LIBRI
www.libridergi.org
Epigrafi, Çeviri ve Eleştiri Dergisi
Journal of Epigraphy, Reviews and Translations

Sayı VI (2020)

Critical Review: R. Hillenbrand, *"Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia"*. Ed. I. Poonawala, *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World*. Oxford University Press (2017) 105-143.

T. M. P. Duggan

Atıf Düzeni T. M. P. Duggan, "Critical Review: R. Hillenbrand, "Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia". Ed. I. Poonawala, *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World*. Oxford University Press (2017) 105-143, £20.99. *Libri* VI (2020) 225-263.

Geliş Tarihi: 12.02.2020 | Kabul Tarihi: 28.06.2020

Elektronik Yayın Tarihi: 15.07.2020

Editörya: Phaselis Research Project
www.libridergi.org

LIBRI

Geliş Tarihi: 12.02.2020 | Kabul Tarihi: 28.06.2020
Elektronik Yayın Tarihi: 15.07.2020
DOI:10.5281/zenodo.3945378

Epigrafi, Çeviri ve Eleştiri Dergisi
www.libridergi.org
LIBRI VI (2020) 225-263

Critical Review: R. Hillenbrand, "Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia". Ed. I. Poonawala, *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World*. Oxford University Press (2017) 105-143, £20.99

Eleştirel Değerlendirme: R. Hillenbrand, "Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia". Ed. I. Poonawala, Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World. Oxford University Press (2017) 105-143, £20.99

T. M. P. Duggan *

Abstract: Firstly, this review enquires into the meaning of the term West Asia employed in the title of this book of conference proceedings and finds it carries a confusion of meanings in respect to the geographical area and the countries that are indicated through the use of this modern term. Secondly this review suggests that the statement that the constructional materials employed determines the difference between Great Seljuk and Rum Seljuk architecture fails to address the matter of the finished appearance of these buildings and, in part has been made possible through the modern mis-translations of the words mâhir ressâmlar recorded in a primary source describing the external appearance of Rum Seljuk architecture. To state that the scale of buildings in Seljuk Iran were greater than those of Rum Seljuk Anatolia, without establishing the size of the respective Muslim urban populations, 80% to about 10%, and the length of time that there was a population of Muslim inhabitants in a Muslim ruled country, respectively of more than 500 years to less than 200 years is likewise misleading, as is the statement that the Christians were minorities in Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory in 13th c. Anatolia.

Keywords: West Asia, Seljuk Paintwork, Translation, Architectural Paintwork, Spolia, Population, Minorities

Öz: Bu eleştiri yazısı öncelikle konu edindiği kongre bildirileri kitabının başlığında yer alan "Batı Asya" terimini ele alır. Bu terim tanımladığı coğrafi bölge ve onun içerdiği ülkeler bağlamında bir anlam karmaşasına neden olmaktadır. Ele alınan ikinci konu ise yayında yer alan "kullanılan yapı malzemelerinin Büyük Selçuklu ve Anadolu Selçuklu mimarisi arasındaki farklılıkların nedeni olduğu "yargısının bu iki devletin e ait yapıların ele alınmasında zayıf kalmış olmasıdır. Makale bu konudaki eksikliğin dönem kaynaklarında yer alan "mahir ressamlar" kavramının modern kaynaklar tarafından yanlış yorumlanmasından kaynaklandığına işaret etmektedir. Müslüman nüfus oranının Anadolu'da %10 iken doğuda %80 olduğu gerçeğini ve ülkelerin Müslüman yönetiminde olduğu süreler arasındaki farkı (200 yıla karşı 500 yıl) göz önüne almadan Büyük Selçuklu yapılarının Anadolu Selçuklu yapılarından daha büyük ölçekli olduğunu ileri sürmenin yanı sıra, 13. Yüzyıl Anadolusu'nda Hıristiyanların azınlık olduklarını belirtmek tarihsel açıdan yanıltıcıdır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Doğu Asya, Selçuklu Resim Sanatı, Tercüme, Duvar Resmi, Spolia/Devşirme, Nüfus, Azınlıklar

* Lecturer, Art Historian, Akdeniz University, Mediterranean Civilisations Research Institute (MCRI), 07058 Campus, Antalya. tmpduggan@yahoo.com| 0000-0003-3042-7489

The papers collected in this volume were delivered on the occasion of the nineteenth Giorgio Levi Della Vida Award and Conference in Islamic Studies at the Gustave E. von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, on the 18th -19th of May, 2010. The intention through the presentation by scholars of papers at conferences and symposia is to serve their discipline and the academic community, making accessible through publication, their discoveries, thoughts and judgements concerning the matter at hand, and the relatively rapid publication of the proceedings of conferences and symposia enables those academics concerned with the same or related subjects to be quickly aware of developments in the field. The passage of seven years from presentation at a conference to the publication of the proceedings is long, and is regrettably no record in this matter. The publishers describe the contents of this volume in the following manner:

- "*Highlights the political and cultural history of the Turks within the context of the Indian subcontinent, Central and West Asia*
- *A collection of papers on the emergence* (sic.) *of Turkish people and their contributions to the Islamic history and civilization*
- *Papers by some of the best scholars on Islamic history*[1]*".*

One may question as to if the Seljuk ruled areas of Rūm (Anatolia-Asia Minor-Turkey), in chapter two, "The Waqf as an Instrument of Cultural Transformation in Seljuq Anatolia" Gary Leiser, in chapter 4, the subject of this review "Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia", Robert Hillenbrand; as also of Seljuk Iraq, in respect to the subject of chapter 5, The Nizamiyya Madrasas, Carole Hillenbrand, is appropriately identified by the modern geo-political term "West Asia". The term "West Asia" has been employed in scientific literature from the latter part of the 19th c. onwards[2], and conveyed at that time the same meaning as conveyed by the term Western Asia. However, the term "West Asia" is often alleged to have been first employed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964), who described it as "a highway[3]" and India established its CWAS, the Centre for West Asia Studies in 2005[4]. It has become the official term used today by India and by many countries in Asia to denote all the Arab countries in Asia, in-

1 https://global.oup.com/academic/product/turks-in-the-indian-subcontinent-central-and-west-asia-9780198092209?cc=tr&lang=en&

2 Employed as an established geographical term in scientific texts, for example: Abbotsbury 1899, 98, employed to describe a Native Habitat of plants; Cabinet 1900, 220, "*Laserpitium, a genus of plants, nat. order Umbelliferae, containing about 20 species of plants, natives of Europe, North Africa, and West Asia*". Felter-Lloyd 1900, 293, *"Calotropis Hamiltanii, "Habitat: North India, West Asia, and Africa*"; idem 892, "*Fenugreek is an annual plant, native of west Asia, but is naturalized in Africa, south Europe, and India*"; Official 1907, 64, No. 190. Lentils. "*It is cultivated at the present time throughout the East, in many parts of Europe, North Africa, West Asia, and North-West India*"; idem 118, No. 304. "*Models of Carrots, the roots of Daucus Carota, L., a biennial found in a wild state in fields and on the sea shores in England and extending through Europe, North Africa, North and West Asia to India*"; idem 131, No. 332. Chamomiles. "*The flower-heads of Anthemius nobilis, L., a perennial herb, wild and cultivated in Europe, West Asia, and North Africa*"; idem 141, No. 464. Figs. "*The well known heads of fruit of Ficus Carica, L., long cultivated in South Europe and West Asia*". "West Asia" as a term employed to mean only Western Asia Minor, an area larger than the Roman province of Asia or Asiana, see: Bible Student 1909, 117, "*It covered the Completion of Paul's Work for the Greek-Gentile World, -embracing the Founding of the New Greek-Christian Center of Influence at Ephesus, the Finishing of* ***his Evangelisation of Greece and West Asia****, and his formal and official Report at Jerusalem of his entire Greek-Gentile Career*".
As a geographical term: Cyclopedia 1900, 102, "Amou, **A river of West Asia**, flowing into the Aral Sea, forms the dividing line between Bokhara and Khiva; L. 1,610m". Hogarth 1909, 88. "The orgiastic practices of the Paphian temple, such as ceremonial prostitution (for which, by the way, our only evidence is Christian), has parallels of course **over all West Asia, even to Armenia and Babylon**".

3 See for example Akalin 2016.

4 https://www.jmi.ac.in › cwas

cluding Egypt, and also the largely non-Arab speaking countries of Turkey, Iran and Israel[5], and was presumably employed as such in the title of this volume of proceedings, *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World.* The use of the term "West Asia" in this title, a term unemployed before the second half of the 19th c., and given a particular form by Pandit Nehru in the mid-20th c., seems somewhat debateable. The U.N. F.A.O. states the following 22 countries and areas comprise the West Asia sub-region: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Cyprus, Gaza Strip, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanese Republic, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, West Bank, and Yemen[6]; while the map showing the countries in the West Asia region and their Exclusive Economic Zone (UNEP 2016) indicates that in West Asia there are not 22 but only 10 countries: Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, which, defined in geological terms is largely the area formed by the Arabian tectonic plate and which is described as *a biogeographical realm*[7]; and a region forming part of what is known as the Middle East, that in linguistic terms, forms a part of the Arabic speaking world, excluding countries such as: Turkey, Lebanon, Iran, and Israel. However, U.N. Environment states the West Asia region comprises 12 member countries; Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestinian National Authority, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates and Yemen[8], also excluding Lebanon and Israel as well as Turkey and Iran. Likewise the EU recognises these same countries as forming "West Asia" e.g. ROWA the Regional Office for West Asia[9]. However, The West Asia Region of the International Council for Education of People with Visual Impairment (ICEVI) has a rather wider idea of what is understood as forming "West Asia" than the U.N. or the E.U., 24 countries: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Turkmenistan, Yemen, Maldives, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Qatar, and the Syrian Arab Republic[10]. As defined by The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, founded 1948), CEM, Commission on Ecosystem Management, the West Asia Region includes 13 countries: Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Ka-

---

5 Nehru chose not to use the term 'Middle East' due to its geographical position in relation to India and because of its use by the colonial power, replacing it with the term "West Asia" which was already in use. For further on this see Akalin 2016 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/19370679.2016.12023289.
The problem with collapsing the Middle East region into "West Asia" is not simply that the middle-intermediary ground of Eurasia, in terms of conception expressed through this terminology, vanishes. It can be understood that rather than being a more neutral term replacing the occidental term Middle East, as has been frequently stated, Nehru was advancing the borders of Asia westwards through this terminological shift, undermining the conception that there was a Middle region, and thereby realigning India towards the centre of Asia. The word Asia derives from the Ancient Greek, Ἀσία, which referred to Anatolia i.e. Turkey and to the Persian Empire, in distinction from both Greece and Egypt. The word Ἀσία, is understood to be from the Akkadian *asu*, meaning, "to go out, to rise" in reference to the sun, thus "the land of the sunrise" meaning the East, as in the *Orient*, as also, Levant. S.O.D.[3] s.v. "Levant" 1497 Fr. "*Levant for the point where the sun rises, 1. Geographical, a. The countries of the East, b. The Eastern part of the Mediterranean, with its islands and countries adjoining".* Derives from the Medieval wind/compass direction Levante East, hence Levantines-from the east, meaning orientals. Levanter, is derived from Levant, the land at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and refers to the wind's easterly direction. The term, "West Asia" is therefore in terms of meaning, an apparent non-sense, literally, West-East, or a poetic expression requiring explanation, like the title of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*, while the term "Western Asia" literally means the western east. The terms "West Asia" and "Western Asia" are certainly ambiguous geographical terms.

6 http://www.fao.org/3/y1997e/y1997e0q.htm

7 https://www.cbd.int/gbo/gbo4/outlook-westasia-en.pdf

8 https://www.unenvironment.org/ozonaction/index.php/networks/west-asia

9 https://europa.eu › file › download

10 http://icevi.org/west-asia/

zakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates, and, Yemen[11]. The Encyclopaedia Britannica does not have a separate article on this relatively new term, but it describes West Asia within Asia as including "*the highlands of Anatolia, the Caucasus, and the Armenian and Iranian highlands*[12]". This term has also been used by the Asia Society Policy Institute (ASPI) as a synonym for the entire Middle East – *al sharq al'awsat*, as in, "*West Asia or the Middle East routinely makes headlines due to a complicated array of security challenges*[13]". While in the Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, this term is employed in the title of the 2004 essay by Salwa Mikdadi, *West Asia: Between Tradition and Modernity*, while the term *Western Asia* is employed in the essay itself, as though these two terms are synonyms[14], although often they are not. It should be noted that the new term "West Asia" is not to be mistaken for being the shortened form of, nor is it to be confused with the somewhat older term "Western Asia[15]" as in "*An extensive region of Western Asia, between the border of the Iranian Plateau and the shore of the Mediterranean, has been the immemorial abode of numerous tribes of people, commonly, but with very doubtful propriety, designated the Semetic or Shemetic race*[16]", of 1844, as the implications of this new term are quite different. Yet the Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services, g-fras's regards "Western Asia" and, "West Asia" as synonyms and states, "*West Asia comprises 18 countries, namely, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Cyprus, Georgia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen*[17]". Yet, for example, the participating economies in the ICP Western Asia Program, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA) are 15 countries and areas: Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, West Bank and Gaza[18]; the 17 countries in 2019 are: Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, The Sudan, The Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, The United Arab Emirates and Yemen. ECWA, The Economic Commission for Western Asia was established on 9 August 1973[19]; while wikimedia.org includes

---

11 https://www.iucn.org/commissions/commission-ecosystem-management/regions/west-asia In the Western Europe Region are: Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Faroe Islands, Finland, France, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Greenland, Guernsey, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Italy, Jersey, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Norway, Portugal, San Marino. Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, Vatican City State. In the Eastern Europe Region are: Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine. While the Central Asia Region has eight countries: Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and, Uzbekistan.

12 https://www.britannica.com/place/West-Asia

13 https://asiasociety.org/policy-institute/west-asia

14 https://www.metmuseum.org › trmd › hd_trmd "By mid-century, many of the countries in **western Asia** that were under European dominance gained their independence. These new nations claimed a renewed political as well as cultural identity. Iraqi artists joined poets and architects in advocating a modernity that embraced the rich and diverse local heritage".

15 A term in use from the early 19th c., if not earlier, and widely used from the 1830's onwards, e.g. Brewster 1830, 216-127, where "Persia and Western Asia" are treated separately from "Greece and Turkey in Europe"; Brewer 1830, 256, "*that a missionary may be sent by us to the Jews, our object has been to furnish the means to support such a missionary in Western Asia*". An area defined; idem 256, Letter of 1826, "*a Missionary to those Jews who reside in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean*", Rennell 1830, passim.

16 Pritchard 1844, 547. Semetic, today Semitic, being a linguistic term invented in the 18th c. to describe the language group spoken in Mesopotamia, Syria and the Arabian peninsular that reached into North Africa.

17 https://www.g-fras.org/en/world-wide-extension-study/asia/western-asia.html

18 https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/icp/brief/was-program

19 http://www.regionalcommissions.org/about/the-regional-commissions/economic-and-social-commission-for-western-asia-escwa/

the following 16 countries and areas as forming what it terms Western Asia: Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, (the occupied) West Bank and Gaza[20]. However, *The South and West Asia region*" as defined by the Australian Government[21], comprises those Indian Ocean Rim countries that are strategically important to Australia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan.

In consequence of the confusion arising from the varied modern usage of this ill-defined term, only in part outlined above, the use of the term "West Asia" in the title of this book[22] is certain to raise questions in the minds of at least some of the potential readers of this volume, as to precisely where in fact "West Asia" is to be found, or rather, which of the numerous definitions of the countries of "West Asia" in circulation today, and those in "blueprint[23]" most closely approximates to the idea of West Asia in Turkish thought over the course of the centuries into the Ottoman period, and, indeed, if there was any such concept. There does not seem to be a terminological synonym for the term "West Asia" that is employed in the literature of the periods that form the subject of the chapters of this volume, in Turkish, or Persian or Arabic. West Asia being a region described at times today by various official bodies as indicating only the countries on the Arabian tectonic plate; and at times as including states such as: Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Afghanistan, Turkey, Lebanon, Cyprus etc.; cannot, in the latter case be described as defining any religious, political, linguistic or geographically coherent region; and, in the former case, excludes everywhere north of the northern borders of Syria and Iraq from "West Asia" which likewise is nonsensical, as the place that was described as Ἀσία Asia by the ancient Greeks, was to the East of Greece, meaning Asia Minor, the peninsular of Turkey, but both Turkey and Iran are excluded from this definition of West Asia; while Russia, east of the Ural Mts. as far as the central Siberian Plateau, surely forms a part of "West Asia" but is not recorded as such in all but three of the modern official and other listings noted above[24]. At other times today, as noted above, the term "West Asia" is employed as a synonym for the modern Middle East, the area formed through the combination of most of the areas formerly termed The Near and The Middle East[25]. Before the terms "The Near East" of 1863[26], and then, "The Middle East" came

---

20 https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Countries_in_Western_Asia

21 https://www.aciar.gov.au/Our-Regions/South-and-West-Asia-0

22 It is worth noting that this term has also been recently employed in the title of a volume published in 2018 by Edinburgh University Press, "Christianity in North Africa and West Asia" Eds. K. R. Ross, M. Tadros, T. M. Johnson, where this term indicates Western Asia, excluding for example Khazakstan, by some definitions also included in West Asia.

23 See for example, Saeed Naqvi, "For Indian Muslims Umma Is A Mirage". In, *The Citizen, 1 September*, 2019, "Mahmoud Abbas's voiceless wailing is, for that reason, also inaudible. None of the GCC or other significant Arab countries are interested in the Palestinian cause ever since US and Israeli strategists have given **a new blue print for West Asia**" https://www.thecitizen.in/index.php/en/NewsDetail/index/4/17489/For-Indian-Muslims-Umma-Is-A-Mirage Likewise, The Asian Age, Sept. 4, 2019, "Washington's current policy towards Iran, which carries Mr Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner's imprimatur, is quite transparent — leave it outside the regional order that the US seeks to impose in **West Asia (Middle East)**... The US was not running away from its **West Asian** responsibilities. The legitimacy conferred on Iran after the nuclear deal made it a key player in the new **West Asian** balance of power which Washington was proposing. Other players in this arrangement would be Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Qatar" https://www.asianage.com/opinion/oped/300318/trump-and-his-hawks-have-war-on-their-mind.html

24 ECWA, The Economic Commission for Western Asia; https://www.iucn.org/commissions/commission-ecosystem-management/regions/west-asia, and, wikimedia.org

25 That is the 17 countries: Cyprus, Oman, Egypt, Bahrain, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Yemen.

26 S.O.D.[3] s.v. "Near East" 1869 The South-Eastern part of Europe, the Balkan states together with Asia Minor, hence, near-eastern".

into more regular use at the turn of the 19th c.[27], as in Arminius Vambéry's, *Western culture in Eastern lands: a comparison of the methods adopted by England and Russia in the Middle East,* John Murray, London, 1906, and which is often forgotten today, is that on March 30th 1856 at the Treaty of Paris following the end of the Crimean War, the Ottoman state was admitted into the concert of Europe and the signatory Powers promised to respect its independence and territorial integrity. The Ottoman state at that time included much of the Balkans including part of modern mainland Greece, Crete, the Dodecanese islands, Rhodes and Cyprus and those areas that today comprise the modern states of: Turkey, Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Lebanon, Qatar, Jordan, Palestine, Israel, Syria, Yemen, the Sudan and Iraq. In other words, the European powers, through the admission of the Ottoman state into the concert of Europe, thereby recognised in 1853 the borders of Europe in the East as being the Indian Ocean, the Iranian border and the Caucasus. It was this area that then became divided in its terminological description, before it became entirely divided up between the European Imperial powers, by the signatories of the 1856 Treaty of Paris, a process largely completed in 1919. It was no longer simply Asia, or the Orient, nor the Levant[28], nor yet, Western Asia; as the Levant became the Near East, beyond which was the Middle East. Then the term the Middle East swallowed up much, but not all, of the area formerly characterised by the term Near East. Concerning the desire for the standardisation of terminology, one does require for any standardisation of terminology, a shared definition of what West Asia means, but such is clearly not the case. One may expect a reader to realise that terms such as "West Asia" or "Western Asia" as employed for example by the Chinese, may differ in the geographical area of concern implied by the use of this same term, from when it is employed by an inhabitant of India, or Russia, or Europe, as likewise from the same term employed in Christian Biblical Studies, in Roman history, and in Mesopotamian archaeology. Knowledge of the use of different terms, as of different toponyms, by different peoples at the same, and at different times, itself being of some value, as such usage clearly marks different perceptions of, and perspectives on, a region or place. One hopes that both editor and authors and the readers, both potential and actual of this volume of proceedings, agree as to where West Asia was, and where its borders were, and, where they are today, and what perspective may be implied through the use of this particular term.

Robert Hillenbrand, "Brick versus Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia"

Chapter 4 in this volume of proceedings, entitled: "*Brick verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia*" was written by Robert Hillenbrand, Fellow of the British Academy, Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (elected 1991), Emeritus Professor of Islamic Art, University of Edinburgh, Slade Visiting Professor at Cambridge University, 2008-09, currently an Honorary Professorial Fellow in the department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies (IMES), and author of numerous book and articles on Islamic art and architecture including *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning*, first published in 1994 by Edinburgh University Press, reprinted 2000, Columbia University Press 2004, and *Islamic Art and Architecture*, Thames and Hudson, World of Art Series, London, 1999. The thirty-eight pages of this chapter published in 2017 are the main subject of this review.

The author states that this chapter is, "*entitled 'Brick versus stone' in the belief that the dif-*

[27] On this see the important research in Foliard 2017, including: W. and A. K. Johnson's text map of the Middle East, 1908, idem. 208; George Bacon, *New Contour Map of the Near and Middle East (the Land of the Five Seas),* London, 1913, idem. Fig. 7.1; and Seth Low's use in 1899 of the term *Middle East*, idem. 209-210.

[28] From the ancient Greek, meaning Ortus-Orient. *Levantisches Meer* was marked on maps produced by the Geographisches Institut (Weimar, Germany) in 1875.

ference in building material is the defining distinction between these two traditions[29]" between the architectural traditions of Seljuk Iran and Seljuk Anatolia, and divides his subject, illustrated with 40 fine photographs, into five sections: material, form, scale, structure and ornament. The stated intention being to describe:

*"**the true relationship between the two architectural traditions**.*[30]"

while also stating on the same page:

"***The relationship between the two, not only politically but also in the visual arts, is that of a senior and junior partner. This relationship must be borne in mind as a corrective to the tendency to make exaggerated claims for the art of the Rum Seljuqs***[31]". Consequently the issue addressed by this chapter is already decided on its fourth page by the author for the reader, stated in the manner of 19th c. orientalists, that continued into the 20th c. with K. Otto-Dorn's conception of Persian (Seljuk) art in Anatolia, - Persia first, the senior partner, Seljuk Anatolia, a junior partner, and into the 21st century, and the author remarks with the imperative, this relationship ***must be borne in mind***. This perspective was noted without comment in a review of 2001 of the author's *Islamic Art and Architecture*, of 1999, by Ruba Kana'an of the Oriental Institute, Oxford: "*He argues that 'the centre of gravity in the Islamic world had shifted from the Arab territories to Anatolia and Iran' and Iran itself became*[32] *an important centre for Islamic art. It is against this strong cultural and political centre that* ***the author perceives the art and culture of Anatolia and Syria between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. As a 'periphery' then, Seljuk Anatolia is represented as a cultural province of Iran, and its artistic wealth produced by or under the influence of Persian poets, mystics, viziers, men of letters, craftsmen and artisans***[33]". It can of course be noted that in terms of recorded architects-builders, those trained in Syria undertook some of the most important of the Sultans' architectural works during the first half of the 13th c., and further, that the Abbasid Caliphs in Bagdad did not recognise Rūm Seljuk Sultans as being "*junior partners*" ruling over, '*a periphery*' in the 13th c., unlike the European orientalists of yesteryear, they awarded Rūm Seljuk Sultans from Ala ad- Dīn Keykubat I. onwards the highest title they could bestow, that of *qasīm amīr al-mu'minīn*, meaning, Partner of the Commander of the Faithful, the partner of the Caliph, a title also given by Abbasid Caliphs to some sultans in the sub-continent. The Iranian bias was noted by Alastair Northedge in his 1996 review of the author's *Islamic architecture: form, function and meaning* of 1994, that, "*On the other hand, the choice of chapter subjects in itself* ***sets in concrete a particular view of Islamic architecture: in this case a medieval Iranian vision***[34]". While Elizabeth Lambourn, also notes in her review of the same volume the emphasis on seeing the architecture of Seljuk and Beylik Anatolia as a derivative of lost Iranian examples: "*The renewed focus he places on Anatolian madrasas of the Saljuq and Beylik periods for the information they provide about lost contemporary structures in Iran is also welcome*[35]". Politically, in fact, the Great Seljuk Sultanate had expired into chaos in the mid-

---

29 Hillenbrand 2017, 107.

30 Hillenbrand 2017, 108.

31 Hillenbrand 2017, 108.

32 It was of course already an important centre of Islamic art.

33 Kana'an 2001, 236-7. Concerning the assumptions concerning recorded craftsmen's signatures see, Rogers 1969, 139, "The interesting correspondence of the style of monuments with the Persian nisba of the craftsman who signs the work, as we have seen at Divrik and Sīvās may lead us to assume that a Persian nisba entails that the craftsman was trained in Persia in Persian crafts; but this, obviously, does not follow. Secondly, since inscriptions in which craftsmen's signatures are given normally contain a series of patronymics, it is never clear whether the nisba refers to the craftsman or his porgenitor, since usage is known to have been fluid at this period".

34 Northedge 1996, 2.

35 Lambourn 1995, 109.

12th c., militarily with the defeat by the Karakitai coalition near Samarkand in 1141, followed by the capture and imprisonment for two years by the Ghuzz-Oğuz nomadic tribesmen of the acknowledged head of the Seljuk family, Muizz ad-Dunya wa ad- Dīn Adud ad-Dawlah Abul-Harith Ahmad Sanjar ibn Malik-Shah, who ruled from 1118 to 1157. This collapse was before the Sultanate of the Seljuks of Rūm had consolidated its control over central Anatolia, from which point, marked by the Battle of Myriocephalum, 13 Rabi 572 /17 September 1176, and the ending of the struggle with the Dānishmends in 1178, and largely during the course of the 7th/13th c., the major works of Rūm Seljuk art and architecture in the *bilad ar-rūm, diyār al-Rūm,* Anatolia were produced. If one chooses to use the prefectorial style of, "senior partner, junior partner" then, in the matter of literature and Muslim education, Seljuk Anatolia was certainly the "junior partner" and in the last two decades of the 13th c., from 1280 onwards, was largely administered by Iranians appointed by the Pagan Mongols, but, in terms of the 13th c., in architecture and over the range of the visual arts, Rūm Seljuk Anatolia was the "senior partner" experiencing a period of outstanding creativity in the arts of Islam, that is perhaps an achievement without parallel for a state with a minority Muslim population established from Christian territory a little over a century before 1200. If comparison does need to be drawn, it is perhaps best made, not with Iran, but with the architecture and over the range of the visual arts, with that of the Muslim Turkish ruled areas of India in the 12th and 13th centuries, likewise with minority Muslim populations, and it is worth noting that the Abbasid Caliphs at this time also gave this highest title, that of *qasīm amīr al-mu'minīn*, to some Turkish rulers on the subcontinent[36]. While in respect to the belief expressed by Robert Hillenbrand that Iran, rather than neighbouring Syria, provided the model for 13th c. Rūm Seljuk architecture, even though the architecture of Zangid and Ayyūbid Syria was primarily of stone, while that of Iran was primarily brick, does itself seems rather an odd position to maintain in the 21st c. for comparative purposes, not least when the contemporary architecture of Iran from 1220 to 1280 has been characterised as "*a virtual blank,*[37]" due to the Pagan Mongol onslaught, and so comparisons and inferences are drawn in this chapter between buildings in Seljuk Iran and those of Rūm Seljuk Anatolia that are not contemporary.

The difference in the number and the scale of works of architecture constructed of brick and of those constructed of stone in the Seljuk ruled territories of Iran and in Rūm (Anatolia) has been recognised in publications for more than half a century[38]. Clifford Edmund Bosworth remarked upon the importance of stone as a construction material, for those coming from an dried mud and baked brick tradition of architecture, in his volume of 1963, *The Ghaznavids: Their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 994-1040*:

> *"The zone of Persia where clay was the basic building material extended eastwards through Khurasan until the rocky core of Afghanistan was reached and stone could be procured. The initial offensive of the Seljuqs came to a halt in the region where mountainous topography becomes more extensive and more elevated, and Balkh remained in Ghaznavid hands for some twenty years until 451/1059. The lack of a cheap, substantial building material has always been one of the bottlenecks of Khurasanian life. The traditional materials there have been clay and sun-*

---

36 Contra, for example the exceptionalism of Seljuk Anatolia as stated by A. C. S. Peacock, "*for it was like no other part of the contemporary Muslim World. It seemed full of anomolies*". Peacock 2012, 265, as the same could of course be said of the contemporary Albari Turkish Delhi Sultanate.

37 Rogers 1969, 147.

38 E.g. Ünsal 1959, 9.

> *dried brick. Even fired brick only came into use gradually in the Islamic period, and timberwork was only to be found in well-wooded regions like the Caspian provinces. These limitations of material have given a distinctive bias to the architectural development of eastern Persia, seen, for example, in the absence of large doming. It is not therefore surprising that questions of building materials and fortification interested Khurasanis. We see this clearly in Nasir-i Khusrau's account of his travels, for he always shows an intense interest in walls and defences, above all when they are of stout stone. He describes the splendid fortifications of places like Mayyāfāriqīn and Āmid before dealing with anything else there, and shows particular interest in their gates, which were wholly of iron and not wooden. As he progresses through Azerbaijan, Armenia, Diyarbakr, Syria and Palestine, his interest in the defences of their towns is sustained. Clearly, this preoccupation represents the interest and envy of a traveller from a land where stone was a luxury building material*[39]*".*

"*the pre-eminent role of the portal*"

Robert Hillenbrand describes the architectural ornamentation of Rūm Seljuk architecture in the *bilad ar-rūm,* as limited to stone carving, glazed brick, tile mosaic and glazed inscriptions on a plaster ground, and writes:

> *"These reflections may also help to explain* ***the pre-eminent role of the portal*** *in so many Anatolian buildings, the way it seems to gather to itself the lion's share of the available decoration,* ***and the corresponding relative neglect of the rest of the outer walls***[40]*" (Bold is my added emphasis to quotations).*

Likewise,

> *"Dramatic muqarnas hoods and richly applied ornament single out such portals even more assertively.* ***These draw the eye, of course, as their architects no doubt fully intended; and this leads almost logically to a corresponding lack of emphasis on the plain surfaces of the rest of the principal façade****, apart perhaps from a succession of widely spaced buttresses*[41]*").*

And,

> *"And for all the intensity of ornament on the portals or mihrabs of thirteenth century Anatolia,* ***there is much less acerage of decoration, inside and out, than the buildings of Seljuq Iran; one has only to contrast the ornament in caravanserais like Ribat-i Sharaf, Ribat-i Mahi, and Daya Khatun with the plainness of their Seljuq Anatolian counterparts***[42]*".*

Likewise in 1994 in the author's *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning*, writing on Seljuk hans:

> *"Stylistically these caravanserais are, as might be expected, the most*

---

39 Bosworth 1973, 160.
40 Hillenbrand 2017, 122.
41 Hillenbrand 2017, 112.
42 Hillenbrand 2017, 135-136.

> *austere of Anatolian Saljuq buildings.* ***They present a forbiddingly plain exterior façade. The only decoration on the main curtain walls is the carved animal figures or heads which serve as water spouts and look for all the world like the gargoyles of a Gothic cathedral. The portal itself, as if by some magnetic force attracts all the decoration which most of the building so ostentatiously eschews***[43]*.*

However, the assertion made in these statements that architectural ornamentation in 13th c. Seljuk Anatolia was concentrated on the portal and mihrab, that "*there is much less acerage of decoration, inside and out, than the buildings of Seljuq Iran*", that "*The only decoration on the main curtain walls is the carved animal figures or heads which serve as water spouts…*" that decoration was concentrated on the portal, "*and the corresponding relative neglect of the rest of the outer walls*", that the emphasis on the portal, "*leads almost logically to a corresponding lack of emphasis on the plain surfaces of the rest of the principal façade*[44]" is a most considerable misconception that is current today, only, and simply, due to the loss over the course of the past 800 years of most of the original surfacing, design and paintwork that was applied to these today exposed bare stone and rubble walls, with much surviving if fragmentary evidence unfortunately removed during the course of ill-informed restorations over the past 30 years in the "cleaning" of the stone-work of Rūm Seljuk buildings. The idea that plain bare stone walls, carved bare stonework, raw rubble walls, and exposed tile, mortar and rubble merlons were a feature of Seljuk architecture in the *bilad ar-rūm* in the 12th and 13th centuries is not correct, but is a well-publicised and endlessly photographed modern misconception derived from the present naked appearance of the formerly colourful external appearance of 12th and 13th c. stone architecture in Asia Minor. It is an anachronism, that in part, seems to have sprouted and been supported by the modern Western cult of truth to materials, in opposition to the past application of meaningful designs of coloured painted decoration applied to the lime-plaster surfacing over the stonework, as to brickwork, as to the plastered surface over rubble walls, as to woodwork, which was standard practice at that time, that thereby clothed the raw materials employed in architectural construction in a smooth surface dressed with meaningful painted content. It is the case that constructional material and form was of somewhat less importance in the eyes of the Medieval patron and public, than the surfacing of colour and design that was applied to the surface of the structure or object. Palaces had tiled and painted wall surfaces over both masonry and rubble walls. The construction material was itself covered over as being unsightly raw material, to be unseen beneath the surface finish. With this surfacing of colour and design the building or object was dressed, and without this surfacing today, the building or object has lost its finish, has been undressed by time.

If the author, an architectural historian, had continued the line of thought indicated by the similarity he drew between Rūm Seljuk 13th c. stone carved water-spouts and the stone carved gargoyles of Gothic cathedrals in 2000, and was aware of the paintwork formerly covering the exterior of contemporary Gothic cathedrals and churches, for example, the traces of 13th c. paintwork found in the 1990's in "cleaning work" on the western facade of the Cathedral Basilica of Our Lady of Amiens dating from between 1220 and 1270 A.D.[45], and had taken the next

---

43 Hillenbrand 2000, 350.

44 Likewise in 2017 concerning decoration: "Architectural façades are generally plain and sparsely decorated. Ornament is concentrated around portals and windows, and on the interiors of mosques or mihrabs". Crane-Korn 2017, 336.

45 Le Goff 2005, 145, "The effects of the colors of stained glass windows in combination with the many colors of painted sculptures have been celebrated by Alain Erlande-Brandeburg in his work entitled Quand les cathedrales

cognitive step, and looked for evidence that the contemporary Seljuk period stone buildings in Anatolia were painted, then the assumption that the facade of Seljuk building were simply bare stone stonework could have been discarded from modern English language publications on Seljuk architecture more than 20 years ago, and steps taken towards the better reading and understanding of the external appearance of Anatolian 12th and 13th c. architecture, concerning that which mattered to patron and public in the 12th -13th c., the building's appearance, not the material employed in its construction – and the process of conservation, preservation, and "virtual" reconstructions of the appearance of Anatolian Medieval architecture, would have been significantly advanced[46].

There is a significant body of published evidence, both archaeometric analysis into the surviving 13th c. Rūm Seljuk lime plaster and paintwork on architecture[47], including the remaining large areas of *in-situ* Seljuk 13th c. exterior paintwork over the plastered, ashlar and rubble fortification walls of 'Alâ'iya - Alâîyye-Alanya[48], as also at Alara castle (Fig. 4), as on Seljuk palaces (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 5), pavilions[49], tershane and hans: Evdir, Kargi, Susuz, Kırkgöz etc. (Figs. 6, 7, 8, 9)[50], and there are the remaining traces clearly visible on the UNESCO World Heritage list (1985) exterior facade of the Divriği mosque and hospital complex constructed in 1228/9[51]; as on surviving Rūm Seljuk building inscriptions (itself clearly indicating the surrounding ashlar stone surface of the building was likewise, filled, surfaced, and painted). There is the surviving physical evidence, and there is also the contemporary and earlier record of this practice, such as Nasir-i Khusrau's remarks in his *Safarname*, *The Book of Travels*, concerning the paintwork over the stonework of the Amid-Diyarbakır Ulu Cami in 1046, that "***all the masonry was carved and painted with designs***.[52]" As in the 13th c. by Ibn Bibi, who records that ***master painters***, "***mahir ressâmlar***" were summoned by Sultan 'Ala' al-Dīn Keykubat I. in 1221, concerned with the painted decoration to be employed in work on the renovation and rebuilding of the fortification walls of Konya[53]:

"سلطان فرمان داد معماران کاردان و رسّامان حاذق را حاضر کردند"

---

e´taient peintes (When cathedrals were painted)". A work first published in 1993 by Gallimard, "This architectural revolution finds its apogee in Gothic cathedrals, real stone lace, originally with vibrant colors". For the example at Amiens see: https://youtu.be/z5GWDhAV-Aw

46 For example, the standard use of lime plaster and paintwork over Rūm Seljuk period masonry, both plain and carved is unmentioned in the section on techniques and materials in Crane-Korn 2017, 330-331.

47 See for the scientific analysis of the lime plaster and some of the pigments employed, Caner 2003, the title of which, "Archaeometrical Investigation of some Seljuk Plasters" regrettably fails to mention the words, paint, colour or pigments, that forms a subject of this scientific research in its title, with the analysis of painted samples from: Alanya Castle, Kubadabad Palaces, Belkis-Aspendos Palace, Selinus Sikarhane Köşk and the Hasbahçe pavilion. An important Msc. thesis on this subject, indicating the pigment was mixed with water and applied to the damp plaster, that slaked lime was the binder agent, that iron oxide provided both the red and the green colours. The white "*was found to be calcite together with opal-A, quartz and dolomite. The presence of opal-A both in red pigment haematite and white pigment calcite increase the possibility of its use as additive to promote pozzolanic reactions and increase durability of pigment layers*" etc. Caner 2003, 87.

48 Lloyd - Rice 1958, 22; Krabbenhöft 2011; Keykubatlı 2019, Giriş, "Bugün görece renksiz ve gri taş duvarlar halinde gördüğümüz yapılarçoğunlukla renkli boyalarla da süslenmiştir".

49 E.g. Lloyd - Rice 1958, 48; Önge 1969, 8-11; also the illustrations, some in colour of the 13th c. paintwork in the Divriği complex, Önge-Ateş-Bayram 1978, 22, 23, 31, 92, 95, 97, 114, 154; Redford 2000, 153, 158, Fig. 98, ill. 73-74, Duggan 2011, 141, 156.

50 Duggan 2008.

51 For example: https://www.yenisafak.com/foto-galeri/gundem/710-yil-boyunca-donen-denge-sutununu-deprem-durdurdu-2035186?page=3

52 Thackston 1986, 9.

53 Bibi 1996, I., 272-3.

> *"Sultan ferman verdi, iş bilir mimârlar ve **mâhir ressâmlar** hazır ettiler[54]".*
>
> *"Ba'dehü emir-i sultanî muce-bince mimarlar, **mahir ressamlar** hazır oldular[55]".*
>
> *"Upon that the Sultan gave orders, skilled architects who knew their work and the master painters were to be brought".*

Unfortunately for the understanding in the English speaking world of the role of painters, master painters and paintwork on 13th c. Rūm Seljuk architecture, the term, *mahir ressâmlar* was translated into English by Howard Crane in 1993 as meaning, not ***master painters***, but ***expert draftsmen***:

> *"The Sultan ordered that skilful architects and **expert draftsmen** be summoned and he rode around the city with them, accompanied by the amīrs and dignitaries of the court[56]".*

mâhir ressâmlar was then clearly, and I think on the basis of the surviving and recorded evidence of Rūm Seljuk paintwork on fortifications at Konya, 'Alâ'iya-Alanya and Alara, together with ibn Bibi's repeated use in his work of the word *ressam* to mean painter, accurately translated into Turkish by Mürsel Öztürk in 1996 as, *usta ressamlar*, meaning, ***master painters***[57]. Hence, Duggan 2008, "*Upon that the Sultan gave orders. Those architects who knew their work and the **master painters** were brought*[58]".

One of these same words in this same text, *ressâmlar,* was in 2011 then transliterated by Scott Redford, as reading *rassāmān*, and this word, *rassāmān* was translated into English and said to mean, ***designers***[59]***,*** not painters, further misleading the reader as to who was involved in Seljuk architectural work, and preventing the reader from comprehending, through this unfortunate mistranslation, the sense of the importance of master painters for the appearance of Rūm Seljuk architecture in the 13th c., but which was explicitly recorded by ibn Bibi in his text. This, because the word *ressam,* was clearly employed elsewhere in Ibn Bibi's *Selçukname*, to indicate a painter, and as a metaphor for The Painter, as in the well-known comparisons made with the work of Chinese painters, as with the famous painter Mani, the Iranian prophet and founder of Manichaeism, and the famous painter Azer'i, Nimrod (Nemrud)'s son-in-law, and/or his vizier: "*…sanatıyla Çin ressamlarını geride bırakan Mani'yi ve Azer'i kıskançlıktan çatlatacak bir ressam çağır da ben onunlar Rum ülkesine gideyim…Dadı'nın söylediği bu özellikleri taşıyan ressam getirdiler*.[60]" And in reference to the Almighty as Painter, "*Hacib Zekeriya, boy endam ve yüz bakımından devrinin en güzeli olan, "Sizi şekillendirdi ve şeklinizi de güzel yaptı". Ressamının varlık atölyesinde benzerini yapmadığı, güneşin ve ayın gözünün çehresine düştüğü zaman parlaklığın ve güzelliğini kıskanmaktan aklını kaybettiği…* [61]"; "*Ertesi güne kudret ressamları, hikmet kalemiyle güneşin altın işlemeli yuvarlağını göğün mavi sayfasına Melik Eşref ve diğer melikler,…*[62]".

---

54 Bibi 1956, 254. My thanks to Mahmut Demir M.A. for his invaluable assistance in this matter.

55 Bibi 2007, 81.

56 Crane 1993, 9.

57 Bibi, 1996, I., 272.

58 Duggan 2008, 338.

59 Redford 2011, 268, the footnote cited, No. 22 on page 275 reads: "*Ibn Bibi, El-Evāmirü'l-'Alā'iyye, pp. 253-254*", i.e. the author is citing the same passage as is given above from the same source: İbn Bibi, El-Evâmirü'l-'Alaiyye fi'l-Umuri'l-Ala'iyye (Tıpkıbasım). Hazırlayan. Adnan Sadık Erzi. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1956, 254.

60 Bibi 1996, I., 88.

61 Bibi 1996, I., 99.

62 Bibi 1996, I., 391.

Ibn Bibi had earlier also made reference to the talented painters who were summoned by Sultan 'Ala' al-Dīn Keykubat I., in respect to the work carried out at 'Alâ'iya-Alanya after Kir Vart had surrendered the city:

و فرمان داد با بنّایان ماهر و عمله شاطر شیاطن فطنت و رسّامان جرب دست بحکم یَعْمَلُونَ لَهُ مَا یَشَاءُ مِنْ مَحَارِیبَ وَتَمَاثِیلَ[63] درکار شروع نمودند[64]

Sanatkâr yapı ustalarıyla, ileri görüşlü işçiler ve eli yatkın ressâmlarla emretti "O ne dilerse mabedler, heykeller yaparlardı" hükmünü yerine getirmeye giriştiler[65].

> *"Sultan'ın fermanı üzerine mahir yapı ustaları, çalışkan ve çevik işçiler, eli uz(un) ressamlar, "O ne dilerse, mābedler, heykeller yaparlardı" hükmünü gerçekleştirmeye başladılar[66]".*
>
> *"Upon that the Sultan gave orders for skilled builders, hard-working and strong workmen, and talented painters, 'Whatever he wishes, they fashion, temples and statues (meaning in the manner of the Prophet Süleyman-Solomon[67], as Sultan 'Ala' al-Dīn Keykubat I (r. 1220-37) was known as "The Second Sulaymān,[68]")' starting to realise the Sultan's (Süleyman's) wish".*

For the past quarter of a century readers of Howard Crane's important article have read *expert draughtsmen* when they should have read *master painters*, the translation would seem logical to the reader, although the translation is wrong, and so from Howard Crane's text the idea that there was at this time a group of master painters employed as a matter of course for the painting of the exterior of Seljuk architecture, who were summoned by the sultan, who were responsible for painted architecture, at 'Alâ'iya-Alanya, as at Konya, as elsewhere, would not have occurred to the reader. This is likewise the case for readers of Scott Redford's chapter in the book entitled, *Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange, of 2011. Ibn Bibi's text reads, "*mahir ressâmlar*" *mahir* from the Arabic meaning, expert or skilful, *ressâmlar* from the Arabic, meaning, painters, and these words certainly read and mean, ***master painters***, the word "*ressâmlar*" meaning neither *draftsmen* as stated by Howard Crane in 1993, nor in this case *designers* as stated by Scott Redford in 2011. For example, Rūmi's *murid*, Aynu'd-Devle, is described in contemporary accounts as being both a "*ressām*" and, a *nakkāş/naqqāsh,* meaning he was both a painter and a designer-master of drawing[69], and this distinction drawn at that time between painter and designer, between paint-colour and ink drawing, seems to have been made explicit at times through the use of this terminology[70], although later they were understood as being synonyms[71]. This same term, *mâhir ressâmlar – mahir ressamlar,* remains in use in publications today[72]. *rassāmān* is a some-

63 Kur'an-ı Kerim 34/13 (Sebe' Suresi).

64 İbn Bibi, El-Evâmirü'l-'Alâ'iyye fi'l-Umûri'l-'Alâ'iyye (Tıpkıbasım). Hazırlayan. Adnan Sadık Erzi. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1956, 249.

65 Çeviri: Mahmut Demir & Meyrem Beyazal.

66 Bibi 1996, I., 267.

67 Qu'ran: Saba', 34. 13, "*They made for him what he willed of palaces, statues,…*".

68 Bibi 1996, 232, 238, n. 596.

69 "In that era there was a painter who was a second Manes when it came to portrait painting (sūratgarī) and the depiction of beings endowed with form (tasvīr-e mosavvarat). He used to say: 'In his art Manes would be at a loss (forū mānī) before our drawing'. And he was called 'Eyn al-Dowla-ye Rūm-ı". O'Kane 2002, 292-293; drawing portraits in ink.

70 "It is transmitted that Kālūyān-e Naqqāsh and 'Eyn al-Dowla were both Greek painters and they were unrivalled in this art and in making pictures". O'Kane 2002, 382, "this art", being that of drawing, as distinct from that of making pictures-painting.

71 ʿAynu'd-Devle, "Rūm milletinden ve Ḳonya'nıň **māhir naḳḳāş**larından idi. O vaḳitler insān resmi yapanlara da **naḳḳāş** deniliyordu. Demek ki ʿAynu'd-Devle **hem naḳḳāş, hem ressām** idi" İpek 2017, 115.

72 "Şu hâlde o mahir ressamlar da dâhil tabiattaki bütün güzel manzaraları yaratıp resmeden Allah, bütün eksik-

what rarer word but is used to mean artists-painters[73].

Paintwork appears also to have been the case for the exterior of the Karatay han in 1277, as recorded by Kadı Muhy id Dīn ibn 'Abdü'z-Zair, his description, indicating that the entire exterior of the building had a surfacing of shiny red paintwork[74], not the different colours of the stone blocks that meet the eye of the traveller today, etc. And there is also the later 19th c. record of this in the literature, such as Léon de Laborde's 1825 remarks concerning the remaining Seljuk paintwork on the Seljuk fortification walls of Konya[75], and Charles Fellows' 1838 remark concerning the paintwork on the Seljuk re-used buildings on the Belkis-Aspendos Acropolis, "***painted with red patterns in a rude style***[76]".

Figs. 1-2. Examples of a horizontal "zig-zag" design[77] repeat painted on the plaster surfacing over the rubble and masonry interior wall of the Seljuk Palace in the inner citadel of Alanya c. 1228. (Photos, D. M. Demir, 2015). Probably the design described by Charles Fellows as, "*painted with red patterns in a rude style*" on the acropolis at Belkiz-Aspendos.

liklerden münezzehtir". Hatip 2009, 187, "En mahir bir ressamdan, ömeksiz olarak zihninden mesela bin insan resmini çizmesi istense ve bu resimlerinin hiçbirinin diğerine benzememesi şart koşulsa, bu ressam belli bir sayıdan sonra zihnindeki farklı ihtimal ve alternatifleri tüketecek ve artık çizdiği resimleri gerideki resimlerden birine benzetmek zorunda kalacaktır" İdem. 415. "Deneme türünün bu yalın, gösterişsiz ama usta kalemi birkaç fırça darbesiyle önümüzde bir manzarayı canlan-dıran mâhir ressamlar gibi canlı hayat tabloları sunuyor bize" Aymaz 2004, 105.

73 The word Рассомон = [Rassāmān] (художники), Rassomon = [Rassāmān] = khudozhniki *Rassāmān* is the equivalent of *khudozhniki* the Russian word meaning artists-painters (Rustamshoevich 2018, 17).

74 "*Shiny marble-like red stone*" Sümer 1985, 80. He mistook the shiny red colour of the applied surfacing for the colour of the stone-work itself.

75 For references to this, Laborde 1837, 117, and comments, Duggan 2008, 337.

76 Fellows 1852, 148.

77 Duggan 2019a.

Fig. 3. Plaster and paintwork (white lime-wash and red painted masoning) over the Seljuk 1237-1240 false buttress applied to the Roman facade of the Seljuk converted palace of Belkis, at Aspendos, Antalya. The visible red outlining of the joints on a background of lime plaster, over the conglomerate blocks of the façade, is likewise Seljuk paintwork (Photo, Author, 1993)

Fig. 4. Seljuk 13th c. lime plaster surfacing and red painted masoning over surface of the middle wall of the Alara fortress, Antalya (Photo, Author, 2007)

Fig. 5. Detail of the façade of the Seljuk Belkiz palace, c. 1240, at Aspendos, with a surviving rectangle of horizontal zigzag paintwork over the window, and traces of red paint outlining the Roman blocks in a masoning pattern, remaining *in-situ,* from the formerly completely plastered and painted Seljuk palace facade (Photo, Author, 1993)

Figs. 6, 7. Traces of Seljuk surfacing and paint-work remaining in protected inner areas of carving on the façade of the portal of Evdir han, Antalya, and detail (Photo, T. Kahya, 2007)

Figs. 8, 9. Details of the portal of Susuz han in 2015, carrying clear evidence of the layer of slaked lime surfacing applied to the carved limestone blocks and traces of colour. (Photo S. Erdoğan 2015)

The record of plasterwork surfacing remaining on city and fortification walls, as well as over the stone walls of mosques and houses, is recorded in drawings and paintings and in travellers accounts and in 19th c. photographs, while the resurfacing of the city walls (*badana*[78]) and the

[78] Boynueğri Mehmed Paşa, 1656 "Bu tarihte Venedik donanması Çanakkale Boğazı'nı kapatmış, Bozcaada, Limni ve Semadirek adalarını da işgal etmişti. Mehmed Paşa'nın ilk işi bazı devlet memuriyetlerine kendi adamlarını getirmek oldu. Yakın adamlarından Saçbağı Mehmed Paşa'yı başdefterdarlığa getirirken kendisinin vezîriâzam olmasını sağlayan Hocazâde Mesud Efendi'ye ve Kadızâdeliler'e sırt çevirdi. Venedik tehlikesine karşı başlıca icraatı, düşman donanmasının Çanakkale Boğazı'nı geçerek İstanbul'a gelmesi ihtimaline karşı İstanbul surlarının deniz tarafındakilerini sağlam ve bakımlı göstermek için badanalatmak oldu". Boynueğri Mehmed Paşa, müellif, Abdülkadir Özcan, TDV Islam Ansiklopedisi, 6 cilt, Ist. 1992, s. 316, meaning in the 17th c., an action taken against the danger presented by the Venetian fleet was to limewash the walls of the city facing the sea, in order to show that the walls of the city were intact and well-looked after, in case the enemy fleet would come from the Dardanelles to Istanbul and threaten the city.

wages and staff employed for this work are recorded into the 19th c. in Ottoman documents[79], show this practice of painted architecture remained the tradition into the 19th c. Plastered and painted, or lime washed and painted over the masonry, coloured surfacing was a feature of Medieval Islamic stone architecture in Rūm Seljuk territory[80], as elsewhere. This was likewise the case for the contemporary Christian architecture[81], where, likewise, masonry, brickwork and rubble walls were plastered over, and upon which designs were incised and these walls were painted and these incised designs were painted over in a strongly contrasting colour. One only needs to look at the record of the exterior of the church, then mosque and now museum of Hagia Sophia, an exterior which has been lime plastered and painted for about 1500 years[82]. It was not therefore a matter of *Brick versus Stone,* as in the title given to this chapter*,* but rather, *Brick and glazed brick versus stone, carved stone, lime-plastered and painted*.

What is of a particular interest in this context of the Medieval painted architecture in Anatolia is the 12th-13th c. Orthodox Alakent Church at Myra, (Demre, Turkey), which, like those surviving if fragmentary published examples in the Balkans, carries, not just the incised in the surfacing masonry pattern under the 12th c. whitewash over the facade, with this incised masonry design painted in red (Fig. 10), but, that the relieving arch above the lintel on the west façade, "*made of blocks of stone was plastered, and a faux-brick arch was drawn on it with a pointed tool. The faux bricks were painted in red and white alternately (Fig. 35)*[83]"; and that, "*the bricks constituting the dogtooth eave of the pediment above the doorway were also plastered, painted with whitewash, and given a border with red paint (Fig. 36)*[84]". while an adjacent 12th-13th c., tomb, "*On its plastered eastern front facade, the plaster was engraved along the arch with courses imitating the rows of bricks, painted alternately in red and blue (Fig. 6)*[85]". It can be understood from this archaeological evidence, preserved because the church was largely buried in alluvial silt from the end of the 13th c. until excavated a decade ago, that a constructional mate-

---

79 The responsibility for renewing the lime plaster work, as well as repairing any damage to the masonry of the city walls and the citadel, belonged to the *divarci* and his workers. For the archive record of this in the 19th c. including payments made in respect to Antalya's city walls, see Moğol 1997, p. 123-4. Documented repairs in: 1815, 1820-21, 1825-1826, 1826-27, 1835-36, idem. 126-128.

80 Duggan 2008, passim.

81 See for examples: Akyürek 2017, 86-88, and references therein dating from 2000, 2004, 2010, fn. 39-41, 112, Figs 31-36, Drawing 12.

82 The 944 mosaic over the south-west entrance of the presentation of the church by Emperor Justinian, indicates the exterior of the church was most probably coloured in blue and yellow, with white framing detailing, in the 10th c. if not before. Following the Ottoman conquest and its conversion into a mosque, Melchior Lorichs's 1559 panorama of Constantinople records the exterior of the mosque covered in a pinkish red surfacing, together with sections of the city walls, https://jsah.ucpress.edu/content/69/1/62.figures-only
The exterior is recorded together with the minarets in 1574 as coloured in a pinkish red, the butresses smooth, clearly carry surfacing, https://trinitycollegelibrarycambridge.wordpress.com/2015/12/11/views-of-constantinople-the-freshfield-album-online/ It is recorded with pink minarets and a white limewash in a watercolour of c. 1760, an adjacent house has a yellow painted facade, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O139795/haghia-sophia-aya-sofia-with-watercolour-unknown/ It is recorded in Gaspare Fossati's print of 1852, http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O514635/aya-sofia-constantinople-print-fossati-gaspare/ as in an Illustrated London News engraving from 1853, and for the 1857 photographed appearance, with painted thin red bands around the facade work dating from the Fossati restoration of 1847-1849, https://www.reddit.com/r/Turkey/comments/ 7a9r32/st_sophia_hagia_sophia_from_the_hypodrome_sic/ See also Arthur Henderson's watercolour from the 1890's-1905: http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1009033/untitled-watercolour-henderson-arthur-edward/ and Marius Bauer's watercolour of 1894, https://www.christies.com/lotfinder/Lot/marius-bauer-the-hague-1867-1932-amsterdam-5741260-details.aspx

83 Akyürek 2017, 86-87.

84 Akyürek 2017, 87.

85 Çömezoğlu Uzbek 2017, 213.

rial such as stone, masonry, brick-work or rubble, was then covered over with plaster, and the plaster was painted, at times incised, not only in a block stone pattern-masoning, but also at times in a brick pattern, over either actual brick, or stone, and then was painted; and although in constructional terms the relieving arch in the west façade was constructed of stone, it appeared to the observer in the 13th c. as if it were in fact made of two colours of brick; while fired bricks forming the dogtooth eave were themselves plastered over and then painted in white. In other words, where today we see bare stone masonry, rubble walls and brickwork, this was not the appearance of this architecture, either Islamic or Christian, when these buildings were completed in 12th and 13th c. Anatolia.

Fig. 10. 12th c. traces of the red painted masoning design on whitewash over the plastered west facade of the Alakent Church at Myra (Photo Author, 2016)

What we see today is simply the consequence of the lack of the maintenance of their finished exterior appearance, the centuries, damp, erosion and at times ill-informed "restoration" work. A traditional 15th c. western tempera or oil painting on panel faces the same problem as the Seljuk architecture of Anatolia. The problem is that the last touches to the last layer of the painting made by the artist, those that completed the painting, the finishing touches, are the first to be lost from the surface, when the painting was cleaned-scrubbed and the surface became worn or abraded. Likewise, the plaster, paintwork, and surfacing applied to the surface of 13th c. Anatolian stone architecture, and the work that completed, that "finished" the building, are the first to be lost from the architecture, and today, except under certain exceptional circumstances, due to weathering over 800 years and recent "cleaning" activity, only traces of this finishing work remains, and hence the entirely false impression that all the decoration was concentrated on the carved stone portal as has been repeatedly remarked upon by the author of this chapter, when both it and the walls were originally covered in colour, the walls, exterior and interior were painted with "acerage" of powerful repeat designs.

It is most unfortunate that the author was unaware of, or chose not to address this matter of architectural paintwork in his 1994 volume on Islamic Architecture reprinted in 2000, nor in this chapter published in 2017, as these publications most unfortunately serve to reinforce in

the minds of students the misconception that bare stonework was a feature of Seljuk architecture in Anatolia, yet the recorded evidence of this architectural practice of painting the exterior of stone buildings in Seljuk territory dates back to the 11th c. and evidence of it had been noted by travellers and archaeologists such as Léon de Laborde, Charles Fellows, Seton Lloyd and David Storm Rice, and, in places, it remains *in-situ* today and can be seen[86]. So although Robert Hillenbrand writes: "*The architecture of the Seljuqs of Rum is overwhelmingly, though not exclusively, of stone, with a steady emphasis on the use of dressed stone for surfaces. This stone is given a high degree of finish*[87]*",* because the stone carving and the masonry blocks were themselves covered by lime plaster and painted in colours, the appearance of 13th c. Seljuk architecture in Anatolia was certainly rather different from the architecture of 12th c. Seljuk Iran and this difference cannot be defined through the reduction of difference to the different constructional material employed, as the stone employed in Rūm Seljuk architecture was not usually visible as stone-work, but was painted, over a lime-wash or a lime plaster applied to the stone or rubble stone and plaster surface, often in bold coloured designs, or in a single polished shining colour. In consequence of the evidence for the use of painted decoration over the stonework of Rūm Seljuk architecture the conclusions reached by Robert Hillenbrand, "*That larger surface area compelled Iranian architects to plan their decorative ensembles on a larger scale than those of their Anatolian colleagues, and this in turn favoured the intensive development of articulating schemes that were essentially architectonic. Such articulation enlivened entire facades in a way that dense, small-scale, carved ornament could never achieve (see Figure 4.30). In short, the differences between Anatolian and Iranian Seljuq architecture boil down to differences in scale, whether in form, structure, or even decoration. And it was the use of brick rather than stone as the basic building material that underpinned all these differences*[88]", are unfortunately unsound conclusions.

The author also writes, "*Since so much of Byzantine architecture in Anatolia, especially in the centuries after Justinian, was of brick, there was no inherent local reason for the choice of stone*[89]". This was not in fact the case[90], in fact, it was the reverse, there are many examples of Christian stone architecture in Central Anatolia constructed between the 6th and the 11th centuries, many additions and renovations to Orthodox Churches employed stone and rubble stone,

---

86 Such work is also recorded as a metaphor in works of literature: "Binanın içini dışını süsleyecek bir nakkaşa ihtiyaç duyulur, nakkaş binanın içini dışını süsleyip şekil verir" İsmail Hakkı Bursevi (1652-1725).

87 Hillenbrand 2017, 109.

88 Hillenbrand 2017, 136.

89 Hillenbrand 2017, 109.

90 The same applies to another of the author's statement concerning Anatolia: "Once built, the caravanserais could serve many purposes, military and civil as well as mercantile. **But it seems inherently unlikely that they were built to encourage internal trade or east west trade, let alone trade with the Byzantines. Hence, presumably, the striking absence of Saljuq caravanserais in western or eastern Anatolia, or to north and south of the major arterial road**" Hillenbrand 2000, 249-250. Concerning this alleged distribution of Seljuk hans, it is worthwhile noting in respect to western Anatolia, the line of Seljuk hans that runs from the border of Roman-Byzantine territory eastwards from Ak Han and the Kara-Sungar Han by Denizli, via Çardak han to Pınarbaşı Han by Eğridir and thence east, north or south; as also the Abacılar and Çandır Hans on the Çankırı – Ankara route; as likewise in Eastern Anatolia the hans constructed at Iğdir, Tercan etc. It should be noted there is simply no "absence of Saljuq caravanserais in western or eastern Anatolia", and international "east west trade" was doubtless facilitated through the construction of hans extending from Iğdir westwards across Seljuk territory to Ak Han in the west. K. Erdmann's, Das Anatolische Karavansaray des 13. jahrhunderts, Berlin, 1961, from half a century ago does of course record hans such as Çardak, Ak Han etc., and it does in fact contains a "Karte der rumseldschukischen Karavansarays" indicating their distribution across Anatolia, at the end of the first volume, and this work is in fact, a work listed in the bibliography in Islamic Architecture, Hillenbrand 2000, 606, and is cited in this chapter, fn. 21-24.

and stone churches and chapels were constructed[91], often in part from *spolia*, while brick, if it was employed at all, was usually only for decorative, rather than structural purposes, and may not even have been visible as being brickwork in the 13th c., as is noted above[92]. As Robert G. Ousterhout wrote in 2005: "*brick, which was the building material of preference in Constantinople and along the west coast of Anatolia*[93]*, rarely occurs in central Anatolia construction…It was possible to produce brick in central Anatolia, and the clay deposits along the Kızıl Irmak continue to be exploited for pottery production. Nevertheless, brick did not figure prominently in the architecture of the region. When brick does appear, it is in limited quantities, and it was almost always used sparingly as a facing material*[94]*.* This matter had earlier been noted, for example by J. M. Rogers in 1969, "*Byzantine architecture in large parts of Anatolia was built in squared stone, in contrast to the Metropolis where brick was more frequent*.[95]", and it can be noted that Jelal-ad Dīn Rūmi in Konya recommended the employment of the skilled Rumi-Orthodox for building work[96]. Consequently, there was in fact a sound *inherent local reason* for the choice of stone for Seljuk architecture in Anatolia, it was the local tradition for building construction, not brick, as was the case in Iran, and, as has been repeatedly noted for Rūm Seljuk constructions in stone in Anatolia, there was within this architectural tradition the re-use of Roman stone blocks and Late Antique stone blocks, some carrying relief carving, as well as newly quarried 12th and 13th c. limestone blocks, although the marble employed seems always to be re-cut *spolia*. The author also writes, "*And stucco, the preferred medium for the sculptural urges of Iranian craftsmen charged with decorating architecture, was too fragile a medium to be suitable for use on external facades*[97]". But such seems not to have been the case for some Rūm Seljuk architecture in Anatolia where stucco was employed on exterior facades, stucco sculpture in a sheltered area of the city walls of Konya[98], and applied to the 10 meters of Seljuk relief carving of 9 animals, (lions, felines and a deer) on the exterior facade of the c. 1240 Belkis-Aspendos palace, where the re-carved Roman blocks today carry the silhouette animal shapes that have been pecked, this pecking of the stone surface to secure applied stucco to the surface of the re-carved stone, stucco that was carved and then doubtless painted[99].

Although Robert Hillenbrand writes, "*That said, in many Rum Seljuq monuments, the masons create a variegated surface by the use of spolia,…*[100]", it can certainly be wondered if the masons' intention through the use of this spolia was to *create a variegated surface*. This because it can be noted in respect to the stone carvings-relief sculptures, both *spolia* from the antique and from later Christian structures, as well as contemporary 13th c. Seljuk work, that were

91 The Seljuk 13th c. conversion of churches to mosques was rare, but occurred after the conquest of Sinope in 1214.

92 The 10th -11th c. Üçayak Church in Kırşehir Province is one of the few in Central Anatolia to have been constructed almost entirely of brick and was imitative of standard Constantinople technique in appearance, but not in workshop practice, see Ousterhout 2005, 69.

93 Neither Constantinople nor the west coast of Anatolia were part of Seljuk territory in the 12th and 13th centuries to provide any local tradition of brick construction.

94 Ousterhout 2005, 68-69.

95 Rogers 1969, 154, fn. 44. Oddly this 1969 review of Claude Cahen's *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, is cited in fn. 3, 7 and 8, of this 2017 chapter.

96 O'Kane, 2002, 502, "Likewise it is a well known story that one day Shayk –'Salāh al-Dīn happened to hire Turkish laborers to do building work in his garden. Mowlānā said: 'Effendi'- that is to say lord –'Salāh al-Dīn, when it is time for building, one must engage Greek laborers and when it is time for destroying something, Turkish hirelings'".

97 Hillenbrand 2017, 135.

98 Duggan 2008, 337-338.

99 Duggan 2011, 148-152, Figs. 1, 3-15.

100 Hillenbrand 2017, 112.

set into the walls of Seljuk buildings and fortifications in Anatolia, not least in the rebuilding and renovations undertaken on city walls and citadels in the 1220's at Konya, Kayseri, Sivas, Antalya, Afyon, Niğde and Beyşehir, (use of this *spolia,* which has been the subject of much published theorising as to the relationship between the Rūm Seljuks and the antique and the Romans-New Romans (aka Byzantines)[101]); that it can be understood that this Rūm Seljuk practice, the use and the re-use of this sculpted relief-work and sculpture, found its religious-cultural precedent and the justification for this practice - at the court of the ruling Abbasid Caliphs in Bagdad. This was because in the period before it became the practice in Rūm Seljuk territory in Anatolia, Benjamin of Tudela had recorded in the 6th decade of the 12th c. in Bagdad, "*Within the domains of the palace of the Caliph there are great buildings of marble and columns of silver and gold, **and carvings upon rare stones are fixed in the walls**[102]".* It can be noted in this respect that "*According to Ebn al-Faqih (p. 243), the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Moktafi be'llāh* (902 - 908) *ordered the transfer of the lion to Baghdad, but his command was blocked by the people of Hamadān, who did not wish to lose the talisman of their city*[103]"; indicating the collection and display of rare stones, including those of ancient statues of lions, like the *Sang-e Shir* of Hamadān was underway at the start of the 10th c. This was the practice of the Abbasid Caliphs. The Caliph al-Nasir had in 1221 completed major work on the fortifications of Bagdad, and included in this work were the pair of lion reliefs on either side of the entrance of al-Bab al-Wastani[104], and the pair of lion reliefs on either side of the Bab al-Hulba-Talisman Gate, and it was probably this Caliphal example that was echoed in the fortification work undertaken in Seljuk territory in 1221-1222, to fix in the walls examples of rare stone carving and carved representation of the lion, emblem of the Abassids, a caliphal practice, which Rūm Seljuk sultans, as others[105], reflected in their re-use of past sculptural remains, with the appropriate re-carving of them[106], as well as Seljuk 13th c. carved stone relief-work, - these *rare stones* fixed in the walls of citadel and city wall, as also into the walls of mosques and madrasa, etc. - thereby signifying their allegiance to the legitimising

---

101 S. Redford, "The Seljuqs of Rum and the antique" 148–156, Muqarnas X 1993, passim. Characterised by S. Yalman, "Scott Redford—the authority on Seljuk spolia (with an essay in the present volume)—has discussed the walls of Konya in numerous publications. Previously, he explained the Seljuk use of spolia as reflective of a "mythic context" that includes "the non-Islamic antiquity of Anatolia" as well as the Perso-Islamic tradition. More recently, he has underlined how both were linked "to an implicit claim to Byzantium" Yalman 2018, 211-212. See also Bockholt 2017, 25-26, "In regard to the imagery program of symbolic power applied by sultan ʿAlaʾ al-Din Kayqubad I, Redford supposes the aspect of istiqbāl (official welcoming) of guests (besides ceremonies of triumph and largess) as a reason for the special decoration of the walls (Redford, "Seljuks" 154). The depiction of a world of myth and legend found on these walls – eagles, lions, dragons, the direct allusion to figures from the Book of Kings, the usage of spolia with talismanic quality – **all these elements may lead to the assumption that the Seljuk sultans (at least 'Ala' al-Din Kayqubad I and his father 'Izz al-Din Kaykavus I) placed themselves in a mythic context in order to make sense of traditions as different as the pre-Islamic antiquity of Anatolia, elements from the Persian past (e.g. the Book of Kings), and the Islamic tradition of the Prophet and the Koran.** Many elements coming from these traditions were carved into stone and thereby inserted into "a visual universe" (Redford, "Seljuks" 154), which heavily expanded the field of symbolic reference of the Seljuk rulers. This process came to an end when the Seljuks were replaced by other Turkish dynasties, **who drew less on Iranian myths than on Anatolian Turkish epics**" (my emphasis).

102 Adler 1907, 36.

103 Ali Mousavi and EIr, "HAMADĀN vii. MONUMENTS". *Encyclopædia Iranica* XI/6 pp. 612-615, available online at http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hamadan-vii (accessed June 2019).

104 Al-Shawi 2004, 4. "Removing the upper layer formed on the surface of the original bricks by cleaning them with abrasive materials, to look like the new ones. This is especially apparent on the relief of the two lions flanking the Southwestern Door, as well as several other parts, outside and inside the Central Tower".

105 Likewise the two late Hittite re-used stone lions from the gate of Germanica Mar'ash, that are today in the İstanbul Archaeological Museum.

106 Duggan 2019b, 139.

authority for their rule, through copying the longstanding practice of the Abbasid Caliphs, and a practice that was also copied by Rūm Seljuk Emirs and others in their construction activities in the 13th c., together with the repeated display of the emblem of the Abbasisds, the lion[107]. It seems evident that this re-use of sculptural material, obtained from a different religious-cultural construct, Pagan or Christian and displayed in public, would need to conform to the requirements of the religious-cultural construct within which it was re-employed and would need for it to be reinterpreted, if not modified through re-carving[108], given a relevant new meaning or interpretation within this different religious-cultural construct in which it was re-employed, and this new meaning was in part at least, the fact that this was the practice of the Abbasid Caliphs, who themselves legitimised Rūm Seljuk rule. Doubtless this practice was understood at the time, as subsequently, by various people of various faiths in various ways, including that it served some talismanic-protective function. The 12th c. notice by Benjamin of Tudela of record of this practice, concerning this matter of the place and reason for the use of ancient *spolia* in works constructed by Muslims, places some recent 20th – 21st c. scholarship on this matter of *spolia* in a somewhat strange light, but, perhaps, not a light so strange as that cast by the author of this chapter, concerning the unfinished carved relief panels on either side of the entrance to the 1265 Çifte Minareli (Hatuniye) Madrasa in Erzurum. We read:

> *"One must concede that the application of this figural or animal sculpture, which as already noted* ***flies in the face of well-established Islamic custom*** *(sic.)[109], was not always well-judged and indeed, as the facade of the Çifte (sic.) Madrasa in Erzurum* ***(among many other examples) shows with its bulky so-called 'Tree of Life', could be downright crass***[110]*".*

For a historian of Islamic architecture and art to employ the expression, *downright crass*, meaning, *straightforwardly*[111] offensive in manner or style, *coarse, stupid, unrefined*[112], concerning the large 13th c. relief carvings in panels carved on either side of the entrance portal of the madrasa with two minarets in Erzurum, this the author writes, (*among many other examples*) of the same, is, to say the least, unexpected. This use of the expression "*downright crass*" is unique within the corpus of published scholarly works concerning 13th c. Anatolian relief sculptures of figural or animal subjects on Islamic buildings.

---

107 In respect to the lions depicted on the Rūm Seljuk Sultan's own seal, Duggan 2007, 317-318. Likewise, a black umbrella was carried over the Caliph; "*its handle is of gold and on the top is a jade lion with a golden* (crescent) *moon on its back, shining like a star and visible from afar off*". Ju-Kua 1911, 135; and there were lions on the black flag of the Abbasids.

108 Op. cit. fn. 103.

109 It does not fly "*in the face of well-established Islamic custom*". On the matter of figural sculpture, there is a vast range of recorded and a lesser number of surviving sculptural examples, carved and cast in relief and in both two and three dimensions, examples dating from the 7th through the 14th centuries (e.g. Duggan 2012, passim), it was not only customary, but was recorded at times by Muslims as a great achievement, and, as is noted above, the Rūm Seljuks were in this matter simply following the example that was provided by the Abbasid Caliphs in Bagdad. What is in fact a well-established custom is the practice of western trained art historians to deny the figural art of the Islamic world on the basis of Islamic religious texts concerned with idolatry, while western museums and collections are filled with examples of Islamic figural art in two and three dimensions, which is a decidedly odd, if not a somewhat perverse custom of western scholarly writing about figurative Islamic art, with unfortunately few exceptions, the idea that a Muslim in the past or in the present is unable to distinguish between a work of figurative art, a painting, drawing or sculpture, and an idol to which prayers are made, is of course an insult to the intention niyet and intelligence of the believing Muslim.

110 Hillenbrand 2017, 134.

111 S.O.D.[3] s.v. "downright" Middle English, Direct, straightforwardly, plain and directly (sometimes to bluntness).

112 S.O.D.[3] s.v. "crass" 1545, 1. Coarse, gross, dense, thick, Now rare. 2. Grossly dull or stupid; dense, unrefined (rare) 1861, crass ignorance 1859, crass minds.

It is the case that this same expression of personal taste does occur in some modern writing, Victor Danner in (1988) 2005, wrote in respect to Pagan Arab idolatry: "*True their paganism was utterly uninspiring and even downright crass in its visual representation of their idols*.[113]" While the word *crass*, was employed in 2002 in the translation of Yves Porter's text by David Radzinowicz, in respect to restoration work on the Moghul mid-16th c. Sabz Burj mausoleum in Delhi, "*The dome of this tomb, which is of an irregular octagonal plan (four large sides and four small), is today covered in cobalt blue tiles, although this crass choice of color (they were surely originally turquoise) is due to recent restoration.*[114]"; and Robert Irwin in *The Arabian Nights, A Companion*, 1994, also employed the word, "*Such crass orientalist theorizing betrays an ignorance of the achievements of Islamic art, which is only balanced by a corresponding unfamiliarity with the characteristics of Islamic literature.*[115]" And one may expect to read this expression employed by some critics writing todays' art and architectural criticism, headlines such as: "*Chennai Loyola College Anti Hindu Art Expo Was Downright Crass*[116]", and, "*from the sublime - to the downright crass*[117]". But, for a scholar of Islamic art and architecture to express, through the use of quotation marks around the description he employs of these relief carvings, together with the expression, '*so-called*,' - a "*so-called 'Tree of Life'*" - indicating to the reader that the actual subject of this relief carving is probably not fully understood, or is inaccurately named, and then, to dismiss this pair of representations of something, but of what today is not fully understood as being "*downright crass*" is doubtless a striking expression of personal opinion concerning the manner of representation of a subject in relief carving, but the subject of which, the author himself indicates, is not fully understood[118]. If the subject represented is not fully understood, how can the style/manner of its representation be characterised as being appropriate or inappropriate, or even, as here stated in an expression of individual judgement and personal taste, *downright crass*? This not least, for the simple reason that the relief carving to the left of the doorway remains today incomplete, that is, the stone carving itself is clearly unfinished, together with areas unfinished of the relief in the panel to the right of the entrance. It is the case that without the discovery through excavation of Rūm Seljuk stone figural or animal sculptures in a near perfect condition, retaining both the originally applied lime plaster layers of surfacing and the paintwork, and any areas of painted applied stucco, as these works of sculpture were set within the plastered and painted setting of walls (as is noted above), it seems that any comment

113 Danner 2005, 45.

114 DeGeorge-Porter 2002, 255.

115 Irwin 1994, 78.

116 http://mesotheliomabook.club/about-loyola-college/chennai-loyola-college-anti-hindu-art-expo-was-downright-crass.html

117 http://www.artloversnewyork.com/zine/the-bomb/2013/12/27/from-the-sublime-to-the-downright-crass/

118 A problem is in the imprecision in the use of the term, as with the term itself, as the term "tree of life" has been applied in a great variety of contexts for which there is no clear evidence that such an idea of a sacred tree was present and, when it was, that it was represented in a particular manner with the intent to convey an aspect of this varied concept. Further, the pair of dragons at the base of this relief can be related in form to similar examples on cast metal candlesticks-şamdan of dragons, but these however date from the 14th -15th c. as in the İstanbul Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi, İnv. No. 4017, in the Hoca Ahmed Yesevi Turbe, Kazakhstan, and a 15th c. example in the David Collection Inv. no. 38/1982, examples, but from a somewhat different cultural context. One does not expect to find reliefs of "tree of life"- sacred trees depicted on either side of the largest Seljuk 13th c. madrasa's entrance, a design being somewhat unrelated to the function of a madrasa. The dragons may relate in some way to the Jinn, there is a crescent moon, four palm-like branches to either side, the second frond from the foot with outward facing birds towards their ends, the other six perhaps with unfinished carving, looking like "fruits", surmounted by a double headed bird of prey, beaks open, within a framing pointed arch. It can be noted that the double headed bird of prey within the arch has the appearance from a distance of a bearded cowelled face, intentional or not is not known. What this combination of elements in these reliefs embodied in the 13th c. is unclear, but possibly the represent the armorial of the patron of the construction.

concerning the coarseness or otherwise of the appearance of the surviving Rūm Seljuk stone figural or animal sculpture today, after the passage of 800 years of temperature changes and weathering, now that the carved raw stone is almost entirely stripped of its applied filling and surfacing, stripped of its 13th c. Seljuk finish, would seem entirely inappropriate[119]. It would have been useful for the author to have made some effort to understand as far as possible both the finished appearance, and at least some of the meaning that was conveyed by a work when completed, within its context, in respect to Rūm Seljuk figural relief sculpture, (as also Rūm Seljuk architecture), as what remains visible today was certainly not its appearance in the 13th c., this, before employing in print such overtly loaded and judgmental expressions as *downright crass* to characterise *many examples* of Rūm Seljuk figural sculpture.

"***numerically important Christian minorities***"

The author also writes:

> *"The presence of* ***numerically important Christian minorities*** *– Greek Orthodox, Jacobites, Armenians and Georgians - all with their own artistic traditions that had very little to do with those of the Seljuq Turks, enriched the cultural mix with a crucial further dimension.* ***Seljuq Anatolian architecture is the medium in which these non-Muslim elements feature most prominently****. Motifs derived from Armenian architecture and book illumination have been identified in the sculpted portals of Divriği, while conversely Islamic muqarnas ornament is found in eleventh-century work at the Armenian capital of Ani, and at numerous sites thereafter. Some scholars have gone so far as to attribute some of the major buildings of Seljuq Anatolia, such as the portal of the Ince Minare Madrasa in Konya, to Armenian architects[120]" (My emphasis).*

Firstly, this passage unfortunately presents an entirely incorrect picture of the Christian populations ruled over by the *Saljūqiyān-e Rūm*, the Seljuks of Rūm, and by the other Muslim Turkish rulers in the *diyār ar-Rūm*, or, *bilad ar-Rūm*, meaning the territory of the Romans –Asia Minor-Anatolia, in the 12th and 13th centuries[121]. The Muslims, in ethnic terms largely, Turks, Iranians, Arabs, Kurds and Christian converts to Islam, formed a small minority in 13th c. Seljuk Anatolia, an even smaller minority in the 12th century. The vast majority of the urban populations of Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory of 12th and 13th c. Anatolia-(that of the Seljuks, Dānishmends, Mengudjaks) were Christians, the Christians in Seljuk Anatolia were certainly not *minorities*, as is stated by Robert Hillenbrand, Christians in fact formed the overwhelming majority of the popu-

---

119 Some possible idea of the expected finished appearance and of the colours employed may be gathered from surviving examples of Seljuk painted stucco reliefs and sculptures from 12th c. Iran, although one may perhaps expect a somewhat bolder use of colour in Seljuk Anatolia, perhaps approximating to the bold colour schemes employed in the mid-13th c. Varka wa Gulshah manuscript illuminations and the buildings therein depicted.
For colour, see for examples: Seljuk stucco figures en.wikipedia.org
https://www.christies.com/lotfinder/Lot/a-monumental-royal-seljuk-carved-stucco-panel-5358694-details.aspx
http://art.seattleartmuseum.org/objects/5829/relief-with-two-fighting-horsemen-star-medallion?ctx=d4f8b828-d63b-4a86-9b1a-1d2e7f3e306e&idx=21

120 Hillenbrand 2017, 106.

121 See for example, Heer 1961, 56. As also Nicephorus Gregoras's 14th c. Rhomäische Geschichte-Roman History, written on the period from 1204-1359 clearly records both in the work's title and elsewhere eg.: Gregoras I 214–215: ές δὲ ξυμφωνίαν ἤδη ἐληλυθότες οἱ Τοῦρκοι κλήρῳ διέλαχον πᾶσαν, ὁπόση τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἠγεμονίας ἐτύγχανε γῆ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν. "The Turks had come to an agreement and divided by lot all the Asian territories that belonged to the Roman empire" that Anatolia was known by all concerned, Latin, Roman, Arab and Turk, as Rūm-Roman territory, Romania, meaning the land of the Romans.

lation. The numerically largest populations being of rumi Orthodox[122] confession, followed by the Armenians, a fact which is recorded in the contemporary sources, such as: William of Rubruck in 1255, Marco Polo in 1270's, in the 1307 chronicle of Hetoum, as also in Marino Sanudo Torsello's, *Istoria*, of 1325-1333[123], and what is remarkable in their brief descriptions of the populations is the absence of record of the urban Muslim population. The vast majority of the population of Muslim ruled territory in Rūm were Christians with their established Christian cultures that had been developed and practiced for more than half a millennia at the time of the formation of Turkish ruled states in Rūm in the aftermath of 1071. Such a situation had not been the case in Iran since before c. 125 A.H., 743 A.D., by which date 10 percent of the Iranian population were Muslims and by the mid-9th c., c. 250 A.H/864 A.D., 80 percent of the Iranian populations were Muslim[124]. It would seem pertinent to have reminded the reader of this difference, given that this chapter focuses upon the comparison that is made between the Seljuk architecture of Iran, where the vast majority of the population of Iran had been Muslim for more than 200 years before the date of the Seljuk conquest in the mid-11th c., and the Seljuk architecture of Rūm, where only a small number, a small minority of the total population in Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory were Muslim by 1250. This, not least, because it concerns the relative size of buildings such as mosques and madrasas, and the sheer number of Islamic buildings constructed, hence both the number/proportion of the Muslim population and the longevity of its history within a place, region or realm does rather matter for the number and the size of buildings that were constructed. For example, the size of the Muslim population of the city of Isfahan, which is said to have had a population of about 150,000 Muslims in the 11th c.[125], meant that when the Great Mosque, Masjed-e Jāme'/Masjid-i-Jami, in the Seljuk capital of Isfahan was rebuilt under Seljuk rule after the fire of 1121, it was, and is, vast, more than three times the area of the Ala ad-Dīn Mosque in Konya, the prayer hall and courtyard of which only reached its current size in 1222, when the total population within the walls of the Rūm Seljuk capital city of Konya has been estimated as being around 35,000-50,000, of which, in all probability, amongst a larger population of Christians, (Rumi and Armenians) and some Jews, there may well have been less than 15,000-20,000 Muslims[126]. It does seem reasonable to expect that the size of the Muslim population in a city of about 150,000 Muslims, as compared to one of maybe 15,000-20,000 Muslims, will be reflected in the scale-size, as also in the number, of Islamic buildings that were constructed.

If the author had considered the relative size of the respective Muslim populations in respect to the size and number of Islamic buildings, he could hardly have penned lines such as the

---

122 In terms of language Greek speaking, in terms of ethnicity a population that included: Slavs, Mardanites (Arabs), Pechenec (Turks), Kurds, Bulgarians, a colony of Mauroi settled in S.W. Asia Minor in 10th c. For the 13th c. in the Empire of Trebizond, Arabs, Kurds, Mongols, Turks, including Cumans from 1230's, the cities of Erzincan-Erzerum were partly Kurdish, and there were some Arabs in western Anatolia, see, Shukurov 2012a, 72.

123 Hopf-Friedrich 1873, 143, "In Asia Minor, e ch' è maggior Paese, che non è la Spagna, délia quai abbiamo detto esser quatro Regni, la quai per la maggior parte è sottoposta a Turchi, **per il più li Popoli seguono il Ritto Greco e sono per il più Greci**" - in Asia Minor, and which is a major country, which is not (like) Spain, of which we have said to be four kingdoms, the majority are subjected to the Turks, **for the most part the people follow the Greek rite and are for the most part Greeks** (meaning Greek speakers).

124 Bulliet 1994, 43.

125 Bulliet 1994, 136.

126 Concerning the matter of rhetoric, the practice of numerical hyperbole in the contemporary written sources, the issue of the area that was actually inhabited within a walled city, in the absence todate of the excavation of any entire strata within any walled Rūm Seljuk city, and the problem of establishing some data to indicate a mean household population, see Duggan 2020, Respective Populations: Muslims and non-Muslims in Seljuk Rūm and Iran, forthcoming.

following, in respect to the size of the madrasas of Seljuk Anatolia as lagging *far behind those of the Maghrib or Iraq,* as both the Maghrib and Iraq had about a 90% Muslim population in the 13th c., while in Seljuk Anatolia the proportion of the Muslim urban population was most probably in the mid-13th c. somewhat less than 10%.:

> *"Not surprisingly, the cells are usually tiny, a scant three paces per side. But it is their paucity that is striking. Even the most splendid of all domed Anatolian Saljuq madrasas, that completed in Konya in 651/1253 by the vizier Jalalad-Din Qaratai, and bearing his name, has no more than a dozen cells. The most capacious madrasa of the period, on the other hand – the Çifte Minare in Erzurum, which at 35 m. by 48 m. is the largest Anatolian madrasa of the period – still has a mere nineteen cells on each of its two storeys* ***and therefore lags far behind the larger madrasas of the Maghrib or Iraq***[127]*".*

And,

> *"The two principal surviving pre-Mongol madrasas in the eastern Islamic world, namely Zuzan and Shah-i Mashhad,* ***are on a scale unmatched by any of the dozens of Anatolian madrasas built during the thirteenth century****. Nor does Seljuq Anatolia have any mosques, not even the great Artuqid domes of Mayyafariqin and Dunaysir,* ***whose raw dimensions challenge the great Seljuq mosques like Qazvin or Isfahan***[128]*".*

Remarks such as *lags far behind,* and, *are on a scale unmatched by any of the dozens of Anatolian madrasas built during the thirteenth century,* and*, challenge the great Seljuq mosques like Qazvin or Isfahan,* quoted above, indicate the author has quite failed to grasp a fundamental matter, the size of the respective Muslim populations of Seljuk Iran and Seljuk-Turkish ruled Rūm, unlike the Medieval patrons and architects of Islamic architecture in both Iran and Seljuk-Turkish Anatolia that form the subject of his chapter. To expect any Rūm Seljuk mosque to match the size of the Great Mosque of Isfahan, or that of Kazvin; to expect a Rūm Seljuk madrasa to match the size of the Bagdad Nizamiye, or of al-Mustansiriya, with for each of the four Sunni *madhhabs*, its 62 students, two professors and two assistant professors, a total of 248 students[129]*,* that opened in 631/1233; is to misunderstand the confessional environment within which these constructions took place. In the 11th c. the Caliphal city of Bagdad had an estimated largely Muslim population of between 1 million and 1,500,000[130], a city with a Muslim population at that time larger than the total urban population of Muslim ruled territory in Rūm in the 13th c., of which less than 10% were Muslim. This is unfortunately likewise the case when Andrew C. S. Peacock wondered in print in 2012:

> *"why the cities that the Seljuk used as their capitals, Konya and Kayseri, seem to have no major centre of orthodox, that is, Sunni instruction. There was no al-Azhar as in Cairo, Umayyad Mosque as in Damascus or Great Mosque as in Aleppo (rebuilt by Nūr al-Din in 1174).*[131]*"*

---

127 Hillenbrand 2000, 210.

128 Hillenbrand 2017, 121.

129 Tabbaa 2017, 315.

130 Polat 2019, 181, citing Ebu Bekir Ahmed ibn Ali ibn Thabit ibn Ahmed ibn Mehdi Al-Shafi`i. "*al-Duri estimates the population of Baghdad at 1 million in the 11th century*" Watson 2008, 133.

131 Peacock 2012, 266.

Yet it is known that Cairo from the 10th c was the newly founded capital of a country with a Muslim majority population since the 9th c. (a palace city built to overshadow the adjacent Fustāt, an Islamic military camp and then city from the 7th c. onwards) and, in the 13th c. Ayyūbid Cairo had a Muslim population well in excess of 150,000[132]; Damascus, capital of Muslim ruled Syria since the end of the 7th c., a country with a Muslim majority population since the 9th c., had a 13th c. city population of 40,000 to 47,000[133], perhaps 80,000-100,000 in 1340[134]; while Aleppo in the 13th c. had a Muslim population of 50,000 to 60,000[135], by 1340 estimated at 100,000[136]. Konya with a 13th c. population of somewhere around 35,000-50,000 within the city walls had a Rumi majority orthodox population, and a history as capital of the Rūm Seljuk state dating from after 1097, with a Muslim minority population in the 13th c. within the walls of maybe 15,000 to 20,000[137], and Kayseri had a Muslim population probably somewhat smaller than Konya's. To need to wonder why Konya - a Muslim minority city, in a Muslim minority state, with a Muslim presence dating back as the capital less than 100 years by 1243 - did not have in the 13th c. the equivalent of an al-Azhar founded by the Fatimids in 970, or the equivalent of an Umayyad Mosque founded in the 7th c., as in Damascus and at Aleppo and each serving as centres of education since then, seems a somewhat surprising thought for a historian such as Andrew C. S. Peacock to entertain. Muhy id Dīn ibn 'Arabi (560-638/1165-1240), in his letter of reply of 609, (between the 3 June 1212 and the 22 May 1213) to the Rūm Seljuk Sultan 'Izz al- Dīn Kaykā'us I. (1211– 20)[138], was presumably written in response to a question posed by the Sultan concerning the proper treatment of his Christian subjects in respect to the *sharīʿah*. Ibn 'Arabi in his reply described the situation as he saw it in respect to the activities and state of the majority Christian population in Seljuk Anatolia at this time, more than a century after the conquest, in the following words: "***The calamity that Islam and the Muslims are undergoing in your realm – and few address it*** *– is the raising of church bells*[139]*, the display of disbelief (kufr), the proclamation of associationism (shirk), and the elimination of the stipulations (al-shurut) that were imposed by the Prince of Believers, 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, may God be pleased with him, upon the Protected People*", with these including, "*the prohibition of establishing in the city or the surrounding area a church, convent, cell, or hermitage for monks*", "*as well as the prohibitions of imitating Muslim dress, using Muslim names, riding on saddles, taking up arms, display-*

[132] Modern estimates range between 250,000 and 500,000 by the 1340's, Shoshan 2002, 2, prior to the onset of the Black Death pandemic. Dols suggested a pop of Cairo c. 1300 of 451.000, Dols 1981, note 29, see also 403. Hurff 1999, 29, writes: "*By the 1300s, Cairo's population, at no less than 500,000 people, is 15 times larger than that of contemporary London*".

[133] Vinogradov 2014, 156.

[134] Watson 2008, 133.

[135] Vinogradov 2014, 156.

[136] Watson 2008, 133.

[137] Vinogradov 2014, 161, records undoubted numerical hyperbole for the population of Konya in 1200 of 120,000, and this same figure for both Sivas and Kayseri, that is, all three were each equal to the size to the population of 11th c. Isfahan. The number 120,000 to be read as meaning Konya, Kayseri and Sivas had large populations,of very many people, most certainly not as the actual number of inhabitants.

[138] The date and contents of the Sultan's letter no longer extant have been inferred from ibn 'Arabi's reply.

[139] The use of bells in the Empire seems to date from after 865 (i.e. after the text of the Pact of Omar), when the Venetian Doge, Orso I Participazio (864-881) presented bells to Emperor Michael III, who built a tower to house them on the west front of Hagia Sophia (Lethaby-Swainson 1894, 208). However there were the square towers that were constructed for the semantron, the orthodox version of the Latin bell towers-belfry, to increase the reach of the sound; and it might be that "*the raising of bells*" refers to these towers, although it has also been translated as "*the clanging of bells*". The semantron was regarded as a type for the trumpet on the Day of Judgement, and it is said a group of Norman Sicilians in Thessalonika in 1185 after taking the city, thought the sound of the semantron from the tower of the Church of St. Sophia, signified the revolt of the population and rushed to arms, Texier-Pullan 1864, 142; Norwich 1996, 150.

ing crosses, and performing loud liturgical recitations in the presence of Muslims"; "they must trim their forelocks, keep their manner of dress the same wherever they are, and fasten girdles (zanāīr) around their waists; "if any thing from among what has thus been stipulated is violated, then there is no protection for them and it is permitted for the Muslims to deal with them as people of rebellion and sedition", "*In Islam, there is no building of churches and no repairing what has fallen into ruin from them.*[140]" This letter, probably written after the Battle of Al-Uqab, Las Navas de Tolosa of the 16th of July 1212, expressed the situation as the Andalusian ibn 'Arabi saw it, in respect to the Christian majority population of Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory in Anatolia, that formed a part of what ibn 'Arabi regarded as being a part of the *dār al-Islām* to be ruled by the *sharīʿah* implemented by the Sultan. The basis for his position was not simply the Pact of Omar[141], as is explicitly mentioned in his letter, but is in the Qur'ān itself: al-Ma'idah, 51; "*O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are* [in fact] a*llies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is* [one] *of them*[142]*. Indeed, Allah guides not the wrongdoing people*". And, at-Tawba, 9:29 "***Fight those who do not believe in Allah or in the Last Day and who do not consider unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful and who do not adopt the religion of truth from those who were given the Scripture -*** [fight] ***until they give the jizyah*** *(cizye)* ***willingly while they are humbled***'. The answer given by ibn 'Arabi at source concerns the last words of at-Tawba, 9:29, in particular the interpretation of the word, *sâghirûn,* words that have been translated as: "*and they be reduced*

[140] Lipton 2018, 55-56, Addas 1993, 234-236. See also, Austin 1970, 42-43, where the portion of the text translated reads: "…One of the worst things that have happened to Islam and the Muslims, a minority as they are (in recently conquered areas), is the clanging of bells (probably meaning the loud beating of the semantron-nāqūs, a wooden board hit with a wooden or metal clapper, or the striking a bronze semantron, rather than "bells"), demonstrations of unbelief and **the general prominence of polytheistic teaching in your land**; **also the relaxing of the constraints imposed on the protected peoples by the Prince of the Faithful, 'Umar b. al-Khattāb, may God be pleased with him; that they should build no new churches in the cities and surrounding areas, nor convents, monasteries, cells or otherwise, and that they should not repair those that have fallen into ruins**; that they should allow any Muslim to stay a period of not less than three nights in their churches and feed him;…that they should not prevent their relatives from becoming Muslims if they so please; that they should show respect for Muslims and rise to them from their seats…". Futūhāt, IV, 547-548. Contrary to the hadith in 'Ibn 'Arabi's letter concerning the prohibition of monastery-church-cell-hermitage construction within the dār al-Islām, the Selime Monastery and the so-called Çarıklı Church, Goreme, both date from the 13th century, and for example, more than 20% of the churches of Cappadocia were constructed during Seljuk rule; although Elizabeth Jeffreys and Cyril Mango write in 2002, "We may set aside those, notably in Cappadocia, that had been conquered by the Seljuk Turks at the end of the eleventh century and to all intents and purposes disappeared from history" Jeffreys-Mango 2002, 294. On some of these 13th c. Cappadocian churches with inscriptions, see the important article of Métivier 2012, and the remark, "I have tried to show here that this evidence was probably not produced by autochthonous communities and that, in any case, these links involved individuals and not communities. The very few known cases all attest to the links of one or two individuals only, and not of a community, with the Empire" Métivier 2012, 251. The construction in Sivas by merchants of Genoa of a consulate and Latin chapel in the late 13th century, after 1280, was doubtless permitted by the Pagan Mongols, but there seems to be no secure evidence of Latin chapels erected in the first half of the 13th c. within Rūm Seljuk territory, although there is the possibility of chapels at the ports of Sinope and Antalya presumably within the depot-fondaco-in the respective mina, rather than separate structures. It seems probable that the cessation of church construction in the 14th c. in Mongol Turkish ruled territory in Anatolia can be related to Ghāzān Khan's October 1295 order for the destruction of churches, synagogues, and temples of other religions in Il-Khanid territory, following his conversion to Islam in Ramadan 694 (July-August 1295). Previously for example Hülegü Khan and Dokuz Khatun had sponsored the constructed for the Catholicus Makikha (1257-1263) of a church in newly conquered Bagdad (De Nicola 2017, 214). As Charles Melville wrote, "The Ilkhans' Muslim subjects still suffered real or imagined dangers, whether from the hostility of the Mongols themselves or from the machinations of the newly confident Christians" Melville 2009, 66.

[141] https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/pact-umar.aspn
http://www.bu.edu/mzank/Jerusalem/tx/pactofumar.htm

[142] See on the matter of imitation the hadith, "*Whoever imitates a people becomes one of them*" Patel 2018, passim.

low"[143], "*while they are humbled*[144]", "*while they are subdued*", "*are in a state of subjection*", "*being brought low*", "*being humbled (in war)*[145]", "*are utterly subdued;*[146]" or, of "acceptance", acknowledgment of the right of the Muslim and of payment of the *jizyah*. It can be understood that the terms of the Pact of Omar were understood by ibn 'Arabi as defining what this state of being, humbled, subdued, reduced low, brought to a state of acceptance, for the People of the Book, in practical terms meant. The statement concerning the Protected People or the People of the Book that, *"if any thing from among what has thus been stipulated is violated, then there is no protection for them and it is permitted for the Muslims to deal with them as people of rebellion and sedition*", it can be suggested is the reason why in Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn's Antaliyah *fetihnāme* inscription of 1216, the terms: *mushrikīn* and *kāfirīn*, polytheists and infidels[147] are employed to describe the rebel Christian inhabitants of Antalya[148], who had ceased through their action in rebellion, to be People of the Book-Protected People, had raised their hands against the Muslims, and had in consequence become *mushrikīn* and *kāfirīn*, polytheists and infidels[149].

Less than two years earlier, before writing this letter of 609, ibn 'Arabi had met Sultan Giyathsed-Dīn Keykhusraw I in Konya in 1210[150], and from Konya, went via Kayseri, Sivas, Arzan

---

143 George Sale, The Koran, commonly called The Alcoran of Mohammed, Translated into English immediately from the Original Arabic: with Explanatory NOTES, from the most approved Commentators, To which is prefixed A Preliminary Discourse, for J. Wilcox, London, 1734, 152.

144 https://quran.com/9/29-39

145 https://www.islamawakened.com/quran/9/29/

146 https://www.islamicstudies.info/tafheem.php?sura=9&verse=25&to=29

147 For disbelievers (unbelievers) from the People of the Book and polytheists, Qur'an Al-Baqarah 2:105; Al-Bayyinah 98:1.

148 Redford-Leiser 2008, 97, who, although struck by the difference in the language employed to describe the inhabitants of the city in this inscription, both, *mushrikīn* and *kāfirīn,* and, *ahl al-balad*, offer no cogent explanation for this difference. The expression: *min qami' al-khawarij wa'l-mutamarridīn* ***qatil al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin*** *qahir al-zanidiqa wa'l-mulhidīn, "the suppressor of the rebellious and the insubordinate,* ***the extirpator of the unbelievers and the polytheists****, the conqueror of heretics and atheists*" (Rogers 1976, 170, fn. 6) itself formed a part of the titulature of Seljuk Sultans*,* and can be understood to have served as a reminder of the consequences due, if the majority of subjects, the People of the Book, broke their treaty of protection with the Seljuk ruler, when they would become, ***qatil al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin***. This appears as a title of the Rūm Seljuk Sultan Giyathsed-Dīn Keykhusraw II, on the enamelled glass plate found in the Kubadabad, *qat'i al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin,* Bakırer-Redford 2017, 182. Likewise in the titulature earlier employed by 'Imad al-Dīn Zangī, *qatil al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin;* by, Salah al-Dīn Yusuf (1237-59) the last Ayyūbid ruler of Aleppo, *qami 'al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin muhyi al-adl fi'l-'alamin sultan al-Islam wa'l-muslimin al-sultan al-Malik al-Nasir Salah al-Dunya wa'l-Din* (Islam 1976, 141); on a brass tray, today Staatliches Museum fur Volkerkunde, Munich, no. 26-N-118, Northern Mesopotamia (Mosul), 1223-59, *qatil al-kufara wa'l-mushrikin,* slayer of infidels and polytheists, (Islam 1976, 179); on a brass basin, Musee du Louvre, Paris, no. 5991 Syria, Ayyubid period, 1238-40, *qami al-kafara wa'l-mushrikin,* al-Malik al'Adil, Abu Bakr, son of our lord the sultan al-Malik al-Kamil Abu al-Ma'ali Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr ibn Ayyub, (Islam 1976, 180). All the latter examples are probably to be understood as references to the Latin Catholic Crusaders rather than to the rumi Orthodox and Armenians. The terms: *qatil*, "killer", or *qahir*, "conqueror", or *qdmi'*, "subdue", *qamic,* "tamer" were employed to describe the sultan's response to the People of the Book who broke their pact with the Muslims and so are described as the *mushrikīn* and *kāfirīn*, the polytheists and infidels.

149 Antalya *fetihnāme* inscription, Redford-Leiser 2008, 108-112, lines 1-42: line 7, polytheists, i.e. Christian rebels; line 11, rebellion, unbelievers and the polytheists, i.e. Christian rebels; line 22, both unbelievers and polytheists. The people of the city moved following the conquest in 1207 from being unbelievers and polytheists to being People of the Book, then in 1212 to people of rebellion and sedition, Line 11, and in consequence, became polytheists and infidels. The survivors returning to being recognised as being People of the Book, through the mercy of Sultan'Izz al-Dīn in 1216, and, as being People of the Book were therefore required to pay the *jizya* and to behave in a subdued or humbled fashion, one of acceptance.

150 Whose mother was a rumi, and whose wife, the daughter of Manuel Maurozomos, was a rumi (Shukurov 2012, 116), which presents no problem under Islam, Qur'ān, al-Ma'idah, 5:5: "*This day [all] good foods have been made lawful, and the food of those who were given the Scripture is lawful for you and your food is lawful for them.* ***And***

(Erzincan), Dunaisir and Harran, to reach Bagdad in 1211[151], and in travelling to and stopping in these cities he would have had little choice but to pay attention to the position and practices of the Christian majorities in this area of the *dār al-Islām,* and to compare it with what he already knew from his experience elsewhere, in Andalusia, Fez, Jerusalem, Mosul, Damascus, Cairo and Aleppo. While in Konya in 1210, in the Rūm Seljuk capital, it would have been difficult not to notice that on top of the citadel hill, overlooking the mosque and the city, was the not so humble shape of the large, functioning church of H. Amphilochios[152], among other examples presented to the eye and ear, including the sudden startling sound of the pounding beats of a hammer striking wood, the beating of the semantron of the not so humbled[153], and, unmentioned in his letter of reply, but doubtless known to its author in 1212, the "peace" treaty of June 1211 between Theodore Laskaris (1204–22) and the sultan, and the close relationships established; both through the ruler's employment of Christians, some while not converting, adopted Muslim names and dress[154], with dual identity[155], and through the visits and relations between Seljuk Sultans and the Laskarid dynasty at Nicaea, as with earlier Rūm Seljuk Sultans and Roman Emperors. Ibn 'Arabi, having spent time in Konya in 1204-1205, in 1210, again probably Konya in 1216[156], Sivas in 1216, Malatya in 1216-1218 and Malatya again in 1221, the city where his son was born, and his companion, in nearly 30 years of travel, 'Abd Allāh Badr al-Habashī was buried, finally settled in Damascus from 1223 and taught in the Umayyad Great Mosque[157]. Neither Konya, with a minority Muslim population of perhaps ten thousand in 1212 and perhaps twenty thousand by 1240, nor Kayseri with a smaller Muslim population, were the ideal environments to be envisioning for the establishment in the 13th c. of another al-Azhar, although the Ala ad-Dīn Mosque in Konya, like other Seljuk-Turkish Great Mosques, would have served as teaching institutions alongside the madrasa.

Secondly, and perhaps as unfortunate for the 21st century readers understanding of Rūm Seljuk architecture and art, is the implication in the second part of the passage quoted above, that ***Seljuq Anatolian architecture is the medium in which these non-Muslim elements feature most prominently,*** giving the reader the impression that Rūm Seljuk architecture is filled with prominent *non-Muslim elements*, and, that in the 12th and 13th centuries, it was ethnicity, rather

---

[lawful in marriage are] ***chaste women from among the believers and chaste women from among those who were given the Scripture before you, when you have given them their due compensation, desiring chastity, not unlawful sexual intercourse or taking [secret] lovers****. And whoever denies the faith - his work has become worthless, and he, in the Hereafter, will be among the losers".*

151 Austin 1971, 41.

152 See Tekinalp 2009, 161. For its former position on the top of the Ala ad-Dīn hill relative to the Ala ad-Dīn Mosque, see Texier 1849, T.II, Pl. 100, *Ruines du Palais des Sultans Seljoukides*, upper extreme left, https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/texier1849bd2/0351/image
For Gertrude Bell's 1907 photographs of the church of H. Amphilochios before its demolition in the 1920's:
http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/photo_details.php?photo_id=2574
http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/photo_details.php?photo_id=2576
http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/photo_details.php?photo_id=2577

153 See on the prohibition, Schick 1995, 74. "This board or bar is called semantron or simandro in Greek, the Armenians call it jamahar. The mallet used to strike it is called roptron" Rockhill 1900, 116.

154 See on the matter of imitation the hadith, "*Whoever imitates a people becomes one of them*" Patel 2018, passim.

155 On the matter of the males of mixed marriages being both baptised and Muslim, of "dual identity" see the work of Rustam Shukurov, Shukarov 2012, 134, practices which certainly would have been found entirely unacceptable by ibn 'Arabi, concerned amongst other things in Konya with the matter giving a proper Islamic artistic imagination to a painter who had converted from Orthodoxy to Islam, see, Austin 1971, 40-41.

156 Possibly also from Konya to Aksaray, if it is to be identified as the place termed *dār al-Baydā,* Addas 1993, 242, fn. 145.

157 Addas 1993, 252.

than the confessional orientation of the architect, builder or designer, that is today and was at that time, important. Yet the architect, builder or designer of a Seljuk building, or of parts of its decoration, a Muslim, an Arab, an Iranian, a Turk, or a convert to Islam from the *Romanoi*-Rumi Orthodox, Armenian, Georgian or Jacobite-Syriac populations, was trained and was working within a tradition of Islamic architecture, with functions and building types long established, variants of mosques of the plan type originating in the 7th c. were constructed in the 12th and 13th centuries in Anatolia, madrasa[158], with covered or open courtyard, han-(called by Iranians *caravanserai* although the terms *hanı* and *caravanserai*, are not in terms of function synonyms, but in modern usage have frequently been employed as such), *ribat*, all had been constructed by the 13th c. for centuries. The Muslim architect, builder or designer, regardless of ethnicity, provided for the patron, architectural variants within these established building types in terms of scale, the techniques and the materials employed, in the detailing, in plan variations and in the building's decoration. The fact that an architectural element or detail, or a particular design motif, occurs elsewhere and is subsequently employed and may itself become incorporated into Islamic tradition, providing an element in a repertory of variety, is to be expected and is entirely unsurprising. The observation made by the author that some motifs found in Armenian manuscript illumination and architecture also occur on the "*sculpted portals of Divriği*" the Seljuk mosque and hospital complex constructed in 1228/9, indicates what exactly, beyond the fact of the re-use of a motif, or of a detail, within this different religious-cultural context? Likewise the observation that Islamic *muqarnas* are found in examples of Armenian Christian architecture from the 11th c. onwards, indicates what exactly within this different religious-cultural context? In the case of the Abbasid *muqarnas*, subsequently employed in Armenian Christian architecture, was the intention in the borrowing and use of this Islamic form in Christian Armenian architecture due to wonder at the marvellous, at the effect of light over the layers of the faceted surfaces and so to its re-use? Or was its re-use, employed to signify power and prestige? Or was it employed in this Christian Armenian context to signify the Divine Light, in the same sense as Islamic *muqarnas* can be read as indicating / representing and reminding of the presence of the *nūr ilahi*?[159] Beyond remarking on the undefined Anatolian *cultural mix* the author in this article defers any explanation of the matter. As stated above, it seems evident however that the re-use of a form, detail or design obtained from a different religious-cultural construct would need to conform to the requirements of the religious-cultural construct within which it was re-employed. It would need to be either neutral in content, as in a form or technique, or for it to be reinterpreted, given a relevant new meaning or interpretation within the different religious-cultural construct, as with the re-use and modification of sculptural *spolia* from antiquity mentioned above, employed because this was the practice of the Abbasid Caliphs.

Robert Hillenbrand draws attention to the difference between the Seljuk Islamic architecture constructed in Iran and that constructed in Seljuk-Turkish ruled territories in Rūm, in terms of both the scale and the number of buildings, and attributes the variety of the forms of Iranian Seljuk brick architecture and the variety of the decoration to the number and scale of these buildings; but offers no reasons for the clear difference in the relative number and in the scale of the buildings that were constructed. However, firstly it does need to be realised that the majority of the Muslim population in Rūm Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory in Anatolia in the 13th c. were in fact nomads, with little use for, and who were not patrons of architectural construction, and villagers; and while the Muslim population of Iran was about 5 million, with some cities of 70,000 to 150,000-200,000 Muslim inhabitants, in Rūm Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory in Anatolia,

158 For example the al-Sa'idi Madrasa of c. 1000, and the Sultaniya Madrasa of 1045 in Nishapur.

159 Duggan 2019a.

the total urban population may have been about a half a million to an extreme of one million, of which certainly only a minority, and considerably less than a fifth in most cities, were Muslims; while the respective capitals, 11th c. Isfahan with 150,000-200,000 inhabitants had at least ten times the Muslim population of Konya, with its approximately 35,000 to 50,000 Christian, Muslim and Jewish inhabitants, and clearly required buildings, both different in number and in size-scale. On the basis of the estimated 13th c. figures for a total urban population at somewhere between roughly 500,000 and an maximum of 1,000,000, the approximate total number of Muslim urban inhabitants in Mongol-Rūm Seljuk ruled Anatolia in the mid-13th c., as estimated by the Franciscan William of Rubruck, ranges from more than 50,000 to 100,000, and was probably less than 10% of the urban total, as he wrote in the Epilogue to his account of his missionary travels, including more than two months, from the 14th of February into April 1255, spent within the territory of the Mongol controlled Rūm Seljuk Sultanate in Anatolia, passing through Arz al-Rūm-Qaliqala-Karin-Erzurum, Kamākh, Sivas 21st to 27th March, Kayseri, 4th April, Quniyah-Konya 18th April, 1255: "*As for Turkey, I can inform you that not one man in ten there is a saracen* (the word Saracen employed here to mean Muslim, not Arab)*; rather they are all Armenians and Greeks and the power is in the hands of boys* (the sons of Sultan Ghiyath ad- Dīn Kaykhusraw II.).[160]" An estimated Muslim urban population of more than 50,000 - 100,000 in mid-13th c. Mongol ruled territory in Anatolia, this in comparison with a Muslim urban population of about 2.5 million in Seljuk Iran in 1141, that is, a Muslim urban population in Iran between twenty five and fifty times larger, the relative size, quantity and quality of Islamic architecture constructed in 13th c. Anatolia for a Muslim urban population of less than one in ten of the total urban population in the 1250's - the scale of architecture per Muslim member of the Rūm Seljuk urban population - is quite simply and profoundly astonishing, mighty.

It is surely worth noting when drawing such comparisons that the Muslim population of the 11th c. Great Seljuk capital city of Isfahan was most probably larger than the entire urban Muslim population of 13th c. Seljuk Anatolia. The relative number of students and the size of Rūm Seljuk madrasa provide an indication of the size of the Muslim urban population; and, as Kenneth Hayes indicated in 2010: "*Assuming that the proper conduct of salat (ritual prayer) requires a minimum area of fifty by eighty centimetres or about four tenths of a square metre per person, and given that Afyon Ulu Cami has a usable area of approximately eight hundred square metres, the main floor would have been able to accommodate about two thousand worshippers and the women's balcony at least three hundred. The somewhat larger mosque in Sivrihisar would have accommodated about 2,375 people at prayer. **These were great mosques indeed. It is worth noting that the later figure amounts to a full quarter of Sivrihisar's modern population, which is almost certainly larger now than at any time in the city's history***[161]". The 12th - 13th c. congregational-Grand mosque architecture of Seljuk Anatolia was not constructed to respond to, nor to reflect the size of the contemporary urban Muslim populations of cities. Rūm Seljuk congregational-Friday-Cuma mosques were constructed to an entirely different scale, disproportionate to the actual small size of the Muslim urban population of cities in the 12th – 13th centuries, the size, decoration and the location of these mosques was chosen to express the prestige and the confidence of Islam expressed by the Muslim rulers over a Christian majority, Muslim minority population, who, in the main, ordered the construction of these congregational mosques.

As outlined above, the relative scale-area of the decoration employed over the exterior of Seljuk buildings in Iran differed little from that in Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory in Anatolia, although the painted decoration has survived the centuries less well than the patterns of fired

[160] Dawson 1955, 219.

[161] Hayes 2010, 115.

glazed and unglazed brick employed in Seljuk Iran; but it could/should be argued for example, that the visual power and impact of the contrast of a red and white zigzag painted repeat pattern over the considerable surface area of the exterior walls of a Rūm Seljuk han or pavilion, or where the entire exterior of a building had a surfacing of shiny red paintwork, as appears to have been the case for the Karatay han in 1277, as recorded by Kadı Muhyiddīn ibn 'Abdü'z-Zair[162], had, one may think, a greater impact in the landscape/cityscape upon the eyes of the beholder, than the exterior appearance of 11th c. Seljuk buildings in Iran, while it is certain that the fresh painted decoration on the exterior of a stone building caught the eye of at least one Iranian familiar with the Iranian brick tradition of construction, Nasir-i Khusrau, who recorded this paintwork over Seljuk masonry, as noted above, in 1046.

Perhaps more meaningful comparisons could have been drawn, if one really does need to be drawn into making comparisons, more informative architectural comparisons could have been drawn between the mid-12th to mid-13th c. Rūm Seljuk and Turkish ruled Islamic territory in Anatolia, with the stone architecture of 12th to 14th c. Muslim ruled Hindu majority states of the sub-continent as noted above; or with the stone architecture of Seljuk Atabeg ruled, Zangid and Ayyūbid 12th c. Syria. The architectural and artistic connections to Syria under Rūm Seljuk Sultans Giyathsed-Dīn Keyhüsrev I, Izzed-Dīn Keykavas I and Alaed-Dīn Keykubat I are clear, including the use of techniques such as ablaq work, cut stone pendant *muqarnas* in portals, stone interlace[163], in wood-working[164], and in some of the figural designs on palace tile-work[165], elements that occur in Zangid and Ayyūbid Syria prior to their use in Rūm Seljuk Anatolia, that all indicate a significant degree of Syrian influence passed into 13th century Rūm Seljuk art and architecture. This, together with the importance and the type of architectural commissions that were given by successive Rūm Seljuk Sultans to architects from Syria, including, Muhammad ibn Khawlan al-Dimashqi responsible for the completion of the capital's Alaeddin Mosque, work on the Konya Palace and the rebuilt city walls and the 1229 Sultan Han by Aksaray, and possibly in the design of the portal of Sa'd al-Dīn (Zazad-Din) Han of 1235-36, and the portal of the Karatay Madrasa in Konya that seems to belong to an earlier structure; and who may also have been responsible for Evdir Han by Antalya of 1216; and, Abū 'Ali bin Abi'l-Rakha' bin al-Kattani al-Halabi, including work on the Sinope castle 1215, probable work on the city walls and the reconstruction of the citadel of Antalya following its recapture in 1216 (the citadel largely destroyed in the earthquake of 1743, but of which an 18th c. drawing survives), the construction of the Red Tower in Alanya, in part in brick, but quite unrelated to Iranian Seljuk brick architecture, and probably also the tershane constructed for the scraping and caulking of the hulls of galleys, and the arsenal-Tophane at Alanya, and it seems possible that one of their pupils or another Syrian trained architect may have been responsible for designing the palace complex at Belkis-Aspendos from 1237 to 1240, of converting the Roman theatre scene building into the core of a

---

[162] "*Shiny marble-like red stone*" Sümer 1985, 80. He mistook the painted shining surfacing for the stone-work itself.

[163] As noted by Tabbaa 2001, 167, "*He* (Nūr al-Dīn d. 1174) *was instrumental, through his patronage of vegetal and geometric arabesque and its exportation to Anatolia and Egypt*". And, stone interlace - polychrome interlaced spandrels, introduced into Anatolia from Aleppo, Tabbaa 2001, 155.

[164] Rogers 1969, 142, "there is no direct connection between Iran and Anatolia traceable in pottery of the earlier Seljuk period, a situation which is paralleled in wood-carving, where the magnificent minbars produced in Anatolia between 1150 and 1300 show a basic familiarity with North Syrian techniques".

[165] Rogers 1969, 142, "The style, though not the colouring, of the Kubābābād underglaze tiles also approximates to that of contemporary North Syrian Polychrome wares" contra Scott Redford in his chapter Mamālik and Mamālīk: Anatolian Seljuk Citadels and their Decorative and Inscriptional Programs, 2013, 309, fn. 6, "Soucek was the first to point out the stylistic similarities between Kubadabad tiles and Syrian ceramics (Bornstein and Soucek 1981, pp. 40–41)".

palace complex, as had occurred earlier at Bosra in Syria[166]. These are all important examples of Rūm Seljuk architecture in Anatolia designed by Muslim architects from Syria or those trained in the Syrian manner. The idea that the stone Seljuk architecture of Anatolia was, at times, the crass little brother, or the "junior partner,[167]" of Seljuk Iranian brick architecture, is incorrect, in architectural, as in familial terms, the Seljuk architecture of Iran and of Anatolia are better regarded as distant cousins, even though for example the architect of the 1201 İplikçi Mosque in Konya was Abu al-Fazi Abd al-Jabbar from Tabriz, and the mosque was constructed of brick, it is exceptional and the architecture in stone of mid to late 12th c. Syria provides us with a closer relative to the stone architecture of Rūm Seljuk Anatolia.

Conclusions

For the conclusions to this somewhat lengthy review the following points can be reiterated.

Firstly, there is little point in making comparisons in terms of architectural decoration until the appearance of the architecture at the time it was completed, was finished, is understood - not as this architecture appears today - and this requires some awareness in the case of the Medieval architecture and sculpture of Anatolia of it having been painted stone architecture and painted stone sculpture.

Secondly, the unfortunate mis-translation of texts can have serious long term consequences for the understanding of Medieval architecture.

Thirdly, that the proportion of Muslims in newly conquered territory may have been relatively small, in 12th -13th c. Anatolia, as in the sub-continent in the 12th and 13th centuries, but, as was also the case with the works produced under the Umayyads, with likewise a minority Muslim urban population, the combination of rulership and a minority Muslim population seems to have resulted in a remarkable surge in means and forms of creative expression.

Fourthy, the size of the Muslim population and the length of time there has been a Muslim population in a particular region does matter, in terms of the size and number of Islamic buildings that were constructed.

Rather than looking at Rūm Seljuk stone architecture as a "junior partner" to the brick architecture of Seljuk Iran, it does seem worthwhile to realise that Rūm Seljuk architecture is quite different from that of 12th c. Iran, distinctive in terms of material, in terms of scale, in terms of decoration and appearance. What is truly remarkable in the field of Islamic art and architecture is what was achieved in decorative and architectural terms within the Seljuk-Turkish ruled territory of Rūm from the late 12th to the end of the 13th c., territory, that had only a small Muslim minority urban population, yet produced a coherent recognisable body of distinctive powerful architecture and art. Scale and numbers matter, and the relative number of structures constructed within a little over a century, markers in city and landscape that convey an identifiable recognisable style, solid, strong, permanent, in newly conquered territory, that articulated in temporal terms that Islam was now an architectural presence, a fixture of townscape and of the landscape, the religion was here to stay, reinforced by having a somewhat squat appearance, often with buttressing, false buttressing and with merlons crowning and reinforcing this image of security, solid, strong, but not heavy, and which would have appeared light and colourful through the application of paintwork to the masonry and the stone carved decoration.

In 13th c. Seljuk-Turkish ruled Rūm to expect there to have been the same scale and quantity of architecture constructed by 1240, 168 years after 1071, on the eve of the Mongol invasion;

166 Duggan 2011, 144-147.
167 Hillenbrand 2017, 108.

as there was in Great Seljuk Iran, where the vast majority of a much larger urban population had been Muslim for more than 200 years prior to the Seljuk conquest of the mid-11th c., requiring buildings in greater numbers and on a far grander scale, as in the case of Grand mosques, for the numerous Muslim urban populations of Iranian cities, than was the case for the mosques in the cities of Seljuk Anatolia with their minority Muslim populations, is to suffer inappropriate expectations. The findings expressed by Robert Hillenbrand in this chapter are misleading, formed from decontextualized comparisons, and they have resulted in the misleading conclusions drawn by the author of this chapter, as to the degree and nature of the relationship between the architecture and buildings of Seljuk Iran and those of Rūm Seljuk Anatolia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

S.O.D.[3] *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. Ed. C. T. Onions. Oxford 1964[3].

Abbotsbury 1899 M. I. Abbotsbury, *Catalogue of Plants in Abbotsbury Gardens* 1899. London 1900.

Addas 1993 C. Addas, *Quest For The Red Sulphur: The Life of Ibn 'Arabi*, Trans. P. Kingsley. Islamic Texts Society. Cambridge 1993.

Adler 1907 N. M. Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, Critical Text, Translation and Commentary*. London 1907.

Akalin 2016 E. C. Akalin, "Is Realistic/Realisable? The West Asian Union Project". *Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)* 10/3 (2016) 98-120.

Akyürek 2017 E. Akyürek (Ed.), *Alakent Church: Location and Architecture*, *Alakent Church: A Byzantine Monument at Myra (12th-13th Centuries)*. İstanbul 2017.

Austin 1970 R. W. J. Austin, *Sufis of Andalusia: The Rūh Al Quds & Al-Durrat Al-Fākhīrah* Ibn 'Arabi. London 1971.

Aymaz 2004 A. Aymaz, *Sadik Yâg*. İstanbul 2004.

Bakırer – Redford 2017 Ö. Bakırer – S. Redford, "The Kubadabad Plate: Islamic Gildedand Enameled Glass in Context". *Journal of Glass Studies* 59 (2017) 171-191.

Bibi 2007 El-Hüseyin b. Muhammed b. Ali el-Ca'feri er-Rugadi İbn Bibi, *Selçukname*. Çev. M. H. Yinanç**.** Ankara 2007.

Bibi 1996 El-Hüseyin b. Muhammed b. Ali el-Ca'feri er-Rugadi İbn Bibi, *El Evamiru'l-Ala'iye Fi'l-Umuri'l-Ala'iye (Selçukname)* I-II. Çev. M. Öztürk. Ankara 1996.

Bibi 1956 El-Hüseyin b. Muhammed b. Ali el-Ca'feri er-Rugadi İbn Bibi, *El-Evâmirül-'Alaiyye fil-Umuril-Ala'iyye, (Tıpkıbasım)*. Haz. A. S. Erzi. Ankara 1956.

Bible Student 1909 *The Bible Student and Teacher: Christian Faith and Life Vol.* XI. New York 1909.

Bockholt 2017 P. Bockholt, "Scott Redford: A New Approach to the Permeability of Political Symbolism in Rum Seljuk Turkey". *META Journal: Middle East-Topics & Arguments* (2017) 25-29.

Bosworth 1973 C. E. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids: Their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 994-1040*. Beirut 1973.

Brewer 1830 J. Brewer, *A Residence at Constantinople, in the Year 1827*. New-Haven 1830.

Brewster 1830 D. Brewster (Ed.), *The Edinburgh Encyclopaedia* Vol. XV. Edinburgh 1830.

Bulliet 1994 R. W. Bulliet, *Islam: The View From The Edge*. New York 1994.

Cabinet 1900 *The New Cabinet Cyclopaedia and Treasury of Knowledge, A Handy Book of Reference on All Subjects and for All Readers. The Articles Relating to America Edited by Ainsworth R. Spofford, Late Librarian of Congress, and Editor of the "Library of Choice Literature". The Articles Relating to Europe Edited by Charles Annandale, M.A., LL.D., Editor of the "Imperial Dictionary" Vol. 5*. Philadelphia 1900.

Caner 2003 E. Caner, *Archaeometrical Investigation of Some Seljuk Plasters*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University. Ankara 2003.

Çömezoğlu-Uzbek 2017 Ö. Çömezoğlu-Uzbek, *Alakent Church: A Byzantine Monument at Myra (12th-13th Centuries)*. Ed. E. Akyürek. İstanbul (2017) 213-223.

Crane – Korn 2017 H. Crane – L. Korn, Turko-Persian Empires between Anatolia and India, 237-Ed. F. B. Flood-G. Necipoğlu, *A Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture Vol.* 1, 2017.

Crane 1993 H. Crane, "Notes on Saldjūq Architectural Patronage in Thirteenth Century Anatolia". *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 36/1 (1993) 1-57.

Cyclopedia 1900 W. H. De Puy (Ed.), *The People's Cyclopedia of Universal Knowledge: With Numerous Appendixes Invaluable for Reference in All Departments of Industrial Life, with the Pronunciation and Orthography Conformed to*

	Webster's International Dictionary Vol. 1. New York 1900.
Danner 1988	V. Danner, *The Islamic Tradition: An Introduction*. New York 1988.
Dawson 1955	C. Dawson (Ed.), *The Mongol Mission, Narratives and Letters of the Franciscan Missionaries in Mongolia and China in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*. Trans. A Nun of Stanbrook Abbey. New York 1955.
De George – Porter 2002	G. De George – Y. Porter, *The Art of the Islamic Tile*. Paris 2002.
Dols 1981	W. M. Dols, "The General Mortality of the Black Death in the Mamluke Empire". Ed. A. L. Udovitch, *The Islamic Middle East 700-1900 Studies in Economic and Social History*. Princeton 1981.
Duggan 2019b	T. M. P. Duggan, "On Early Antiquarians in Asia Minor to the Start of the 19th Century". *Gephyra* 17 (2019) 115-167.
Duggan 2019a	T. M. P. Duggan, "On Reading the Meanings Carried by the Zigzag Design Employed in Islamic Art-İslam - Sanatında Zikzak Deseni ve Anlamları Üzerine Bir Okuma". *Akdeniz Sanat Dergisi* 13/23 Özel Ek Sayı (2019) 781-799.
Duggan 2012	T. M. P. Duggan, "On the Tradition of Islamic Figural Sculpture to 1300". *MJH* II/1 (2012) 61-86.
Duggan 2011	T. M. P. Duggan, "An Interpretation of Some Unpublished in situ and Recorded Rum Seljuk 13th c. External and Internal Figural Relief Work on the Belkıs (Aspendos) Palace, Antalya". *Gephyra* 8 (2011) 143-184.
Duggan 2008	T. M. P. Duggan, "The Plaster and Paintwork from Evdir and Kırkgöz Hans by Antalya - and Some Implications Drawn from These Finds and Related Material Concerning the Original Appearance of These and Other 13th c. Seljuk State Buildings". *Adalya* XI (2008) 319-358.
Duggan 2007	T. M. P. Duggan, "A 13th Century Profile Portrait Seal Depicting the Face of the Rum Seljuk Sultan Alaed-Din Keykubat I (1220-37) from Antalya Province Precedents and Possible Influence". *Adalya* X (2007) 309-349.
Fellows 1852	C. Fellows, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor (More Particularly in Lycia)*. London 1852.
Felter – Lloyd 1900	H. W. Felter – J. U. Lloyd, *King's American Dispensatory; Entirely Rewritten and Enlarged Vol.* I (A-F). Ohio 1900.
Foliard 2017	D. Foliard, *Dislocating the Orient: British Maps and the Making of the Middle East 1854-1921*. London 2017.
Le Goff 2005	J. Le Goff, *The Birth of Europe*. Trans. J. Lloyd. London 2005.
Hatip 2009	A. Hatip, *Kur'an ve Hikmet Işığında Cevşen Şerhi*. İstanbul 2009.
Hayes 2010	K. Hayes, *The Wooden Hypostyle Mosques Of Anatolia: Mosque - And State-Building Under Mongol Suzerainity*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Middle East Technical University. Ankara 2010.
Heer 1961	F. Heer, *The Medieval World Europe 1100-1300*. London 1961.
Hillenbrand 2017	R. Hillenbrand, "Brick Verses Stone: Seljuq Architecture in Iran and Anatolia". Ed. I. Poonawala, *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World* (2017) 105-143.
Hillenbrand 2000	R. Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning*. Edinburgh 2000.
Hogarth 1909	D. G. Hogarth, *Ionia and the East: Six Lectures Delivered Before The University of London*. Oxford 1909.
Hopf – Friedrich 1873	J. Hopf – C. H. Friedrich, *Istoria del Regno di Romania, Chroniques gréco-romanes: inédites ou peu connues, pub. avec notes et tables généalogiques*. Berlin (1873) 99-170.
Hurff 1999	M. Hurff, *The Millennium Time Tapestry*. London 1999.
Irwin 1994	R. Irwin, *The Arabian Nights, A Companion*. London 1994.
Islam 1976	*The Arts of Islam (Exhibition Catalog) Hayward Gallery 8 April-4 July 1976*. London 1976.

İbnü'l-Cevzi — Ebu'l Ferec ibnu'l-Cevzi, *Kuruluşundan XII. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısına Kadar Bağdat*. Çev. H. Polat. Ankara 2019.

İpek 2017 — N. İpek, *Tâhirü'l-Mevlevî'nin Kudemâ-yı Mevleviyye Adlı Eseri*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi. İstanbul 2017.

Jeffreys – Mango 2002 — E. Jeffreys – C. Mango, Towards a Franco-Greek Culture. Ed. C. Mango. *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Oxford 2002.

Ju-Kua 1911 — C. Ju-Kua, *His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, Entitled Chu-fan-chi*. St. Petersburg 1911.

Kana'an 2001 — R. Kana'an, "Book Review: R. Hillenbrand, Islamic Art and Architecture: World of Art Series. Thames and Hudson, London 1999". *Journal of Islamic Studies* 12/2 (2001) 235-238.

O'Kane 2002 — Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī, *The Feats of the Knowers of God: Manāqeb Al-'ārefīn*. Trans. J. O'Kane. Leiden 2002.

Keykubatlı 2019 — S. Keykubatlı, *Alanya Kalesi Duvar Resimleri*. Yayımlanmamış Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi. Antalya 2019.

Krabbenhöft 2011 — N. Krabbenhöft, *A Veneer of Power: Thirteenth-Century Seljuk. Frescoes on the Walls of Alanya and Some Recommendations for their Preservation*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Koç University. Istanbul 2011.

Lambourn 1995 — E. Lambourn, "Book Reviews, Islamic Architecture: Form, Function and Meaning, R. Hillenbrand, 1994". *Architectural Heritage* 6/I (1995) 108-111.

Lethaby – Swainson 1894 — W. R. Lethaby – H. Swainson, *The Church of Sancta Sophia, Constantiople A Study of Byzantine Building*. London-New York 1894.

Laborde 1839 — L. de Laborde, *Marquis, Voyage en Orient Voyage de l'Asie Mineure. Voyage de la Syrie*. Paris 1839.

Lipton 2018 — G. A. Lipton, *Rethinking Ibn 'Arabi*. Oxford 2018.

Lloyd – Rice 1958 — S. Lloyd – D. Storm Rice, *Alanya ('Alā'iyya)*. London 1958.

Melville 2009 — C. Melville, "Anatolia under the Mongols". Ed. K. Fleet, *The Cambridge History of Turkey Vol. 1 Byzantium to Turkey 1071-1453*. Cambridge-New York (2009) 51-101.

Métivier 2012 — S. Métivier, "Byzantium in question in 13th-century Seljuk Anatolia". Eds. G. Saint-Guillain, D. Stathakopoulos, *Liquid & Multiple: Individuals & Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegean*. London (2012) 235-258.

Moğol 1997 — H. Moğol, *Antalya Tarihi*. Ankara 1997.

Naser-e Khosraw — Naser-e Khosraw, *Safarname. The Book of Travels*. New York 1986.

Nicola 2017 — B. Nicola, *Women in Mongol Iran: The Khatuns 1206-1335*. Edinburgh 2017.

Northedge 1996 — A. Northedge, "Review: Robert Hillenbrand: Islamic architecture: form, function and meaning. Edinburgh". *Bulletin of The School of Oriental and African Studies* XXVI (1996) 645.

Norwich 1996 — J. J. Norwich, *Byzantium: the Decline and Fall*. London 1996.

Official 1907 — *Official Guide to the Museums of Economic Botany Dicotyledons*. London 1907.

Önge, Ateş – Bayram 1978 — Y. Önge, I. Ateş – S. Bayram (Eds.), *Divrigi Ulu Camii ve Darüşşifası*. Ankara 1978.

Önge 1969 — Y. Önge, "XIII ve XIV. Yüzyıllarda Anadolu Mimari Eserlerini Süsleyen Boyalı Nakışlar". *Önasya* 4/43 (1969) 8-11.

Ousterhout 2005 — R. G. Ousterhout, *A Byzantine Settlement in Cappadocia*. Washington 2005.

Patel 2018 — Y. Patel, "Whoever Imitates a People Becomes One of Them": A Hadith and its Interpreters". *Islamic Law and Society* 25 (2018) 359-426.

Peacock 2012 — A. C. S. Peacock (Ed.), *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. London 2012.

Peacock 2012 — A. C. S. Peacock, "Court and Nomadic Life in Saljuq Anatolia". Ed. D. Durand-Guedy, *Turko-Mongol Rulers Cities and City Life*. Leiden (2013) 191-222.

Pritchard 1844 — J. C. Pritchard, *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind: Researches into the History of the Asiatic Nations Vol.* IV. London 1844.

Redford 2011 — S. Redford, "City Building in Seljuq Rum". Eds. C. Lange – S. Mecit, *Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*. Edinburgh (2011) 256-276.

Redford – Leiser 2008 — S. Redford – G. Leiser, *Victory Inscribed: The Seljuk Fetihnāme on the Citadel Walls of Antalya*. Antalya 2008.

Redford 2000 — S. Redford, *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia: Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya*. Oxford 2000.

Rennell 1830 — J. Rennell, *The Geographical System of Herodotus Examined and Explained Vol.* I. London 1830.

Rockhill 1900 — W. W. Rockhill, *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World 1253-55*. London 1900.

Rogers 1969 — J. M. Rogers, "Recent Work on Seljuk Anatolia". *Kunst des Orients* 6/2 (1969) 134-169.

Rustamshoevich 2018 — T. J. Rustamshoevich, *ТЕМУРОВ ДЖАХОНГИР РУСТАМШОЕВИЧ АНТРОПОНИМИЯ «ТЫСЯЧА И ОДНА НОЧЬ» (ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ) Anthropoonomy, linguistic aspects of the "Thousand and One Night"*. Dushanbe 2018.

Schick 1995 — R. Schick, *The Christian Communities of Palestine from Byzantine to Islamic Rule: A Historical and Archaeological Study*. London 1995.

Shoshan 2002 — B. Shoshan, *Popular Culture in Medieval Cairo*. Cambridge 2002.

Shawi 2004 — N. Al-Shawi, "The Restoration of Al-Bab Al-Wastani". *The Third International Conference on "Science and Technology in Archaeology and Conservation,* Queen Ranya Institute of Tourism and Cultural Heritage. Jordan (2004) 1-10.

Shukurov 2012a — R. Shukurov, "Foreigners in the Empire of Trebizond (The case of Orientals and Latins) At the Crossroads of Empires: 14th - 15th Century Eastern Anatolia*". Proceedings of the International Symposium Held in Istanbul, 4th - 6th May 2007*. İstanbul (2012) 71-84.

Shukurov 2012 — R. Shukurov, "Harem Christianity: The Byzantine Identity of Seljuk Princes". Eds. A. C. S. Peacock – S. N. Yıldız, *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. London (2012) 115-150.

Sümer 1985 — F. Sümer, *Selçuklular Devrinde Milleterarası Büyük Bir Fuar*. İstanbul 1985.

Tabbaa 2017 — Y. Tabbaa, "The resurgence of the Baghdad Caliphate". Eds. F. B. Flood – G. Necipoğlu, *A Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture, Vol. I. From The Prophet to the Mongols*. London (2017) 307-326.

Tabbaa 2001 — Y. Tabbaa, *The Transformation of Islamic Art during the Sunni Revival*. Seattle 2001.

Tekinalp 2009 — V. M. Tekinalp, "Palace Churches of the Anatolian Seljuks: Tolerance or Necessity?". *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 33/ 2 (2009) 148-167.

Texier-Pullan 1864 — C. Texier – R. P. Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture: Illustrated by Examples of Edifices Erected in the East During the Earliest Ages of Christianity*. London 1864.

Texier 1849 — C. Texier, *Description de L'asie Mineure* II. Paris 1849.

Ünsal 1959 — B. Ünsal, *Turkish Islamic Architecture: In Seljuk and Ottoman Times 1071-1923*. London 1959.

Vinogradov 2014 — A. G. Vinogradov, *The Population of the Countries of the World from most Ancient Times to the Present Days: Demography*. London 2014.

Watson 2008 — A. M. Watson, *Agricultural Innovation in the Early Islamic World: The Diffusion of Crops and Farming Techniques 700-1100*. Cambridge 2008.

Yalman 2018 — S. Yalman, "Repairing the Antique: Legibility and Reading Seljuk Spolia in Konya". *Spolia Reincarnated: Afterlives of Objects, Materials, and Spaces in Anatolia from Antiquity to the Ottoman Era*, Eds. I. Jevtić – S. Yalman. İstanbul (2018) 211-233.