy between

543 The inscription shows the same verse (II: 225) as in the Gök Medrese (my reading from mine and Meinecke’s photographs). N. Burhan Bilget, Sivas’ta Buruciye medresesi (Ankara, 1991), 35-41 gives some of the building’s inscriptions, but not the ones on the main īwan.

544 Erdmann, Tagebücher, XII: 1156 makes a similar observation, suggesting that workmen of similar training but lesser skill than those constructing the Çifte Minareli Medrese worked on the Buruciye.
patrons, reflected in their agency, intersected with the differences that were rooted in the agency of different workshops.

The concepts of design used on both facades are similar: flat low relief from which large and fleshy floral motifs arise in prominent spots, such as over the apex of arches. In the Buruciye Medrese, a total of seven highly plastic motifs emerge from the flat background carving (fig. 95), four of them in the spandrels between muqarnas hood and the beginning of the rectangular frames enclosing the portal, and three within the broadest of these frames. In addition to these motifs, two medallions with geometric decoration jut out from the bases of engaged colonettes that form the top part of the innermost molding around the doorway and muqarnas. The composition is even more striking than the façade of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, perhaps because it is not dominated by tall minarets that attract the attention of the viewer.

If the Buruciye indeed can be seen as a small version of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, this opens questions beyond the notion of scale. The hierarchy of patronage is one issue: although nothing is known about his life, it is safe to assume that al-Barujirdī was inferior in rank to a member of the very prominent Juwaynī family, with the cautionary note that the question of his position and affiliation, whether with the Ilkhānid or Seljuk elite, has not been resolved. The architecture of the Buruciye Medrese shows that its patron operated on a more modest scale, reflecting the hierarchy of patronage. Barūjirdī clearly was of some importance, since he was able to build his foundation on a prominent site within the inner course of walls of Sivas. Thus, even though in terms of size and possibly richness of decoration of the Buruciye Medrese is less imposing than its neighbor the construction project was equally ambitious. Perhaps, the investment of the patron was even higher in personal terms, since unlike Juwaynī, Barūjirdī is buried in a mausoleum inside his madrasa.
Knowing the relationship between the two patrons would greatly help in understanding the precedence of one over the other building. It cannot be resolved from the inscriptions: both monuments were built in 670/1271-72, but the month in which the construction was begun is not given. In certain ways however, the architecture might reflect the hierarchical distance between the two patrons, with Juwaynī commissioning the construction of the more impressive madrasa, and Barūjirdī aspiring to a similar aesthetic. This possibly points to the employment of the same workmen on both construction sites.

Beyond comparing the two buildings, the affiliation of their patrons opens the question whether style reflects political rule in medieval Anatolia. In much of the literature that has been written about them, the portals of both madrasas have been considered entirely Seljuk in style, expressing political competition and statements of sovereignty through architecture.

In this context, style could mark political intention, such as in the case of Juwaynī who imported Iranian elements such as double minarets and tile decoration in order to establish a physical connection to the center of the Ilkhanid realm, and thus mark the political ties that now bound Anatolia to this region. Still, the use of such elements was not limited to patrons directly connected to the Ilkhanids. Thus, Barūjirdī may have had such as connection, yet the foundation inscription on his building mentions the Seljuk sultan while at the same time, tile decoration referring to Iran adorns the interior of the patron’s mausoleum.

Style thus could indicate a direction of political intention, yet the public’s understanding of the patron’s motivation was at the same time also reliant on inscriptions. As discussed in Chapter Two, a direct reading of these inscriptions requires of course literacy and knowledge of Arabic. The impact of oral transmission, however, is considerable here and thus, the inhabitants

---

545 RCEA No. 4642, No. 4643, No. 4644.
of Sivas were certainly aware of the fact that both Ilkhanid and Seljuk patrons built in their city, even several generations after construction was completed. This issue is pertinent in a context of the complexity of thirteenth-century Anatolia, where two major competing dynasties, several ethnic groups with their respective languages, and at least two major religions were present as early as the eleventh century. Still, neither is the use of certain stylistic elements exclusively the premise of artistic agency, nor are inscriptions the only place for patrons to state their political and territorial intentions. Rather, a complex system of negotiation was in place, in which imported and local elements were combined: this reflected both craftsmen’s skills in certain materials (especially stone) and patrons’ intent towards displaying political tendencies through use of certain architectural features (such as tile and double minarets).

With the addition of Mongol presence beginning in the 1240s, the picture became even more complicated. At the time of the construction of the madrasas in Sivas, the Ilkhanid rulers had not yet converted to Islam. Some of them were Shamanists, some Christians, or Buddhists. At the same time, the majority of the administrative elite of the Mongol rulers of Iran, the Ilkhanids, were Persian-speaking Muslims. The Juwaynīs belong to this group. Only with the conversion of Ghāzān Khān in at the end of the fourteenth century Islam became more central for the Ilkhanid rulers, who began to be named in foundation inscriptions, as Chapter Five will show. Thus, Juwaynī’s omission of the mention of a sovereign in the inscription of the Çifte Minareli Medrese was probably a show of disdain for the powerless Seljuk sultan, and the patron’s own name was so prominently placed in absence of an alternative. The style used on the monuments carries the potential for a two-fold interpretation: on the one hand, it reflects a local style of Sivas, pointing to the activity of craftsmen familiar with the materials and conditions of this city. On the other hand, the monument in some ways is distinct from the Gök Medrese, a
monument built by a high-ranking Seljuk patron, pointing perhaps to political adaptation of this style. The presence of the Buruciyê Medrese, however, leaves this conclusion ambiguous: even though in stylistic terms, the monument is quite close to the Çifte Minareli Medrese, its patron named the Seljuk sultan in the foundation inscription. Once more, the style of the monuments may have been the result of the agency of craftsmen and architects, while the inscriptions reflected political aims.

The Gök Medrese

The Gök Medrese (fig. 96) stands outside the Inner Citadel, in a part of the city that used to be at the foot of the Upper Citadel.546 The waqfīya of the foundation describes dependencies of the madrasa within the city, including a dār al-ḍiyāfa (possibly a guesthouse or banquet hall) that stood next to it.547 This might concern the lodge-like structure that Wolper refers to when describing the urban context of the madrasa, indicating the accommodation of travelers nearby.548 Changes to the building during the Middle Ages and early modern period are not

547 VGM, 604-67-90, l. 40.
548 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 61. Wolper refers to a dervish lodge, supposedly located near the madrasa, and described by Ibn Battuta without citing the exact passage in the source. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s mention of a dār al-siyāda seems to be the closest to the type of structure Wolper described. The text does not however associate this structure with the Gök Medrese: “There is there [in Siwās] a fine building which is called Dār al-Siyāda. No person lodges in it except sharīfs whose naqīb lives in it.” Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Travels of Ibn Battuta, A.D. 1325-1354, ed. B.R. Sanguinetti and C. Defrémery, tr. H. A. R. Gibb (Cambridge, 1958), 434-435. The Arabic text contains two more words that might have incited Wolper to draw the association with the Gök Medrese: “[…] wa bi-hā dārun mithla ‘l-madrasati [like the madrasa] tusammī dār ‘l-siyāda la-yanziluhā illā ‘l-shurafa’ai.” Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Voyages d’Ibn Batoutah, ed. and tr. C. Defrémery et B. R. Sanguinetti (Pari, 1879-1914) ed, II: 289. The emphasis is mine.
recorded, but even the number of restorations that took place in the nineteenth and twentieth century is enough to indicate that the aspect of the madrasa is today much altered.\footnote{It is not my aim to give a complete overview of these restorations, since this is much better left to the restorers and excavators themselves who had the chance to see the finds and the structure of the monument first hand. What follows is much rather to show that the observations made later on about the monument are subject to a certain amount of caution.}

The first recorded restoration to the building dates to 1239/1823-24 as stated in an inscription in the east īwān.\footnote{Rogers, “The Çifte Minare,” 67; van Berchem and Edhem, MCIA, 23; Ferit and Mesut, Selçuk veziri Sahip Ata, 116.} The inscription, written in Arabic on plaques of white marble inserted into the back courtyard wall, reassembled from loose architectural pieces at this date, reads as follows: “(1) Sayyid ʿAbdallāh, the muftī and teacher, ordered and restored (2) indeed (he) built [the madrasa] again and [his achievement] is due to God purely and endeavoring (3) on the first of Ramaḍān in the year 1239.”\footnote{\textit{wa la-qad ‘amara wa-rammama ‘l-sayyidu ʿAbdallāh ‘l-muftī ‘l-mudarrisu} (2) ka-innahū banāhā thāniyan fa-li-llāhī darrahū khāliṣan saʿiyan (3) fī ghurrati Ramaḍān sanatī tis’a wa thalathūn wa-alf.” My transliteration and translation after Rizvān Nāfid [Edgüer] and Ismaʿīl Hakkı [Uzunçarşılı], 	extit{Sīvās şehrī}, 120.}

Another restoration, including the replacement of the wooden entrance doors and of the fountain in the courtyard, took place in 1904 under the governor of Sivas, ʿÁkif Paşa.\footnote{Rizvān Nāfid [Edgüer] and Ismaʿīl Hakkı [Uzunçarşılı], 	extit{Sīvās şehrī}, 120.} Thereafter the Gök Medrese became a military depot and, later, a religious high school until it was transformed into a museum in 1926. In 1937, the building was restored under the direction of Sedat Çetintaş.\footnote{For a brief summary of the results and pictures, see: Sedat Çetintaş, 	extit{Sivas Darüşşifasi} (Istanbul, 1953).} Further work was executed in 1944, 1951 and 1960, but details on the extent of these restorations are not published. In 1967, the museum was transferred to the Buruciye Medrese. In 1968, Alpay Özdural restored the building with a team from Middle East Technical University in Ankara. During a partial excavation in 1979, Orhan Cezmi Tuncer made
technical drawings for the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü and suggested a reconstruction. In the course of this work, the roof of the madrasa was repaired. Beginning in 1994, the municipality of Sivas took care of the building and a new restoration began in 1996 under the direction of Burhan Bilget. During this work, the fragments found in the courtyard during the 1937 restoration were taken out and the courtyard leveled out. Further technical study of the madrasa was done in 1997-98 by Istanbul Technical University. Another restoration under the direction of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü began in 2006 and was still in progress in 2010. The archaeological work done between 1995 and 2000 has been published in a review article and shows interesting finds such as glazed ceramics and records damages to the building due to earthquakes. Overall, the monument is today so much altered that historical photographs and descriptions are invaluable for an assessment of its architecture.

The patron of the Gök Medrese was Sāhib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī, one of the most powerful amīrs affiliated with the Seljuks even in the years of decline. Unlike al-Barūjirdī and Juwaynī, he is known as a prolific patron in Anatolia: Sāhib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī was responsible for several foundations, mostly in Konya, Kayseri, and their environs. The Gök Medrese is his only foundation in the eastern part of Anatolia, inviting speculation on his motives to endow a madrasa in Sivas in the same year as a high-ranking Ilkhanid rival, and

554 For some of the resulting drawings, see: Orhan Cezmi Tuncer, Anadolu Selçuklu Mimarisi ve Moğollar (Ankara, 1986), 14-18.
555 The documentation including detailed drawings and photographs of this restoration was published in 2008: Orhan Cezmi Tuncer, Sivas Gök Medrese (Şahip Ata Fahrettin Ali Medresesi) (Ankara, 2008).
556 In 1989, this scholar also published a booklet on the building in the series on historical monuments supported by the Turkish Ministry of Culture: N. Burhan Bilget, Gök Medrese (Ankara, 1989).
558 Author’s observation, Sivas, July 2010.
559 Kâhya et al., “Sivas Gökmedrese üzerine yeni bir değerlendirme,” fig. 8 and 445-446.
another patron possibly affiliated with the new overlords of the Seljuks. In this context, it may be significant that the inscriptions of the Gök Medrese state a more precise date than those of the two other buildings, naming the month of Muḥarram 670 (9 August to 5 September 1271).\textsuperscript{561} Perhaps, the patron of the Gök Medrese, unable to construct on the more prestigious site inside the interior course of walls due to his connection to the Seljuk sultan, may have pushed his project to earlier completion.

Among the medieval \textit{madrasas} in Sivas, the full text of the endowment deed has only been preserved for the Gök Medrese. Since the original document does not survive, an early twentieth-century copy in Arabic has to be the basis for all study.\textsuperscript{562} The document notes the location of buildings such as a bath and stores related to the \textit{madrasa}, as well as the names of villages that were intended for its upkeep. The identification of these sites is difficult due to changes in urban structures and place-names. The \textit{waqfiya} also notes that the \textit{mudarris}, the professor of Islamic law teaching at the \textit{madrasa}, could be either Shāfiʿī or Ḥanafī. According to the editors of the \textit{waqfiya}, this stipulation expresses the patron’s personal preference.\textsuperscript{563} These two schools of law were the most popular under Seljuk rule and the choice is thus not surprising.

\textsuperscript{561} \textit{RCEA} No. 4640.


nor is the fact that the Ḥanafī school was named first, putting it in a privileged position. The document was established on 24 Dhū ‘l-Ḥijja 678 / 24 April 1280, several years after the construction was completed. Waqfīyas that postdate their physical structures are not, however, an uncommon occurrence in medieval Anatolia.

As discussed in Chapter Two, in Anatolia, the Ḥanafī and, to a lesser extent, the Shāfiʿī schools of law were preferred without much competition, and in rare instances, waqfīyas related to medieval Anatolian madrasas mentioned related stipulations. Our understanding of the role of ulamā’, however, suffers greatly from a lack of relevant sources.

Unlike the two other contemporary buildings in Sivas, Gök Medrese is signed by its architect, Kālūyān al-Qunawī, i.e. Kālūyān ‘from Konya’ (fig. 97). The identification of this signature with one specific person is disputed in the literature, and has been complicated by the presence of a similar, yet equally obscure signature on other buildings of the same period. An architect signing “Kalūk ibn Abdallah” is documented on three buildings endowed by the same patron in Konya: the Nalıncı Baba Türbe (c. 1255), the Sahip Ata Mosque (656/1258), and the İnce Minareli Medrese (c. 1264). The signature “Kālūyān al-Qunawī” appears on a bath in İlgın (between Konya and Akşehir), built by the same patron, and on the Great Mosque in Bünyan,

567 Kâhya et al., “Sivas Gökmedrese üzerine yeni bir değerlendirme,” 441; RCEA No. 4646. The signature is located on two cartouches on the inner side walls of the portal, the one to the right reading “ʿamal al-üstādh” [work of the master], the one to the left “Kālūyān al-Qunawī,” Bilget, Gök Medrese, figs. 1 and 2. The corresponding captions are switched.
near Kayseri.\textsuperscript{569} It is not clear whether the different signatures, recorded with several variant Arabic spellings, refer to the same person. Meinecke argues that the Kālūyān in Sivas and the one documented in Konya are not the same person on the grounds that the reading of the name is not clear from the Arabic spelling, to the point that the rendering K.lwk, indicating only the vowels used, has been preferred.\textsuperscript{570} Independently of each other, Brend and Tuncer have suggested that Kālūyān might be the apprentice of Kalûk. In his own work, the latter would have been inspired by monuments that his master constructed in Konya.\textsuperscript{571}

Even under the assumption that we are dealing with two different architects, it is significant that Kālūyān al-Qunawī was active for the same patron in other cities, but is not otherwise known to have worked in Sivas. Together with the activity of Kalûk ibn Abdallah, it shows that Şāhib ‘Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alî had a preference for certain architects, and maybe their style, and continuously employed them. Moreover, the presence of Kālūyān al-Qunawī in Sivas at the behest of his patron shows that the transfer of workforces was a possibility if taste dictated and finances permitted.

With reference to the marble decoration used on the façade of the Gök Medrese, Rogers suggests that the master learned his craft from a Northern Syrian emigrant in Konya, the place indicated by his nisba, al-Qunawī. These marble carvings are indeed singular in Sivas and are a
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\textsuperscript{570} Meinecke, \textit{Fayencedekorationen}, vol. 2: 308 discusses all the earlier suggestions of identifying Kalûk with Kālūyān, but himself argues against them; Rogers admits that he does not wish to discuss the identity of this second master since the monuments that he signed – if we are speaking indeed of one person in all three cases – do not give any indication beyond the “culmination of the always eclectic tendencies of Central Anatolian Seljuk decoration.” Rogers, Patronage, 447. In an earlier article, Rogers seems to consider the identification of Kālūyān and K.lwk/Kalûk as one person, even though he is more inclined to see them as local variants of the same name that might refer to two different masters. Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese,” 80-81.

further indicator of an outside origin of some of the workforce; the connection to the façade of the Sahib Ata Camii in Konya is especially strong as it displays a very similar motif carved in marble. This does of course not mean that all workers came to Sivas specifically for the project: some stone masons, as well as men carrying out heavy manual labor might as well have been locals. This is reflected, for instance, in the close resemblance of the corner buttresses of the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Gök Medrese.572

The composition of the façade is similar to that of the Çifte Minareli Medrese with the exception that in the Gök Medrese, the portal projects from the façade (fig. 98). Following the familiar scheme, rectangular frames run around the portal. The outermost frame is decorated with a geometric motif of intersecting stars. It extends to both sides to divide, on one side, the blue tile panels (figs. 99, 100) -now heavily restored- that are placed underneath the minarets, and, on the other side, the moldings that form decorative shapes in the lower two thirds of each side of the façade. The same frame extends around the outer corner and ends at the juncture of the portal and the façade wall, in an attempt to tie together the façade and the main portal block.

On the interior of this frame, three more frames are decorated with different vegetal motifs, step by step receding towards the muqarnas hood (fig. 101). In the top part, this is followed by an inscription. The muqarnas hood hangs under a segmental blind arch. An inscription runs along the inside of this arch, springing from the capitals of the corner colonettes. On the doorway level, a vegetal band is placed between the inscription and the doorway. The bottom part of this inscription lies inside the portal niche, closing off the muqarnas field that recedes toward the level of the doorway.

The doorway, a four-centered arch, comprises stones cut to join in a see-saw pattern. Animal

572 Rogers, Patronage, 166-167 and 445-447.
heads springing from scrolls are carved into the stones placed at the springing of the arches (fig. 102).\textsuperscript{573} The figures have been identified as the animals of the Chinese calendar, and thus been considered representations of the zodiac.\textsuperscript{574}

This identification is not the only possible connection to Central and East Asia present in the monuments. Parallels to the animal heads enveloped in a scroll pattern can be found in Ilkhanid paintings from Iran which displayed masterly skills in the depiction of animals. In a miniature from the Great Mongol Shāhnāme, painted in Tabriz ca. 1330-40, Iskandar is depicted underneath the talking waq waq tree (fig. 103). From its branches the heads of rabbits and birds emerge, addressing Iskandar and peeking out from the leaved in a way that evokes the scrolls in Sivas.\textsuperscript{575} In a manuscript of Ibn Bakhtīshū’s Manāfiʿ al-ḥayawān [The Use of Animals], copied and illustrated in Marāgha on the Caspian Sea between 1297-1300, a pair of fighting elephants resembles the head on the Gök Medrese relief (fig. 104).\textsuperscript{576}

The decoration of the portal is fragmentary at the top between the bases of the minarets. Older photographs depict the two marble crenellations on the right next to the minarets; these crenellations might have been part of the original structure. In pictures taken during the
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\textsuperscript{573} On the right side of the doorway, nine different animals are depicted.


\textsuperscript{575} Oleg Grabar and Sheila S. Blair, Epic Images and Contemporary History: the Illustrations of the Great Mongol Shahnama (Chicago, 1980), 132-133.

\textsuperscript{576} Diez rejects Jerphanion’s identification of one of the animals as an elephant and suggests that it is rather a boar: Diez, “The Zodiac Relief,” 100. I follow Jerphanion in Mélanges d’archéologie anatolienne, 82.
restoration, the one in the center has the same color as the old pieces. Thus, it might have been retrieved from the pieces found in the courtyard during excavations in the 1990s.577

The scheme of the portal decoration is close to that of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in its overall structure. The use of different motifs within the individual frames, however, and especially the combination of two kinds of stone, rather than one, combined with the brick minarets give it a distinctive aesthetic turn. To both sides of the portal frames, thick moldings form further decoration running parallel up from the base of the façade to about one third of its height (fig. 105). There, they intersect to form first a pointed arch, then an eight-pointed star, after which they form a rectangular panel containing inscriptions; they serve as a base for a large and plastic vegetal motif. A medallion with an inscription and a palm motif are placed under each of the pointed arches.

On the outer sides of the portal block, a large floral motif resembles that on the front, placed on the same level. The elongated field below is decorated with a shallow niche crowned with a pointed arch. A decorative rosette is placed in its center. A small rectangular niche with an inscription in foliated kufic script rests above the inscription. This is framed by a semi-circular molding that develops into a tree-pointed leaf topped by a palmette. This type of decoration appears on the Sahip Ata Mosque in Konya, commissioned by the same patron in 656/1258.

Besides these central motifs, the decoration continues on the lateral parts of the façade much as it does on the Çifte Minareli Medrese. Muqarnas niches are placed to both sides of the portal. The one on the right is more elaborately decorated and pierced by a window. Colonettes with vegetal capitals support the muqarnas hood, which is encompasses by a four-centered

577 Kâhya et al., “Sivas Gökmedrese üzerine yeni bir değerlendirme,” 445-446. Pictures taken by Walter Denny in the 1970s and 1980s also show quantities of loose pieces in the courtyard and in what seems to be a back wall recreated from rubble. The photographs are available on www.artstor.org.
arched molding. Above the arch, a panel carries an Arabic inscription in cursive script. On this same side of the facade, a round arched window is inserted in the center. The niche on the left side of the façade is less elaborately decorated and remains in a bad state of preservation.

Next to the niche, a large three-lobed arch with ornamental keystones is inserted into the wall (fig. 106). It is surmounted by two lines of an inscription. The spandrels between the arch and the inscription are filled with intersecting double moldings. From three fountain heads, water formerly sprang from the wall below the arch; the water flowed into a rectangular basin below as part of the pious provision of the foundation, providing clean water for the neighborhood. The inscription reads:

“The greatest master, the great law-giver, father of good deeds and beauties, pride of the state and religion [ʿAlī] son of al-Ḥusayn, the great notable, ordered the construction of this source during the days of the rule of the greatest sultan, the great king of kings, Ghiyāth ʿl-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn Abū ʿl-Fath Kay[khusraw] bin Qilij Arslan, may God perpetuate his rule.”

The façade is closed off on both sides by round corner buttresses standing on a square base. Both are decorated with vegetal motifs in the lower half and a net pattern in their upper half. The left one reaches to the same height as the façade with its muqarnas cornice. On the right side, but the cornice and the top of the tower are broken off. In the decoration of the corner buttresses, strong local influence is apparent, suggesting that these motifs had become part of a standard repertoire. The connection to the Çifte Minareli Medrese is most apparent in these elements, setting the Gök Medrese’s Konya roots into the local context of Sivas, with the implication of local workforce participating in the construction even if some workers had been brought from elsewhere. The same motif also appears in a square panel and a molding reaching
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around a rounded corner of the Torumtay Türbe in Amasya (fig. 107), a striking cubic structure on two levels dated 679/1280-81 and located facing the entrance of the Gök Medrese Mosque in that same city. 580

A further element that the Gök Medrese and the Çifte Minareli Medrese have in common is the presence of tile decoration on the pair of brick minarets placed over the stone of the façade. The decoration of the minarets in both monuments is closely related, and has been thought to be based on the combination of examples in Konya and the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum. 581

The major difference between the two ways of minaret construction is the zone of the façade at the base of the minarets: In the Gök Medrese, it is covered in rectangular panels of turquoise tile that reach below the muqarnas cornice to both sides of the portal (fig. 108). In the Çifte Minareli Medrese, the decoration of this zone is in an even more fragmentary state, but it appears that the raised circles in brickwork visible in the Gök Medrese were present at least on one face as well. They are framed with two rows of brick and the same material forms a circle on the lower panels. On top of these panels, the minaret bases form a transition from square to round using corner triangles. The arched panels between them are decorated with different tile motifs. The minarets are built of brick and decorated with vertical rounded moldings of turquoise tile on the shafts. On the surface between these, small pieces of glazed brick are placed to form an intersecting rhombus pattern in different shades of blue. The shafts end in a band of turquoise tile and in muqarnas corbels – not quite identical on both sides – that support a balcony. Above


these, only fragments of the shafts decorated with brick patterns are preserved and topped by modern metal sheet roofs for protection against the elements.

The pair of minarets over the portals, which appears also on the Sahip Ata Mosque in Konya, has been linked to the taste of the patron, who created, in concordance with the use of marble, a version of Seljuk portal patterns sufficient to point to his own patronage rather than that of the Seljuk sultan.\textsuperscript{582} This agrees well with Yildiz’s suggestion that the Seljuk \textit{amīrs} were very much independent and created their own field of action, becoming a force that the Ilkhanids had trouble controlling.\textsuperscript{583} At the same time it suggests the inadequacy of understanding these portals in terms of a single “Seljuk” royal style; this may be especially a phenomenon of the late thirteenth century. The observations made in Sivas, even though unresolved questions remain, show that the notion of a unified “Seljuk” style does not hold on a local, let alone on broader regional level. A similar phenomenon has been observed for the Muslim principalities of northern India in the twelfth century, where different styles of diverse origin could coexist in a given place.\textsuperscript{584} Thus, the position of Sivas is not unique within the broader context of the medieval Muslim world, pointing to the necessity of reevaluating the existing classifications of styles, traditionally drawn along fairly firm dynastic lines, according to the specific context of such multi-cultural frontier regions.

The plan of the Gök Medrese was originally composed of an open courtyard with four \textit{iwāns}; the main \textit{iwān} at the northern end of the building was destroyed and replaced by a wall composed of rubble detached from the monument.\textsuperscript{585} From the appearance of the building, it

\textsuperscript{582} Wolper, “Portal Patterns,” 69.
\textsuperscript{583} Yildiz, “Mongol Rule in thirteenth-century Seljuk Anatolia,” 597-602.
\textsuperscript{584} Flood, \textit{Objects of Translation}, 225.
\textsuperscript{585} Meinecke, \textit{Fayencedekorationen}, vol. 2, 440.
seems clear that it used to be two-storied, but the upper level is no longer preserved.\footnote{Rogers, “The Çifte Minare Medrese,” 66.} The plan and elevation of the structure may have been very similar to the Gök Medrese in Tokat, a two-storied monument that has served as a model for suggested in reconstructions (fig. 109).\footnote{Tuncer, Sivas Gök Medrese, 163-164; Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, 95-96; Sözen, Anadolu medreseleri, vol. 1: 214-218 and vol. 1: 42.} In a reconstruction of the plan, Kuran suggests two large rectangular chambers to the left and right of the main īwān at the eastern end of the building.\footnote{Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, 92-96.} Two domed chambers are placed to the left and right of the portal, as in the Buruciyê Medrese; the one on the right of the portal served as a mosque.\footnote{Meinecke, Fayencedekorationen, II, 440.}

Arcades (fig. 110) run from the entrance towards the destroyed main īwān located at the far end of the building. The arch at the center of each side, serving as the front to the lateral īwāns, is higher and wider than the other arches. The four-īwān plan, as typological studies of medieval madrasas in Anatolia have shown, is typical for the region and appears both with an open courtyard, as in the three examples in Sivas, and with a closed courtyard.\footnote{Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri studies the preserved madrasas in chronological order, beginning with the late 11th century but does group them together in monuments with open and covered courtyards, respectively, in each chapter; Sözen, Anadolu medreseleri discusses the open-courtyard madrasa in volume 1, the ones with a covered courtyard in volume 2.} In this respect, Sivas does not stand out from the patterns known throughout the region, including the Seljuk capital of Konya. As the preceding analysis has shown, the particularities are much rather manifest on the level of decoration, suggesting perhaps that the liberties were greater, or craftsmen more mobile, in a region where centralized patronage was not strong enough to hold them in a specific location for extended periods of time. Furthermore, and perhaps most
obviously, structures proven to be stable were repeated rather than experimented with at the risk of the collapse of a building.

In terms of their size, two of the *madrasas* in Sivas, the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Gök Medrese, stand out among other examples in Anatolia. The Gök Medrese measures 31.25 m by 43 m, the remaining façade of the Çifte Minareli Medrese is about 45 m long.\(^{591}\) The Buruciye Medrese, at 25 m by 30 m, is closer in size to monuments in other cities: the Sırçalı Medrese (638/1243) and the Karatay Medrese (649/1250) in Konya, and the Yakutiye Medrese (710/1310) in Erzurum measure about the same. The Gök Medrese in Tokat (ca. 1280) and the Sahibiye Medrese in Kayseri (667/1265) are somewhat larger, at 25 m by 40 m. The largest extant *madrasa* in the region, the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum, measures about 35 m by 50 m, including the mausoleum. Thus, the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Gök Medrese in Sivas are among the largest monuments in thirteenth-century Anatolia, perhaps indicating a move towards larger monuments in the latter half of the century, even though this did not apply throughout, but only to certain monuments by high-level, if not royal, patrons. Striking is the fact that on all of the three largest *madrasas*, double minarets were placed at the top of the portal, even accentuating the size and the monumental impression of the buildings.

The simultaneous construction of three large *madrasas* in one city opens the question of the workforce involved. The number of workers needed on each construction site is not known, but it must have been considerable. Unfortunately, knowledge of medieval construction processes in the Muslim Middle East is limited. The sources are rarely indicative of the number of workmen or the duration of construction, except in extreme cases that triggered disapproving and possible exaggerated remarks about expenses and forced labor. As discussed before, similar

\(^{591}\) All measurements are taken from Kuran, *Anadolu medreseleri*. 
problems are present for Byzantine and Armenian architectural history. Rare drawings etched in stone or in included in mathematical treatises may give an indication of the construction of muqarnas vaults, even though the two phenomena might just reflect the extremes of a spectrum ranging from theory to practice.

The presence of an ethnically mixed workforce was not limited to Anatolia: in 709/1309, the endowment deed of Rashīd al-Dīn for his charitable establishment in Tabrīz mentions the presence of “Turks, Greeks, ‘Blacks’, Georgians, and Armenians” and others among the slaves responsible for the upkeep of the complex. The focus on where a building’s workmen came from has been dismissed as placing too much emphasis on ethnic dimensions without offering new insights into the reasons certain motifs were chosen.

The same stucco motifs travelled much further than Anatolia: they appear in Egypt, from the twelfth century onwards, still in stucco and never in stone, making the Anatolian adaptation a clearly local phenomenon. In Cairo, the first examples appear in the twelfth century, pointing out that the cross-cultural networks involved are not a phenomenon exclusive to the thirteenth century.
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592 Ousterhout, Masterbuilders of Byzantium; Laor-Sirak, “The Role of Armenians in Eastern Anatolian Muslim Architecture (1071-1300).”
595 Rogers, Patronage, 436-437.
**Sufism and Madrasa Education**

An assessment of the *madrasa* in medieval Anatolia is not complete without a look at what has often been depicted as the opposite end of the religious spectrum: Sufism, and its architectural manifestations. Since the first decades of the thirteenth century, Sufis spread throughout Anatolia, many of them refugees from Central Asia and Iran who had to flee the Mongol incursions into these areas, and played an important role in the Islamization of the region. An important distinction must be made between antinomian Sufis such as the Qalandars or the Abdāls of Rūm who willingly put themselves outside society by rejecting social norms, and the ones organized in orders (*ṭarīqa*) who did not fully exclude themselves from the community. The antinominian dervishes continued to be despised from all sides, including the intellectual elite, throughout the later Middle Ages. Even non-deviant Sufis who had gradually become part of the intellectual establishment were critical of them and wished to distinguish their own practice from theirs.

Thus, some Sufis, such as Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī in Konya, were part of the intellectual elite; they are likely to have been the ones that patrons supported with the construction of lodges since it seems that they were too independent to join the establishment of the ‘ulamā’ in the *madrasas*, but not anti-social to the extent that they would refuse patronage.

The connection between the Mongols and Sufism is certainly of interest at this point. The Ilkhanid ruler Hülegū (r. 654-663/1256-1265) had Qalandars executed after Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī referred to them as the most despicable human beings. On the other hand, a few decades later, Barak Baba (d. 707/1307-08), a deviant Sufi from Tokat became close to sultan Üljaytū, Köprülü, *The Seljuks*, 5-6.

Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends – Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1220-1550* (Salt Lake City, 1994).
travelled on his behalf and was buried in a mausoleum sponsored by the ruler in Sulṭānīye.

Hülegü’s action received positive comments, a rare case of praise for the then still pagan Mongols by Muslim scholars, showing to what extent such antinomian behavior was unpopular with and despised by, the intellectual establishment.599

In terms of religious institutions, circumstances in medieval Anatolia may not have been as static as the idea of a diametrical opposition between Sufi lodges and madrasas would suggest. It appears that the role of the madrasa in Anatolia was very different from that in Seljuk Iran in the late eleventh century. This was when the great vizier Nizām al-Mulk used the madrasa as a tool to reinvigorate Sunnism in the face of a Shi’i challenge.600 The movement, known in modern scholarship as Sunni Revival, expanded into Syria in the earlier twelfth century, creating changes in calligraphy and architecture.601

Such a ‘Sunni revival’ did not take place in Anatolia in the same terms for the simple reason that Islam was not sufficiently established in the first place. Moreover, in the frontier milieu of Anatolia, the distinction between orthodoxy and heterodoxy was utterly blurred, discouraging attempts to create a unified religious identity.602 In the context of the religious milieu of Anatolia, the madrasa has at times been regarded as an antithesis to Sufism, as an institution that was too established for large parts of the Muslim population.603 A focus on socio-cultural Sufism in recent studies has brought an emphasis on buildings established for these mystics and their circles of students/orders. As part of the discussion of these zāwiyas the

599 Karamustafa, God’s Unruly Friends, 5-6 and 62.

600 Makdisi, The Rise of the Colleges; Tabbaa, The transformation of Islamic art during the Sunni revival; Peacock, “Sufis at the Seljuk Court: Politics and Patronage.”

601 See chapter 2 for the relevance of this notion for early thirteenth-century Anatolia.

602 Kafadar, “Rome of One’s Own,” 10.

603 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 21-24, 68-69.
madrasa appears as the institutional counterpart, as a place that a true Sufi would reject for its association with orthodox Islam and its teachings. In this view, a zāwiya becomes an island for Sufis, especially built to accommodate their needs outside the traditional institutions of learning.

The buildings were specially erected for them by patrons who took a special interest in the Sufis. This could happen for two reasons: either they could relate to their teachings or, they needed to be sure that the Sufi masters did not wander about and spread unrest among the population. This development in the late thirteenth to the early fourteenth centuries seems to be due to earlier Sufi rebellions such as the Baba Resul revolt in the region of Amasya in the 1240s. The result of the construction of zāwiyas would thus be a tool for political neutralization, indebting the Sufis to their patrons and making them unlikely candidates for restive actions. If distaste for the Sufis was so great among the ‘ulamā’ in the madrasas the scholars could not have been especially happy about this development.

The emphasis on Sufism as the central factor in the development of architecture in this period may be somewhat narrow and excludes or at least marginalizes other types of buildings. In some instances, mostly between 1240 and 1275, Wolper argues, a zāwiya was built in the vicinity of an existing madrasa in such a way that whoever entered the older building, could not help noticing the new construction. There certainly is a contradiction between the statement that Sufis were generally critical of the scholars employed in the madrasas and their reliance on the institution of waqf to assure the legal status and the protection of the property of their zāwiyas. In Ilkhanid Iran in the fourteenth century, madrasas and khānqāhs could be part of
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605 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 42-59.
606 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 24.
the same multifunctional complexes, in an attempt to neutralize potential tensions. Such an attitude of blurring boundaries between madrasas and khānqāhs is also reflected in Aflākī’s Manāqib al-ʿĀrifīn, where disciples of Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī can be found to live in and visit both types of institutions, seemingly without distinction.

As mentioned above, large numbers of scholars were forced to emigrate from Central Asia, and many had to find a new home in Anatolia. The construction of madrasas in this region throughout the thirteenth century is quite certainly due to this arrival of highly qualified immigrants who could contribute to the development of Muslim scholarship in Anatolia, even though their names are in many cases not known today, a gap that further study of hagiographies as historical sources, rather than as mere tales of saints’ lives, might begin to solve.

Conclusion

Based on the three madrasas in Sivas examined in this chapter, several preliminary conclusions can be drawn. First, the three buildings, although constructed in the same year and in the same city, are stylistically diverse in certain aspects, pointing to a local tradition open for creative application of old and new motifs. Second, the Buruciye Medrese and the Çifte Minareli Medrese are rather closely related and firmly rooted in the local tradition of the region of Sivas, even though the latter building has been shown to have traces of Iranian influence attributed to the origin of its patron, the Ilkhanid official Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī. Third, the Gök Medrese displays elements that are rooted in the monuments that its patron, Şāḥib ʿAṭā

607 For instance in the Rab’-i Rashīdī: Blair, “Ilkhanid architecture and society,” 83.
609 I thank Professor Shahzad Bashir for this suggestion.
Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥasan sponsored in Konya, while retaining references to the local tradition of Sivas in the details of decoration, e.g. in the pattern on the corner buttresses. Thus, even though it may be suggested that the patron marked the city with his own style, or rather that the architect whom he preferred for many of his commissions continued to work with elements that he usually employed, the impact of local workmen on the overall appearance of the building is notable.

Fourth, the façade scheme employed in the three madrasas in Sivas, with the exception of the minarets, originates in early thirteenth-century caravanserais, rather than in the mosques and madrasas of Konya.

The case of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum proved to be ambiguous: since the date of construction is not clear, it is difficult to place the monument in its proper historical context. The construction may have been interrupted by the Mongol attack on the city in 639/1242, yet the evidence suggests that the monument was rather built in the second half of the thirteenth century, possibly between 1250 and 1280. In this case, the question of the identity of its patron remains pressing, since it would help resolve the question of Ilkhanid patronage. So far, only the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas and the Cacabey Medrese in Kirşehir (670/1272) are known to have been built by patrons coming from Iran. The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum may still be added to this group, yet so far all suggestions as to its patron are inconclusive.

The double minarets, however, support an argument for a later date. Even though pairs of minarets were used in Seljuk Iran, such as in the twelfth-century Do Minār Madrasa in Tabas,

this feature was not used under the Seljuks in Anatolia. Rather, it seems that this import from Iran happened at a later date, under Mongol rule. Thus, the first dated example in Anatolia is the portal of the Sahib Ata Complex in Konya, built in 656/1258, although only one of the minarets has been preserved. The two madrasas with minaret pairs built in Sivas in 670/1271-72, the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Gök Medrese even more strongly emphasize the renewed reference to Iran that is distinct from the early thirteenth-century connections that the Rûm Seljuk sultans made with their use of Iranian names and tile decoration. Thus, even though the attribution to a specific Ilkhanid patron remains disputed, a post-Mongol date for the monument can be strongly supported on the grounds of the minaret pair. Moreover, a number of Ilkhanid examples in Iran show the survival of this feature into the early fourteenth century, for instance in Sultānīya, built under sultan Ūljaytū (703-716/1304-16), and in the Friday Mosque of Yazd, built in 1324.

In stylistic terms, a clear attribution to Ilkhanid patronage is not possible for two major reasons. First, hardly any monuments built in Iran at this time have survived. Second, the two thirteenth-century monuments in Anatolia known to have an Ilkhanid background are very different. The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas is for the most part rooted in the local tradition, even though a certain number of possible connections to Iran have been pointed out. The Cacabey Medrese in Kırşehir is entirely idiosyncratic, to a point where it nearly defies a discussion in stylistic terms.

Jonathan Bloom argues that the three examples in Erzurum and Sivas are the earliest surviving examples of double minarets, but that this feature originated in Seljuk Iran: Bloom, Minaret, 179.

Sultānīya, now largely destroyed, is depicted in Matrakçı Nasuh, Beyân-i Menâzil-i Sefer-i ‘Irâkeyn-i Sultân Süleymân Hân, fols. 32b-33a. For Yazd, see: Wilber, The Islamic Architecture of Iran, 159-160. Further Ilkhanid examples in: Sheila Blair, The Ilkhanid Shrine Complex at Natanz, Iran (Cambridge, MA, 1986), 28 and Bloom, Minaret, 179.
The cross-regional context, spanning from the eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, is important for understanding certain features. The plastic floral motifs, including scrolls, palmettes, and fleshy leaves that appear so prominently in Sivas are rooted in the local context due to their presence in the Mosque and Hospital at Divriği. In this building, the motifs partly originating in Iranian stucco decoration are first adapted translated into stone, helped by the soft limestone of the region. The mode of transmission from Iran is unclear, yet the motifs are clearly part of the same vocabulary as in Iranian examples in stucco, for instance the qibla wall of the Great Mosque in Ardistān, decorated in 553-555/1158-60. At the same time, it has been demonstrated that Iran is likely not the sole model for these motifs, which already appear as widely spread as Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Ahlat in south-eastern Anatolia in the twelfth century.

In the caravanserais built under Seljuk royal patronage in the first four decades of the thirteenth century, the preeminence of geometric over vegetal decoration is clear, as Chapter Two has shown. Most of the frames adorning the central portal block are composed of interlace and star patterns that can be extended into infinity. After the middle of the century, the emphasis moves toward the increasing use of complex vegetal scroll patterns. This is especially pronounced in Sivas, where the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Buruciye Medrese are richly decorated which variations of such motifs. The motifs are used in a range of sizes, from tiny palmette leaves framing an inscription to large leaves jutting out from the portal façade of both buildings. This emphasis on plasticity is a unique feature that is present only in Sivas and has been connected to the stunning stonework of the Great Mosque and Hospital in nearby Divriği,

614 Pancaroğlu, “The Mosque-Hospital Complex at Divriği,” 184-188.
built in 626/1228-29. This building is in itself unique, and the possible survival of its workshop over several generations until the construction projects in Sivas began in 670/1271-72 has been a tacit assumption in many studies on the region. Unfortunately, no buildings have survived that would allow the gap between 1228 and 1271, thus leaving this discussion at the level of suggestions.

The persistence of elements that may be connected to Iran over time has often led to assumptions of long lines of workshop practice entirely steeped in oral transmission from master to student over generations. Beyond such reconstruction, based on very close observation of the decoration itself in the absence of written sources, the question of drawings needs to be posed. As the discovery of the Topkapi Scroll and its subsequent study by Gülru Necipoğlu have shown, it is compelling to suggest that such models for architecture and its decoration existed even earlier than the scroll’s fifteenth-century date. Thus, the following discussion will keep this possibility in mind, since it may be helpful in explaining some of the puzzles that thirteenth-century Anatolia poses. One of them is of course the gap between the building in Divriği and those in Sivas, which would be more easily bridgeable if there were some sort of written or drawn record of the designs that could have helped them to survive over the decades in between, although of course the existence of further monuments that are no longer extant must not be excluded.

Moreover, the transmission of the motifs from Iran to Anatolia may be more easily explained in the presence of such drawings. The migration of people from Iran as they fled the Mongol conquests of the 1220s certainly is another element in this transmission, since it created

615 Pancaroğlu, “The Mosque-Hospital Complex at Divriği,” 188.
616 Necipoğlu, Topkapı Scroll, 1-23.
– at first forcibly – a level of mobility that was to endure under the Mongol imperial umbrella throughout the thirteenth and early fourteenth century.

Regarding the monument in Divriği, the timing would of course be perfect, since the building was constructed shortly after these migrations were known to have occurred. The difficult task is to explain how workmen who were accustomed to execute motifs in small scale and in stucco all of a sudden move to the large-scale salient motifs that are present in Divriği and later in Sivas. The soft limestone of the region might have facilitated the task, and the larger scale may also be explained that local craftsmen were not familiar with small size of the original motifs. Collaboration between local experts in the carving of stone, and immigrants bringing their designs, such new results are more easily imaginable, again possibly with the help of drawings to bridge not only a technical, but also potentially a linguistic gap. After all, with the beginning of Seljuk rule in Anatolia, Turkic dialects were added to the Greek and Armenian that were already spoken in the region. The refugees of the Mongol conquest may have spoken some forms of Turkish, certainly Persian, and possibly Arabic. In this potpourri of language, the negotiation of work on a construction site might not have been all that easy. Unfortunately, the question has not been posed, even though signatures assert the presences of workers from Ahlat in Divriği, and stylistic connections have been made to northern Syria for the stonework on the façade of the Alaeddin Camii in Konya.

The façade scheme familiar from caravanserais built in the first half of the thirteenth century is also used in madrasas of the second half of the century. This is the case in the three madrasas in Sivas, in the Gök Medrese in Tokat, in the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum, and in the Çifte Minare Medrese in Erzurum (assuming that it dates to that period). The construction of caravanserais had ceased, and the mausolea that were built were generally too small in scale to
require this type of monumental portal. The hospital of ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs, built in the early thirteenth century, features this portal scheme as well, as does the Timarhane in Amasya from 709/1308. The madrasas and mosques in Konya before 1250 do not, however, use this scheme. Considering this evidence, two suggestions present themselves. First, the scheme might have been conceived originally for use outside Konya, possibly with a focus on caravanserais, although that might be just an accidental observation due to the sheer dominance of this building type. Second, by the 1250s CE, the scheme seems to have been generalized to such an extent that despite the decline of Seljuk royal patronage, it continued to be used, and for a wide range of building types.

There doesn’t seem to have been any construction by Ilkhanid patrons in Konya or Kayseri, which supports the notion of Sivas as an important city at the western outskirts of the Mongol advance. No monuments were commissioned by Mongol or Ilkhanid patrons right after the conquest of Anatolia. The impact on architecture was, if anything, destructive: parts of Erzurum were badly damaged, according to contemporary Armenian sources, and the walls of Konya were partly destroyed. Nevertheless, destruction as far as it is known did not take the proportions of the Mongol conquests of Central Asia and Iran, where entire cities such as Balkh were wiped out. The Mongol rulers had not yet at this point converted to Islam; thus their lack of interest in sponsoring corresponding buildings does not surprise. The administrative elite of the western part of the empire, especially since the establishment of the Ilkhanate centered in Iran, was Muslim and Persian.

The inclusion of Anatolia into the framework of the architectural production of the Islamic world after the Seljuk conquest of the late eleventh and twelfth century is crucial in creating a corridor reaching from Central Asia through India, Egypt, and even North Africa. The
continuous existence of cultural networks, of longstanding connections between the eastern Mediterranean, Iran and Central Asia that were transformed, but not created by the Mongol presence is the major feature of this period. The creation of separate artistic vocabularies with dynastic connotations really only appeared when Anatolia, Central Asia, and Iran drifted apart under the Ottomans, the Timurids, and, later, the Safavids.
Chapter Four

Architecture, Scale, and Empire: Anatolia between Mamluks and Mongols

“Concerning the hospital that is in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn next to the mausoleum of al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn, the describer summarizes its beauties; in it are [quantities of] objects and medication, and it is said that its expenses are 1000 dinār per day.” (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Riḥla, section on Cairo) ⁶¹⁷

This chapter addresses medieval architecture in Anatolia in its position between the Mamluk and Ilkhanid Empires. Focusing on aesthetic considerations of size, scale, and decoration, I will argue that in visual terms, the architectural production of the region operated within specific local parameters, rather than falling into the patterns of monumentality, power, and empire that were in place in the realms of its formal overlords, the Ilkhanids, and their primary rivals, the Mamluks. ⁶¹⁸ Indeed, the relationship between the size of monuments and the visual emphasis on decoration in Anatolia differs greatly from the paradigms in place in Mamluk Egypt and Syria, and in Ilkhanid Iran.

The Mamluks and the Ilkhanids are known for their competition for political power, leading to warfare over territories in northern Syria, and complex diplomatic relations. This rivalry extended to architecture, where rulers on both sides aimed at creating the largest and most impressive monuments for their own glory, hoping that delegations sent by the respective rival would carry back the news of such constructions. ⁶¹⁹ Even the production of manuscripts was


⁶¹⁸ Preliminary research on the concepts of size and scale used in this chapter was presented as: “Monumental Structure versus Intricate Detail – On Size and Scale in Medieval Islamic Architecture,” 45th International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo MI, 16 May 2010.

⁶¹⁹ This was first studied in Necipoğlu, “Challenging the Past,” and later expanded in Bernard O’Kane, “Monumentality in Mongol and Mamluk Architecture,” Art History 19, no. 4 (1996): 499-522.
included in this competitive stance: both sides produced monumental copies of the Qur’an that were sent as gifts with diplomatic missions.620

This competitive aspect was by no means exclusive to the Mamluks and Ilkhanids, but has been observed throughout the history of Islamic architecture, beginning with the creation of an Umayyad visual idiom in the seventh century. The phenomenon became especially accentuated in the early modern period, when competition between old and new monuments became a conscious part of the architectural discourse, for instance in the mosques that the architect Sinan built for the Ottoman rulers, members of their family, and their notables.621 Within this context, the Mamluk-Ilkhanid competition is only one aspect of a larger picture that connects the large scale of architecture with a demonstration of dynastic power. The place on Anatolia within this framework yet needs to be understood; as argued before, the Mongol conquest of the region ended the budding emergence of a ‘royal’ Seljuk style. The changes in patronage related to the slow decline of Seljuk power caused a resurgence of locally rooted styles as observed in the previous chapter.

The pursuit of architectural monumentality in the Mamluk and Ilkhanid empires appears to be an intrinsic part of the rivalry that led them to conduct wars and send spies in both directions from the beginning of Mamluk rule in 658/1260 to the demise of the Ilkhanate after 735/1335. During this period Anatolia, once the Seljuk rulers had lost more and more actual power to Mongol overlords and their administrators, became a buffer zone between the Mamluk and Ilkhanid realms, a fact that had far reaching effects on the political and ultimately on the cultural level.


Despite the political and geographical position of Anatolia between the two rivaling Muslim empires of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the architectural discourse created in this competition does not appear to have affected “post-Seljuk” architecture. Rather, the region continued to produce an architecture connected to local patterns and workshops. In the late thirteenth century, a lack of resources for large foundations and monuments further accentuated this development, as Chapter Five will show.

In comparison with the monumental buildings of the Ilkhanid realm and the early Mamluk monuments in Cairo, monuments in medieval Anatolia are small in terms of their measurements. Rather than on size, the creators of the latter monuments capitalized on the effects of decoration, which is often so exuberant that the small size of the monument is not evident to the viewer. The mechanisms that are at play in this creation of monumentality through decoration rather than size are yet to be understood fully, yet I argue that it is specific to thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Anatolia.

The focus on smaller monuments was not, however, specific to this region and moment in time. Rather, it was part of a phenomenon of moving towards smaller, often multifunctional structures in the regions ruled by the Great Seljuks and their successors from the early eleventh century onwards. 622 This shift in architecture, going hand-in-hand with the political fragmentation of the medieval Islamic world, appears to represent a move away from the monumental unity of the Abbasid realm, reflecting the political changes in the construction of monuments that are a far cry from the monumental palaces of Samarra.

Here, I will argue that medieval Anatolia found its place somewhere between these two tendencies, that is the competition for monumentality between Ilkhanids and Mamluks on the

one hand, and the small scale monuments current in many regions from the twelfth to the late fifteenth century, on the other hand. In creating a scheme and level of decoration that dominate the visual impact of a monument, architects in medieval Anatolia in fact transcended size by the means of intricate details in decoration.

In methodological terms, the dearth of medieval sources concerned with the perception of monuments by contemporary viewers poses the problem of understanding the aesthetic principles at hand. Therefore, the first part of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of approaches and their potential for realization with regard to this specific topic, shaped by the lack of specific reference to visual practices in the medieval written sources related to Anatolia.

The second part of this chapter will address the perception of architectural monumentality in the medieval Islamic world, Byzantium, and the Caucasus. Concepts of monumentality in Byzantine architecture will reveal sensibilities that pertain to Islamic architecture in Anatolia as well. The use of architectural models or small-scale representations of churches, found in Armenia and Georgia, will be relevant in terms of addressing the questions of miniaturization versus monumentality.

In the third part of this chapter, I discuss the relationship between monument and decoration as it affects the visual impression of a building’s size. Surveying examples of both interior and exterior decoration as they relate to the structure of a monument, I show that often, the elaborate decorative schemes make the monuments appear larger than they are, to the extent that the viewer does not consider size as a pertinent issue in assessing the aesthetic qualities of a building.
Theoretical Considerations

In the monuments that are the object of this study, decoration appeals to the viewer in a way that visually obliterates the smallness of the buildings. This phenomenon, as opposed to the monumental construction prevalent in other regions of the Islamic world, is difficult to explain due to the absence of written sources that convey the perception of architecture by medieval viewers, especially acute in the region under discussion here.

Medieval texts written in the Islamic world tend to address architecture in terms of the wealth deployed in construction, rather than with a focus on aesthetic concerns. This absence of a contemporary perspective on the monuments poses the danger of subjectivity on the part of a scholar assessing the visual effects and reception of these monuments. In the present case, the suggested discrepancy between decoration and size perhaps springs from my observation and the prejudices of my art historian’s eye, yet a careful approach to theoretical means of discussing these issues is nevertheless productive for the further assessment of the issue below.

Thus, concepts using a construction of perception during a given period may be useful if considered with appropriate caution, yet are not easily adapted to the circumstances under discussion here. Due to the visual appeal of the monuments, reconstructing the viewing habits of medieval Anatolia is a tempting pursuit despite the dearth in written sources speaking to the topic. The concept of aesthetic of reception (Rezeptionsästhetik) that Wolfgang Iser so poignantly described in the first chapter of his seminal work Der Akt des Lesens may, however, be helpful.623 The central problem in using ‘Rezeptionsästhetik’ for this discussion lies in the nature of the approach itself. It relies on an understanding of the ways in which a reader (or beholder, if applied to visual works) approaches a text (or monument, painting etc.) based on the

623 Wolfgang Iser, Der Akt des Lesens (Munich, 1976).
cultural presumptions of a certain time. In fact, even though the concept of aesthetic of reception broadens the possibilities of interpretation in that it moves away from the eye of the critic to that of the public, it poses new problems. In its initial conception, the approach was meant for a discussion of (post-) modern literature and by extension art, which defied traditional tools of interpretation to the point of consciously subverting them.

Thus, historicizing the approach may be problematic, depending on how precise the sources are on the perception of a given work of literary or visual art. If applied to earlier periods and, as in the present case, to a non-Western cultural sphere, the need for caution is even more acute since the approach contains the inherent preconceptions of twentieth-century European culture. Iser points out the importance of sources for a study in the context of reception theory, that is, the reaction of the reader (or viewer) to a text (or monument, painting etc.) must be known through direct records that are relevant to this type of reception, specific to a given period. In this context, Iser suggests that prior to the eighteenth century, such sources might not be readily available, and that the scholar thus may need to reconstruct readers’ reactions from the work itself and from knowledge about the cultural milieu of a given period. In this sense, the approach can be applied to Anatolia with due caution, taking into account what can indirectly be gathered from written sources and monuments. The genre of ekphrasis, current in Byzantine literature and evocative of architecture and its perception does not exist in the Islamic world, at least not in surviving texts.

In a recent article, Alicia Walker has successfully used aesthetics of reception in the discussion of Islamic elements added to a Middle Byzantine ivory casket. Walker demonstrates that the way in which early twenty-first century viewers perceive an object is based on

624 Iser, *Akt des Lesens*, 52.
assumptions and visual habits that are entirely different from those of a medieval Muslim or Christian. Based on a source that describes a Muslim woman’s reaction to, and interpretation of a Christian painting remaining in a church converted to a mosque, Walker argues that the reaction to images depended on the cultural conditioning of the viewer, an observation that is as valid for the Middle Ages as for our time.625

Cultural assumptions play a major role in assessing visual habits. In the larger argument of cross-cultural adaptation and reuse of portable objects in the medieval eastern Mediterranean (and beyond, such as in objects from the Islamic world that entered church treasuries all over Europe), this theoretical approach offers a compelling explanation for the ease with which objects were received in different cultural contexts.

If applied to architecture, such an approach again may most easily rely on passages from sources that relate to the specific monuments or to attitudes towards architecture in general. In medieval Islamic sources written before the fourteenth century, such passages are not readily available because architecture is rarely described in detail. This is certainly true for the History of the Seljuks by Ibn Bībī, the most important account of the history of Muslim Anatolia. In a study of this account as an art historical source, the German scholar Kurt Erdmann noted in 1962 that the references to architecture are too general to be of use in the understanding of the many monuments that have not been preserved.626

In fact, Ibn Bībī rarely refers to the specifics of a site in which events took place. Descriptions of cities and their monuments such as mosques, madrasas, and mausolea are absent with the exception of accounts of the restoration of fortifications at the order of sultans, and often


financed by the *amīrs* of the court. Thus, the citadel of Antalya was restored after the conquest of the city in 610/1214. The same happened with the city walls of Sinop the following year. The most detailed passage describes how sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād, after inspecting the fortifications of Konya, ordered his *amīrs* to restore them, and to do the same in Sivas.

The burial of sultan ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs in the hospital that he had commissioned in Sivas in 614/1216-17 is mentioned in the text. The details of the building were not of interest to the author, only the fact that the sultan was laid to rest in this building, today known as the Şifaiye Medrese (fig. 34). The mention might have arisen from the location, as this ruler was not buried in the mausoleum in the courtyard of the Alaeddin Mosque in Konya, where many of his predecessors found their final rest. Neither the dome of the mausoleum, nor the striking tile decoration of the façade of the tomb attracted the author’s attention. We do not, however, know if Ibn Bībī ever saw this building; but even in the case of Konya, a city that he knew, the author did not resort to detailed descriptions. The absence of detailed descriptions of cities and monuments may simply lie in the nature of the text which, as a chronicle of Seljuk rule, is mostly concerned with political events involving the sultans and their entourage. From this point of view, travel accounts are often more specific: their authors actually saw the monuments, while chroniclers did not necessarily have direct access to them, nor perhaps the time or curiosity to ask for descriptions of those cities that they had not visited.

An awareness of the possible pitfalls of an attempt to reconstruct medieval viewing habits, and by extension a medieval viewer *per se*, is inherent in the discussion that will follow.

---

627 Ibn Bībī, tr. Yinanç, 50.
628 Ibn Bībī, tr. Yinanç, 54.
629 Ibn Bībī, tr. Yinanç, 81-82. In Konya, the beauty of the surrounding landscape incited the sultan to establish stronger fortifications for this city: Redford, *Landscape*, 53.
Considering the state of written sources in general, and those on Anatolia in particular, the monuments will be sources in their own right. In medieval Anatolia, it seems obvious that the decoration was a primary concern, more important than the construction of monumental buildings designed to impress by their size. The decoration, rather than the size of the buildings seems to have mattered to builders and patrons alike, since it is here that the main effort in technical and financial terms was invested. Yet, in the absence of sources on the public’s reaction, interpretation remains influenced by modern impressions and reception rather than by the actual response of the medieval viewers. Thus, an approach concentrating on the visual impact of monuments and their decoration remains a game of the mind that may be useful in discussing the architecture, but does not necessarily lead to insights about medieval viewing habits.

Size and Scale: Islamic World, Byzantium, Caucasus

Monumental buildings were an essential part of architecture in the medieval Islamic world, beginning with mosques designated for worship, and palaces as residences for rulers. Monuments commissioned by the Umayyad rulers, such as the Dome of the Rock (71/691) in Jerusalem and the Great Mosque of Damascus (90-96/709-715) began this trend, and competition was part of these early projects, as discussed in Chapter Two. In the Abbasid Palaces of Raqqa and Samarra in the ninth century, this ambition for more and more expansive structures culminated. Competition with the past especially became a central feature of patronage.  

In written sources, these monuments were often described in terms of their monumental scale, rather than looking at other aspects such as plans or details of decoration. Comparison to pre-Islamic monuments frequently arose as part of the competitive nature of construction, striving to create buildings larger than those of the past. The Sasanian palace at Ctesiphon (fig. 111), referred to in the sources as “Khusraw’s arch” (īwān Kisorā or ṭāq Kisorā in Arabic), became a topos for monumentality in architecture. The poet al-Buḥṭurī (d. 284/ 897) dedicated an entire poem to the monument, staging it as a reminder of lost imperial glory, and in some ways including a critique of the Abbasid court.632 In this text, the Īwān Kisrā becomes a decaying memory of the past, still reflecting its magnificence:

“As if the Arched Hall, by its wondrous craftsmanship, were hollowed in the cliff of a mountainside. It would be thought, from its sadness – to the eyes of morning and evening visitors – distraught like a man torn from the company of loved ones, or distressed by the breaking of nuptials. Nights have reversed its luck. There, Jupiter whiled the night but as a star of misfortune. It shows hardiness but the cruel weight of time is fixed upon it.”633

The monument, despite or perhaps because of its praised monumentality, did not remain uncontested: In sources on the construction of Madīnat al-Salām (Baghdad), it is told that the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr (r. 136-158/ 754-775) considered having the Īwān Kisrā torn down in order to use the materials in the construction of his new capital. Despite contrary advice, the ruler ordered the destruction to begin, only to have it stopped when the costs of dismantling the Sasanian palace proved too high.634 Yet reprieve was temporary: A century and a half later, parts of the Īwān Kisrā were destroyed in order to supply building materials for the palace of caliph al-


634 O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 501.
Muktafī (r. 289-295/902-908) in Baghdad. Both anecdotes use the monument, and a ruler’s ability or incapacity to destroy it as ways to reflect the power of a sultan in controlling such resources, but, from the perspective of a skeptical author, also their inability to surpass the achievements of past rulers.

The topos of the Īwān Kisrā as a paradigm for monumentality became prevalent in passages of sources that mention architecture. Thus, speaking of the Madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan in Cairo (758-765/1357-64) the fifteenth-century writer Khalīl b. Shahīn al-Ẓāhirī compares the grandeur of this monument with the Sasanian building:

“Concerning the Madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan [located] facing the victorious citadel; it does not have an equal in this world. It was told that the above-mentioned al-Malik al-Nāṣir Ḥasan, when he ordered its construction, summoned all engineers from the regions of the world, and ordered them to build a madrasa [in such a way that] there is no building higher than it on the face of the earth. He asked them which were the highest places in the world in [terms of] building, and he was told: the Īwān Kisrā Anūshirwān. And he ordered that [the Īwān Kisrā] be measured and rendered accurately, and that the madrasa be built higher than it by ten cubits, and [so] it was built, and four minarets were built for it, and it was said that three [were] in the elevation of the madrasa as well, and then some of the minarets were destroyed, and today two remain. The Īwān Kisrā [had] one [īwān] and this [madrasa had] four īwāns. It is a wonder among the wonders of the world, the thickness (sumk) of its walls is eighteen Egyptian cubits, and the abovementioned minarets are visible from a distance of one day. What is more it was said that the yearly revenue (mutaḥaṣṣil) of its waqf exceeds the income of a large kingdom.”

In this passage, the size and especially the height of the monuments become the measure for their overpowering appearance. The question of the Mamluk sultan inquiring after the highest known monument elicits the expected answer: the Īwān Kisrā in Ctesiphon, by then firmly established as a topos for monumental architecture. The ruler’s desire to surpass this construction again reflects that of the Abbasid caliphs to trump bygone imperial grandeur. The architecture of

---

the sultan’s madrasa, in exceeding the Īwān Kisrā in height, as well as featuring four rather than one īwān, becomes the symbol of the Mamluk ruler’s supreme power. Considering that since the Mongol conquest of Baghdad by the Ilkhanids in 656/ 1258, the Mamluks had become the keepers of the Abbasid caliphs, now devoid of power, this statement is one of supremacy with reference to the past, as well as to the present.

The correlation between monumental architecture and power is clear, and by no means unique to the text above. In the late fourteenth century, Ibn Khaldūn (d. 809/ 1406) explicitly stated this connection in the Muqaddima, suggesting that the grandeur of a dynasty’s architecture was equivalent with its power.637 According to the author:

“The third stage [of a dynasty] is one of leisure and tranquility in which the fruits of royal authority are enjoyed. (These fruits are) the things that human nature desires, such as acquisition of property, creation of lasting monuments, and fame. All the ability (of the ruler) is expended on collecting taxes; regulating income and expenses, bookkeeping and planning expenditures; erecting large buildings, big constructions, spacious cities, and lofty monuments.”638

“The monuments of a dynasty are its buildings and large edifices (haykal). They are proportionate to the original power of the dynasty. They can materialize only when there are many workers and united action and co-operation. When a dynasty is large and far-flung, with many provinces and subjects, workers are very plentiful and can be brought together from all sides and regions. Thus, even the largest monument (haykal) can materialize.

Think of the works of the people of ‘Âd and Thamûd, about, about which the Qur’ân tells. Or, one should see with one’s own eyes the Reception Hall of Khosraw (Īwân Kisrâ), that powerful achievement of Persian (architecture). Ar-Rashid intended to tear it down and destroy it. He could not do so for all his trouble. He began the work, but then was not able to continue. The story of how he asked Yaḥyâ b. Khâlid for advice in that affair is well known. It is worth noting that one dynasty was able to construct a building that another dynasty was not able to tear down, even though destruction is much easier than construction. That illustrates the great difference between the two dynasties.”639

637 For a discussion of these passages, see: Necipoğlu, “Challenging the Past,”170; O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 499.
After pointing out the correlation between power and architecture, Ibn Khaldūn returns to the Īwān Kisrā as the supreme and nearly insurmountable example of imperial glory expressed in architecture. The motif persisted a long time: an inscription (fig. 112) over the gate of an Ottoman house in the citadel of Masyaf (Syria), and dated 1208/ 1793 refers to the Īwān Kisrā. In the last line of the inscription, belonging to a relatively modest residential structure rather than a monumental expression of kingship, the Sasanian precedent is evoked as a long-gone reminder of part glory: “Īwān Kisrā qad fanā,” the Īwān Kisrā has faded, in comparison to present rule and architecture.  

Similarly to Ibn Khaldūn, the early fourteenth-century traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was preoccupied with architecture mostly in its monumental form. The context of the two works is of course entirely different – Ibn Khaldūn establishing the parameters for his history of the world, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa writing the memories of his travels – yet the perception of the importance of architecture through size it similar in both cases.

Thus, visiting the Mamluk capital of Cairo, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa praised the large size of monuments such as the funerary complex of sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn (r. 678-689/ 1279-1290), including a madrasa, mausoleum, and hospital.  

640 The text of the inscription is to my knowledge unpublished. For the date and the architectural context, see: Haytham Hasan, “Introduction to the Citadel of Masyaf.” In: Stefano Bianca (ed.) *Syria – Medieval Citadels between East and West* (Turin, 2007), 195 and fig. 158. The photograph of the inscription is very small and in parts hard to read, yet I had the occasion to see the passage on the Īwān Kisrā during a visit to Masyaf in summer 2005 with Professor Leisten’s excavation team at Bālis/ Meskene.

641 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Voyages d’Ibn Batoutah*, I: 70-71. See the quote at the beginning of this chapter for the passage in question.
construction of a mausoleum for the ruling sultan’s ancestor, Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak (r. 602-607/1206-1211). The mausoleum was probably never finished, but the enterprise appears to have been impressive:

“I was occupied with the construction of a tomb for sultan Quṭb al-Dīn. The sultan [Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ṭughrulshāh] had ordered that a dome be built for him [Quṭb al-Dīn], of a height of 100 cubits, that is 20 cubits higher than the dome of Qāzān, king of Iraq [Ghāzān Khān]. He ordered that 30 villages be bought as waqf for it, and gave them into my hands, giving me a tenth of their income, according to custom.”

This passage in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa again contains a topos, namely that of a ruler competing with a scion of an earlier dynasty in establishing the largest mausoleum. Thus, Ghāzān Khān, who for the Indian ruler became the model of such exploits in patronage, had competed with the mausoleum of the Seljuk sultan Sanjar, built in 552/1157:

“Since he [Ghāzān Khān] was in the capital Tabriz, he chose it was the site and laid the foundation himself outside the city to the west in the place called Shamb. They have been working on it for several years now, and it is planned to be much more magnificent than the dome of Sultan Sanjar the Seljuq in Merv, which is the most magnificent building in the world and which he saw.”

Apart from the reference to this domed mausoleum as an example of monumentality, it is striking that Ghāzān Khān is said to have seen the building himself, putting the authority to decide about monumental scale with him, rather than with a group of advisors. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, as the author of the account, uses the reference to boast the merit of his project. In Anatolia, where not many buildings seem to have met his criteria of admirable monumentality, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa focused on the riches of gardens and orchards, praising the hospitality of the Akhī communities that

642 O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 504-506.
welcomed him for feasts and provided lodging. Even the Gök Medrese in Sivas, a rather large monument, did not attract Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s attention although he describes a hostel for sayyids nearby.645

In later sources on Anatolia, architecture does not take a prominent role. In his account of Anatolia, the Mamluk chronicler al-ʿUmarī is hardly impressed with the architecture, with the exception of the Karatay Han, a mid-thirteenth century building that was described in detail based on the sources that the author drew on.646 The monument attracted some attention, as another source refers to the patron of the monument, Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy, deciding against a visit to his newly finished commission for fear of displaying pride. Even though the passage may have been inserted as anecdotal prove of the amīr’s well-known piety, it is illustrative in that the wealth and beauty of the monument trigger a negative, rather than a positive reaction:

“Once the caravanserai that he commissioned in the region of Zamandū on the way to Elbistan was completed, [Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy] set out from Kayseri to see it. Approaching the site, he regretted his decision and turned around. He thought that seeing this large building would incite his vanity, a vanity that would cause his good works to stay behind. Even though he had commissioned the entire construction of this magnificent building (that does not have an equal in this world), [Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy] did not see it. When they brought him the account and expenditure records of the building, he saw that much of the money had disappeared before being spent [on the construction], and burnt all the papers. He did not want that the clerks, workmen, overseers, and pay masters get into trouble and become known to be indebted because of these arrears.”647

With these exceptions, contemporary or near contemporary descriptions of architecture in medieval Anatolia are absent from the known sources. This poses the obvious problem that the

646 The passage is quoted in Chapter Two, p. 130.
perspective of the contemporary, local viewer can only be extrapolated from an observation of
the architecture, rather than from specific sources. The preoccupation with monumentality
present in texts relating to Abbasid Iraq or Mamluk Egypt is not apparent in the texts on
Anatolia. This may be a hint at differences in aesthetic sensitivities between these regions, as
external observers did not find the monuments in Anatolia impressive in terms of size, and
conversely, architecture was not a central issue in local sources. Possibly, an external observer
would have been more attuned to the specifics of architecture than a local writer who saw the
monuments on a daily basis. Considering the mobility of individuals between different parts of
the Islamic world, it would be desirable to better understand the intricacies of perceiving
architecture, and how they shifted from one place to another.

The reasons why architecture in Anatolia eluded the concepts of monumentality
presented in the texts just discussed will be investigated below. First, I will discuss the notion of
monumentality in Byzantine architecture. On a conceptual level, observations on size and scale
may be helpful in connecting the two narratives, Byzantine and ‘Seljuk,’ continuing the
discussion begun in Chapter Two on the past of architecture in Anatolia.

From the late ninth century onwards, churches in Constantinople (and in the provinces to
the extent that they are preserved) tended to move towards a smaller scale. This reduction in
scale has been considered one of the primary characteristics of Middle Byzantine architecture.648
The reduction in scale is especially striking in comparison to the monumental churches of the
sixth century, with Hagia Sophia as the most obvious example. In examples such as the church of
Constantine Lips (today known as Fenari İsa Camii; fig. 113) in Istanbul, consecrated in 907, the

cross-in-square plan with five domes and multiple lateral chapels is consistently employed, and the plans become reduced in size.  

As a reason for this reduction in size, the need for more privacy in church ritual has been quoted, along with the practical aspect of fitting chapels into pre-existing churches. In this context, the use of side or subsidiary chapels became part of a “standardization of certain elements of plan, as well as a new sense of compositional order, both in plan and in the external massing of the structure.” Moreover, reduced availability of funding for construction projects may have played a role in foregoing large scale while maintaining rich interior decoration.

The implications of these changes are not entirely clear, yet once introduced, the different types of plans with integrated subsidiary chapels remained in place for several centuries. Examples have been preserved, spread out over various regions of the Byzantine Empire, from the late ninth to the thirteenth century. These examples are all built on a smaller scale than previously common, and are spatially related to the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I (built in 880), a five-domed church with subsidiary chapels that is no longer extant. The fragmentation into more and smaller spaces is a notable feature of the period that went hand-in-hand with a general reduction of size. The latter has been ascribed to both a lack of resources, and to the increased wish for privacy in church ritual among wealthy patrons. This miniaturization commonly associated with Middle Byzantine architecture remained in place for several centuries, into the early fourteenth century in Constantinople.

---

649 For a detailed description of the plan as well as extensive references on this church, see: Ćurčić, “Architectural Significance,” 98-99.


Richard Krautheimer has argued that a central concept of this move towards small spaces was its combination with exuberant decoration to captivate the visitor, making the best possible use of the restricted space to apply ornament in varied techniques.\footnote{\
"Lastly, smallness, intimacy, and subtlety are basic stylistic concepts of Middle Byzantine architecture. A wealth of decoration designed to overwhelm the visitor would be crowded into the tiny space of these churches: marble sheathing and precious tapestries on the walls and mosaics or murals in the vaulting zone; icons and reliquaries of gold, enamel and glass, such as have survived in the treasure of S. Marco in Venice. […] Founders, builders, and visitors alike were trained to savour the subtle interlocking of space, its expansion or restriction, the delicate curving of a niche, the membering of a wall by fine mouldings, the carving of a profile or an ornament." Krautheimer, \textit{Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture}, 344.\
}

As I shall argue below, it appears that in Seljuk architecture, this principle of capturing a visually astute public with decoration, rather than size, was taken to the facades of the buildings. Interior decoration was an important factor as well, yet the facades and the portals especially, became the central focus in which patrons displayed their wealth and craftsmen their skill.

Even though it is impossible to draw a direct connection between this move towards smaller scale in Byzantine architecture, and the smaller scale of Seljuk monuments, the conceptual parallels are nevertheless appealing. The small size may not only have been functional, but been born out of aesthetic concerns which, in the culturally fluid milieu of thirteenth-century Anatolia might have reached from Byzantine into Seljuk architecture.

Architectural models, as miniaturized representations of architecture, are part of the same discussion of size and scale. Small reproductions of architecture existed in Byzantium and in the Caucasus, yet their uses may have been somewhat different. The significance of architectural representations could be multiple, and often the current state of research does not allow for a clear-cut understanding of the modes of representation in place.\footnote{Slobodan Ćurčić, “Architecture as Icon.” In: Slobodan Ćurčić and Evangelia Hadjidryphonos (eds.) \textit{Architecture as Icon – Perception and Representation of Architecture in Byzantine Art} (Princeton, 2010), 3-37.}
Byzantine models of churches, as Slobodan Ćurčić has recently argued, were symbolic representations of the liturgical space. This interpretation places the models within the concept of Architecture as Icon, coining architectural representations in both two- and three-dimensional techniques as symbolic reflections of the church as the house of God, and of Heavenly Jerusalem. The three-dimensional representations of architecture that have been preserved are thus not models in the narrow sense; they were not used as part of the building process. This latter type has not been preserved, yet examples from the Caucasus, and depictions of architectural models in Byzantine paintings and mosaics suggest that they existed.655

Architectural models (figs. 114 and 117), found in Armenia and Georgia, have been variously explained as actual models used in construction, dedicatory objects, or pieces of symbolic use. It has been suggested that architectural models of symbolical significance may have included deposits of relics because some of the examples carved in stone are hollowed out at the center, allowing for reliquaries to be inserted.656

Examples include dedicatory images in which a patron presents a model of the church that he sponsored. At the church of Saint Gregory (1001-1010) in Ani, a now-lost statue of King Gagik, nearly carved in the round and holding a model of the church was integrated into the exterior wall (fig. 115).657 Another well known example at the church of the Holy Cross (915-921) at Aghtamar in Lake Van (fig. 116) depicts King Gagik Artsruni holding a model of the


657 Cuneo, “Modèles,” 210-211.
church that was built at his behest. The architectural representations (fig. 117), possibly intended as reliquaries, pose the problem of their original purpose. Examples that have been addressed as reliquaries are either detachable or have been preserved without an architectural context. The cavities inside them are the strongest indication of a purpose as reliquary, yet the group cannot be defined with certainty. The architectural representations from Armenia addressed as models are problematic in that their function has been deduced from physical resemblance with actual monuments. In terms of design principles, it is relevant that the Armenian architect Trdat, responsible for the reconstruction of the dome of Hagia Sophia in the tenth century, is known to have prepared a model as well as a plan of the construction. What kind of model this was is, however, unclear; the ones that Cuneo suggests as examples might not quite fit the needs of an architect.

Architectural models have not been found in relation to Seljuk buildings in Anatolia (or any other Islamic architecture for that matter). This fact strongly suggests that the Armenian examples were of a religious nature, either as part of sculpted donor portraits or as reliquaries. The first type, the donor portrait, has been preserved in examples, all attached to the outer walls.

---


660 In the eleventh-century Universal History of Step'anos Tarōnec'i, the architect’s work is described: "Even [Hagia] Sophia, the cathedral, was torn to pieces from top to bottom. On account of this, many skillful workers among the Greeks tried repeatedly to reconstruct it. The architect and stonemason Trdat of the Armenians also happened to be there, presented a plan, and with wise understanding prepared a model, and began to undertake the initial construction, so that [the church] was rebuilt more handsomely than before.” Translation in: Christina Maranci, “The Architect Trdat: Building Practices and Cross-Cultural Exchange in Byzantium and Armenia,” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 62.3 (Sep., 2003), 295.


662 Ceramic models of houses from Seljuk Iran were reproductions of domestic architecture rather models in the sense that is part of the design process. Their function is still not clear: Margaret S. Graves, “Ceramic Mouse Models from Medieval Persia: Domestic Architecture and Concealed Activity,” Iran 46 (2008): 227-252.
of monuments or their roofs, rather than appearing in the interior. Based on the parallels that have been detected on the technical level between Armenian and Seljuk monuments, the absence of architectural models suggests that they were not intended as small scale models for architects and masons. If so, similar examples most likely would have turned up in Anatolia and related to Seljuk buildings. Rather, the Armenian examples had a purpose specifically related to the churches that they were connected to, frequently as part of a donor portrait, a type of representation that would have been inappropriate on a public monument in Muslim Anatolia.

The function as architectural models is thus unlikely; indeed, the notion of making a small-scale model out of a durable material such as stone does not appear a very logical step to take. Rare examples of architectural drawings carved in stone have been found and given a medieval date, yet nothing suggests that this use of a hard support was common practice. If drawings were regularly used, they would have been on parchment or paper, rarely preserved due to the strains of using them on the building site.

The elaborate drawings of the Topkapi Scroll, that were most likely conceived in a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century Iranian context, suggest that such drawings were current in the conception of architecture. The approach to architecture reflected in the scroll is known mostly from textual sources, especially for the pre-Mongol period. Nevertheless, the elaborateness of the scroll does suggest a longer tradition of such depictions. An understanding of such drawings is essential in that it shows the translation of three-dimensional

---

664 Laor-Sirak, “The Role of Armenians in Eastern Anatolian Muslim Architecture.”
666 Necipoğlu, *The Topkapi Scroll*, 3-6, and chapter 2 for a description and dating of the scroll.
space on a flat surface, and the reproduction of architecture onto a much smaller scale. Models may have been a further step in this process of translation, even though the elaborate drawings and the mathematical skill displayed in relevant treatises indicate that they may not always have been a necessity.

Overall, the notion of scale in architecture may not be necessarily connected to the notion of the architectural model. Whenever size is invoked, the comparison is between large monuments, whereas the idea of miniaturization does not seem to matter in those contexts. Nevertheless, the use of small scale architecture suggests specific meaning behind it, and medieval Anatolia offers an environment to examine it.

**Small Buildings – Elaborate Decoration: An Anatolian Phenomenon?**

Compared to contemporary buildings in other parts of the Islamic world, monuments constructed in Anatolia throughout the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries remain small in scale. In a study focusing on palaces, Gülru Necipoğlu has suggested that in certain regions of the Islamic world, especially Syria, the architecture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is characterized by a move away from the monumentality of Umayyad and Abbasid construction. Anatolia, where the architectural patronage of the Seljuks really only expanded from the late twelfth century onwards, was a late-comer to this phenomenon that had started elsewhere as the region had only just begun to be integrated into the Islamic world. Nevertheless, the region remained within the logic of the “Seljuk successor states,” adopting also the taste for smaller monuments.667

The relationship between decoration and structure in small-scale monuments varies over time. Bernard O’Kane has suggested that in North Africa in the early fourteenth century decoration in intricate details was privileged over monumental scale especially the madrasas that the Marinid sultan Abū ʿInān sponsored in Morocco (figs. 118 and 119). These buildings are small in scale, yet intricately decorated in their courtyards with carved woodwork, stucco, and tile mosaic that create an overwhelming impression of intricate design. The exterior, however, does not display an impressive façade; rather, the exterior of these monuments is plain, and not accentuated in any obvious way. The splendid decoration remains in the interior.

In medieval Anatolia, façades were accentuated by decoration that renders a visual presence to the exterior of the monuments. Due to this strong presence of the exterior decoration of mosques, madrasas, and caravanserais in central Anatolia dating to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries display a curious discrepancy between the small scale of the architecture, and the towering impression made by their carved stone decoration, centered on the portal façade.

This question of scale, and the connected issue of emphasizing decoration, rather than size, finds its place within the previous discussion of style and its implications in medieval Anatolia. Thus, this section addresses how this discrepancy works visually to enhance the buildings’ effect in a way particular to medieval Anatolia. Comparisons to contemporary buildings in other regions of the Islamic world will show how the decoration of these Anatolian monuments operates in a specific way, enhancing the impact of monuments on the viewer without resorting to monumentality or all-over decoration. Several of the monuments discussed in Chapters Two and Three can serve as examples for the ways in which these modes of

---

668 O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 504.
decoration operate in capturing the attention of viewers and passersby. It has been argued that the location of certain monuments, especially of mausolea and zāwiyas, along main thoroughfares and near public places such as market and city gates was crucial in attracting people to a building.\footnote{Wolper, \textit{Cities and Saints}, 42-59.}

Equally, the ways in which decoration was distributed on the façade of a monument, creating an impressive image through its presence, was a crucial factor in drawing the public to a building. This is especially the case of a monument such as the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas (670/ 1271-72), placed so closely to the facing Şifaiye Medrese that viewing of the façade from afar is only possible at an oblique angle.

In the Buruciye Medrese (670/ 1271-72) in Sivas, the focus of decoration lies at the center of the main façade. The carved elements are arranged around the single portal giving access to the interior of the building. Surrounded by a succession of rectangular frames of various widths, increasing in size to ultimately surpass the cornice of the façade in height, the doorway becomes the main attraction of the building, inviting passersby to enter. The doorway, placed in a recess in the façade, is small compared to the decorated frames that prepare and accentuate it. The frames that form the accentuating block for the portal are decorated with geometrical or vegetal motifs that greatly vary from one band to the next, but not within the same band. In the interior, a large and intricately decorated inscription attracts the viewer to the main īwān. Colored decoration is only present in the interior of the mausoleum chamber, visible only upon entering this section of the building.

The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas (670/ 1271-72), located just a few 100 yards away from the previous example, has two brick minarets rising over the portal. The arrangement of the
decoration around the portal in frames remains the same. Again frames are drawn around the doorway, even though in this case the recess is not as deep because unlike in the Buruciye Medrese, the portal is not salient with respect to the rest of the façade. In addition to the floral and geometric decoration of the portal, the corner buttresses of the Çifte Minareli Medrese are emphasized by decoration, consisting of a dado zone of triangles, that transition into a net of bulbous vegetal motifs covering the rest of the buttress, originally likely up to the cornice that has disappeared.

In a variation on the theme, the central portal decoration of the Gök Medrese in Sivas is carved in marble, while the rest of the façade is built of the same stone that is used in the Çifte Minareli Medrese and the Buruciye Medrese. Rectangular frames run around the doorway, forming a focal point at the center of the façade. Each frame is decorated individually: geometric and vegetal motifs in high and low relief, kufic and cursive Arabic script are used. Corner buttresses carved with vegetal motifs close off the façade, and are decorated in the same way as in the Çifte Minareli Medrese. The walls between portal and buttresses break up this symmetric structure. To the left, a fountain is placed beneath a trilobate arch; to the right, small irregularly spaced windows pierce the façade. Overall, the effect is one of symmetry, even though the insertion of windows at irregular intervals in the two wings of the façade to some extent breaks up this impression.

Even in examples that introduce variants on the decoration of the portal block, such as the İnce Minareli Medrese in Konya (ca. 1260-65) the emphasis on the entrance remains in place and powerfully draws the viewer’s attention towards the monument. Here, an inscription band frames the doorway (fig. 120) and is knotted at the center just above the door, in place of the more common muqarnas hood. The knot is placed in a receding conch, rendering the effect of the
inscription band even more dynamic as it crosses over the edge of the recess to continue vertically towards the top of the portal block. Within the conch, to both sides of the inscription band, large plant motifs grow out of crescent moons atop crenellated squinches. Fields filled with palmettes surround these central motifs. At a slanted angle just outside the conch, engaged colonettes covered with vegetal motifs are placed to both sides of the recess preparing the doorway. Above them, a band decorated with wine-leave like motifs runs towards the cornice. On the outside of this single colonette, another pair of colonettes, decorated with scales, is placed. Above these colonettes, thick moldings cross over each other before connecting to a large palmette motif. Then, a thick molding covered in a geometric pattern within a frame carrying an inscription. Larger than the inscription band, a frame decorated with interlacing scrolls ending in palmettes closes the portal off towards both sides. The rest of the façade has been so heavily restored in recent years that it cannot be taken into account here. Only a fragment of the single brick minaret, decorated with intermittent accents of turquoise and black tile remains. The tall minaret was the main accent of the monument before it was destroyed by lightning in the early twentieth century.

As carefully as they are geared towards guiding the viewer, these façades do not reveal the plan of the monuments. The examples in Sivas have open courtyards with two and four īwāns respectively, and are built entirely of stone just as the façade. The façades are similar to those used on some caravanserais, yet the interior plan differs from the latter type of monument which at time consists of a series of two courtyards, or a combination of open spaces and covered halls. The courtyard of the İnce Minareli Medrese is covered with a wide brick dome (fig. 121), and
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670 Sözen, Anadolu medreseleri, vol. 2: fig. 12 shows the parts of the façade that were rebuilt.
the interior structure consists of one large īwān facing the entrance, and rectangular and square side chambers.

Thus, the differences in function between certain buildings became apparent only upon entering. The interior aspect of the monument, rather than being revealed in the structure of the façade, was reserved to those who had access to it. This created a public face of architecture marked by the parallels between monuments as apparent in façade structure, even though details still diverged. Moreover, the interior of a monument did not necessarily depend upon the structure of the façade, and could be developed according to functional needs, while still preserving a representative façade that provided some sense of uniformity.

The interior decoration of these different buildings varies from stone carving to glazed tile mosaic applied to brick in various stages of elaboration. In the İnce Minareli Medrese, the interior of the dome is decorated with geometric patterns in turquoise and black tile, alternating with the bare brick. An inscription band in black kufic tile script on brick background, and with a hint of turquoise decoration runs around the base of the dome. The Turkish triangles forming the transition from the square plan of the courtyard to the dome are delineated with narrow bands in turquoise and black brick.

In the nearby Karatay Medrese, a large brick dome covers the courtyard, to which a large īwān is attached (figs. 122 and 123). The entrance into this central space, however, does not lie in the axis of the building. Rather, the visitor enters through a domed vestibule that separates a small door at the eastern corner of the courtyard from the central space. This indirect approach leaves the viewer unprepared for the rich interior decoration: the dome is covered in turquoise and black tiles, with black flower-like medallions emanating from a geometric interlace pattern. Elaborate kufic inscriptions in tile run along the base of the dome and around the oculus at its
The Turkish triangles below are covered with square kufic script in black on a turquoise background, and framed with bands of dark-blue leaves on a white background. A dark-blue cursive inscription on a background of turquoise scroll frames the arch of the īwān. Around the square of the courtyard, touching at the tips of the Turkish triangles runs a kufic inscription framed by bands of vegetal patterns, all in black on a turquoise background. Panels above the windows and openings between the courtyard and side chambers are decorated in the same manner.

The wall decoration, to the extent that it has been preserved, consists of hexagonal turquoise tiles with gilded inscriptions on them. Even though the parts of the walls where tile decoration has not been preserved are today whitewashed, it is likely that the entire interior was covered with these same tiles. This decoration, in its visual richness, makes the small space of the courtyard measuring 12 m by 12 m appear much larger than it actually is.

To a similar effect, the tile decoration in the tomb chamber of the complex of Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī enhances the importance of this small space. Even though much smaller than the domed courtyard of the monument (fig. 124), the section containing the burials of the founder and his relatives is decorated more prominently, displaying tiles on all walls and on the cenotaphs. The courtyard, similar in size and plan to that of the İnce Minareli Medrese except for the presence of four īwāns, is covered with the same type of dome, yet carries little tile decoration. Thus, the courtyard remains a preparatory space, announcing the tomb chamber without revealing the splendor of the decoration within. The portal of this section of the complex, conceived as a khānqāh, is decorated with bands of geometric patterns framing the portal block. A pointed arch with engaged corner colonettes forms the recess for the doorway. Over the segmental arch of the doorway, the foundation inscription is carved onto the trilobite
panel. In this building, the portal is less elaborately decorated than the interior, yet it serves its purpose of drawing the visitor towards the central space. There, the decoration is applied hierarchically, with the mausoleum of the founder, the main attraction of the monument, receiving the largest share of the tile work.

The attention paid to decoration obtains a singular layer of meaning in connection with the relatively smaller size of the monuments. Thus, the Buruciye Medrese measures just 25 m by 30 m, a size that is quite common for central Anatolia during the period in question.671 The Sirçalı Medrese in Konya, the Karatay Medrese, and the Yakutiye Medrese all measure about the same. The Gök Medrese in Tokat and the Sahibiye Medrese in Kayseri are both somewhat larger with 25 m by 40 m. The Çifte Minareli Medrese in Erzurum with its elongated plan measures roughly 35 m by 50 m, not including the mausoleum. This makes it one of the largest buildings in Anatolia, somewhat of an exception together with the Şifaiye Medrese in Sivas with its 61 m by 41.5 m. Overall, however, smaller buildings are more common. In the smaller ones of these monuments in particular, the overwhelming decoration of the portal façade and of the central block around the entrance in particular, is the first element that the viewer takes in. Thus, the small size does not become apparent at first, and only conscious attention to the measurements reveals the relatively limited dimensions of these buildings.

In contrast, the main façade of the building complex of Sultan Qalāwūn in Cairo (683-84/1284-85) stretches over 70 meters (fig. 125). In addition to the width, the height of the façade and its complex composition with multiple salient angles distinguish this and other Mamluk monuments from buildings in Anatolia. Behind this long façade, the multi-functional complex consisting of the mausoleum of the founder, a madrasa, and a hospital once covered a large

671 The measurements given here are taken from the plans in Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri.
surface (fig. 126). The foundation inscription (fig. 127), written in large naskhī script, runs across the entire façade at a height of about two meters above the ground level, and visually ties the length of the building together. The portal stands out far less than in the Anatolian examples, its decoration being tied into that of the façade, rather than jutting out from it and carrying distinctive decoration.

Generally, portals in Mamluk architecture are not emphasized in the same way as in the Seljuk monuments of Anatolia. Even when the portal is salient, such as in the Mosque of Baybars (664-667/1266-69) the decoration emphasizes the entrance of the monument more subtly, without variedly decorated frames that immediately capture the eye of the viewer. This lighter approach to portal decoration is especially striking compared to the portals of Sivas or Konya, where the virtuosity of the stonemasons concentrated on this part of the façade.

The Madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan (758-765/1357-1364; figs. 128 and 129) has been connected to Seljuk architecture. In a detailed study of this building, J. Michael Rogers has examined whether the building might be the work of craftsmen from Anatolia, at least in some parts especially of the portal decoration. The focus of Rogers’s study lies on the portal of the madrasa, a salient porch that at first sight indeed does evoke Seljuk architecture. Upon investigation of the details of the construction, Rogers suggests that the connection is not so direct as to warrant the involvement of actual workmen who immigrated to Egypt from Anatolia. Rather, Rogers posits, the decoration of the madrasa evokes a near-forgotten memory of Seljuk

---


673 The example of the mosque of Baybars al-Bunduqdārī establishes a local precedent, supplanting the need to look far afield for comparisons.
monuments, maybe through a workshop that migrated several decades earlier or through a craftsman who travelled in Anatolia at some point in his life.  

A clear discrepancy between the Madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan and Seljuk monuments lies in scale. Whereas in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Egypt, monumentality was a main concern, the elaborate decoration of portal façades in Anatolia conceals the smallness of the buildings from the viewer, suggesting a different attitude towards architecture, possibly concentrating material expense on the skill and quality of carving, rather than on size. The measurements of Seljuk monuments in Anatolia, as Sharon Laor-Sirak has shown, rely on the same units as those of Armenian buildings in that region and in the Caucasus, constructed throughout the Middle Ages. This suggests connected architectural traditions, and probably collaboration between workmen and builders of different origin. The small size of many Islamic monuments may thus also reflect the connection to the Armenian tradition, a line of inquiry that has not yet been pursued.

Within the context of the region, the impact of older traditions and contemporary is as important as the competition for monumentality that the Mamluks and Ilkhanids engaged. The geographical position of Anatolia placed the region between these two competing forces; the mobility of craftsmen led to added transfer of motifs and concepts of design. Within this architectural landscape of size and scale, the place of Seljuk Anatolia has not been explored in detail. Geographically, the region is at the center of the phenomena just outlined. In chronological terms, it is at the junction between the smaller structures in the wake of early Islamic monumentality, and the new quest for it pursued by the Mamluks, Ilkhanids, and little

---

later the Ottomans. It appears that the special place of Anatolia lies in the ways in which the relationship between plan, size, and decoration of a building is played out.

In the longstanding conflict between Mamluks and Ilkhanids, Anatolia was involved for geographical as well as political reasons, as the Ilkhanids gained more and more influence over the Seljuk sultans in the second half of the thirteenth century for the reasons discussed in Chapter Three. The aesthetic mechanisms in place in Anatolia had developed in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, in line with the construction of smaller monuments under Zengid and Ayyubid rule in Syria, and later Egypt. Thus, in the fourteenth century, when the conflict between Mamluks and Ilkhanids was fully in force, architectural practices in Anatolia were sufficiently engrained to continue in their previous path.

Bernard O’Kane has argued that the conflict between Mamluks and Ilkhanids was played out on an artistic level in the production of oversized Qur’ans and in the construction of monumental mosques and madrasas. Similarly monumental buildings were erected in the Ilkhanid realm, such as the mausoleum of Īljiyyūṭū in his capital of Sulṭānīya near Tabriz, built between 707/1307 and 713/1313 (ﬁgs. 130 and 131). Economic prosperity allowed for the construction of such monuments, even if they were at times pushing resources to the limit.677 Comparing the monuments in Egypt and Iran to their smaller contemporaries in Morocco, such as the madrasa of Abū ʿInān in Fez (751-756/1350-1355) and several similar buildings sponsored by the same ruler, O’Kane concludes that in some regions, “the dominant aesthetic of

---

677 O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 503.
the time seems to have been in favour […] of reducing scale and increasing ornament.”678 Such a taste was perhaps dominant in Anatolia as well.

The Mamluk and Ilkhanid monuments, on the other hand, tower over the cityscape by their sheer size, but still resort to intricate decoration in the interior, such as the painted stucco in the mausoleum of Úljaytū, or the gilding in the mausoleum of sultan Qalāwūn. Conversely, the exterior receives only touches of decoration, such as a large inscription connecting elements of a façade, a salient porch that itself remains devoid of decoration, or exterior arches and galleries that structure the silhouette of a monument.

In comparison with contemporary buildings in Anatolia, the Mamluk and Ilkhanid monuments strive to impress with their size, rather than intricacies of decoration. The latter are still present, yet they do not form part of the first impression of a monument. Contemporary monuments in Anatolia, however, emphasize exactly that aspect: the decoration of the portal is such that it takes over the appearance of the building.

Conclusion

In Anatolia, the portal facades with their decoration are the main point of attraction for a viewer. Since the medieval urban fabric has not been preserved in most Anatolian cities, it is hard to tell to what extent the buildings were surrounded by other constructions that would have influenced the possibilities of approaching the monuments. Early twentieth-century photographs often show residential structures right next to the medieval monuments, yet to what extent these later structures are reminiscent of the situation at the time of construction is unclear.

678 O’Kane, “Monumentality,” 504.
It is, however, obvious that the monuments were designed with a focus on one façade that contains the portal and thus serves to attract passersby into the building. Inside the buildings, the decoration varies greatly. In buildings with open courtyards, such as the three madrasas in Sivas, stone carving continues on the walls and in the īwāns of the courtyard. Special rooms within madrasas, such as the mausolea of the founders, or chambers designated as mosques, often received tile decoration in dark blue, black, and turquoise. Such decoration can also be found in the domes over the courtyards of the İnce Minareli Medrese and the Karatay Medrese in Konya, as part of the brick construction of the dome rather than in plaster applied over stone.

The significance of these choices - whether they were caused by aesthetic preference or technical conditions – is hard to assess. The ways in which these aesthetic preferences played out in the architecture of the time are difficult to trace in the sources. Observing the monuments of medieval Anatolia, however, it is clear that in this region as well, O’Kane’s statement concerning the presence of overwhelming decoration in small monuments can be adopted for an inquiry into the curious discrepancy between the small size of the buildings and the abundant use of rich ornamentation.

Yet it is the façade, the public face of the monument that received the most attention. The contrast between the impact of the exuberant decoration and the relatively small size of the monuments is not apparent at first sight: the decoration involves the viewer to such an extent that the small size is not a primary concern. Thus, I argue that the size of the monuments was a conscious aesthetic choice.

The monumental architecture of the two rival empires was not introduced into Anatolia. It appears that the dynamics of size and scale created in Anatolia during the first half of the thirteenth century, as the Seljuk rulers provided architectural patronage that proved to foster
creativity beyond the tight constraints of an imperial style, continued into the fourteenth century. The relative monumentality, by Anatolian standards, of the madrasas in Sivas and Erzurum that were at the center of Chapter Three, however, suggests a change in emphasis. Similarly, the use of tall double minarets on facades indicated an increased impact of Ilkhanid dominance.

The rivalry between Mamluks and Ilkhanids, even though affecting Anatolia in political terms, did not lead to a change in architectural style and paradigms. Rather, the terms in which local architecture operated continued, and were affected by internal changes in patronage rather than the competition of those two major empires. The latter in the end did not choose, unlike the Ottomans from the late fifteenth century onwards, to impose their style on territories that came within their realm.
Chapter Five

Anatolia as the Westernmost Province of the Ilkhanid Realm (1290-1335)

“Grosse Bauten geben noch in ihren Ruinen von der Grösse der Herrscher, die sie ausgeführt, Zeugniss, und der berühmte Grabdom Ghasan’s wölbte sich kühn zum Dome des Himmels auf; als an diesem die Sonne der mongolischen Herrschaft in Iran unterging, stand im Westen schon der aufgehende Mond des osmanischen Reiches.” (Hammer, Ilchane, II: 344)

This chapter discusses the question to what extent Anatolia was culturally integrated into the Ilkhanid realm during the period of closest political involvement, from the late 1270s to the decline of the Ilkhanid dynasty after the death of sultan Abū Saʿīd (r. 716-735/ 1316-1335). During these few decades, the Ilkhanids extended their political and administrative hold over the region.679

The cultural side of these developments has been little studied and will be at the center of this chapter. I will focus on the few monuments that have been preserved, their inscriptions, and waqf documents in an attempt to unite a sizeable amount of evidence for this little-known period. Extant monuments in eastern and central Anatolia, dated between 1290 and 1335, are for the most part located in Amasya, Tokat, Sivas and Erzurum (map 6), cities located on the route to Iran and those more closely connected to the center of the Ilkhanid realm. Some of these monuments have been studied in more detail than others, but the question of connections between this architecture and the Ilkhanid rulers of the region has not been addressed in a comprehensive manner. At times, the relevance of this question has been outright dismissed, and the historiography emphasizing the Turkishness of Seljuk culture and architecture has done nothing to encourage a study connecting late medieval Anatolia to the surrounding regions.

679 On the conflict, see Amitai, Mongols and Mamluks.
As we shall see, the architecture of this period was in part dependent on the integration of Anatolia into the Ilkhanid realm, combined with increasing fragmentation and uprising local rulers who would eventually gain independence as the Ilkhanate disappeared in the second quarter of the fourteenth century. Closer Ilkhanid control of Anatolia was triggered by the campaign that the Mamluk sultan of Egypt, Baybars I. (r. 658-676/ 1260-1277) undertook in 675/ 1277.

This invasion of Anatolia was directed at the Ilkhanids, the greatest political rival of the Mamluks for control of the Levant. The Mamluk campaign was successful to some extent: the Ilkhanids suffered a major defeat in the battle of Elbistan (Abūlustayn), and the Mamluk armies occupied the city of Kayseri in central Anatolia for six months, before a lack of provisions forced Baybars to abandon the city and retreat to Syria as winter was approaching.

Feeling directly threatened, and fearing future attacks in a political climate rife with espionage and treason, the Ilkhanid ruler Abaqa Khān (r. 663-681/ 1265-1282) opted for closer control over Anatolia. The administration was connected more closely to the Ilkhanid center in Iran than before, governors were appointed from Iran, and the Seljuk sultan definitely became a puppet ruler.

Within the next decade, the two most powerful local figures in Anatolia died: the pervâne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān was executed on suspicion of conspiracy with the Mamluks in 675/ 1277 and Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī passed away in 684/ 1285.681 With the disappearance of these two figures, Anatolia was entirely under the influence of the Ilkhanid administration that appointed changing governors, and sent armies to suppress occasional revolts. As the Ilkhanid

680 Amitai, Mongols and Mamluks, 176-177.
681 As noted in an inscription in Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī’s tomb within the Sahip Ata complex in Konya: RCEA No. 4863.
dynasty itself grew weaker, especially under the rule of Abū Saʿīd, control gradually began to slip away and some local notables and certain Ilkhanid administrators began to gain independence. By the mid-fourteenth century, this led to a situation very similar to what had been happening in western Anatolia since the 1280s: small local principalities (beyliks) were competing for power, and central control was entirely absent.

The first part of this chapter will discuss the economic and political incorporation of Anatolia into the Ilkhanid realm, since an understanding of this background is essential as part of the parameters within which the Ilkhanids related to the region. The appointment of governors directly from Iran and for limited spans of time in an attempt to reduce corruption may have reduced the interest in patronage, evidently a long-term investment, in Anatolia. Taxation placed a heavy burden on the region, perhaps depleting it of the resources necessary for major construction projects.

The second part of this chapter will discuss the conversion of the Ilkhanid rulers to Islam. The permanent adherence of the Ilkhanids to Islam since Ghāzān Khān may have had an impact on patronage for Islamic institutions such as mosques and madrasas, even though the architectural evidence is limited. Once they adopted Islamic titles, the Ilkhanid rulers appeared in foundation inscriptions, especially on larger monuments. In Anatolia, the first examples date to the rule of Üljäytū (r. 703-716/1304-1316), a time when the Ilkhanids had recast their public identity in terms appropriate for Muslim rulers.

The third and fourth parts of this chapter address the nature of architectural patronage in eastern Anatolia around 1300. Inscriptions will show at which dates monuments were built, and whether the Ilkhanid sultans were named in them according to the conventions of Arabic epigraphy. The third part will focus on the smaller foundations such as mausolea and zāwiyas.
that locals, rather than rulers, founded. The fourth part will be concerned with the two larger monuments built in the region during the period in question: the Bimarhane in Amasya (708/1308) and the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum (710/1310). The patrons of both buildings are likely to have been directly associated with the Ilkhanid administration of Anatolia, which may explain their ability to commission larger monuments.

The fifth part of this chapter will be concerned with pious endowments (waqfs). The evidence for Anatolia shows that between 1280 and 1330, a majority of newly established waqfs were small in scale, with only a few rural properties such as fields, villages, or springs serving as revenue producing property.682 The same is true for the buildings that these endowments belong to, in general small zāwiyas. The small scale of the property is especially striking when compared to endowments of the mid-thirteenth century, such as the waqf of Şāhīb ‘Atā Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī or that of Nūr al-Dīn Jājā.683 Such endowments contained large expanses of agricultural lands, as well as urban properties such as bathhouses, shops, and public water fountains.

The change in scale of endowments in Anatolia is likely to be a consequence of the combination of the lack of direct Ilkhanid patronage, and the high tax burden, which prevented local patrons from establishing larger endowments and monuments. Comparison with Iran will show that this is indeed a regional development, and that large-scale patronage was now limited to the central lands of the Ilkhanid realm. There, truly monumental complexes and corresponding endowments were created in the region of Tabriz, as evidenced in the waqf of the Rab‘-i Rashīdī,

682 The waqf of the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum, dated 710/1310, is the only substantial endowment in eastern Anatolia during this period of which a record has been preserved. The waqfiyya is only preserved in passages carved into the stone in the interior of the building (see below).

founded by the vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīb in 709/1309. A comparison between the waqf document of this foundation and those preserved from Anatolia will demonstrate the difference in scale. In terms of the architecture, the limited number of extant Ilkhanid monuments in Iran makes a comparative analysis very difficult. Therefore, waqf documents are the most reliable source of information on patronage, despite the limited number that has been preserved.

The generally eastward orientation of Ilkhanid court culture may have led to a certain marginalization of the western regions of the realm. Nevertheless, as the western end of the wider Mongol realm, Anatolia was not necessarily an irrelevant backwater. Still, the region was perhaps less central (in a cultural and ideological sense) than the easternmost part of the larger Mongol realm, Yuan China. The cultural milieu that sprang from these interactions is relevant for the discussion of the architecture and its decoration, and will show whether the increase in Ilkhanid administrative involvement along with the presence of Mongol patrons resulted in stylistic change compared to the period of Seljuk dominance.

684 The waqf-nāme of the Rab‘-i Rashīdī has been carefully discussed and partly translated into German by Birgitt Hoffmann: Hoffmann, Waqf im mongolischen Iran – Rašīduddīns Sorge um Nachruhm und Seelenheil (Stuttgart, 2000). The relevant documents from Anatolia have not for the most part been published, and the discussion will rely on my own readings and translations of documents preserved in the Archives of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü in Ankara.

685 In Donald N. Wilber’s standard account of Ilkhanid architecture, the timeframe is extended beyond the demise of the Ilkhanid sultanate. Wilber justifies this expansion by asserting that the demise of Ilkhanid rule did not result in a change of architectural style, and that the same type of architecture continued to be produced throughout the fourteenth century: Donald N. Wilber, The Architecture of Islamic Iran - the Il-Khanid Period (Princeton, NJ, 1955), v.
Incorporating Anatolia: Economics, Politics, Religion

In political terms, the Ilkhanids were interested in Anatolia mostly as a buffer zone between Iran and the territory of the Mamluks in Syria. This became especially important after the Ilkhanids had repeatedly failed to capture Syria.\(^{686}\) The Mamluks defended Syria even at the cost of undertaking an expedition into Anatolia: in 675/277, they temporarily occupied Kayseri after inflicting a defeat on the Ilkhanids. The Ilkhanid ruler Arghūn Khān (r. 683-690/1284-1291) subsequently decided to tighten hold over Anatolia, and governors were dispatched. This tighter control remained in place until in the 1330s, with the decline of Ilkhanid rule, appointed governors such as Eretna and his descendants in Sivas, and local actors, began taking their own independence.\(^{687}\)

The fiscal aspect of this integration was bound to deplete Anatolia of some of its resources to the benefit of Iran. Sources on the exact extent of these taxes are scarce as the budgets of the Ilkhanid administration have not been preserved. The most important source on this issue is thus the geographical section of Ḥamd-Allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī’s (fl. 1330-1340) \textit{Nuzhat al-Qulūb} which includes the relevant figures for important cities throughout the Ilkhanid realm.\(^{688}\) The author was a \textit{munshī}, a functionary of the Ilkhanid administration, who had access to this information as part of this office. In 711/1311, he became the governor of Qazvīn and began to write his historical account. After losing his appointment, he spent several years

\(^{686}\) On the main bone of contention, see Reuven Amitai, “Northern Syria between the Mongols and Mamluks: political boundary, military frontier, and ethnic affinities.” In: Daniel Power and Naomi Standen (eds.) \textit{Frontiers in question: Eurasian borderlands}, 700-1700 (New York, 1999), 128-152.

\(^{687}\) Whereas the \textit{beylik}s in western Anatolia are well studied, less work has been done on similar political formations in eastern Anatolia. Thus, a seminal early work on this topic is still being reprinted: İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, \textit{Anadolu beyilikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu devletleri siyasi, idari, fikri, iktisadi, hayat, ildim ve ictimali meseleri}, halk ve toprak (first published in Ankara, 1937).

travelling through Iran before returning to Qazvīn in 740/1340, where he died around 744/1344.689 Given Qazvīnī’s position within the Ilkhanid fiscal administration, the figures that he gives for the time at which he is writing, are likely to be correct. In addition to giving the fiscal information, Qazvīnī also provides brief descriptions of the cities that he is listing, including a brief assessment of their importance and major goods traded there.

In his description of Anatolia, Qazvīnī gives a general description before proceeding to a list of important cities.690 The image of the region drawn in the introductory remarks is rather pessimistic:

“Section 7 about the places in the kingdom of Rūm. There are here about sixty towns. It is a cold place. The scholars of the past named Rūm the one that incites the lands to slight the commands of God. A ḥadīth of the Prophet serves to confirm this, as he indeed said: Nothing innocent enters Rūm. It is [written] in [the book] Masālik al-Mamālik [by Ibn Khurdādbih] and other scholars also said so: When the Romans [Rūmiyān] destroyed Jerusalem and took prisoners, God became enraged with them, and made it a custom that prisoners and captives be carried away from there [Rūm]. Since that time, not a day has passed on which prisoners are not taken from Rūm to other provinces. The author says that this is still so today. Also, many captives are taken from Īrān into Rūm. The Qur’ān confirms this with the verse: We too did not destroy the villages, except when the people thereof were unrighteous [Qur’ān XXVIII: 59]. We seek refuge with God from His wrath.

The frontiers of the province of Rūm are connected to Georgia, Armenia, Sīs [Cilicia], Syria and the Mediterranean. Its revenues today are 330 tūmān, as recorded in the account books. During the times of the Seljuks, they were higher than 1500 tūmān in today’s currency.”691

Striking in this assessment is especially the decrease in revenue since “the times of the Seljuks” even though it is not clear to what period of Seljuk rule the writer refers to. Generally, the negative description of the region may have to do with it being considered a source of unrest.
outside the central lands of the Ilkhanid realm. Similarly, in the Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh of Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīb, mentions of Anatolia are more often than not related to riots and upheaval, such as the rebellion of Sūlāmīsh in 698/1298. Qazvīnī does, however, also reuse literary stereotypes of negatively viewing Rūm that date back to a time in which the region was still under Christian, i.e. Byzantine, rule; the passage from the Qurʿān quoted in the text is one such case.

Following this pessimistic account of Anatolia, Qazvīnī continues with a list of cities, including the revenue drawn from each. He also points out that Sivas was the most important city in the province of Rūm. In comparison with Tabriz or Baghdad, this supposedly most important city of the province of Rūm appears to be of little consequence, maybe in accordance with the considerable decline in revenue that the author notes in his introduction. Clearly, Tabriz is referred to as the center of the Ilkhanid realm along with Sulṭānīye, the new capital of sultan Üljäytū that was constructed in the same region. Even Baghdad, a city that had suffered badly during the Mongol conquest of 656/1258, is described as far richer and more densely populated than the apparently most prosperous city in the province of Rūm.

The value of Qazvīnī’s work as a unique source on the economic and fiscal history of Anatolia under Ilkhanid rule has been recognized. In a lengthy article originally published in 1931, A. Zeki Velidi Togan included it in a study of the monetary system of the Ilkhanid

---


693 “Sīvās is in the fifth clime. Its longitude is that of the Fortunate Isles [the first meridian of Ptolemy] and its latitude is that of the equator [tr. Le Strange: longitude 71˚31’, and latitude 39˚20’]. Its walls are in ruins, but they were built by sultan ’Alā al-Dīn b. Kayqūbād al-Saljūqī of stones. The weather [of Sivas] is cold. Its crops are wheat, fruit, and cotton. The well-known wool of Sīvās comes from there.” Ḥamd-allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī, ed. and tr. Le Strange, vol. 23 part 1: 94 and vol. 23 part 2: 95. The description of Konya is much more detailed: Ḥamd-allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī, ed. and tr. Le Strange, vol. 23 part 2: 97-98.
realm. In purely quantitative terms, the decline in revenue that Qazvīnī noted over time is astounding, begging the question of the reliability of his numbers. Contrarily to the pessimistic image that Qazvīnī painted, Togan, combining a vast array of sources, concluded that Anatolia and Iran did, in fact, better under Mongol rule than before. Togan argued that due to the unification of the monetary system and trade, the volume of economic transactions increased, even though in purely monetary terms, the revenue was lower that under Seljuk rule. Even though this assessment had to be revised following new studies on monetary values in the medieval Islamic world, the overall image of a trans-regionally connected trade system remains valid. This is especially true for the integration of the regions around the Black Sea which under Mongol rule became more closely connected than ever before.

Tax inscriptions are another source for the fiscal hold of the Ilkhanid administration over Anatolia. These texts mark the Ilkhanid fiscal claim over the city that they are placed in, and at times were used to settle disputes. An inscription over the gate of the citadel of Ankara is still in place (fig. 132), even though in part deteriorated and thus difficult to read. The text, written in Persian, is dated 730/1330, during the reign of sultan Abū Saʿīd, and reads as follows:

---

694 A. Zeki Velidi Togan “Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period,” translated by Gary Leiser, *Annales islamologiques* XXV (1991): 203-240 [first published as “Moğollar devrinde Anadolu’nun iktisadî vaziyeti,” *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası* 1(1931): 1-42]; all subsequent references are to Leiser’s translation and explanatory notes. As Leiser points out in this introduction to the translation, Togan’s article is still the most important (and nearly the only) work on the economy of Anatolia under Mongol rule, even though some of its conclusions are in need of revision especially when concerned with the value of coinage: Togan, “Economic Conditions in Anatolia,” 203.


696 Togan, “Economic Conditions in Anatolia,” (translator’s comments).


698 The text has so far been published twice, by Paul Wittek in 1931 and by Walter Hinz in 1949. Since Hinz suggests some corrections to Wittek’s reading, I will rely on the more recent publication.
“Allāh makes things easy. When according to the decree of the great king the arrival in Ankara occurred, the peasants complained of the cattle tax and of the [fee for] appraising the wheat harvest. For the continuation of the rule of our pādishāh of Islam – may his rule last eternally – the following norm for [tax] collection is valid in the province beginning Adhar 1, 730 [March 1, 1330]: taxes in cash and in kind were established and noted in the tax register. Hence the city [pays] trade- and commerce tax (tamgha), whereas the province pays [according to] our norm for collection. Who henceforth demands cattle tax and illegal [lit. ‘new’ in a negative sense] tithe or takes even just a bushel of wheat, the curse of God, the angels, and the Prophets may come upon him. ‘He who alters it after he has heard it, the sin thereof shall surely lie on those who alter it.’ (Qur’an II: 182). Work of Khalīl.”

The edict contained in the inscription is likely to have been directed against imposition of additional tax on the local population; thus, only the taxes directly ordered by the sultan and recorded in the inscription were to be charged to the population of the city and province of Ankara. The act of recording this edict, presumably brought to Ankara from the court of the Ilkhan written on paper, established a permanent reminder of the document. Even though the inscription is devoid of legal value because it does not contain the seals of ruler and judge, it established a public copy of an edict that the ruler had issued. It would have been widely visible to the population, and intelligible to those who were literate in Persian and Arabic. Considering the location quite high above the portal of the citadel, and the rather small script of


701 A similar problem exists with inscriptions recording waqfīyas (deeds of endowment). See below for a discussion of such an inscription in the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum (dated 710/ 1310).
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the inscription, however, I would suggest that the mark of presence was more important than the diffusion of the content.

The inscription in Ankara is not unique – several other examples have been preserved in Anatolia, all either dated to the reign of sultan Abū Saʿīd (716-735/1316-1335) or so similar in content to the inscription in Ankara that they can be considered contemporary. This is the case on an undated inscription inserted on the Cacabey Medrese in Kırşehir, a monument dated 671/1272-73. The text, missing a date and attribution to a ruler, but similar to that in Ankara, declares the abolishment of several taxes and warns against infractions:

“Since the luminous consequences of the justice of the ruler, may God prolong his rule, extend over all subjects, it is ordered that the tax for the local governor (shāhnāgī), the providing of construction materials (tābqūr), the soap and lane tax (matrāh-i sābūn va kūcha) be lifted. According to the order that the world obeys, these wrong burdens must be repealed in the entirety, and the prayers for the continuity of the victorious realm must be extended. From now on, God’s curse, wrath, and ire may hit those who levy this burden or attempt to do so, as well as for the tax on linseed and the fee for public kitchens.”

A third tax inscription was excavated in Ani, the Armenian city in northeastern Anatolia, in the early twentieth century. It is the most detailed of the three and, judging by the few published photographs, also the largest one. Originally, the inscription was part of an exterior wall of the so-called Manūchehr mosque. The wall collapsed in the 1890s and was reassembled

702 On the definitions of these various fees and taxes: Hinz, “Steuerinschriften,” 754-755.


704 The inscription has since disappeared. To my knowledge, the photography published by Hinz is the most recent reference to the inscription. The photographs in the article date back to 1908. For photographs of the inscription see Wilhelm Barthold, “Die persische Inschrift an der Manucehr-Moschee zu Ani,” Deutsche Bearbeitung von W. Hinz, ZDMG CI (N.F. XXVI) 1951: Tafel I and Tafel II (between pages 242 and 243). For a drawing indicating the location of the inscription within the larger context of the ruined mosque, see: Nikolai Yavkovlevitch Marr, Ani – Knizhnaja istorija i raskopki na meste gorodishtcha (Leningrad and Moscow, 1934), fig. 262.
by 1908, during excavations conducted at the site under the direction of the Russian
archaeologist Nikolai Marr. The inscription, again dated to the rule of Abū Saʿīd is of similar
content as those in Kırşehir and Ankara:

“God is clement to his servants. Abū Saʿīd Bahādur Khān. An edict (yarlıgh) which at
this time is issued in the site of the throne of the lord of the surface of the world, the wise
sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn, may God prolong his rule – from East to West the
worlds are under his grace and justice – may God the All-high let his order and command
come to completion. Just as the surface of the earth depends on his command, and the
dīvān on his pen, nobody must be able to alter or add any of this, the order is that:
nothing except tamgha and customs duty may be levied, and from no one may anything
be taken on the grounds of qalān, nâmārī, ūtar and similar [taxes]. Before, qalān,
nâmārī, and other undue taxes have been taken from the city of Ani and other provinces
of Georgia as ūtar. Violence was applied, the peasants left, and the stewards of city and
province, because of qalān and tarnāgīr, left lands, farms, and houses. The order was
written down so that God the All-high [would not] withdraw his shadow from the heads
[of his servants].

The text is complex, mentioning different types of taxes that the Ilkhanid state apparently knew
and recognized as legitimate, versus those that were considered problematic. Not all of these
taxes are clearly understood. It is beside the point here to investigate the exact meaning of
these inscriptions, yet the inscriptions clearly show that by the 1330s, the levying of randomly imposed
taxes, and burdens added to the legal tribute had become a serious problem.

As a whole, the inscriptions are rare documents of direct Ilkhanid involvement in
Anatolia. They were apparently intended to curb additional taxation at the hands of local power-

---

706 “(1) allāh laṭīf bi-ʿabbādihi (2) Abū Saʿīd Bahādur Khān (3) yarlīgh darīn vaqt ki az takhtgāh-i pādishāh-i rūya
zamīn (4) sultān-ʿalīm ʿalā-ʿl-dunyā va-l-dīn khallada mulkahu (5) ki az mashriq tā maghrib jahāniyān dar sāy-ye
marhamat u maʿdalat avnad ḵaq-i taʿālā ḵuḵm u farmānash-rā bi-ziyādat bi-tamām rasānd (6) u dīgar ḵuḵm-i
chūnānak rūya zamīn bi-farmān ḵuḵm-i dīvān bi-sar-i qalam ūst tā hīch afrīda kam va bish natavānād
kard (7) u bi-ghayr az tamghā u bāj bi-rāstī chūzī dīgar nastānand u az hīch afrīde ba-ghallat qalān u nâmārī u tārī u ḵaṭrī
u ḵavārakh nakhwānband (8) chūnānak būshtar azīn bar shahr Anī u dīgar valāyat-i Gurjistān sabab-i qalān u nâmārī
u ḵavālāt nā-vājib u tārī ziyādān (9) karde būdand u zūr rasānādā rūye njaṛībī nahāda u raʿāyā mutafarriq gushta u
kadhkhudāyān-i sar-i velāyet sabab-i qalān u tānḵārī mulk (10) u asbāb u ḵān u mān khūd-rā gūzāsht u rafta
Ḵuḵm navashtand ki ḵaqq-i taʿālā sār-yi ʿlā az sar ...” Transliteration after Barthold, “Die persische Inschrift,” 243-244. For a German translation by Walter Hinz, see: Barthold, “Die persische Inschrift,” 244-245.
707 For a discussion of the more common taxes, such as qalān (tribute for military purposes), qubchur (cattle tax),
and tamgha (customs duty), see: Dashdondog, The Mongols and the Armenians, 111-120.
holders who began to establish their sovereignty as Ilkhanid control faltered. The effect of the inscriptions, or rather of the Ilkhanid edicts that they reproduced for public memory, in Anatolian cities is not known. Considering that with the end of the Ilkhanid dynasty a few years later, the region came under the rule of various local principalities, the impact cannot have been but short-lived.

The impact of the economic situation, characterized by a high tax burden, cases of extortion, and a general sense of decline, on architectural patronage will become clear in the third and fourth sections of this chapter. Before beginning to investigate the role of patronage within the Ilkhanid realm on the local and imperial levels, I will turn to the conversion of the Ilkhanid rulers to Islam, a development that affected patronage in Iran, and possibly in Anatolia.

At the beginning of Ilkhanid rule over parts of the Muslim world, the Mongol rulers largely relied on the established local bureaucratic elite. In Iran, local notable families of long standing had established positions in the administration that they continued to hold under the new rulers. These families were Muslim and Persian speaking, and thus the administrative practice continued to be carried out in this language. Some families had begun to be integrated into the Mongol administration as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century, when the Mongols conquered Central Asia and Khurāsān.

---


709 The Juwaynî family (see Chapter Three) was one of these; their ancestor Bahâ’-al-Din al-Juwaynî had already served under the first Mongol rulers of Khurāsān in the 1220s: Aubin, Emirs mongols et vizirs persans, 13-16.
Conflicts between the *yasa*, the Mongol code of law and the Islamic *sharīa* could arise, both before and after the conversion of the Ilkhanid rulers to Islam. This became first apparent in 681-83/1282-84, during the short rule of the Ilkhan Tegüder, who converted to Islam, taking the name Aḥmad, and was promptly criticized for his action. The circumstances of the conversion are rather unclear, and the quick removal of Tegüder from the throne shows that, despite having ruled over large parts of the Islamic world for several decades, the Mongol elite was still far from willing to accept the religion of its subjects.

Yet only a decade later, in 694/1295, the Ilkhanid Ghāzān Khān (r. 694-704/1295-1304) converted to Islam, setting a trend that had immediate consequences for the religious configuration of the Mongol realm. The ruler turned away from the religious tolerance of his predecessors, especially beginning to prosecute Buddhist communities, destroying their temples and chasing their priests from the realm. Christians still fared better, for instance in Armenia where local Christian notables commissioned the reconstruction of several monasteries during the rules of Ghāzān Khān and Īljāytū.

Despite many accounts on the subject, it is not quite clear under which conditions Ghāzān Khan converted. The involvement of Sufis has been suggested, yet neither the nature of this involvement nor the type of Sufis involved has been clarified. The problems encountered in
the study of this issue, that is conversion and the involvement of Sufis, have been observed in similar ways for the Islamization of Turkish tribes in Central Asia from the tenth century on.\textsuperscript{715} Even with the ruler’s conversion, the adherence of the Ilkhanids to Islam did not become uniform. Sultan Úljāytū, for instance, was raised by a Christian mother, came in contact with Buddhism, and later in life was first a Sunni, then a Shiʿī Muslim.\textsuperscript{716} The attitudes towards Islam were still ambiguous on many levels, as sources from the period show in detail. Conflicts often arose when old Mongol customs turned out to be forbidden according to Islamic law. Examples occurred in all aspects of daily life. Thus, resistance was great against the ritual washings prescribed in Islam before the five daily prayers. This went against the Mongol custom that forbade the washing of body and clothes. Similarly, when Ghāzān Khān wished to marry his father’s widow according to Mongol custom, a subterfuge had to be found in order to circumvent the \textit{sharʿīa}. The earlier marriage was promptly declared invalid since it had not been contracted according to Islamic law.\textsuperscript{717}

Despite such conflicts, Ghāzān Khān and his successor Úljāytū became prolific patrons of Islamic institutions. After his conversion, Ghāzān Khān began to sponsor institutions such as \textit{khānqāhs} as lodgings for Sufis. He also ordered the construction of a monumental mausoleum corresponding to the practice of Muslim rulers of the time, outside the walls of Tabriz.\textsuperscript{718} The mausoleum was part of a larger complex of monuments that contained a mosque, several \textit{madrasas}, a \textit{khānqāh}, a \textit{dār al-siyāda}, an observatory, a library, a hospital, and a soup-

\textsuperscript{715} Madelung, “The Spread of Māturīdism and the Turks.”

\textsuperscript{716} Hoffmann, \textit{Waqf}, 79.

\textsuperscript{717} Amitai, “Ghāzān, Islam and Mongol Tradition,” 2-4.

\textsuperscript{718} At the same time contravening Mongol practice, according to which a ruler’s burial had to be unmarked and the site kept secret. Johann de Plano Carpini, \textit{Geschichte der Mongolen und Reisebericht 1245-1247}, tr. Friedrich Risch (Leipzig, 1930), 80-86; Bertold Spuler, \textit{Geschichte der Mongolen, nach östlichen und europäischen Zeugnissen des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts} (Zurich, 1968), 207-208.
kitchen. These monuments have not been preserved, and the locations of other foundations mentioned in texts from the period are not known.

In Anatolia, the conversion of the Ilkhanids to Islam is reflected in foundation inscriptions of monuments. In the late thirteenth century, monumental inscriptions in Anatolia still referred to the Seljuk sultans as overlords, even though in fact, they had completely lost their power by the early 1280s. Thus, the conversion of Ghāzān Khān may have been a turning point, since it allowed for naming the actual overlord according to the epigraphic conventions of the time, with the titles reserved for Muslim rulers. Several examples of monuments built in the 1290s will illustrate this point.

**Architecture: Towards Smaller Foundations**

Extant buildings in Anatolia, built between the 1290s and the 1330s, tend to be smaller than monuments of the previous period. In term of types of monuments, “convents” for Sufi and Akhī communities, variously addressed as zāwiya or khānqāh, prevailed. Wolper uses the term “dervish lodge” for these structures, a choice that I prefer not to follow mostly due to its ahistorical nature. Wolper in turn prefers “dervish lodge” in order to avoid confusion between the various Arabic and Persian terms used for such buildings: Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, introduction, n. 1. This emphasis continues into the late fourteenth century, as Wolper argues reflecting the development of a civic identity very much reliant on such foundations and their occupants. It appears that the Sufis who are at the center of Wolper’s study of dervish lodges in Sivas, Amasya, and Tokat from the mid-thirteenth to the mid-fourteenth century are those who were part of the ṭarīqas and, to some

---

719 Hoffmann, *Waqf*, 111-113 with a detailed account of the historical sources on the complex. According to Hoffmann, the latter was already damaged by the early seventeenth century and had completely disappeared by the 1840s.
720 Wolper uses the term “dervish lodge” for these structures, a choice that I prefer not to follow mostly due to its ahistorical nature. Wolper in turn prefers “dervish lodge” in order to avoid confusion between the various Arabic and Persian terms used for such buildings: Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, introduction, n. 1.
extent, belonged to the intellectual establishment. They agreed to be connected to a lodge built by a wealthy patron and financed by *waqf*, the institution of charitable endowments founded in Islamic law. This is a context that would not have been fitting or acceptable for Sufis of the extreme anti-nomian kind such as the Qalandars. Rather, the individuals affiliated with these buildings were Sufi scholars like Rūmī, who pursued the path towards the dissolution of the self in God (*fanāʾ*) in a more institutionalized way.

I will concentrate here on a few smaller foundations, and examine both architecture and *waqfīyas* for signs of changes that may be due to the increasing fiscal and administrative pressure exerted by the Ilkhanid rulers. At the same time, evidence of strong local identities and their architectural expression will appear. One difficulty in assessing *waqf* and architecture in parallel lies in the limits of surviving monuments and documents. Only few documents from the period in question in the Vakıflar Arşivi in Ankara match up with extant monuments, and the number of documents dating to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries is generally small.722

One of the rare cases in which both the monument and a *waqf* document are preserved is the Sünbül Baba Zāviye in Tokat, built in 691/1292 (fig. 133). The foundation inscription (fig. 134) is carved in four lines on a rectangular slab of stone placed directly over the doorway:

“God the All-High spoke: Whatsoever good ye send before you for your souls, ye will surely find it with Allah, better and greater in the recompense. And seek forgiveness of Allah [Qurʾān LXXIII:20]. Begged for grace by means of the building of this blessed abode, called house of piety [i.e. a structure reserved for Sufis] for God the All-High during the time of the greatest sultan Ghiyāth al-dunyā wa-l-dīn [Masʿūd] bin Kaykāwūs, may God extend his rule, the manumitted slave of the great, brilliant, generous queen venerated for her double ascendance Ṣafwat ‘l-dunyā wa-l-dīn, daughter of the late *amīr* Muʾīn ‘l-dīn Pervāne, may God have mercy with him [the *amīr*], and preserve her [Ṣafwat ‘l-dunyā wa-l-dīn], the ornament of the pilgrimage and of the two sacred

722 A search in the database at the Vakıflar Arşivi in Ankara yielded only four documents relating to foundations in eastern Anatolia dated between 1290 and 1330.
precincts [Mecca and Medina] Sunbul bin ʿAbdallāh may God accept [this] from him, in the year 691 [1292].”  

Unfortunately, the structure appears to have been much changed over time, not surprisingly given that is was still active as a zāwiya as late as 1908. When facing the portal, a two-storied building that houses a dentist’s office is attached flush with the late thirteenth-century portal, and even runs over the top of the truncated portal. The structures behind the portal may be in part of a more recent date.

The remaining parts of the portal are built with marble that stands out from the rubble construction of the rest of the portal. Over the pointed doorway, the foundation inscription is placed below a narrow muqarnas hood. The decoration is plain: the two engaged colonettes at the corners of the niche that leads to the doorway are devoid of ornament except for a few stylized vegetal scrolls and palmettes on their angular capitals. The rectangular moldings that surround the muqarnas hood are also mostly composed of plain marble. Only one narrow band that runs directly along the engaged colonettes is decorated with a stylized acanthus pattern.

The monument has been noted as one of a few commissioned by a female patron who was possibly closely related to the Seljuk house. In her article on female patrons of buildings intended for the use by Sufi orders, Wolper argues that the inscription of the Sünbül Baba zāwiya emphasizes royal Seljuk lineage. A daughter of Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān pervāne, known by her


725 I have not been able to locate an architectural survey or restoration report for the Sünbül Baba zāwiya.
honorific title *Safwat al-dunyā wa-l-dīn*,\(^{726}\) is here presented as being doubly connected to the Seljuk house. These ties, either marital or through her mother, and the explicit statement that the patron was the *pervān*e’s daughter created a powerful dynastic claim, at least locally in Tokat, a city where her father had been influential.\(^{727}\)

Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān *pervān*e was, however, long dead at the time of construction. He had been executed for treason by order of the Ilkhanid ruler two decades earlier, under circumstances discussed above. The reference to the patron’s father may thus just have been a nostalgic evocation of the glorious past of the family or a reminder of her personal lineage. As a claim for dynastic legitimacy, certainly on an Anatolian and even on a local level, this association as well as that with the Seljuks might have been rather weak at the time of construction.

Possibly, the name of sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Masʿūd b. Kaykāwūs (r. 681-700/1282-1301 with several interruptions) may have been used for epigraphic convention. Given the patron’s lineage, her display of loyalty to the Seljuks may suggest a grudge held against the Ilkhanid rulers for having her father executed.\(^{728}\)

---

\(^{726}\) As a caveat to Wolper’s argument, this honorific title, translated as ‘Purity of the World and Religion’ was exceedingly popular for female patrons of some standing.

\(^{727}\) Ethel Sara Wolper, “Princess,” 42-43; Wolper furthermore suggests that three inscriptions by female patrons in Tokat, that on the Sünbül Baba *zāwiya*, that on the Abū-Shams *zāwiya* (687/1288-89) and that Khalif Ghāzī *zāwiya* (691/1291) express the rivalry between two or possibly three local noble ladies, and that the Khalif Ghāzī *zāwiya* inscription was formulated in such a way as to outdo the other two in terms of the emphasis on direct descent from the Seljuk rulers: Wolper, “Princess,” 44.

\(^{728}\) The family of Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān *Pervān*e indeed became rather powerful for a short time in the 1280s and early 1290s in the area of Tokat, Sinop and Samsun. For their patronage, see: M. Kemal Şahin, “Pervane Muineddin Süleyman ve Oğullarının yaptığı yapılar üzerine bazı gözlemler.” In: Haşim Karpuz and Osman Eravşar (eds.) *Konya Kitabı*, volume X, Yeni İpek Yolu Dergisi Özel Sayı (Konya, 2007), 543-578. On Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān *Pervān*e taking hold of Sinop in the 1270s: al-Aqsarāyī, *Müsâmeretü ’l-ahbār*, tr. Öztürk, 63-64.
The waqfiya of the Sünbül Baba zāwiya has not been preserved in its initial form from the time of construction, but two documents dated 725/1325, are probably connected to it.729 The identification of the documents with the Sünbül Baba zāwiya is likely, but not entirely confirmed contrary to the statements of some scholars.730 The waqfiyas in question discuss a posterior endowment made for: “the welfare of the khānqāh that the late ḥāj (who has been forgiven) the eunuch731 Khwāja Saʿīd b. Sunbul, built in the city of Tokat.”732 This Saʿīd b. Sunbul may be a son of Sunbul b. Abdallāh, the founder named in the building inscription of the Sünbül Baba zāwiya.733 This monument is a rare early example for which a foundation document has been preserved, even though one that was established after the death of a founder and possibly even his son. The document does not refer to the building beyond naming it and describing its location within Tokat; thus, it does not serve as a source on the state of the building at the time when the waqfiya was established, probably revising an earlier version drafted during the patron’s lifetime.

The Sünbül Baba zāwiya is only one of a group of mausolea and zāwiyas that were built in Tokat in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. The architecture of these monuments is rather idiosyncratic, with references to local monuments such as the Gök Medrese, built probably in the 1270s, and use of the reddish stone of the region. Local references are frequent,


730 Wolper, “Princess,” n. 12 refers to one off the two documents without discussing the attribution to the monument. Her faulty rendering of the document number in the archive sheds doubt on her statement of having consulted the original. Savaş’s article correctly identifies both versions of the document, and carefully discusses the names of the founder in the foundation inscription, versus the variants in the document: Savaş, “Tokat’ta Hoca Sünbül Zaviyesi,” n. 12 and 201-202.

731 Savaş, “Tokat’ta Hoca Sünbül Zaviyesi,” 200 suggests this reading. In the document there are two letters before this, making a reading as Üṭūshī possible. I thank Nicholas Trépanier for this suggestion.


and even though built in the same city and within a small period of time the monuments are at first sight rather different and only close observation reveals connecting details.

Some of these monuments, including the Sünbül Baba zāwiya just discussed, have inscriptions that still refer to Seljuk sultans. Those built in the early fourteenth century, after the conversion of the Ilkhanid rulers to Islam, mention the Ilkhanid sultan unless the name of an overlord is omitted entirely. As the following discussion will show, this shift of proclaimed allegiance on the part of the patrons is not reflected in the architecture. Thus, the verbal statement of Ilkhanid allegiance – as superficial as it may have been – did not translate into adopting the style of Ilkhanid architecture in Iran. As we will see below, this may have been due to a discrepancy in scale and materials, as well as to the absence of Ilkhanid royal patronage and travelling workshops.

The mausoleum of Nūr al-Dīn b. Sentimūr (fig. 135) was built in 713/1313, as stated in the foundation inscription (fig. 136) placed over a window: “This is the mausoleum of the late amīr, Nūr al-Dīn b. Sentimūr, may God have mercy with him, he died in the middle of Dhū ‘l-qaʿda in the year 713 [March 1313].” The relatively small monument is today located at the center of a small park among apartment buildings. The base of the mausoleum, square and built of stone, supports a pointed brick dome. The zone of transition is also built of brick, featuring an arched panel at the center of each side of the square and triangular squinches over the corners. Decoration of the mausoleum is limited to the door and window frames. The foundation inscription on the west window is carved on a rectangular slab of grey marble. It is inserted into the wall below an arch of whitish stone, decorated with a geometric pattern, and closed off at the bottom with the same band. Below this, palmettes and leaves are plastically carved into reddish

\[
\text{hādhihi turbatu ’l-amīri ’l-maṛḥūmi Nūr al-Dīn b. Sentimūr raḥimahū ‘llāhu (2) māṭa fi awṣaṭi dhī ‘l-qa’dati sanata thalath’ashari wa-sab’amā’ia,” RCEA No. 5326.}\]
stone. This panel in the shape of a rounded arch is enclosed by an inscription written in Persian.  

This panel, as well as the window below it are enclosed by a rectangular frame with interlace motif (fig. 137). The red stone panel is seemingly supported by two engaged colonettes, decorated with knotted motifs that form the sides of the window. The pointed arched band that encloses the foundation inscription runs down to the base of the window. It is decorated with a smaller version of the same palmette motif that dominates the panel of red stone (fig. 138) over the window. The motif is again taken up on the capitals that support the springing of a pointed arch that forms the window recess. The colonettes that belonged to these capitals are missing today, probably having been removed for reuse in a different location. The bases are still in place as well, and seem to have been decorated with vegetal motifs that are obscured now. To close off the window ensemble towards the wall, a rectangular frame with zigzag pattern was carved around it, reaching down to the base of the missing engaged colonettes.

The door of the mausoleum is shaped as a segmental arch; the stones forming the arch were joined in a double-rhomboid pattern, with every other of them today appearing to be filled in with reddish clay. Over the door, an inscription reads: “*kullu nafsan dhāʾiqatu ‘l-mawt*” (“every soul will taste death,” Qur’an, III: 185) as a reminder of the mortality of patron and visitor (fig. 139).

Only four years later, in (717/1317), the *tekke* of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib was built (fig. 140). The foundation inscription (fig. 141) of this building, also locally known under the name of Ahi Muhittin reads as follows:

---


“Approaching God the All-High and begging for his well-meaning. This building, a house of those who say thanks and of those who recite dhikr [both references to Sufi practices], was ordered during the days of the rule of the greatest sultan Abū Saʿīd, may God support his rule. The weakest of the slaves of God, ʿAbdallāh b. ʿl-Muhīyī, may God support his happiness, endowed it on 10 Rabīʿ ‘l-ākhar in the year 717 [20 June 1317].”

The waqf document of this tekke has been preserved and is dated 719/ 1319, two years after the construction of the building.737 A record of personnel (şahsiyet kayıdı) appointed to the building and dated 1225/ 1810, suggests that the monument was still in use at this date.738 This continued use of the building may also explain why the foundation inscription appears to have been placed within a structure that is at least in some parts most certainly later than the early fourteenth century.

Other small structures built in Tokat between 689/ 1290 and 725/ 1335 include the Ajabir Türbe, also dated (717/ 1317) in a fragmentary foundation inscription that refers to the Ilkhanid sultan.739 Similar structures were also built in other Anatolian cities, although not many of them have survived until today. Waqfiyas related to zāwiyas have been preserved, although the monuments no longer exist.740 As in the case of the tekke of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, these documents


737 VGM 608-63-52. The endowment contains several villages in the environs of Tokat, a garden and a mill, destine to finance the zāwiya and the mausoleum that is part of it.

738 VGM 221-182-775-779.

739 “[…] for ʿAjabshīr during the days of the rule of the greatest sultan Abū Saʿīd b. sultan Muḥammad, may […] prolong […] from them in the beginning of Jumāda I in the year 717 [July 1317] In Arabic: “… li-ʿAjabshīr fī ayyāmi dawla ʿl-sulṭānī ʿl-aʿzamī Abī Saʿīd b. sułṭān Muḥammad khalīda (2) minhā fī awaʾi ʿlī jumāda ʿl-ālā sanata sabʾaṭa ʾashara wa-sabʾaʿamāʾ i’a” My transliteration and translation after RCEA No. 5390.

740 Examples are the endowments of: Ḥasan Bey bin Selvī ve Kardeşi for the Ḥasūm Bek zāwiya in Kayseri (677/ 1278), VGM 730-52-27, in Arabic and Ottoman Turkish (a later copy of a lost original document); İskender Efendi bin Abdulcebbar, Sivas, VGM 594-102-0090; Shams al-Dīn known as Nahcivānzāde Ahi Nahcivān, for a
record properties such as arable lands, springs, and occasionally real estate within the city boundaries. Over all, the endowments operate on a much smaller scale than those of the first three quarters of the thirteenth century discussed in Chapter Three. Moreover, the patrons appear to be figures of some local importance, but without the political ties that would have led to them being recorded in the chronicles of the period. Thus, the documents are often the only surviving records of the founders, as well as of the witnesses that signed them.

On the level of patronage, it becomes clear that these figures were important for holding up a certain level of building activity, even though the scale was much smaller than in preceding decades. Nevertheless, in the absence of Ilkhanid patronage in Anatolia, these local patrons enabled the survival of craftsmen and architects.

A focus on socio-cultural context of Sufism in recent studies has brought an emphasis on buildings established for these mystics and their circles of students/orders. Within the discussion of these zāwiyas, Wolper has placed the madrasa as the institutional counterpart to these small foundations, as a place that a true Sufi would reject for its association with orthodox Islam and its teachings.741 This complete separation between scholars associated with madrasas, and Sufis connected to zāwiyas is problematic, especially in a milieu like medieval Anatolia, where religious identities were fluid and clear boundaries between groups not necessarily in place.

The buildings were specially created by patrons who took a special interest in the Sufis. This could happen for two reasons: either they could relate to their teachings or, they needed to be sure that the Sufi masters did not wander about and spread unrest among the population.742 The result of the construction of zāwiyas would thus be a tool for political neutralization,

---

741 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 23 and 68-69.
742 Wolper, Cities and Saints, 24-38.
indebting the Sufis to their patrons and making them unlikely candidates for restive actions. If distaste for the Sufis was so great among the ‘ulamā’ in the madrasas, the scholars could not have been especially happy about this development.

On the other hand, the Sufis in the lodges are unlikely to have been anti-nomianists, and thus might not have been viewed with such a critical eye since they were almost part of the establishment themselves. In this context, Wolper’s hypothesis that dervish lodges were a useful tool to bind rebellious forces is questionable: the lodges may have controlled restive Sufis but by upsetting scholars, their construction might have led to new discontent. There certainly is a contradiction between the statement that Sufis were generally critical of the scholars employed in the madrasas and their reliance on the institution of waqf to assure the legal status and the protection of the property of their zāwiyas.

**Larger Foundations with ‘Ilkhanid’ Inscriptions**

The Ilkhanids were interested in Anatolia largely as a buffer zone between the center of their realm and the territories of their greatest rivals, the Mamluks. This had repercussions on architectural patronage: today, not a single foundation commissioned by a member of the Ilkhanid court is extant in Anatolia, and no clear evidence points to such monuments that may have been destroyed over time. The Ilkhanid sultans, once they converted to Islam and began to sponsor Islamic institutions did so in Iran, even though few monuments are preserved there today. Even textual references to royal Ilkhanid patronage in Anatolia are extremely scarce. Ghāzān Khān is said to have sponsored lodgings for sayyids (descendants of the Prophet
Muḥammad) in a passage that may records actual foundations, or rather reflects the topos of the generous ruler supporting charitable foundations all over the realm.\textsuperscript{743}

Thus, architecturally speaking, the visibility of Ilkhanid rule in Anatolia is relatively limited. The most obvious signs of Ilkhanid presence are inscriptions that mention the Ilkhanid sultans; examples are preserved from the rules of Ūljaytū (703-716/1304-16) and that of Abū Saʿīd (716-735/1316-1335). Only in one case, the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum (710/1310) Ghāzān Khān is named (posthumously) along with the current ruler Ūljaytū. Some inscriptions that fall into the period do not mention a ruler at all; this appears to be the case mostly of smaller foundations such as mausolea and zāwiya discussed in the previous section. Nevertheless, the practice is not universal even in these types of buildings. This practice appears similarly in Iran, where certain small monuments also have inscriptions that refer exclusively to the patron.\textsuperscript{744}

The earliest inscription that shows a connection to Ilkhanid rule in Anatolia, while at the same time omitting mention of a ruler, is that of the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas in 670/1271-72. There, the fact that the patron was a high-ranking member of the Ilkhanid elite, commissioning a monument in the territory of the defeated and increasingly powerless Seljuk sultans, and acting possibly at the behest of his non-Muslim overlord offers a multitude of possibilities that might have affected this choice.\textsuperscript{745}

This may seem obvious since the imperial Seljuk umbrella had disappeared. The fact that the local styles reemerged, however, shows that Seljuk unity, even at its peak, was a not firmly

\textsuperscript{743} “Er ließ sogleich einen Reichserlaß in alle iranischen Lande ergehen und ordnete überall die errichtung von Sayyedenstiften für sämtliche Reisenden und Pilger aus der Nachkommenschaft des Propheten an, so wie es aus den wohltätigen Einrichtungen (abwābo ‘l-berr) von Šam-e Tabrīz, Anatolien, Bağdād, Kermān und Šīrāz verwirklicht ist.” Al-Qāshānī, Die Chronik des Qāšānī über den Iľchan Ölǧäitü (1304-1316), ed. and tr. Parvisi-Berger, 86.

\textsuperscript{744} Examples include inscriptions in the Imāmzāde Yaḥyā in Varamin (dated 707/1307): \textit{RCEA} no. 5222, the tomb of Ābd al-Ṣamad in Natanz (dated 707/1307): \textit{RCEA} no. 5223, the Great Mosque of Natanz (date missing): \textit{RCEA} no. 5224.

\textsuperscript{745} See Chapter Three for a discussion of this monument and the text of the inscriptions.
established, and never supplanted diverging cultural tendencies within Anatolia. When royal patronage with its demand for a certain unity disappeared, the local agents returned to the modes of work and decoration that they were familiar with, and expand on them as long as patronage was available.

Once they more firmly asserted their rule over Anatolia, the Ilkhanids did not impose their own imperial style, developed in Iran with local and Central Asian models. When the Ilkhanids conquered Anatolia, they had not yet developed an architectural expression of their rule. Such an imperial architectural vocabulary became manifest most poignantly beginning with the foundations of sultan Üljäytü in the 1310s. At this time, large-scale monuments with tall domes were built, and decoration became increasingly inspired by East Asian motifs, brought to Iran by way of trade with Yuan China. These developments, however, did not take told in Anatolia. The shift to small-scale local patronage that came with the absence of direct Ilkhanid patronage in this region may be a direct consequence of the apparent lack of imperial interest. The craftsmen who participated in the large-scale projects in Tabriz and Sulṭānīye would have been unlikely to move westwards as long as the imperial Ilkhanid circles provided them with work. Thus, the construction projects within Anatolia were left to local workshops that did not take the chances, for whatever reasons, to travel to Iran in search of work.

It appears that local building tradition continued much as it had developed with the introduction of plans suited for Islamic structures under the Seljuks. The use of tile decoration that was introduced under the Seljuks persisted, even though work of the extent and quality of the palaces of Kubādabād and the madrasas in Konya all but disappeared after the 1270s.746

746 The miḥrāb of the Aslanhane Mosque in Ankara (691/ 1292) with its rich use of tile decoration and stucco represents something of an exception to this rule. This is especially true for the use of stucco which is hardly
Overall, the use of portals with carved decoration, as well as ashlar masonry combined with certain features such as domes and minarets continues both in monuments sponsored by local patrons, such as the small structures discussed in the previous section, and in rare larger monuments that I will turn to now.

The Bimarhane, Amasya

In Amasya, architectural evidence for this period is scarce; in fact, only the Bimarhane (also known as Timarhane) a hospital dated 709/1308 remains from the early fourteenth century (fig. 142). This is surprising given the relative importance of the city as a place where Ilkhanid governors were appointed.

The Bimarhane today serves as a music school. The foundation inscription on the portal names one ‘Anbar b. ‘Abdallāh, the date, a royal lady named Īldūs Khātūn, and the fact that the monument was built during the rule of the Ilkhanid sultan Īlājūt (r. 703-716/1304-1316):

“(1) God - may his rule be glorious, has supported the construction of the blessed house of healing during the days (2) of the rule of the exalted sultan, the greatest khāqān Ghiyāth al-dunyā wa-l-dīn Uljāytū sultān Muhammad, may God extend his rule, and during the days of the glory of the exalted lady, the queen of the great (3) Īldūs Khātūn may her rule be extended, the weak slave ‘Anbar bin ‘Abdallāh, may God accept [this] from him in the year 709 [1308].”

preserved in Anatolia, possibly in a combination of decreased used compared to Iran and badly suited climatic conditions.

747 The mummified bodies of several local officials connected to the Ilkhanids were found in the city in 1855 and 1928. The mummies are now – rather eerily – exhibited in a thirteenth-century structure in the garden of the Amasya Archeological museum. The bodies are identified (it is unclear on what grounds) as those of Cumudar Noyan (d. 696/1297), İşbuğa Noyan (d. 720/1320), and of Īlājūt al-Dīn Muḥammad Pervān, possibly a son of Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān, and governor of Sinop and later Amasya. The bodies of a woman and four small children are connected to the latter man: Ahmet Yüce, Amasya Müzesi (Amasya, 2004), 121-125.

748 Kuran suggests, unfortunately without indicating a source, that the patron was one of the eunuchs in the harem and connected to Īldūs Khātūn: Kuran, Anadolu medreseleri, 128.

The mention of the patron and of his overlord Īljāytū corresponds to the standard protocol of foundation inscriptions written in Arabic. Less common is the mention of Īldūs Khātūn, a wife of the sultan. A similar invocation of the ruler’s wife appears in the foundation inscription of the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum, discussed below. Although he appears as the patron in the inscription, the eunuch ʿAnbar probably built the monument at the order Īldūs Khātūn, a suggestion further supported by the fact that hospitals in medieval Anatolia were often a prerogative of high-ranking female patrons. In Anatolia, these two examples appear to be the only extant instances in which a female figure is mentioned in her relationship to the ruler, rather than as a patron.

The foundation inscription is the only historical text on a monument that is otherwise sparsely decorated. Qur’anic texts appear on two small rectangular panels inside the portal niche (fig. 143). The portal, a niche surmounted by muqarnas, is surrounded with rectangular frames with flatly carved vegetal and geometric decoration (fig. 144). The style of carving is especially striking when compared to the late-thirteenth century monuments of Sivas which are remarkable for the extreme plasticity used in the representation of floral patterns. In the Bimarhane, all patterns are cut into the stone in such a way that a flat surface results and no elements are jutting out from this surface level.

In plan, the Bimarhane resembles a madrasa with two īwāns: the portal leads into an elongated rectangular courtyard with shallow arcades on the long sides (fig. 145). The round wa-ayyāma ʿizzati ‘l-ḥātūni ‘l-muʾazzamati malikati ‘l-ʿakābiri (3) Īldūs Khātūn zayadat dawlatuhā ‘l-ʿabd u l-daʿāʾī’ Anbar bin ʿAbdallāh taqabbala ʿllāhu minhī fī sana wa-sabʿamāʾi. “My transcription and translation after RCEA No. 5238.

750 See the foundations of Gawhar Naṣība Sulṭān and of Mahperī Sulṭān in Kayseri, discussed in Chapter Two.

arches of the arcades are supported by columns and capitals (fig. 146). Some of the latter may be spolia whereas others, with muqarnas patterns, are likely to have been newly carved for the purpose of this construction. The īwāns are placed in the central axis of the building, one forming the entrance vestibule, the other facing it at the far end of the courtyard. Both are framed by tall pointed arches. The interior of the main īwān is painted in white and partly covered with draperies hung along the walls, so that possible decoration is not apparent.

Some elements in the portal decoration can be observed on other buildings in Amasya, especially on the Torumtay mausoleum, built in 677/1278. Its patron was a powerful local amīr, who even became a governor under Ilkhanid rule, and died in 679/1280. The mausoleum is located just across the portal of the Gök Medrese Mosque, placed so closely that the façades of both monuments can be viewed only with difficulty. In its cubic form, the mausoleum is unique in the region, where cylindrical funerary monuments with conical roofs are the most common type. In terms of decoration, the Torumtay mausoleum is especially notable for a square field on the façade facing the Gök Medrese Mosque (fig. 147). It is composed of rows of plastically carved palmette motifs.

In the Bimarhane, the same motifs appear in the spandrels of the niches on either side of the portal, and on the broadest frame surrounding the doorway, even though in flat rather than plastic carving in the latter case. Moreover, the outermost frame of the doorway composed of stars and crosses may refer to the use of these motifs on the north portal of the Great Mosque of Divriği (626/1228-29). As a second reference to the region of Sivas, the badly deteriorated human figure, depicted in a cross-legged stance on the keystone of the doorway, may be connected to similar figures on the Şifaiye Medrese in Sivas (611/1216-17). These regional

---

752 Kayaoğlu, “Turumtay Vakfiyesi,” 91-93.
references may have been conscious, especially in the case of the Torumtay mausoleum in same city. However, they may also point to the existence of styles that were present within relatively closed geographical perimeters: late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century monuments in Amasya do show parallels with Sivas and Tokat, but not with the more distant Konya. Moreover, unlike Sivas, Amasya, and Tokat, Konya was not on the main route to Iran; this may explain the closer stylistic affinities between the first three cities. The patron’s connection with the Ilkhanid royal house does not have any apparent effect on the architecture in this case, pointing to increased activity of local, rather than travelling workshops. Decreased mobility, compared to the first half of the thirteenth century, appears to have characterized patronage and construction activity in early-fourteenth century eastern Anatolia.

The following discussion of the Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum, built in 710/1310 will show a monument that again is stylistically grounded in local and regional traditions, despite its patron’s direct connection to the Ilkhanid rulers.

The Yakutiye Medrese, Erzurum

The Yakutiye Medrese in Erzurum (fig. 148) is one of two larger early-fourteenth century buildings that are known to have existed in this city. The second one, the Ahmadiye Medrese (dated 714/1314) has now disappeared and was in ruins even at the beginning of the twentieth century. The Yakutiye Medrese was in a poor state of preservation for a long time, due to its

753 Ünal, _Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d’Erzurum, _52-57; Konyali, _Erzurum Tarihi, _292-296; Beygu, _Erzurum Tarihi, _153-156.
location in the courtyard of military barracks that were built in the nineteenth century. Only in the 1960s was the building restored and later turned into a museum.\footnote{Ünal, Les monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d’Erzurum, 32.}

The inscription (fig. 149) on the main portal, just above the entrance to the building, refers to its patron:

“Jamāl al-Dīn Khwāja Yāqūt al-Ghāzānī ordered the construction of this tomb during the days of the rule of Uljāytū sultan – may God eternalize his rule – from the benefits of the benefaction of Sulṭān Ghāzān and Bulughān Khātūn\footnote{Buluğān Khātūn died on 8 Ṣafar 709/ 5 January 1310: al-/Qāshānī, Die Chronik des Qāšānī über den Ilchan Öljäytü (1304-1316), ed. and tr. Parvisi-Berger, 82. This provides a more precise terminus post quem for the construction of the Yakutiye, or at least for the writing of its inscription.} may God enlighten [their proof] in the year 710 (1310 CE).”\footnote{“Amara bi-ʾimāratī hādhā ‘l-madfānī fī ayyāmi dawlatī ‘Uljāytū sultan khallada ‘llāhu mulkahu min fawādīli in ʾāmi ‘l-sulṭānī Ghāzān wa-Bulughān khātu fī ‘llāhu [burhānahāmā] Jamāl al-Dīn Khwāja Yāqūt al-Ghāzānī fī sanāti ṣharāta wa-sab’īmā.” My transcription and translation after RCEA no. 5276}

As this foundation inscription states, the Yakutiye Medrese was built in 710/ 1310. Very little is known about its patron, Jamāl al-Dīn Khwāja Yāqūt al-Ghāzānī. He may have been the Ilkhanid governor of Erzurum and Bayburt.\footnote{Aflâkī, Ariflerin Menkibleri, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, 635-636; Ünal, Monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d’Erzurum, 48; Konyalı, Erzurum Tarihi, 332-333.} The laqab al-Ghāzānī that the founder carries as part of his name may explain the dedication of the building to Ghāzān Khān, by then deceased, along with the ruling sultan Uljāytū. The laqab indicates a close connection to Ghāzān Khān, who may have been the founder’s patron or even owner earlier in life, if Jamāl al-Dīn Yāqūt was a slave. In the inscription, the monument is designated as ‘madfān’ (place of burial), rather than as madrasa. The emphasis of the initial function may thus have lain on the burial, possibly that of the founder, in the mausoleum at the eastern and of the monument.

The plan (fig. 150) of the Yakutiye Medrese is based on a four-īwān layout, with the modification of a vestibule connected to the portal taking the place of the West-īwān.
building measures about 22m x 35m, excluding the corner buttresses on the portal façade and the mausoleum attached to the east-īwān. The portal leads into a vestibule that gives access to the rectangular courtyard.

The courtyard is surrounded by the four īwāns and 14 chambers that vary in size. The two largest chambers are situated to both sides of the East- īwān, which is larger than the North- and South- īwāns. The northern one of these chambers has a large window in its eastern façade. On each side of the North- and South- īwāns, two smaller chambers are placed. They are approximately equal in size, but the two chambers closest to the West side of the building have rounded corners at their south-western and north-western ends, respectively. This is necessary to leave space for the corridors providing access to the chambers in the north-west and south-west corners of the building, leading through the corners of the courtyard. The chambers on each side of the vestibule are accessible only from there, whereas the other chambers are accessible from the courtyard. The chambers are neither connected with each other, nor with the īwāns that they flank. All chambers and īwāns are covered with barrel vaults.

A passage, no longer accessible today, leads from the east-īwān into the mausoleum that jolts out from the east façade of the building. This circular chamber is connected to a roughly square room to its north side, the latter again connecting to the chamber in the north-east corner of the building. In the center of the courtyard, four pointed arches form a square that serves as a support for the central dome, shallowly built up with rows of muqarnas.

In the center of the western façade of the Yakutiye Medrese, the decorated portal projects from the flat wall built of ashlar masonry. The circular minaret, including a winding staircase in its interior, is situated on the southwestern corner of the building, projecting outward. A partly blocked passage may have given access to the staircase from the chamber in the southwestern
corner. On the northwestern corner, another circular structure projects from the building. No way of access is detectable on the plan.

The structure of the portal frames is complex, and they are decorated with a variety of motifs (fig. 151). The portal decoration is composed of eight rectangular frames with different motifs. Engaged colonettes placed on each side of the portal close it off towards the entryway. The capitals of these colonettes enclose the lintel with carries parts of the foundation inscription. From the capitals springs a decorative band in the shape of a stilted arch, decorated with vegetal motifs. Its apex touches the tip of the *muqarnas* hood above the lintel. Between the innermost portal frame and the stilted decorative arch, fragments of an inscription are visible (fig. 152).^758^ Below the lintel with the inscription follows a narrow *muqarnas* band. The doorway itself is rather low and narrow and framed by a four-centered arch which is devoid of decoration except for two leaves at the springing of the arch, and is composed of stone blocks connected in a waved pattern. The spandrels between the arch and the lower lintel are decorated with vegetal motifs. Towards the undecorated part of the façade, the portal is closed off by corner columns that run up to the entire height of the building. They are interrupted by capitals with *muqarnas* decoration at about one third of their height.

The sides of the projecting portal are also decorated with rich motifs carved into the stone. The two sides are different in their details, but the general structure of the decoration is the same. The bottom third of the surface, up to the *muqarnas* capitals of the corner column is taken up by figurative decoration. Two affronting lions standing beneath a palm tree are placed under a profiled pointed arch (fig. 55). A one-headed eagle, depicted frontally with spread wings, is

---

^758^ They are hardly legible today, but Konyalı suggested the following reading of parts of the inscription in the 1960s: “*l-salaw[fāj]t* ʿalā Muhammad ʿalayhi *l-salāmī amara* ʿl-amīṛu ... ʿl-ʿālimu ʿl-ʿādilu nāṣiru ʿl-amīṛ ... ʿalayhi ʿl-salāmī ʿl-ʿādil... Konyalı, Erzurum tarihi, 304. In English: “prayers for Muhammad – may peace be upon him – the ... wise and just amīr ordered, the supporter of the amīr ... may peace be upon him, justice...”
placed in the space between the parted leaves of the palm tree and the apex of the arch. The remaining space over its head is taken up by a medallion with floral decoration. The pointed arch springs from pineapple-shaped medallions that end just above the low bench in the lower part of the portal. A plain band delineated by fine lines encloses the inner side of both these medallions and continues to form a four-pointed flower shape to each side. This interlacing motif is missing on the right flank of the portal. There, only the central circular medallion is enclosed by two parallel lines following its shape.

The larger part of the space above this arch is decorated with a series of rectangular frames. The inner frame slightly recedes from the surface of the wall and the vegetal motif differs from the outer one. A rectangular strip decorated with a geometric motif fills the gap below this inner frame.

The inner sides of the portal are decorated as well (fig. 153), repeating the decorative scheme of the portal on a smaller scale, displaying a niche with a muqarnas hood flanked by engaged colonettes and surrounded by rectangular frames with vegetal motifs. The niches are decorated with a geometric pattern. The engaged colonettes are plain, but the capitals decorated with vegetal motifs. In the center above the muqarnas hood we find a rectangular field with vegetal decoration, followed by a vegetal frame and a rectangular geometric field. Above this, the foundation inscription runs in continuation of the lintel. Its beginning is placed on the right portal wall following the reading direction of Arabic script. The decorated zone of the portal is closed off at the bottom by two plain moldings. The low dado below is left without decoration.

The only other exterior decoration on the building is found on the mausoleum. The dado has projecting triangles on two sides, making the rounded shape appear more angular. Two plain moldings separate the dado from the main part of the façade. Its façade is articulated with a
series of four full and two half pointed arches with double moldings and small impost at the
springing of the arches. Above this a narrow and a wide geometric band are running around the
circumference of the building. The lower one stops where the mausoleum is connected to the
body of the building, and the upper one runs full-circle just below the roofline. The two windows
are set in rectangular niches and surmounted by muqarnas hoods. The conical roof is covered
with tiles on with two lines of ornamental arches appear.

A striking aspect of the Yakutiye Medrese is the inclusion of references to several local
monuments, both in the structure and decoration. The muqarnas dome (fig. 154) over the center
of the courtyard connects the Yakutiye Medrese to the Great Mosque of Erzurum, built in the
late twelfth century. The placement of the mausoleum (fig. 155) in the longitudinal axis of the
monument, and its cylindrical form jutting out partially from the back wall, corresponds to the
arrangement in the Çifte Minareli Medrese.759 It has also been noted as a feature of Ilkhanid
funerary architecture in Iran, even though no example has survived.760 Another example of a
mausoleum being placed in the axis of a madrasa is the Madrasa of Sultan Ḥasan in Cairo (758-
765/1357-1364), a connection that may appear farfetched, but could still hark back to the

759 On the controversially discussed date of the Çifte Minareli Medrese, see Chapter Three.
760 The mausoleum of Rashīd al-Dīn in a suburb of Tabriz seems to have corresponded to this plan scheme. In this
case, the monument that the mausoleum was connected to was a mosque, rather than a madrasa. For reference, I am
including the full description as Hoffmann gathered it from the sources: “Das Mausoleum Rašīduddīns war ein
vermutlich aufwendig gestalteter Kuppelraum oder selbständiger Kuppelbau hinter dem Haupt-Iwan der rauza, der
wie die Wintermoschee qubba oder gubad, aber auch dār ul-huffāz bzw. bayt ul-huffāz („Raum der
Koranrezitantoren“) genannt wurde. Die eigentliche Begräbnisstätte lag in einer Art Krypta unter diesem Kuppelraum
und sollte neben dem Stifter auch die sterblichen Überreste künftiger mutawallsis aufnehmen (WRR 39, 41, 135). Die
Plazierung des Mausoleums auf der qibla Achse und hinter dem mihrāb einer Moschee ist auch anderweitig belegt.
Auf diese Weise kam der Verstorbene zwischen den Betenden und Mekka zu liegen und profitierte von der
Heilswirkung, welche den Gebeten der Gläubigen innewohnte. Durch ein hölzernes Gitter konnte man ins Innere des
Kuppelraumes hineinsehen. Vor dem Gitter befand sich ein kleiner Iwan oder eine Art Estrade (suffača, suffa-yi
küčik), wo die Koranrezitantoren auf drei niedrigen minbars normalerweise ihren Dienst versahen. Der Kuppelsaal
selbst durfte nur zu besonderen Anlässen, nämlich an den islamischen Feiertagen und am Todestag des Stifters von
den Koranrezitantoren betreten werden (WRR 135-137).” Hoffmann, Waqf, 123.
architectural expression of competition between Mamluks and Ilkhanids discussed in the previous chapter.

The brick minaret with its decoration of purple and turquoise tile pieces is also likely to be a reference to the Çifte Minareli Medrese. As in the case of the Bimarhane in Amasya discussed previously, the inclusion of local reference in the Yakutiye Medrese points to increased use of local styles in eastern Anatolia by the early fourteenth century.

The references to earlier monuments in the same city are even more prominent than in Amasya, and may point to the fact that workshops remained more stationary than in previous decades. Thus, references to neighboring Armenia remain as strong in the fourteenth century as they are in the twelfth-century Great Mosque. In construction technique, with an emphasis on heavy yet carefully hewn ashlar masonry and carved decoration especially are strong connections. The absence of references to Ilkhanid architecture in Iran, where the foundations of sultan Üljäytū were built contemporaneously, is more than obvious. The reasons for this development are less so, yet may be connected to the fact that the most mobile workshops flocked to the monumental building sites of the new Ilkhanid capital Sultanîye, rather than to move to Anatolia where no large-scale employment was available at the time. The regional architectural identity of Anatolia, based on stone construction, was firmly established by this time, whereas in Iran construction in brick and tile was similarly engrained. The regional identity of Anatolia was not uniform, but rather characterized by major urban centers that functioned in their own terms within the broader patterns, as the differences that have emerged between cities demonstrate.
A question of scale: *Waqf* in Ilkhanid Iran and Anatolia

Only few *waqf* documents have survived from late thirteenth- and early fourteenth century, and many of them in later copies. Moreover, only rarely can surviving documents be connected to extant monuments, and often the identification is additionally rendered difficult by later changes in name.

Extant *waqf* documents from the cities of Amasya, Sivas, Tokat, Konya and Kayseri, dating between 690 and 720 A.H. most strikingly resemble each other in the small scale of the foundations. This applies to both the buildings that benefit from the endowment – if identified, they are mausolea or *zāwiya*s – and the property endowed in the context of the *waqf*. Often, the latter consists of a few villages in the region, small amounts of agricultural land, and in some cases a fountain or a spring.

In comparison to *waqfiyas* from the same region established before the 1290s, these endowments are exceedingly small. In earlier endowments, such as that of the Gök Medrese in Sivas (679/1280) and the Cacabey Medrese in Kırşehir (671/1273) the endowed property both within the city in question and in the surrounding region is much more extensive. In the Cacabey *waqfiya* for instance, the agricultural lands and their location with regard to the city, roadways, and rivers are described in such detail that they can be used to reconstruct parts of the rural fabric of the region.761 In the case of the *waqfiya* of the Gök Medrese in Sivas, especially the properties within the city are described in much detail, including the location and adjacent properties.762

These differences may have two major reasons: first, the discrepancy in size between monuments built before and after 1280 CE, respectively. Second, a major shift in patronage took

---

761 As Clive Foss showed in an unpublished study. I thank Professor Cemal Kafadar for this reference. For a publication of the different versions of the document, see: Ahmet Temir, *Kırşehir emiri Caca oğlu Nur el-Din’in 1272 tarihli Arapça-Moğolca vakfiyesi* (second edition, Ankara, 1989).

762 For a more detailed discussion of this document, see Chapter Three.
place. From the 1240s to the 1270s, the powerful amīrs, such as Jalāl al-Dīn Qaraṭāy, Ṣāḥib ʿAṭā Fakhir al-Dīn ʿAlī, and the pervāne Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān, navigating between the Seljuk and Ilkhanid rulers, were the major patrons. They were wealthy enough to construct major monuments – madrasas in many cases – and endow them with sufficient property to assure their upkeep for generations to come.

By the late 1280s, all these figures were dead, and their fortunes dispersed between heirs. Moreover, the Seljuk sultans had entirely lost their power and the administration was fully in Ilkhanid hands, with governors appointed directly from Iran. These Ilkhanid administrators only rarely founded monuments during their appointments in Anatolia.

The case of Jamāl al-Dīn Khwājā Yāqūt has been discussed earlier; unfortunately nothing is known about this patron beyond his madrasa in Erzurum. Yet, an inscription in the Yakutiye Medrese provides a unique source. In the south īwān of this monument, an inscription runs along the two sides (figs. 156, 157). A miḥrāb is placed at the back wall of the īwān, indicating the direction of prayer, the qibla. The inscription is a rare example – at least in Anatolia – of a rendering of a foundation document on the building that it pertains to itself.763 In eastern Anatolia, it is the only extant waqf inscription that conveys such an amount of detail on the

---

763 The practice was more common in Ayyubid Syria where extracts from waqfīyas frequently appear as part of foundation inscriptions (rather than as individual texts). See for instance the inscription on the portal of the Madrasa Shaʾmiya, Damascus (628/ 1231): (Basmala) hādhihi ′l-madrasau ′l-khātūni ′l-kubrā ′l-ajalla ′ismati ′l-mulūki wa-l-salāṭini Sitt al-Shām Umm Ḥusām al-Dīn bint Ayyūb bin Shādī ṭahimahā ′llāhu taʿālā wa-l-ṣalāṭīn wa-l-walidhayhā waqfun ′alā ′l-umāmā i ′l-mutafaqihat min ashghābi ′l-imāmi ′l-Shafiʿī ′l-raḍiya ′llāhu anhu wa-l-mawqūfū alayhā wa-ala yim mā yatbaʿu jamīʿ a- ′l-qariyati ′l-maʿ rūfat bi-Turaiya wa-jamīʿ a- ′l-ḥaṣṣati ′l-shāʾiʿi ati wa-hiya iḥḍā ′ashara shamanin wa-nisf amin arbaʿ ati ′ashrīna shamanin wa-jamīʿ a- ′l-mazraʿati ati bi-Jarmānā wa-jamīʿ a- ′l-ḥaṣṣati arbaʿ ati ′ashara shamanin wa sabʿa sahmin min arbaʿ ati a- ′ashrīna shamanin mina ′l-qariyati ′l-maʿ rūfat bi-Tayna wa-nisf a- ′l-qariyati ′l-maʿ rūfat bi-Mujandal ′l-Suwaydā wa-jamīʿ a- ′l-qariyati ′l-maʿ rūfat bi-Mujandal ′l-farqa fil-shahri Ramadānī ′l-muʿ azzami sanata thāmāna wa- ′ishrīna wa-sittamāʿ iāʾ, after RCEA no. 4025. The inscription clearly states that the madrasa was dedicated to the Shafiʿī madhhab, and lists villages and agricultural lands endowed for its upkeep.
endowment.\textsuperscript{764} Despite the details given in the \textit{waqf} inscription, it should probably not be viewed as a replacement of the legal document since only the latter carried the signatures of witnesses and \textit{qāḍī} (judge) that were required to render the document and thus the \textit{waqf} valid.\textsuperscript{765} Thus, the inscription may rather have served as a reminder of the foundation, the carving in stone creating a metaphor of the perpetuity of the endowment as stipulated and required by law.\textsuperscript{766}

The inscription of the Yakutiye Medrese is in Arabic and mentions the founder as well as several villages that were endowed to provide revenue to the building. Thus, it is much more detailed than the short passages of the \textit{waqfiya} of the Buruciye Medrese in Sivas that are given in inscriptions.\textsuperscript{767} In the absence of references to the monument in chronicles, the \textit{waqfiya} is the most important primary source on the Yakutiye Medrese. Therefore, I will quote its full text here before discussing its contents:

[West wall] “God high refers and with the first dedication - The great master Jamāl al-Dīn Khwājā Yāqūt –may his victory be ennobled - ordered the construction of this noble building during the days of the greatest sultan Uljāytū - may God perpetuate his rule – from the benefits of the benefaction of the felicitous sultan Ghāzān and of Bulghān Khātūn ‘l-Khurāsānīya may God enlighten their proof and rest them in peace, and he [Jamāl al-Dīn Khwājā Yāqūt] endowed for its [the building’s] benefit all of the villages and lands and among them are the village Ḥartanf\textsuperscript{768} and the village Kinfangk in the province Bāsin and the villages Sunganārij and Tawārij in the district of Erzurum and all of the great khan, the stores, the two baths, the vegetable garden and the soap-works…

\textsuperscript{764} In western Anatolia, in Seyitgazi near Eskişehir, the addition of property to the \textit{waqf} of Sayyid Battal Gazi by Kurd Abdal is recorded in a late fourteenth-century inscription. The patron was the son of the Germiyanid ruler Süleyman Şah b. Mehmed (r. 1363-1378 CE), and the inscription is written in Turkish: Zeynep Yürekli, “Legend and Architecture in the Ottoman Empire,” PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2005, 111-112.

\textsuperscript{765} On the procedure of legalizing a \textit{waqf} document, see Hoffmann, \textit{Waqf}, 33-35.

\textsuperscript{766} A full discussion of the issues of memory, mortality, and eternity as they are connected to the deeply ingrained role of \textit{waqf} in medieval Islamic societies is not possible here. I do however hope to pursue this issue in future research.

\textsuperscript{767} See Chapter Three for a discussion of this inscription.

\textsuperscript{768} The names of the villages are difficult to read and have been variously rendered in publications of the inscriptions. I rely here on Ünal, \textit{Monuments islamiques anciens de la ville d’Erzurum}, 49-51. Ibid, 50, n. 17-29 for suggestions on the identification of these names with village names of the mid-twentieth century.
[East wall] and the khans for the whole suburb and the one mill in the aforementioned city and all the villages that are in the district of Bayburt which are Ḥāratun and Karzū and Ermenā and Hinzawarak and Hawābis and Meraks and the well-known baths that the founder built in Bayburt as a true, lawful and eternal endowment which may not be sold, and not inherited, and not be given as a pawn and not exchanged but is settled on its manner and its defined expenses are diverted and the appropriate conditions [of which are] in the waqfīya that is recorded in the records of the judges who have ruled on it [the waqfīya] in the face of the exalted God; verily God does not let perish a recompense from a[…] and God is merciful on those who found, and appoint, and pray for its founder but he who strives for its abolishment and spends for things other than those recorded in its [the waqf’s] conditions, upon him is the curse of God and the companion angels and of the sent prophets and of all people until the Day of Judgment.769

The text mentions several villages in the region of Erzurum and Bayburt that are endowed for the benefit of the Yakutiye Medrese. Konyalı attempted to identify these with modern place names, with limited success.770 The fact that these villages are located in the districts of Erzurum and Bayburt, as indicated in the text, is in accordance with the suggestion that Jamāl al-Dīn Khwājā Yāqūt was a governor of these two cities. The urban properties assigned to the waqf, namely baths, a mill, a soap-factory, and garden are located in these cities as well. The mention that the baths in Bayburt were built at the behest of the same founder is the only known reference to his patronage apart from the construction of the Yakutiye Medrese.


770 Konyalı, Erzurum Tarihi, 325-329.
On the level of function of the building, the *waqf* inscription gives a further hint that the monument might not have been conceived as a *madrasa* at the time of its construction: unlike other examples of *waqf*-inscriptions, and of *waqf* documents relating to madrasas, the text does not make any mention of a personnel appointed to the building, nor does it refer to the function of the monument. Rather, the text uses the neutral “*buqʿa*” (building).

The mention of the records of the *qāḍī*-court (*sijill al-quḍāt*) in the inscription is a rare reference to judicial records. While very common for the Ottoman courts from the early modern period onwards, such documents are so rare for the medieval period that even their form is not clearly known.

The fact that the inscription, carved in stone, refers to the recording of the *waqf* in the court records provides a striking inter-textual reference. Moreover, the notation in the court records would probably just have recorded the transaction of establishing the *waqf*. The full text of the *waqfīya*, however, which also should have included a detailed description of the location of endowed properties, the beneficiaries of these properties, the *mutawallī* (overseer, administrator) appointed for the administration of the endowment and his possible successors,

---

771 In the Buruciye Medrese in Sivas, the inscription names the function of the building as *madrasa*, and stipulates the appointment of several employees: “(1) Wa sharaṭa ‘l-wāqifu mudarrisan wāḥidan wa thalāṭha mina ‘l-muʿḍīna wa thalāṭha (C) mina’- ṭuqārāʾi (2)Wa-arbaʿata mina ‘l-ḥuffāzi wa imāman wāḥidan wa-muʿadhdhinan wa-khāzinan wāḥidan li-khīzānat (C) ‘l-kutubi (3)Min jumlati mā waqafa ‘l-wāqifu raḥimahū ‘llāhu ʿalā hādihi ‘l-madrasati ‘l-mubārakati qariyatū Eskī min (C) nāḥiyatī Īlbeklū” after RCEA No. 4651.

772 The first known references to the building as a *madrasa* seem to date to the early seventeenth century: Konyali, *Erzurum Tarihi*, 325.

773 On court records (*kadi sicilleri*) before Ottoman times, see: Wael Hallaq, “The ‘qāḍī’s dīwān (sijill)’ before the Ottomans,” *BSOAS* 61. 3 (1998): 415-436. “In this context, a caveat is in order; namely, that the survival of the *qāḍī* records or lack thereof is a matter that is in no way causally connected with whether or not pre-Ottoman *qāḍīta* established the practice of keeping records in a formal and systematic way. They may have established the practice formally and systematically, but the records, as it were, may still all be lost; conversely, they may not have established it thus and, quite conceivably, some records may none the less survive.” Hallaq, “The ‘qāḍī’s dīwān’,” 417.
and the signatures of witnesses, would have been written down in a separate document.\(^{774}\) Thus, the record in the building might have been used to provide an additional security in copying the essential passages of the deed of endowment and referring to the legal record of the foundation, thus linking the separate pieces in one, physically secure, place.

Another Ilkhanid patron was active in Anatolia a few years later: Timūrtāsh, the son of Choban Nuyān, remained in the region after his father had returned to Iran in 714/1314 at the end of his appointment, intended to quell an insurrection. In 722/1322, Timūrtāsh established himself in Aksaray, independently from dwindling Ilkhanid rule. Only one monument he was responsible for has survived, namely the Şeyh Hüseyin Râî fountain in Sivas.\(^{775}\) In the foundation inscription of the Bezistan Mescid in Samsun, dated 723/1322, Timūrtāsh is named in his function as a local ruler, just after the Ilkhanid sultan Abū Saʿīd, thus pledging allegiance even though he had long stopped following orders from Iran.\(^{776}\) This bold course of action was eventually the cause of Timūrtāsh’s downfall: in 727/1327, he had to take refuge in Egypt, where he was eventually executed as part of a deal exchanging traitors on the Mongol and Mamluk sides.\(^{777}\)

Apart from these interventions, patronage of figures directly connected to the Ilkhanid elite is not known in Anatolia. Rather, local patrons benefitted from the absence of central rule and of an imperially imposed style, relying instead on local resources and workmen. Overall, it

---

\(^{774}\) For a rare example of a surviving medieval document see the photographs of the Karatay waqfiya in Turan, “Selçuklu devri vakfiyeleri III,” plate XI-XXV.


appears that in eastern Anatolia, patronage moved towards a smaller, localized scale with patrons building small structures in their own cities, and endowing them with whatever property they could afford. The differences in scale are especially striking when compared to Ilkhanid Iran, where large foundations by the sultans and their close entourage were established in the early late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. One such example is the foundation of a new capital, Sultānīya, by sultan Ūljāytū in the early fourteenth century. Not much of this city has been preserved, but the monumental mausoleum of sultan Ūljāytū testifies to the scale of the endeavor. 778

Perhaps even larger was the earlier foundation of Ghāzān Khān in the vicinity of Tabriz, of which nothing has remained. The ruler first founded a large complex called abwāb al-birr (Doors of Piety), consisting of a mosque, two madrasas, a khānqāh, a house for sayyids, an observatory, a hospital, a library, a room for tax papers, a cistern, and a bathhouse.779 It is in this complex that the sultan was buried after his death on 11 Shawwāl 703/ 17 May 1304.780 The complex has not survived, but parts of its waqfiya were recorded, showing the various funds made available for education, charity, and repairs to the building.781 Surrounding this complex in

778 The site began to decline in the seventeenth century, after Shāh ʿAbbās had moved his capital to Isfahan. Hardly anything remains standing apart from Ūljāytū’s mausoleum, and only further archaeological work could reveal the layout of the site: Sheila S. Blair, “The Mongol capital of Sultāniyya, ‘the Imperial’,” Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies 24 (1986): 139.


the Tabriz suburb of Shamb-i Ghāzānī, Ghāzān Khān ordered the construction of a city, named Ghāzanīya.\textsuperscript{782}

Equally, if not more ambitious was the foundation of the vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīb who constructed and endowed and entire suburb of Tabriz, known as the \textit{Rab`i Rashīdī}. The monuments were looted and destroyed after its founder was executed in 1318, leaving no trace on the ground. The deed of endowment (\textit{waqf-nāme}) of the foundation however has been preserved almost in its entirety. It encompasses over 200 pages written in Persian, and has been published in a facsimile, as well as in a German translation.\textsuperscript{783}

Rashīd al-Dīn Ṭabīb, also known as Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl-allāh, was born to a Jewish family in Hamadān around 645/1247. He received medical training and later converted to Islam. Under the Ilkhanid ruler Abaqa, Rashīd al-Dīn was a court physician. In 697/1298, he became a vizier under Ghāzān Khān. In 718/1318 he was executed on charges of having tried to poison the ruling sultan, Ūljaytū. Apart from his political position, Rashīd al-Dīn produced the \textit{Jāmiʿ al-Tawārikh}, a major historical work containing the history of Mongol rule, but also a universal history beginning with the creation of the world, and the histories of the prophets.\textsuperscript{784}

The endowment of the \textit{Rab`i Rashīdī} reflected the wealth and power of its patron. None of the architecture has survived, and even though the location of the site is known it has not been

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{782} “He also ordered another city larger than the encompassment of Old Tabriz built in Shamb (also called Shamm), where the Abwabu’l-birr was constructed, in such a way that it encompassed the Abwabu’l-birr and most of its gardens. He called it Ghazania, and he ordered that merchants coming from Anatolia and Europe unload there, but the customs official for there and the city of Tabriz is the same lest there be dispute.” Rashīd al-Dīn, \textit{Jamiʿ u’r-tawārikh: Compendium of Chronicles – A History of the Mongols}, tr. Thackston, vol. 3: 684.

\textsuperscript{783} Hoffmann, \textit{Waqf}.

\end{flushleft}
excavated. The extent of the site, as well as the financial information recorded in the *waqf-nāme*, clearly show a use of resources that were simply not available on the same scale in eastern Anatolia.

The main cause for this discrepancy seems to lie in the absence of large-scale ‘royal’ patronage in eastern Anatolia. While the Ilkhanids were at the height of their power in the early fourteenth century, and the Ottomans were expanding their rule in western Anatolia, the eastern part of this region remained fragmented. Even though nominally under Ilkhanid rule, eastern Anatolia was not attractive for its overlords as a place for foundations. The local rulers who would govern after the fall of the Ilkhanids were only just on the rise, and presumably did not have the same possibilities.

**Conclusion**

Within the Mongol imperial framework, Anatolia appears as a rather peripheral place, both in terms of geography and the lack of interest in patronage. In a mindset that was directed towards the East, and especially Yuan China, the regions west of Iran were not bound to be of a central significance in cultural and ideological terms. Anatolia remained at the western extension of the entire Mongol realm, even after its division into four parts: the Chagatai Turks in Central Asia, the Golden Horde in the Crimea, the Yuan in China, and the Ilkhanate in Iran. Within the

---


786 Similar to Ilkhanid foundations, the earliest Ottoman *waqfiyas* that have been preserved tend to be on a larger scale than those endowed in eastern Anatolia in the early fourteenth century. See: İsmail Hakki Uzuuşçu, “Gazi Orhan Bey Vakfiyesi,” *Belleten* 5 (1944): 277-288; İsmail Hakki Uzuuşçu, “Orhan Gazi’nin, vefat eden oğlu Süleyman Paşa için tertip ettirdiği vakfiyenin asıl,” *Belleten* 27 (1963): 437-443.
eastern perspective of Mongol politics and culture as a whole, Anatolia was rather marginalized, as it did not offer the coveted point of reference that for instance Karakorum, the old Mongol capital in Central Asia, or Yuan China provided.

The rivalry between Ilkhanids and Mamluks was detrimental to Anatolia in that the region became a buffer zone, especially given the frequent unsuccessful attempts that the Ilkhanids made at conquering Syria. Thus, neither the Ilkhanids nor the Mamluks had an interest in investing in the region, the Ilkhanids because of the steady threat of a Mamluk invasion, and the Mamluks to avoid making the region north of Syria even more attractive to their rivals.

At the same time, this meant an absence of imperial control and patronage which left plenty of space for local actors to pursue their own interests. This is noticeable in the progressive development of local principalities that held on to rule as Ilkhanid power waned. In architecture, this tendency can be distinguished even earlier, by the last decades of the thirteenth century, when foundations became smaller and localized, adhering in styles to precedents within the same city or at least a close geographical perimeter.

The two ends of the lands under the Mongol umbrella, eastern and western, were different in their cultural position within the realm. The influence of the eastern part, that is China, was crucial in the development of the arts of Ilkhanid Iran. Elements derived from Chinese ceramics, metalwork, and painting became pervasive in the production of such objects in Ilkhanid Iran, as the Mongol networks facilitated trade and thus access to the eastern models. The blend between Chinese, Central Asian, and Iranian motifs is especially notable in textiles where motifs and techniques are combined in order to create precious materials for the garments of members of the court. Precious little has survived, yet the few pieces that have been preserved demonstrate the skill applied to textile production in Tabriz and Herat. The same is true for book
production where the influence of Chinese painting is visible in both the miniatures themselves in borders, frames, and vignettes. These Chinese elements became part of an artistic vocabulary that united the Mongol world even after the division of the realm into the Ilkhanid, Chagatai, and Yuan empires, and provided a unified visual culture despite political fragmentation.

In architecture, this influence is a lot less noticeable on the whole, apart from decoration. The difference in religious adherence is likely to have played a major part in this development, since buildings developed for Buddhist worship in China would not have been suitable for mosques in Iran, and vice versa. In terms of structure and building techniques, the monuments erected under Ilkhanid patronage are Central Asian and Iranian, relying on brick construction and stucco decoration. In the tiles that are used in the decoration of the monuments, the influence of Chinese art is recognizable in motifs such as dragons, phoenixes and cloud bands. The narrative content of inscriptions on these tiles relied on Iranian narratives such as the *Shāhnāme*, widely used as an exemplary work for the history of the rulers of Iran.

Located at the western end of the Ilkhanid (and, by extension, the Mongol) realm, Anatolia did not become part of this visually united empire despite is political inclusion. Since Ilkhanid patronage did not extend westwards from Iran, and because trade with Anatolia was at an all-time low during the last decades of Ilkhanid rule, the region largely maintained stylistic features that had been established, with their local variants, throughout the thirteenth century.

---

787 For a detailed discussion of examples of such Chinese impact in Ilkhanid Iran, see: Yuka Kadoi, *Islamic Chinoiserie: The Art of Mongol Iran* (Edinburgh, 2009). While careful in the analysis of examples, and appealingly illustrated, Kadoi’s study does not expand the discussion of the role of Chinese argument in the arts of Ilkhanid Iran beyond stating the known fact of their importance.


The stylistic diversity that remained in place in Anatolia even as Seljuk rule unified the region persisted into the time of the Mongol conquests, and survived the establishment of an Ilkhanid imperial style.

Thus, the architecture that is built under Ilkhanid rule – but not necessarily patronage – in Anatolia, can hardly be termed Ilkhanid based on stylistic terms. The Ilkhanids did not strive to impose the visual idiom that they developed in Tabriz and its surroundings in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries onto their westernmost province. Rather, Ilkhanid rule, even though it has often been considered oppressive in depleting Anatolia of resources, in fact opened up a vacuum in which local actors could pursue their own patronage even though not necessarily on a monumental scale.

Moreover, the peak of Ilkhanid power in Iran was brief, and its decline began already as the imperial architectural idiom had barely been established and was still evolving in competition with the Mamluk rulers of Egypt.

---

Conclusion

“Ein Wort für die Seldschukken (sic!)


In this dissertation, I have reframed the architecture of medieval Anatolia, and shown the complexities of its style and construction that have often been obscured by the established, uniform narrative of Seljuk architecture. Thus, I have demonstrated that the complexities of the region in this particular historical moment are reflected in architecture, reaching beyond the standard narrative of unified dynastic style, and establishing a particular sense of place. In such a context, Anatolia appears both as a distinctive geography that carries features particular to this region, and as a space that is closely connected to larger neighboring landscapes such as the Caucasus, northern Syria, and western Iran.

The focus on geographical connections has allowed me to reframe an inherent limitation of the historiography, in which the assumption of Anatolian unity under Seljuk rule, combined with a disregard for Mongol presence, led to a narrative that defines architecture primarily through Turkish dynastic patronage.

The historiography that lies at the basis of this simplified narrative is, as I have shown, utterly complex in itself. A first layer of studies, mostly written by German and French

Orientalists in the late nineteenth century while the Ottoman Empire was still in existence, emphasizes the varied influences on an architecture that is often presented as rooted in Iran. Within the Ottoman Empire, scholars of the fin-de-siècle were mostly concerned with constructing Ottoman legitimacy, and thus emphasized the architecture of this dynasty, while showing little interest in medieval Anatolia. This was to change with the foundation of the republic of Turkey in 1923, when the past of Anatolia became all of a sudden important: the territory of the new nation-state consisted mostly of this region. Thus, the Seljuks became one of many Anatolian civilizations that now attracted political and scholarly interest. This dynasty was particularly attractive because it could be posited as an ethnically Turkish proponent of Anatolian unity. Later, the Muslim aspect of the Seljuks was emphasized more prominently, beginning in the 1950s and culminating with the 900-year anniversary of the battle of Manzikert in 1971, widely presented as the beginning of Turkish Anatolia. Many studies present a standard narrative of Seljuk glory without being aware of the political and ideological contexts that shaped it.

The historiography outlined above is often reflected – indirectly and in a simplified way – in the standard narrative of Seljuk architecture that proposes continuity from the late eleventh to the early fourteenth century, in which the Mongols are a negative force incapable of productive agency on the cultural level. Thus, in this narrative, Anatolia becomes a stable unity that belies the context of the medieval frontier region.

In a survey of the patronage of Seljuk sultans before the Mongol conquest of Anatolia in 639/1243, it has become clear that central Anatolia, namely the zone between Konya, Aksaray, Kayseri, and Akşehir was the most stable place for investments, thus attracting the greatest number of royal foundations. In the coastal zones, the port cities of Alanya and Antalya on the
Mediterranean, and Sinop on the Black Sea were occasional sites of patronage by the Seljuk elite.

The south-western coastal region of Cilicia, under the rule of Armenian kings for much of the period discussed here, is separated from the plains of central Anatolia by the Taurus Mountains. This geographical barrier divided political spaces, and on the architectural level, the region south of it belonged to northern Syria, especially after the latter came under Mamluk rule in the second half of the thirteenth century.

The western regions of Anatolia, such as Bithynia that never came under Seljuk control, present a different narrative based on continued Byzantine control throughout the thirteenth century. Once Turkish warriors conquered these areas and began to build there, a blend of local Byzantine architecture with very few stylistic elements that evoke Islamic monuments in central and eastern Anatolia emerged.792 Structurally, monuments were adapted to the needs of Muslim worship, yet the hybridity formed here was distinct from that in central and eastern Anatolia, particularly in its prominent use of the Byzantine past as part of this new architectural memory of place.793

In early Ottoman architecture, specific references to the Seljuk past of Anatolia are scarce. The Yeşil Cami and Türbe in Bursa (822-827/1419-1424), with their forms and tiles evoking Central Asia and, more vaguely, the thirteenth-century monuments of Konya, are somewhat of an exception here. Overall, their style is more readily explained through their adherence to the International Timurid style, introduced by craftsmen who had been taken to


Central Asia following Timur’s campaign into Anatolia, and later returned to their homelands. These monuments did not enter the mainstream of Ottoman style, where an ‘architecture of empire’ soon began to emerge. As a new rising dynasty, the Ottoman did not need to be associated with a ‘Turkish’ past of the region. Rather, a visual connection to the Byzantine past, evoking the coveted prize of Constantinople, was more appropriate for these ambitions.

This dissertation has shown that in stylistic terms, thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century monuments in central and eastern Anatolia are less homogenous than often implied in studies focusing on the patronage of the Seljuk sultans before the Mongol invasions. In fact, even those monuments built under direct ‘royal’ patronage are quite diverse in terms of decoration and structural features. Nevertheless, a tendency can be detected beginning around 1200 and becoming more evident in the 1230s, towards what might have become a truly Seljuk style, in the sense that it was easily recognizable and closely associated with the ruling dynasty.

The Mongol conquests interrupted this effort to establish a dynastic style, ending all patronage by Seljuk sultans. The architecture of the 1240s through the 1270s has its own set of dynamics: the wealth of the notables, combined with a certain absence of political control, permitted foundations that might not have been possible under the tighter hold of a ruling dynasty with a keen interest in unified architectural style. With the decline of the Seljuk sultans, officials who now worked as Mongol vassals had more control of the monuments that they sponsored, leading to an increase in personal foundations as funds became available that before

---

794 Emerging from the region in Central Asia that is today Uzbekistan, Timur conquered wide stretches of the former Mongol Empire between 771/1369 and his death in 807/1405. The campaign into Syria and Anatolia in 804-805/1400-1402 was his farthest western expansion. See: “Timur Lang,” Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition.

had to be used for infrastructure, such as city walls, at the order of the sultans. Moreover, the
officials now had increased access to workshops and craftsmen as the absence of central
patronage created a power vacuum. Mongol control was limited to the fiscal and political level,
ensuring that taxes were collected and insurrections were suppressed, while architectural
patronage was left to the local administrators. Culturally speaking, the Mongol influence on
Anatolia during the late thirteenth century was limited, as the scarce evidence for Mongol
patronage shows. The eastern orientation of the Mongol imperial realm as a whole contributed to
further transforming Anatolia into a frontier; the region was no longer a magnet, but rather a
difficult set of borderlands.

A caesura in architectural patronage came in the mid-1270s when Mongol-Ilkhanid
political control over the region became tighter. In architecture, a period of silence of nearly two
decades ensued from which no monuments or deeds of endowment have been preserved. Thus,
Anatolia does not seem to have been an important place on the Ilkhanid cultural map. The
eastern orientation of the Mongol elite continued, and the Muslim Persianate families at the
center of the administration preferred to keep their investments close, in central regions of Iran
and Iraq.

For reasons that are not entirely transparent, monuments were again built in Anatolia
beginning in the 1290s, mostly on a smaller scale by local patrons in cities such as Tokat and
Kayseri. Ilkhanid royal patronage is absent from Anatolia: after their conversion to Islam in 692/
1294, when they began to sponsor Islamic institutions, the Ilkhanid rulers concentrated their
patronage in the region of Tabriz. After the disintegration of the Ilkhanate in the late 1330s,
eastern Anatolia became an entirely troubled (and troublesome) frontier, with former governors
competing for the scraps of the Ilkhanid lands, and the Ottomans slowly expanding from the western regions.

This period of transition requires further studies, taking into account that the eventual apogee of Ottoman rule was not a given: the defeat of sultan Bayezid I (r. 791-804/1389-1402) against the Central Asian conqueror Timur in the battle of Ankara in 804/1402 nearly wiped the Ottomans from the map. Only the recovery of the sultanate from this blow after a period of succession struggles permitted the continued ascent of the Ottomans. Thus, the full-fledged expression of Ottoman imperial power in architecture that the architect Sinan achieved in the sixteenth century might never have been reached. With this in mind, early modern Ottoman architecture should not be taken as a goal to which the medieval monuments of Anatolia were predestined to lead.

Anatolia remained restive throughout the period covered in this dissertation and beyond, far into the period of Ottoman domination, never really settling down as late as the second quarter of the sixteenth century. Thus, even when it was no longer an external frontier, Anatolia retained some characteristics of such a place: the instability of rule, the fluidity of identities, and the changing patterns of culture and dominance.

The shifting and permeable borders between the regions surrounding Anatolia, and between the cultures that shaped it throughout the Middle Ages, are part of the complexity of its architecture, composed of multiple layers of empire, culture, religion, and intertwined networks of peoples, trade, and politics. It is not a simple equation of power and imperial architectural style that we have observed throughout this dissertation, but a complex world of shifting

---

796 The historical background is discussed in Dimitris J. Kastritis, *The Sons of Bayezid: Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402-1413* (Leiden and Boston, 2007).

797 Kafadar, “A Rome of One’s Own,” 8.
paradigms where things change in the very instances in which they appear to become stable. Thus, in medieval Anatolia and regions that functioned according to similar parameters, such as northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the assumption of a direct and near exclusive correlation between political rule and architectural style is problematic.\textsuperscript{798} The absence of empire and central control, and the fluidity that a power vacuum created, were beneficial to the diversity of construction in fostering connections that could not have been as easily made under centralized rule, allowing freer agency to both craftsmen and non-royal patrons.

In the monuments examined in this dissertation, spanning over more than a century, a style to express Anatolian unity was never formed. The region remained part of a larger geopolitical context, with a specific sense of place tied to references to both the local past, and surrounding regions. A unified style contained within one region is an assumption of the early twentieth century, disconnected from the realities of the medieval frontier region. The architecture of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries is a reflection of the unruly nature of Anatolia, never quite settling down and shifting styles at will.

The established narrative of a progression from ‘Seljuk’ to ‘beylik’ architecture has been challenged in this dissertation. The close stylistic analysis of monuments and their decoration has revealed the nuances of architectural production in Anatolia during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Combined with a study of inscriptions, deeds of endowment, and the socio-historical context, my dissertation shows the multiple layers of patronage, artistic agency, cultural interaction and rule that shaped the monuments. My dissertation shows that the Islamic architecture of medieval Anatolia is a complex result of the multi-faceted social, cultural, and historical context of this region.

\textsuperscript{798} On cultural exchange, architecture, and material culture in medieval northern India: Flood, \textit{Objects of Translation}. 318
To reach beyond the framework of Anatolia and Islamic architecture spanning from this region to Central Asia, the concepts of pre-modern globalization\(^{799}\) and ‘global Middle Ages’ are potential starting points. Even though first defined with regard to contemporary art, the concept of global art can be expanded to include connected cultural spaces such as the one presented here. Thus, it can provide a canvas for understanding how mobility and identity shaped artistic production and patronage in this context.\(^{800}\) The understanding that globalization is not – at least conceptually – limited to its twentieth- and twenty-first-century incarnations with their implication of leveling cultural differences, is an important issue. Even though the concept is not uncontested, if applied with caution, it can lead to a better understanding of pre-modern connections between regions that appear exceedingly remote in a period without motorized transportation. And yet, these connections were there, with architecture, objects, and archaeological excavations to testify to their extent.

A roundtable discussion published in recent issue of *October* has shown that art historians in different fields – although all working on pre-twentieth-century topics – may vastly disagree on the implications of networks and globalization for these periods. Thus, Christopher Wood cautioned against simplistic use of the concept of globalization that appears readily applicable to any number of periods and places.\(^{801}\) Alessandra Russo pointed out that the differentiation, possible in Romance languages between ‘mondialisation’ and ‘globalisation’ as argued by Serge Gruzinski, may be a fruitful way of thinking about the problems of uncritically


using such concepts. \textsuperscript{802} ‘Mondialisation’ in this sense is an open and multi-directional movement that incites local reactions, while ‘globalisation’ implies a finite sense of expansion, from one place to another, but not in reverse. \textsuperscript{803} Barry Flood, a historian of Islamic art acutely aware of the historiographical limitations of his field, presented examples that show clearly how a specific sense of place and memory, was attached to objects recorded in medieval sources, even as they were moved across distances. \textsuperscript{804}

Striking about this debate is its focus on objects that easily transported from one place to another and back, acquiring new meanings in the process. The question of architecture is not raised, yet I argue that the issues discussed are just as relevant and pertinent for a study of the architecture of a specific place or region within a larger pre-modern global context.

Establishing such a framework of globalized culture can provide a wider perspective on the place of Anatolia in the arguably globalized world of the Mongol empire. The connectedness of the Mongol world system, stretching at its largest extent from Anatolia to China, has long been recognized and increasingly become the subject of studies that frame it within the context of global connections, world history, and cultural networks. \textsuperscript{805}

Issues such as mobility, identity, borders and frontiers, networks and movements that have been at stake throughout this dissertation, find their place within the broader context of these investigations of pre-modern globalization. The Mongol imperial context emerges as a case


\textsuperscript{803} Alessandra Russo in “Roundtable: The Global before Globalization,” 5


study of how pre-modern global systems functioned, and affected socio-cultural developments, including art and architecture, in the lands within their reach. Anatolia, through its incorporation into the Ilkhanid realm in the second half of the thirteenth century, becomes a case study within the case study, demonstrating how this region was politically, fiscally, and culturally affected by the broader mechanisms of the Mongol world.

Rather than erasing differences, a critique that today’s globalization has often been subjected to, this medieval globalization is rather conducive of local differences that appear within a larger cultural and political context that provides access to materials, models, and patronage. Thus, localism thrives within a global context that created a background for the mobility of people and objects.806 Even though not devoid of problems, the concept of pre-modern globalization provides a mental tool to conceive of interactions, across vast distances and between remote regions, and their eventual bearing on specific places within the larger context of the Mongol realm.

In Anatolia, this sense of place provides a site for a specific memory, a theme that is as pertinent for the medieval architecture, as it is for the latter’s reception today. Thus, in the Middle Ages, the Seljuks created a sense of place composed of references to the Iranian roots of their dynasty, and the local Roman and Byzantine past of the region that they had conquered. Architecture reflected imported elements in combination with local techniques and materials. This sense of place persisted under the Mongols, when a connection with Iran became renewed, although the combination with local elements became renewed. Eventually, the integration of Anatolia into the Mongol world systems seems to have fostered both the importation of elements

806 As in the recent conference at Harvard University on “Ornament as Portable Culture: Between Globalism and Localism,” organized by Gülru Necipoğlu and Alina Payne. For the program, see: http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1030569.files/program.pdf, accessed 11 April 2012.
circulating in the eastern Islamic world, such as chinoiserie motifs, and the recurring use of local architectural traditions. Thus, the specifically Anatolian sense of place was not dissolved, but rather transformed and refined, a development that further research will pursue.
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