The Connectedness of the Rum Seljuks and the Kingdom of Georgia:

A Framework for Artistic Exchange in the Thirteenth Century

By

Sarah O. Aldrich

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences & Humanities In
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts
in
Archaeology and History of Art

Koç University, October 2015

Abstract

Thirteenth-century Anatolia is a complicated mix of religions, ethnicities, and invading forces. The cultural and artistic interactions between the Kingdom of Georgia (1080–1259) and the Rum Seljuk Sultanate (1077–1307) have subsequently been largely overlooked in academic studies. However, these two societies played a significant role in the political constructs of thirteenth-century Anatolia in their negotiations with the Byzantines, Armenians, Mongols, and of course, one another. This thesis endeavors to understand the artistic relationship between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuks through analyzing such themes as cultural contact, patronage, mobility, identity, and exchange. Historical texts, such as those by Ibn al-Athir (d. 1233), Aflaki (d. 1360), Ibn Bibi (d. 1285) and the anonymous *Kartlis Tskhovreba* (11th-12th centuries) document cross-cultural marriages between the Seljuk and Georgian royalty. These documents provide the foundation for the analysis of the art and architecture of the two societies. Architectural monuments such as Divriği, two Sultan Hans, kümbets, Georgian churches in Tao-Klarjeti, and the Gelati Monastery exhibit proof of cultural interactions. Further supporting the argument for artistic exchange are small portable objects such as manuscripts, bowls, and coins. This thesis illuminates the close connection between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate in the thirteenth century.

Keywords: Rum Seljuks, Kingdom of Georgia, thirteenth-century, cultural exchange, patronage, architecture.

Özet

On üçüncü yüzyılda Anadolu, dinler, etnik kimlikler ve istila eden güçlerden oluşan karmaşık bir yapıydı. Bu karmaşık durumla ilişkili olarak, Gürcistan Krallığı (1080–1259) ve Anadolu Selçuklu Devleti (1077–1307) arasındaki kültürel ve sanatsal etkileşimler akademik çalışmalarda büyük oranla dikkate alınmamıştır. Fakat, bu iki toplum, Bizanslılar, Ermeniler ve Moğollar ın yanı sıra kendi aralarında yürüttürdükleri müzakereler sonucunda, on üçüncü yüzyıl Anadolusu'nun siyasi yapılanmasında önemli rol oynamıştır. Bu tez, kültürel temas, hamilik, hareketlilik, kimlik ve etkileşim gibi temaları analiz ederek Gürcistan Krallığı ile Anadolu Selçukluları arasındaki sanatsal ilişkiyi anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. İbnü'l-Esir (d. 1233), Aflaki (d. 1360), İbn Bibi (d. 1285) gibi tarihçilerin metinleri ve anonim *Kartlis Tskhovreba*(11-12. yüzyıllar) gibi tarihsel metinler Selçuk ve Gürcü hanedanları arasındaki kültürler arası evlilikleri belgelemektedir. Bu belgeler, bu iki toplumun sanat ve mimarisini incelemek adına temel oluşturmaktadır. Divriği, iki Sultan hanı, kümbetler, Tao-Klarjeti'deki Gürcü kiliseleri ve Gelati manastırı gibi mimari anıtlar bu tip kültürel etkileşimler için kanıt oluşturur. Elyazmaları, kase ve sikke gibi küçük taşınabilir objeler de sanatsal etkileşimin inceleneceği diğer bir alanı oluşturmaktadır. Bu tez, on üçüncü yüzyılda Gürcistan Krallığı ile Anadolu Selçuklu Devleti arasındaki yakın ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Anadolu Selçukları, Gürcistan Krallığı, on üçüncü yüzyıl, kültürel etkileşim, hamilik, mimari.

Acknowledgements

To those who supported me along the way. A special thank you to Dr. Suzan Yalman for helping me navigate the research and writing process. Thank you also to Dr, Nina Ergin and Dr. Oya Pancaroğlu for their time and feedback.

Note on Transliterations

The subject matter of this thesis deals with a number of languages, including Persian, Arabic, Turkish, Georgian, Armenian, and Greek. I have done my best to maintain the current accepted English transliteration of most words. For those that have been adopted into the English language I have treated as English words. Diacritical marks have been omitted.

Table of Contents

Abstract iv

Özet v

Acknowledgements vi

Note on Transliteration vii

Table of Contents viii

List of Images xi

Introduction 1

Chapter I: THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY POLITICAL LANDSCAPE IN ANATOLIA AND THE CAUCASUS

I.1 An Introduction to the Political Entities of Thirteenth-Century Anatolia 9

I.2 The History and Context Surrounding the Anatolian Seljuks 10

I.3 The History of the Kingdom of Georgia Leading up to the Thirteenth Century 18

I.4 Armenian History and its Relevance to the Study of Georgia 22

I.5 Differentiating Between Georgian and Armenian Architecture 25

I.6 An Overview of Existing Scholarship Pertaining to Medieval Anatolia 36

Primary sources written in and about Anatolia 36
Scholarship relating to Rum Seljuks 41
Studies on the Kingdom of Georgia 52
Scholarship covering the Kingdom of Armenia 58

I.7 The Culmination of Cross-cultural Scholarship and the Direction of this Thesis 62

Chapter II: PATRONAGE: A WEB OF POLITICS AND INTERMARRIAGE

II.1 Patronage: Its Meaning and Relevance to Medieval Anatolian Studies 65

II.2 The Patterns of Patronage within the Kingdom of Georgia 67

II.3 The Patronage of the Rum Seljuks 77

II.4 Intermarriage between the Georgians and the Anatolian Seljuks 84

II.5 Prominent Patrons of Thirteenth-century Anatolia and their Contributions 85

Chapter III: TRANSFERABILITY AND THE EXCHANGE OF ARTISTIC AESTHETICS

III.1 The Ideas of Influence, Exchange, and Cultural Identity 104

III.2 Kümbets: Familiar Tomb Structures in Northeastern Turkey 109

III.3 The Divriği Complex: A Case Study for Traveling Ideas, Objects, and Artisans 116

III.4 Traveling Craftsmen and Objects: Their Contribution to the Cultural Landscape 121

III.5 Constructions Materials and Motifs in Medieval Anatolia and Caucasia 133

III.6 Tied Economies: The Sharing of Numismatic Iconography and Metals 138

III.7 From Anatolia to Caucasia: A Suggestion for Further Studies 150

Conclusion 160

Bibliography 164

List of Images

Fig. 1. Map of Anatolian and Caucasus Region (Peacock, 2006, p. 132). 2

Fig. 2. Map of Anatolia depicting the Byzantine dispersement after 1204 (U. Mich). 12

Fig. 3. Map of united Georgia (Soltes, 1999, p. 82). 18

Fig. 4. The Four Gospels, Constantinople, folio 6v eleventh- twelfth century (Evans, 2006, p. 93). 27

Fig. 5. Folio from the Georgian Alaverdi Manuscript, 1054 (Burchladze, 2012, p. 211). 28

Fig. 6. Oshki Cathedral, 963–973 (Wohilem, 2008). 29

Fig. 7. Plan of Oshki Cathedral, 963–973 (Djobadze, 1992, p. 94) 30

Fig. 8. Plan of the Kars Cathedral or Church of Holy Apostles, 928–961 (Photo by author, 2014, virtualani.org). 31

Fig. 9. Multi-colored stone of the Church of St. Gregory at Ani (virtualani.org). 32

Fig. 10. Schematic drawing of masonry styles. (McGraw-Hill, 2003). 32

Fig. 11. Donor portrait of Doliskana Church (Photo by author, 2014). 34

Fig. 12. Jvari Monastery, 586–604 (Photo by author, plan by Mepisashvili 64). 68

Fig. 13. Samtavisi Cathedral, 1030 (Photo by author, plan by Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 161) 69

Fig. 14. Detail of Oshki Cathedral window, 963–973 (Photo by author, 2013). 71

Fig. 15. Aerial of Gelati Monastery, near Kutaisi, Georgia and plan (Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 182, plan by Alpago-Novello, 1980, p. 328). 72

Fig. 16. Donors flanking the Deesis on the south wall of the Oshki Cathedral, 963–973 (Photos: Djobadze, 1992, p. 113–117, author, 2014, Drawing: Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 140). 74

Fig. 17. Two portraits of King David VI Narin from the south chapel of the Gelati Monastery (Mepisashvili1979, p. 186). 75

Fig. 18. The donor panel of Kintsvisi (Q'inc'visi) (Photo by author). 76

Fig. 19. Coin minted by Kaykhusraw II, 1241 (The Barber Institute Coin Collection, no. 4563). 89

Fig. 20. Detail from the Incir Han, 1238–1239 (Branning, "Incir Han"). 90

Fig. 21. Mevlana Mausoleum in Konya, 1273 (Photo by author, 2014). 96

Fig. 22. Plan of the Mevlana Mausoleum (Karamağaralı, 1966, p. LXIX). 96

Fig. 23. The donor portrait from the Church of St. George (Kırk Dam Altı (Suzek, 2008, p. 145). 100

Fig. 24. Sitte Melik Kümbet (Pancaroğlu, “Sitte Melik tomb”). 110

Fig. 25. Kharraqan Towers, 1067 and 1093 (muslimheritage.com). 113

Fig. 26. Stone carving at the Mama Hatun Türbesi (Lu, 2007, p. 1108). 115

Fig. 27. The hospital and mosque complex at Divriği (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 195). 116

Fig. 28. The Divriği hospital portal (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p.196) 117

Fig. 29. Canon table in Gospel book from Hromkla/Rum Qal’a, 1253 (Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., Ms. 44. 17. tables 4 and 5) 119

Fig. 30. The interior of the Innsbruck Plate (Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum,Innsbruck, Austria). 124

Fig. 31. The exterior of the Innsbruck Plate (Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum, Innsbruck, Austria). 125

Fig. 32. The reception room in the Norman Palace in Palermo, 1150–1200 (Hoffman, 2001, p. 34). 127

Fig. 33. High relief on the external wall of Oshki Cathedral (Photo by author, 2014). 128

Fig. 34. Seljuk building fragment, Konya (Photo by author, 2014). 130

Fig. 35. Kubadabad Palace tiles, ca. 1230 (Photo by author, 2014). 130

Fig. 36. St. John Chrysostom from the Chora church in Istanbul (José Luiz Bernardes Ribeiro, 2011). 132

Fig. 37. The north dome of the Great Mosque at Isfahan (J. Powell). 134

Fig. 38. The Aladdin Mosque in Konya (Brotherton, 1984). 135

Fig. 39. Copper coin from King Giorgi III from 1156-1184 (Lang, 2004, p. 9). 139

Fig. 40. King Nineveh carved on walls of Aghtamar Church, 915–921 (Mnatsakanian, 2010, p. 135). 140

Fig. 41. A silver medallion depicting Caliph al-Moqtadir (Jones, 2007, p. 59). 140

Fig. 42. Kubadabad Palace Tiles, Konya (Photo by author, 2014). 141

Fig. 43. Copper coin minted by Queen Tamar, 1200 (Lang, 2004, p. 11, pl.11, 8). 142

Fig. 44. Copper coin minted by King Giorgi Lasha IV, 1210 (Lobja, 2003). 142

Fig. 45. Silver coin minted under Georgian Queen Rusudan, 1230 (Lobja, 2003). 142

Fig. 46. Coin of Seljuk Sultan Mesud I (r. 1116–1157) (Aydın, 1994, p. 22). 144

Fig. 47. Coin minted by Kiliç Arslan, 1180–1225 (sticc.edu). 145

Fig. 48. Copper coin minted by Nasir al-Din Muhammad (Pancaroğlu, 2004, p. 157). 146

Fig. 49. Silver coin from King David VI Narin, 1245-1293 (Lang, 2004, p. 16). 147

Fig. 50. Copper coin minted under King Demetre II, 1280-1289 (Lobja, 2003). 148

Fig. 51. Silver dirham minted by the Mongols in 1244 (Lang, 2004). 149

Fig. 52. Church of St. Nicholas of the Gelati Monastery (Left photo by author, right photo by Nikoloz Davreshidze). 151

Fig. 53. Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Kayseri, 1232–1236 (Branning, "Sultan Han, Kayseri," Photo on right by author). 154

Fig. 54. Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Aksaray, 1229 (Branning "Sultan Han, Aksaray"). 155

Fig. 55. Detail from the Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Kayseri. (Branning, "Sultan Han, Kayseri"). 156

Fig. 56. The church of Surb Astvatsatsin at the Amalu Noravank (Keefe, "Amalu Noravank' "). 157

INTRODUCTION

Medieval Georgian and Anatolian Seljuk studies have long been relegated to the periphery of Western academia. These two cultures were located on the geographic fringe of great empires such as Byzantium (330–1204, 1261–1453), the Sasanians (224–651), the Great Seljuks (1040–1157), and the Abbasid Caliphate (750–1258). Nonetheless, the territory that was comprised by the Georgian Kingdom and the Seljuk Sultanate became important crossroads for trade between east and west. Such a position resulted in the utilization and adaptation of diverse artistic styles and practices. It is precisely this physical location and the dynamics of the many thirteenth-century political powers, that enabled the cultural exchange which will be highlighted and examined within this thesis.

The Seljuks ruled in Anatolia from approximately 1081 through to 1307. They took over lands that were once ruled by Byzantium, their domain encompassing the lands of present-day Asian Turkey; stretching from the Black Sea in the north to the Mediterranean in the south and from Lake Van in the east to Denizli in the west (Fig. 1) (Peacock and Yildiz, 1–9). It was during the thirteenth century that the Anatolian Seljuks reached the peak of their power. Nonetheless, the preceding centuries were marked by a complex series of relationships; Anatolia was home to a number of small dynasties such as the Danishmendids (1071–1178), Saltukids (1071–1202), Artuqids (1101–1409), and the Mengücekids (1180–1228), the Byzantines were displaced as a result of the Latin occupation of Constantinople




Fig. 1. Map of the Anatolian and Caucasus regions and the respective political groups in the late twelfth century (Peacock, 2006, p. 132).

(1204-1261), and the Mongols invaded in mid-century. Perhaps as a result of the diversity of issues at hand, many studies of this region and era have long focused on Byzantium and the Crusades. Early Turkish scholarship on the Seljuks was tinted with an overtly nationalist view, while Western scholars dismissed the Seljuks as invading barbarians. However, this trend has recently begun to change and medieval Anatolia is receiving more attention in international academic circles.

The Kingdom of Georgia, which existed as a unified state between 1008–1490, has also been largely ignored by non-Georgian academics.[1] Located between the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea and on the southern border of the Caucasian Mountains, this small kingdom once had strong ties with the powerful Byzantine Empire. Positioned on the eastern frontier of Byzantium and subscribing to the same religious doctrine, the Georgian Kingdom was a key ally in the events pertaining to

[1] The oversight of the study of medieval Georgia is demonstrated through the scant number of publications available, furthered by the frequent confusion of of political characters. The titles of rulers such as King David IV Aghmashenebeli and David VI Narin have respectively been published as David III (Crowe, 2001, p. 340) and David V (Kolbas, 2006, p. 163). The publication of such mistakes in prominent books emphasizes the low level of attention afforded to Caucasian studies in Western scholarship.

Christian and Muslim encounters (Matchabeli, 2000, p. 184). Like their Seljuk neighbors to the southwest, the Kingdom of Georgia reached the height of its power in the thirteenth century. At this juncture, the Georgians controlled much of the Caucasus including lands previously under Armenian jurisdiction (Rapp, *Languages and Cultures* xxxix). However, in the face of the impending Mongol conquest, the Georgians found an ally in the Seljuks. This alliance forged in the early thirteenth century had impacts beyond the political sphere. These cultural exchanges are asserted and discussed within this thesis.

The body of this work examines the history and artistic patronage of both the Kingdom of Georgia and the Seljuk lands with the purpose of highlighting the artistic exchanges and proposing a direction for further research. It is an important step in reaching a better understanding of the cultural layout of medieval Anatolia. Due to academic disciplinary boundaries, scholars often conduct isolated studies of the artwork of empires, kingdoms or dynasties. In reality, the middle ages were a time characterized by the travel of people and objects which resulted in an exchange of ideas and aesthetics. This shared visual culture documents the travel of ideas and the connections of the era. It is seen in the dispersement of objects, coins, and comparable building elements. Such an understanding challenges the nationalistic constructs of many past art historical studies.

This study provides a new perspective to the existing understanding of thirteenth-century political players through the examination of the interactions of the lesser studied dynasties. The Anatolian Seljuks established a distinct style of architecture. Many scholars downplay the artistic agency of the Anatolian sultanate,

crediting the origins to the Great Seljuks in greater Iran (ca. 1040-1157). However, it is apparent that Anatolian Seljuk art and architecture included local traditions found in Anatolia and neighboring regions. Equally, the Georgians partook in a very unique and identifiable style of architecture within the Caucasus region. The question then becomes, did, and if so, how did the two artistic cultures mesh, transfer and translate between these neighboring political entities? While a handful of studies have examined the links between the peripheral powers in Anatolia and the larger empires of the Byzantines and Sasanians, few have looked at the relations between the smaller political powers themselves. In answering this question, it is important to consider the more portable arts that could have possibly aided the transfer of ideas and artistic styles. As objects and people move throughout a landscape, regional motifs can be seen by wider audiences and thus be adapted and included in another cultures' artistic program. Additionally, there is the documented common occurrence of traveling artisans who further contribute to a diverse cultural aesthetic. As such, the acknowledgement of the multiplicity of influences and cultural encounters must also be noted.

Scholars who have laid the groundwork for this thesis have compiled catalogues of artwork and architecture. They have examined the political affairs and power dynamics of the larger dynasties such as the Byzantines, Seljuks, Sasanians, and the Mongols. These studies provide the foundation for further examination of the relationships between the smaller powers of the era. However, much of this work emphasizes formal analysis, typological grouping and a strict timeline of trends. This thesis utilizes these studies, yet takes the analysis a step further. By bringing in

primary sources, such as, but not limited to, the early thirteenth-century Arabic chronicle of Ibn al-Athir and the thirteenth-century hagiography of the Sufi mystic Jalal al-Din Rumi by Aflaki of Konya, this study establishes the close connection between the Georgian court and the Anatolian Seljuks.

The examination of the personal relationships and political alliances enables a validated assessment of artistic styles and the context surrounding cultural exchange. The establishment of the close connection between these two cultures is achieved through the examination of patronage practices in the respective regions and how artistic styles overlap. Although determining documented occurrences of cultural exchange is difficult to prove, this thesis identifies architectural monuments that potentially exhibit cross-cultural characteristics. In addition to the documented battles and alliances between the Georgians and the Anatolian Seljuks in the late twelfth century, the two powers came under Mongol control by the mid-thirteenth century. These series of events contribute to the exchange of cultural characteristics that were transferred and appropriated across societal lines.

This thesis utilizes three primary chapters to navigate the questions and issues pertaining to this field. The first chapter outlines the political and social background of the ruling powers that had a significant bearing on the thirteenth century. Focusing on the history of the Kingdom of Georgia and the Anatolian Seljuks, this chapter includes their relationships with the Great Seljuks, Byzantium, and the Armenians. The years and centuries leading up to the thirteenth century provide the context necessary to comprehend the later events and relationships. It allows us to better understand the identities and movements of individuals within the given societies.

Following the synopsis of the Anatolian and Caucasian historical background, this chapter examines and comments upon the existing scholarship of the relevant fields. The particular topic of Georgian and Seljuk relations, especially those considering the artistic exchanges, have been merely mentioned in most studies with an appeal for further research (Peacock, 2006; Rogers, 1976). The majority of the scholarship which has been consulted for this thesis consists of studies pertaining to a single dynasty and culture. The methodologies of these studies have contributed greatly to the discussions and conclusions in this thesis.

The second chapter delves deeper into the close connections between the Anatolian Seljuks and the Georgians in particular. There are a number of cases of royal intermarriage which provide proof of the close connection between the two cultures. The relationship subsequently provides the framework for this study of influence and shared cultural artistic styles. Building upon the marriage alliances, this chapter focuses on the patronage patterns and individuals in the Seljuk and Georgian courts. This chapter examines the identities and backgrounds of patrons, the types of buildings they commissioned, and how scholars today negotiate and understand cultural identity through architecture. By looking at who commissioned building projects and how and where they went about the process, the possible connection between peoples, cultures, and exchanges becomes more evident.

The third and last chapter of this thesis is concerned with the artistic practices of the Georgian and Seljuk courts. While the evidence is not yet present to directly connect the characters discussed in Chapter II to specific arts and monuments, Chapter III examines the respective artifacts of the two cultures in an effort to find

commonality. It aims to answer questions about the distinct characteristics of both Georgian and Seljuk architectural traditions and the lasting stylistic exchanges that seem to cross stylistic and cultural boundaries. The northeastern region of Anatolia acted as the immediate contact zone between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Seljuks, subsequently providing some of the most apparent examples of cultural exchange. The contributions of traveling craftsmen and portable objects are explored and the elements of artistic exchange are analyzed within key architectural monuments. In addition to artistic media, the circulation of coins between the two cultures is further exemplified by the numismatic record. It is within this chapter that further possible linkage between the Georgian and Seljuk architectural styles is proposed.

Although this study is limited in scope and is hindered by my own language deficiencies, it provides a platform for the continuation of research pertaining to the cross-cultural exchanges between Georgia and the Seljuks. The topic of cultural exchange between medieval Georgia and Anatolia is a subject far too broad to address within this Masters Thesis. Instead this study provides the political and scholarly background as well as an analysis of regional patronage patterns to determine the connectedness of the artistic practices. As previously stated, Georgia has long been overlooked, yet it played a substantial role in the history of medieval Anatolia. Whether it has been passed over because of the difficult language and script, or because of its small geographic footprint, it is necessary to remedy this omission in the larger historical picture. The Seljuks offer linguistic challenges as well. Their court language was Persian, while many official inscriptions were in

Arabic; yet, they spoke Turkish and occasionally Greek. The documentation that remains from the Seljuk Sultanate is scant and much of the information garnered has been acquired through foundation documents, inscriptions and historical accounts. The majority of the scholarship that pertains to this thesis is in Turkish, Georgian, or Russian. Language barriers aside, this thesis takes the step to examine the varying cultures and encounters of an Islamic state and that of a Christian one, each of which comprises the periphery of their respective religions and regions. It compiles past studies, expands upon the theme of cross-cultural patronage, and proposes a direction for future scholarship.

CHAPTER I

THE THIRTEENTH-CENTURY POLITICAL LANDSCAPE IN ANATOLIA AND THE CAUCASUS

I.1 An Introduction to the Political Entities of Thirteenth-Century Anatolia

The study of Georgian and Anatolian Seljuk relations in the thirteenth century and that of their respective artistic practices cannot be done without an understanding of the political powers and events of the region. To begin, one must address the historical context of the thirteenth century as well as that of the preceding centuries. The Byzantine Empire (325–1453 CE), the Great Seljuk Empire (1040–1157 CE), and the Armenian Kingdom (885–1400 CE)[2] contributed greatly to the political landscape of the era and must be factored into the following analysis. Ultimately, the Mongol invasion of the mid-thirteenth century significantly impacted the various ruling powers of Anatolia and their relationships. The various frameworks and dynamics that existed between these political groups need to be considered to further the understanding of the artistic and cultural connections between the Anatolian polities. Equipped with background knowledge about the thirteenth-century political environment in Anatolia, the history and interactions between the Seljuks of Rum and the Kingdom of Georgia can be better appreciated. Their story is a complex web of attacks and allegiances which fluctuated from year to year. The sequence of intermarriage between the Georgians and the Anatolian Seljuks provides clear

[2] Many different dates could be given for the Kingdom of Armenia depending on which royal houses one considers. According to Chahin (1987, p. 277), the first royal house of Armenia dates from c. 1300 BC. For the purposes of this thesis, I am including the Bagratid Monarchy (885-1064) and that of the Rubens in the formation of Armeno-Cilicia (c.1100- c.1400).

evidence of sustained contact between the cultures and allows us to further explore the connections between their art and architecture. Throughout history, marital ties were a common means to form alliances with foreign powers, often with the purpose of bolstering defenses in times of upheaval. The Georgians and the Seljuks were no different. With whom and how these connections were negotiated greatly affected the patronage of monumental architecture and the subsequent display of cultural identity in the Anatolian built environment. The theme of intermarriage will be further addressed in Chapter II. This chapter provides an overview of the background information on the political relations of thirteenth-century Anatolia and analyzes the existing academic literature.

I.2 The History and Context Surrounding the Anatolian Seljuks

In the Middle Byzantine period (843–1204) the Byzantine Empire had weakened as a result of the previous onslaught of Arab attacks. Benefitting from a diminished Byzantine army, Anatolia became an easy target for invading forces. It was eventually taken and dominated by the Anatolian Seljuks following their decisive victory and capture of Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes in 1071 (Peacock, 2010, p. 5). The branch of the Seljuks that moved into Anatolia was an offshoot of the Great Seljuk dynasty that came to power in the early eleventh century and ruled over greater Iran, Iraq and Syria for nearly two hundred years. The Great Seljuks had established themselves as a powerful and influential authority in the region, challenging the Abbasid Caliphate, conquering Baghdad (1055), and extending their rule to Anatolia, the Caucasus, Central Asia as well as south to parts of India

(Branning). Their rise to power is a critical turning point for Islamic history and the spread of the Islam, thus changing the political landscape of the medieval world. Prior to their divergence, the Anatolian Seljuks were a part of the Great Seljuks expansionist policy (Cahen, 2001, p. 10).

The Anatolian Seljuks split from their relatives in approximately 1081 when a remote cousin of the Great Seljuk Sultan Malikshah (r. 1072-1092), Süleyman bin Kutalmış (r. 1077–1086), declared independence from the Great Seljuk Empire and established his own principality in Anatolia (Peacock, 2010, p. 26). The capital of the new state was founded at Nicaea or present-day Iznik. Just nine years after their victory over the Byzantines, the Anatolian Seljuks were shaken when the Great Seljuks killed Kutalmış and imprisoned his son, Kılıç Arslan (r. 1092–1107). Malikshah I, the man who was responsible for the killing and imprisonment of the leaders of the Anatolian Seljuks died in 1092. With this turning point, Kiliç Arslan was released and resurrected the dynasty that his father, Kutalmış, had established (Peacock, 2005, p. 217–20). He relocated the Seljuk capital to Konya in 1107 where it would remain for the duration of the dynasty's rule. The Anatolian Seljuk dynasty had a difficult start, but their prominence and power increased by the late twelfth-century, specifically after the 1176 Battle of Myriokephalon. The battle was a result of the Byzantines plotting to recapture Central Anatolia from the Seljuks. They were quickly ambushed in a mountain pass, resulting in another definitive defeat. The Seljuks continued to strengthen their rule and in the early thirteenth century, under Kaykhusraw I (r. 1192–1196, 1205–1211), the Anatolian Seljuks began to successfully expand their territory from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea. They



Fig. 2. This map depicts the political layout of the region on the eve of the Mongol invasions.The stars denote the Byzantine capitals established after the 1204 conquest of Constantinople by the Latins (Map Courtesy of University of Michigan (http://sitemaker.umich.edu/mladjov/files/europe1240ref.jpg))

reached their pinnacle between 1204 and 1243, coming to an halt when they were vanquished by the Mongols in 1243 (Holt 11, Cahen, 2001, p. 30).

During this period, Byzantium was substantially weakened by the Fourth Crusade. In 1204 Constantinople fell to the Latins, causing many inhabitants of the capital city to flee and to establish various peripheral states. They fled to the western Peloponnesian city of Arta, the relatively close city of Nicaea, as well as places as far as the northeastern principality of Trebizond (Haldon, 2005, p.179) (Fig. 2). Byzantines in each of these regions set up their own rule and government, thus making reunification upon the recapture of Constantinople difficult. The most dominant and successful branch was the Lascarids ruling from Nicaea. The conquest of Constantinople in 1204 by the Latins created a unique political environment for the Seljuks. They were able to take advantage of the defeated Byzantines, taking control over much of Anatolia. However, not having to govern these lands allowed the Lascarids to focus on recapturing Constantinople; which they successfully did in 1261 (Haldon, 2005, p. 140). The displacement of the Byzantines from their capital city marked the start of a tumultuous century. The occupation of Constantinople by

the Latin Empire lasted nearly sixty years and overlapped with the Mongol attacks in Eastern Anatolia, which began in the 1220s.

The newly formed Anatolian branch of the Seljuks became known as the Seljuks of Rum. This name refers specifically to the lands that the Seljuks acquired in Anatolia; the lands that were once governed by the Byzantine Empire. The Byzantines referred to themselves as the Eastern Roman Empire, and thus the citizens were called *Romaioi* or Romans. It should be noted that, the term "Byzantine" was coined in the late sixteenth century and has been used ever since (Oxford Dictionary). Nevertheless, when the lands administered by the Roman Empire were taken by the Seljuks, they referred to themselves as the "Sultanate of *Rum"* or the "Seljuks of *Rum."* The term *Rum* related directly to the word "Rome" (Holt, 1986, p. 167). According to Korobeinikov, Rum is a term that denotes the dynasty's geographical locale rather than the sources of their legitimacy (p. 81).

Kaykhusraw I, the ruler at the start of the thirteenth century is credited as the sultan who contributed greatly to the rise of the Seljuks of Rum and the man who was responsible for the initiation of the dynasty's "golden age" (Branning). In 1207 he took control over what is present-day Antalya, a move that extended the Rum Seljuk rule to the Mediterranean Sea (Mecit, 2011, p. 69). However, Antalya proved to be the one city in which the Christian population of Anatolia revolted against Muslim Seljuk rule.[3] The city was retaken in 1215 by Kaykhusraw's son, Kayka'us

[3] After the Christian rebellion in Antalya in 1212 and upon the recapture of the city by the Seljuks, they erected a monumental inscription upon the city walls referring to the Christians as "unbelievers" and crediting God for restoring the city to Seljuk control (Redford, 2008, p. 110-111) William of Rubruck also cites the Seljuks' dislike and disregard for Christians in his travel account. His statement, "My guide presented me to the Soldan. The Soldan said he would be pleased to have me taken to the sea of Hermenia or of Silicia. But this trader (Nicholas) knowing that the Saracens would take little care of me (p. 277)" perhaps shows more of his own prejudice than what would have been showed by the Sultan. For shortly thereafter he points out that only one in ten of the population of Anatolia is Muslim (p. 280).

(r. 1211–1220) (Redford, 2005). A year prior, in 1214, also under Kayka'us, the Seljuks of Rum took Sinop. This victory provided them with a harbor on the Black Sea. With ports in the north and south of Anatolia, the Seljuks of Rum began to place a heavy interest in sea trade (Mecit, 2011, p. 69). At the height of their power, the Seljuks of Rum rule encompassed Lake Van and Erzurum in the east. To the west, the Seljuk reign stretched to Denizli; thus, their rule included much of the Anatolian plateau (Fig. 1).

As stated previously, the Seljuk Empire acquired much of its land from Byzantium, an empire built around its Christian identity.[4] Thus, the majority of the population who came under Seljuk control were Christians. The Seljuks would have encountered conflict had they wanted to impose Islam across their lands. As a result and perhaps from fear of additional revolts, the Seljuks embraced a degree of religious tolerance. A part of the Rum Seljuks' law allowed non-Muslims to continue the practice of their own beliefs and worship under the condition of special taxes, a move which provided substantial financial resources for the sultanate (Wolper, 1995, p. 41). Unlike their Byzantine predecessors, the Seljuks did not distinguish between different Christian practices. This meant that the population that did not subscribe to the Byzantine church and Chalcedonian[5] beliefs no longer felt pressure to change or hide their religion.[6] For this reason, many Christians throughout Anatolia welcomed

---

[4] Constantine the Great (r. 306-337) founded the city in 330 as the new capital of the Roman Empire. He is responsible for decriminalizing Christianity and contributing to the establishment of the first Christian Empire (Encyclopedia Britannica).

[5] The Council of Chalcedon in 451 is a defining point in Christian theology. Byzantium embraced the notion that Jesus's humanity and divinity existed as two natures within him, a view that was termed Chalcedonian Christianity. However, some parties at the council rejected the idea of Jesus possessing two natures. In response, the term Monophysite came to represent the belief that Jesus possessed only one nature, that of the divine (Encyclopedia Britannica).

[6] Further discussed on page 23.

the change of rule and embraced Seljuk control (Cahen, 2001, p. 125). This degree of religious tolerance carried over into the court life of the Seljuks.

Although the Seljuks were an invading force, they would eventually come to have a tolerable relationship with the Byzantines. Elite individuals would move between courts, and intermarriages occurred with some regularity (Redford, 2010, p. 44). In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it was not unheard of for dignitaries of both the Rum Seljuk court and that of the Byzantine court to seek refuge with one another (Brand, 1989, p. 12). We know that Greek was a language frequently spoken in the harem by the wives and the children of the rulers (Biehammer, 2011, p. 600, p. 642). Furthermore, there were a number of churches built inside the Seljuk palatial complexes (Tekinalp, 2009, p. 149). These details prove that diversity was accepted within the court and that religion was not an essential defining factor of the Seljuk rule. In his article, "Harem Christianity; the Byzantine Identity of Seljuk Princes," Rustam Shukurov proposes that foreign brides, particularly Greeks, were favored over local or Seljuk women (p. 116). The inclusion of foreign women into the Seljuk harem was a part of a dual identity, which allowed for the navigation of political allegiances.

The downfall of the Seljuks was initiated in 1243 by the battle of Kösedağ when they fought against the invading Mongols (Eastmond, 2004, p. 82). Following their defeat the Seljuks of Rum were reduced to vassals under Mongol overlords. Andrew Peacock aptly writes in his article, "Seljuk Legitimacy in Islamic History,"

> Indeed, the very survival of the Seljuq dynasty in the second half of the 7th/ 13th century is itself testimony to the aura of legitimacy it gave to the business of ruling Anatolia. … Although the Seljuq sultan's ignominious flight from the field of battle, leaving his vizier to seek what terms he could,

> hardly redounded to the dynasty's credit, Ghiyath al-Din and his successors were maintained in office, if not in power. (p. 82)

This speaks to the recognition and impact that the Seljuks garnered throughout their lands. Despite the Seljuks' embarrassing defeat at the hands of the Mongols, the victors still saw it fit for the Seljuks to carry on with a minor degree of autonomy (Crane, 1993, p. 45). Although they were under Mongol rule, the Seljuks were able to continue their own building projects, albeit to a limited degree. It was at this point that the nature of patronage changed from court commissions to commissions by wealthy amirs who built medreses, tombs and Sufi lodges (Wolper, 1995, p. 39, fn 46).[7] Provided that the Seljuks were under the Mongol protectorate, the power dynamics within the Seljuks themselves shifted. The viziers and emirs were able to take on a more prominent role in commissioning buildings, whereas the sultans were ceremonial figure heads with limited power (Crane, 1993, p. 24; Kolbas, 2006, p. 122).[8]

Despite their close familial ties to the Great Seljuks and their fundamental role in weakening the power of the Byzantine state, it should be noted that the Seljuks of Rum were largely considered a periphery state. Regarded from a modern western perspective, the Seljuks were beyond the eastern boundary of Europe and were one of the smaller dynasties that contested the Byzantines. Although the Byzantine Empire called for assistance in the fight against the encroaching armies of

---

[7] The scholarship of Howard Crane discusses this fact using different terms. His writings indicate that the Mongol protectorate initiated the decline of Seljuk architectural patronage. "Thus, Saldjuq architectural patronage in Anatolia through the course of the thirteenth century parallels the gradual devolution of authority and power away from centralized dynastic rule to regional administrative figures and finally, after the loss of all autonomy at the end of the century, to complete Mongol domination in the east and fragmentation among Turcomen emirates in the west" (p. 24). In this statement, he acknowledges the changes, understanding it to be the devolution of the grand monumental structures built in Anatolia under the Seljuks in the years postdating the Mongol subjugation.

[8] This will be expanded upon in Chapter II.

the Great Seljuks, the troops of the First Crusade (1096–1099) were focused upon the Holy Land and subsequently ignored the Byzantine plea (Ibn al-Athir, Part 1, 2002, p. 13).

From a religious perspective, the Seljuks of Rum were on the eastern frontiers of Islam. The central and most important centers of the Islamic world were traditionally present day Iran, Iraq and the Arab peninsula. The idea of the Rum Seljuks as a spur of another political power has placed the Sultanate on the periphery of academic study as well. The dynasty has been overlooked in many modern studies in favor of their greater known relatives, the Great Seljuks. They have also been bypassed by scholars who prefer to study the greater Islamic powers such as the Arabs, Caliphates, and the Ottomans. This indifference by academicians has begun to change. Throughout the past few decades, in-depth studies have been published on the court culture, the administrative networks, commerce, private life, and gardens (Peacock & Yildiz, 2011, p. 1–7).

Although the Seljuks are have often been considered a periphery state in modern scholarship, there are additional dynasties which have be understood to be on the margins of the Seljuks of Rum. The Danishmendids (1071–1178), Saltukids (1071–1202), Artuqids (1101–1409), and the Mengücekids (1180–1228)[9] were minor dynasties within Anatolia. In some regions, the respective dynasties held more control than the Rum Seljuks (Kadafar, 2007, p. 9; Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001; Sinclair, 1990, *Vol. II,* p. 312.). However, after some power struggles the

[9] Pancaroğlu provides the approximate date of the dynasty's origination. The date of the demise aligns with when they were absorbed into the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate (2009, p. 173). The Mengücekids are famous for building the Hospital and Mosque of Divriği in 1228, a monument that is adorned with exquisite carvings and ornate portals, suggesting a dynasty of wealth and power. They became vassals of the Seljuks a year later. This is discussed in Chapter III.

smaller dynasties were eventually absorbed into Seljuk control and the Rum dynasty territory by the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In the scholarship, these powers are frequently grouped within the Rum Seljuk Sultanate. In addition to these smaller Anatolian dynasties, the lands of the Seljuks of Rum were bordered to the east by the Armenians and the Georgians in the Caucasus, a region more frequently overlooked.

I.3 The History of the Kingdom of Georgia Leading to the Thirteenth Century

Georgia is a country that has historically been repeatedly divided and subjected to foreign invasions. Numerous small kingdoms were unified into the Kingdom of Georgia under King Bagrat III (r. 1008–1014) who joined together the regions of Imereti, Samegrelo, Abkhazeti, Guria and Svaneti (Fig. 3). It was his reign and unification efforts that are considered to be the start of the "Golden Age" of the



Fig. 3. The map provides the approximation of the various principalities that were united under Bagrat III (r.1008–1014) in 1008 (Soltes, 1999, p. 82).

Kingdom of Georgia (Rapp, 2003, p. 413). The borders grew to encompass the greatest expanse of territory under his granddaughter, Queen Tamar (r. 1184–1213). She is an integral individual in the history of Georgia and is occasionally referenced as King Tamar in historical writings. The male title was used as she was considered a prominent and successful ruler; moreover, that many of her contemporaries doubted the ability of a woman to lead a kingdom (Eastmond, 1998, p. 104).[10] The "Golden Age" of the Kingdom of Georgia reached its pinnacle under Queen Tamar. The century of prosperity was brought to an end by the Mongols in 1236.

Christianized in the early fourth century, Georgians have long identified with their strong Orthodox Christian background. Throughout the early periods of the middle ages, the Georgians maintained a close alliance with Byzantium. The conversion of Georgia to a Christian kingdom is seen as a move by the nation to shift away from their Sasanian ties[11] and towards a Byzantine political orientation (Lomouri, 2000, p. 183). Consequently the two powers forged strong ties built upon their mutual Orthodox religion. David the Builder started a precedent in which he would select promising youths to send to Constantinople to learn languages and to encourage scholarly writing. In the time of Queen Tamar, Byzantium and Georgia collaborated to found the Trebizond Empire(Eastmond, *Art and Identity in Thirteenth Century Byzantium* 20). As with most political relationships, there were times of tension as well. In the tenth century Georgians accused the Byzantines of stealing their tributes that they had sent to Mount Athos (Lomouri, 2000, p. 184). These

[10] For further reading on the depiction of Tamar, look to Eastmond's *Royal Imagery in Medieval Georgia,* Toumanoff, "On the Relationship Between the Founder of the Empire of Trebizond and the Georgian Queen Thamar" and Jones and Met'reveli, *The Georgian Chronicles of K'art'lis C'xovreba.*

[11] The Sasanians had held considerable control over much of the Georgian regions beginning in the fifth century and stretching to the late seventh century. At this point, in 888, the Georgian throne was regained by Adarnase IV of Iberia (Lomouri, 2000, p. 182; Rapp, 2011, p. 13).

tributes sent from Caucasia to the Greek mountain never reached their destination and presumably were intercepted by the Byzantines within their territory. During this same time period, Byzantium also attempted to prevent efforts to unify the various states of the northern Caucasus region to form the Kingdom of Georgia, a move which further strained relations (Lomouri, 2000, p. 184). Nonetheless, the earlier close relations can still be seen in varying degrees throughout Georgian art and architecture.[12] The strong association with Christianity and the threat of invasions by the Seljuks and the Mongols did lead to cooperation between the Byzantine Empire and the Georgian Kingdom.

As mentioned earlier, Georgia has a long history of invasions. The present-day capital of Tbilisi, once known as Tiflis, was controlled by Muslims for nearly four hundred years. Arabs took the city in the eighth century and maintained control until the Great Seljuks under Sultan Alp Arslan (r. 1063–1072) took control in 1068 (Asatrian & Margarian, 2004, p. 32). This move sparked tensions which resulted in the Georgian-Seljuk wars which lasted from 1099 until the start of the thirteenth century. The Syrian chronicler Ibn al-Athir (1160–1233) wrote about the events in his work *The Complete History* (*Al-Kāmil Fī'l-Ta'rīkh,* 1231), noting a number of years in which the Georgians attacked the Seljuk Sultanate (p. 70, 85–6, 123, 142, etc.). He clearly writes from a Muslim perspective, for he often damns the Georgians and describes them as being consumed by lust and deceit. A prime example is his description of the Georgians' siege of Ganja in 1225–1226:

> The Georgians realized that the town was too strong for them, so they withdrew after the people of Ganja had inflicted serious losses on them. "God drove back the infidels in their raging, They achieved no good"(p. 251).

[12] The relationship of Georgian and Byzantine architecture will be expounded in Chapter III.

His words characterize the Georgians as weak. The inclusion of the quote from the Qur'an further insults the Georgians. Aside from the loss of Tiflis, the Georgians proved very successful in the Georgian-Seljuk Wars. With a new sense of confidence in the years leading up to the thirteenth century, Georgian attacks on Seljuk lands became quite common.

The Georgians regained control of Tbilisi and further united their kingdom in 1122 under the rule of King Davit IV Aghmashenebeli, known today as King David the Builder (r. 1073–1125). After the recapture of the city, Tbilisi had a substantial Muslim population. David the Builder set up a series of laws to protect the Muslim community (Minorsky 1949, p. 29; Suny, 1988, p. 38). His motions ensured that the call to prayer and the reading of the Qur'an would be allowed in Tbilisi, that pigs would not be slaughtered in the Islamic quarter of the city, and that the Muslim baths were closed to Jews and Christians. Even after the time of David the Builder, Georgians had a close connection to Muslim societies. The coins minted under King Giorgi (George) III (r. 1156–1184) included the name of both the Caliph and Allah in addition to his own name and that of the Christian God (Minorsky, 1949, p. 33–34; Asatrian & Margarian, 2004, p. 34).[13] The degree of accommodation for the Muslims in a Christian kingdom can be compared to the Seljuks and their rule over Christians and the necessity for tolerance to avoid internal conflict.

The medieval history of Georgia is not often studied by non-Georgian scholars. The historical segmentation of the state and its small size are contributing factors as to why Georgia has escaped the notice of many academics. Although non-

[13] The numismatic patterns of the Kingdom of Georgia will be discussed further in Chapter III. Fig. 39 depicts the copper coin mentioned above.

Georgian medieval sources include mention and comments pertaining to the Georgians and their Kingdom's participation in the politics of Anatolia, the history of northeastern Anatolia and the southern Caucasus has been largely overlooked. Similar to the Seljuks, we can consider this culture to be on the periphery of most studies. The medieval Kingdom of Georgia had substantial interactions with the larger surrounding empires such as the Byzantines, the Sasanians, the Great Seljuks, and the Seljuks of Rum; however, they were never considered enough of a substantial power to attract much scholarly concern or attention from Western audiences. These factors as well as the uniqueness and difficulty of the language has pushed the Georgians to the margins of most scholarship.

I.4 Armenian History and its Pertinence to the Study of Georgia

Armenia, too, must be factored into this study. Although the thirteenth century was not the pinnacle of Armenian power, the Armenians had long been an intrinsic region on the eastern border of Byzantine territory. Similar to the Georgian Kingdom, the Armenians were once strongly aligned with the Sasanians. Upon their adoption of Christianity in the early fourth century, their political alliances were drawn closer to powers in Syria as well as with the Byzantines. Byzantium gained control of parts of Armenia as early as the fourth century (Chahin, 1987, p. 218). After the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the Armenians rejected the adoption of the Byzantine Chalcedonian doctrine, preferring to subscribe to the Monophysite position/ doctrine.[14] This theological difference perpetuated tensions and eventually led to

[14] For an explanation of the differing beliefs, see p. 15, n. 4.

Armenians preferring Seljuk rule over that of the Byzantines in the eleventh century. Rather than differentiating between different Christian views, the Seljuks considered all Christians the same and no longer singled out the Armenians (Der Manuelian, p. 2). The differing theological interpretations, Chalcedonian and Monophysitism, also affected Armenian relations with Georgia as the Georgians subscribed to the Chalcedonian Byzantine church.

Nonetheless, within the Byzantine Empire, Armenians made up one of the more populous minorities and a number of their emperors had Armenian lineage (Garsoian & Martin-Hisard, 2011, p. 64; Rapp, 2012, p. 9). Armenia long marked the southeastern territory of the Byzantine Empire and was a valuable region for the latter. Yet, the political position of Armenia had been severely minimized by the thirteenth century. Soon after the Battle of Manzikert (1071) when the Byzantines lost to the Seljuks, Armenia came almost entirely under Seljuk control. As a response, the Armenians set out to Cilicia to create a new national home, establishing Cilician Armenia (Nersessian, 1978, p. 122). Thus, in the thirteenth century, Georgia was the prevailing power in the Caucasus region with their dominion stretching into lands previously controlled by Armenians (Chahin, 1987, p. 235).

The Georgians and Armenians have a long shared history. Although they converted to Christianity in the same period, their understanding of church beliefs diverged after the Council of Chalcedon. The two kingdoms also differ in their languages. Armenian is Indo-European, whereas Georgian is an amalgamation of unique regional dialects. Georgian is a Kartvelian lanuguage, a family of languages consisting of Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian, and Laz. The respective languages are spoken within different regions of Georgia (Suny, 1988, p. 4). In the ninth century,

both nations came under the rule of the Bagratid dynasties, ruling groups that were different branches of the same family.[15] The family likely originates from Armenia, but is thought to have existed since the sixth century CE (Toumanoff, 1943, p. 155). Both sides of the Bagratid family claimed their legitimacy through their direct lineage from the Prophet David. The Armenians and Georgians both married across political lines into the Seljuk and Byzantine courts.

The art and architecture of Georgia and Armenia share many similarities. The close proximity to each other and the ever-changing borders have cultivated many parallel artistic styles and architectural elements. It is easy to confuse the arts of the two kingdoms; thus, the term Caucasian or Transcaucasian art and architecture has been used. Transcaucasia refers to the area bordering on the southern side of the Caucasus Mountains and includes the modern countries of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan (Margarian, 2001, p. 75). The term denotes the inclusion of multiple nations, wheres as the term Caucasian can be understood both as an ethnicity as well as the region (Britannica).[16] The history of fluid boundaries between Georgia and Armenia make strict definitions of art and architecture problematic, leading to the value of terms that encompass this region and its shared culture.[17]

---

[15] Armenia came under the rule of the Bagratid dynasty in the early ninth century (Chahin, 1987, p. 228), while a different branch of the Bagratid family assumed control of the Georgian Kingdom in 888 (Toumanoff, 1966, p. 145).

[16] The issue involving terminology pertaining to this region will be addressed on page 60.

[17] This issue of terminology will be discussed and clarified later in Chapter III.

I.5 Differentiating Between Georgian and Armenian Architecture

In the effort to identify the close relationship between the Seljuks and the Georgians, it is necessary to determine what constitutes Georgian art. Before delving into the examples of respective cultural practices, one must make the distinction between Armenian and Georgian artistic elements. Many of the aesthetics within the Caucasus region are similar: yet, when a Caucasian motif is identified outside of the region, it is typically the Armenian culture that tends to be credited as the source of *influence*. The blind attribution of artistic elements from the Caucasus leads to the perpetuation of inaccuracies. Determining the precise origin of specific motifs is near impossible and adds minimal value to studies. However, in examining the Georgian-Seljuk connection, it becomes important to note the differences between the two Caucasian styles. Defining architecture that is of Armenian style versus that of Georgian is a challenge that most current scholarly sources avoid. Rather, Transcaucasian architecture has frequently been lumped together as a branch of Byzantine architecture (Maranci, 2001, p. 161). To add to the difficulty, Byzantium also shared artistic motifs and methods with Georgian and Armenian cultures as a result of their shared Christian identity, although this distinction is beyond the scope of this thesis. Stephen Rapp highlights the unfair and relatively unreasonable attention that Armenian arts have received in academia and how the art and cultural interactions of medieval Georgia has been subsequently overlooked (Rapp, 2011, p. xxi-xxii). Many authors tend to blindly attribute art and architectural elements to Armenian origins when examining unusual styles observed in Seljuk arts. For instance, Barbara Brend looks at the monuments at Divriği in her article “The Patronage of Faḫr Ad-Dīn ʿalī Ibn Al-Ḥusain and the Work of Kalūk Ibnʿabd Allāh in

the Development of the Decoration of Portals in Thirteenth-century Anatolia" and claims that Armenian manuscripts greatly influenced the architectural façade (1975, p. 173). It is true that, when one looks at these manuscripts, one can notice a striking similarity between the illumination and the vegetal motifs present in the stone carving. However, when looking through Georgian and Byzantine manuscripts, one may see the same similarities between painting and carving.

To further exemplify the issues in understanding cultural appropriation, let us turn our attention to illuminated manuscripts. Many scholars will look at these books to identify the aesthetics and trends of an era. Painting has long been considered the height of artistic expression, typically falling under the classification of "high art." The motifs and images which are included in illuminated manuscripts reflect the hierarchies, clothing, and architecture of a time. Writing in 1914–1916, Dorothy Lamb specifically connects the Alaeddin Mosque in Konya to Armenian manuscripts. She goes so far as to identify the flourishes that can be seen in the manuscripts and how they translate to the facades (p. 38). The imagery used in the comparison is a set of four letters from the Armenian Gospels housed in the British Museum. The similarities between these few characters and the decorative elements seen on the facades of Seljuk buildings is not enough to draw a firm conclusion about cultural influences. Another issue with the comparison is the lack of an explanation of how these styles are categorically Armenian as opposed to Georgian. Rapp correctly states that "One of the lessons for scholars is that Late Antique and medieval Georgia cannot be understood apart from Armenia, and vice versa" (Rapp, 2011, p. xxi-xxii). This is an area of study which requires greater attention and much



Fig. 4. The Four Gospels, Constantinople, folio 6v eleventh- twelfth century. This Byzantine manuscript holds many of the same features as seen in the Georgian and the Armenian manuscripts (Evans, 2006, p. 93).

more clarification. Equipped with such an understanding, artistic and historical analyses would gain strength, credibility and value.

An added critique to the attribution of influence given to Armenian manuscripts is the presence of motifs similar to those highlighted by Lamb in Byzantine and Georgian texts (Fig. 4, 5). Does this mean that the Byzantine and Georgian manuscripts copied the Armenian ones? Of course, to answer such a question, the completion dates of each as well as the life and travel of the monks who completed the works must be compared. The association of influence from one manuscript or another through the use of formal comparison is difficult at best, as




Fig. 5. This folio from the Georgian Alaverdi Manuscript (1054), depicting Christ writing a letter. Here we can see the similarities of the architectural elements shared by the Armenian manuscript highlighted by Rogers and Brend (seen in Fig. 22) in comparison with a Georgian manuscript. (Burchladze, 2012, p. 211)

there is no proof that the architect and/or stonemason had seen, or even had access to such a work. The Divriği complex proves to be a similar cautionary tale in the appropriation of the term "influence" and the process in which one reaches such a conclusion.

For studies that are not focused on Armenian or Georgian arts, the term "Transcaucasian art" becomes a more appropriate descriptor when space cannot be designated for the differentiation. When tracing a regional stylistic evolution, it can be tempting to connect two cultures based strictly on a formalist assessment and the

use of similar structures and motifs. However, rarely is the connection between two cultures as simple as a direct connection between two monuments or two cultures. Georgia's preeminent art historian, Giorgi Chubinashvili (d. 1973), argued that the Armenian churches with polygonal or cylindrical cupolas were mere attempts to copy Georgian monumental structures (Nersessian, 1978, p. 48). Nersessian counters this by highlighting the close connections between the two countries, the parallel growth from a shared religion and culture, as well as the sharing of craftsmen. This instance illustrates how Chubinashvili was subject to the nationalist pride of his community-- a common theoretical problem among early art historians, using methodology to support their ideology.



Fig. 6. Oshki Monastery, 963–973, as seen from the south (Wohilem, 2008).




Fig. 7. The triconch plan of Oshki Cathedral in Tao-Klarjeti (present-day Turkish province of Erzurum) 963–973 (Djobadze, 2991, p. 94).

The commonalities between Georgian and Armenian churches extends to their ground plans. The basilica plan entered the region after the introduction of Christianity. The form evolved to incorporate local building traditions, and by the tenth century the majority of Georgian and Armenian churches were built using a triconch plan (Djobadze, 1992, p. 90). This consists of a large nave augmented with a cross arm situated perpendicularly and adjacent to the apse (Fig. 6, 7). In comparing then tenth-century plans of the Georgian and Armenian churches, the Georgian constructions in Tao-Klarjeti are largely cathedrals built with three naves and a centralized dome such as Oshki (963) and Khakhuli (latter half of the tenth century), whereas those built by the Armenians are smaller single-nave or centralized plans as seen in the churches of Mulk‘ (tenth century), Gndevank‘ (936), and West C‘alac‘k‘ar (c. 935) (Thierry & Donabédian, 1989, p. 120-121, 598-602).




Fig. 8. The Armenian cathedral in Kars, the Church of the Holy Apostles, and its ground plan, 928–961 (Photo by author, 2014, plan from *virtualani.org*).

The more visible challenge comes in recognizing the differences between Georgian and Armenian architecture. As Rogers points out, Armenian churches are typically built on a smaller scale than their Georgian counterparts (1976, p. 316). This is quite evident when examining the mid-tenth-century Armenian Cathedral built in Kars by the Armenian Bagratid King Abas in comparison with those in Tao-Klarjeti (Fig. 6, 7, 8). Built with a tetraconch plan, the Cathedral of Kars, also known as the Church of the Holy Apostles,[18] is shorter in stature, more angular, and gives the impression of being generally squat and heavy (Fig. 8). The building stands twenty meters tall with a proportionate footprint which maintains the verticality of the building. The columns supporting the porches are thicker than their Georgian counterparts and the decorative carvings that appear across the exterior facade are


[18] In 1579, under the Ottomans, the Kars Cathedral was converted into a mosque (virtualani.org). The Turkish name is Kümbet Camii. Kümbet likely references the central structure which bears a strong similarity to many Seljuk mausoleums in shape and form.



Fig. 9. This image of the cupola of the Church of St. Gregory at Ani depicts the common coloration seen in medieval Armenian churches (virtualani.org). The blind arcade that is found on so many Georgian monuments can also be seen on this Armenian construction.

more bold and stylized. The Cathedral at Oshki Monastery reaches a total height of 34m, while its base is approximately 40 by 27m (Djobadze , 1992, *p.* 93).

Armenian churches are distinct from Georgian ones in the use of material. Armenian churches, by and large, are built using multi-colored stone, a strong juxtaposition to the Georgian constructions that have a monochrome aesthetic. The red, black, and grey stones that comprise Armenian churches are a tell-tale sign which culture was responsible for its construction (Fig. 9). While stone is the fabric of choice for monumental architecture in Caucasia, the stone utilized for churches varies, based on the building's regional context. While both Georgian and Armenian constructions have the outward appearance of ashlar construction, most are



A) random-range quarry-faced ashlar
B) random-range dressed-faced ashlar
C) coursed quarry faced ashlar
D) coursed dressed ashlar with margin draft
E) bonder in ashlar
F) rubble filling back of ashlar

Fig. 10. Schematic drawing of the various types of ashlar masonry. (McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Architecture and Construction, 2003)

comprised of rubble construction faced with impeccably cut stones used to mimic ashlar masonry (Fig. 10) (Marsagishvili, 1999, p. 99). While lime mortar is used to secure the building material, it is not visible from the exterior (Djobadze, 1992, p. 178).

Perhaps the most immediately apparent similarity, and the one underlined by Chubinashvili is the high drum of the centralized dome which is completed with a capped conical roof. This cupola structure is pierced by tall narrow windows which are framed by a blind arcade, encircling the whole structure. Windows are not always placed under each arch of the arcade, but are placed alternating around the dome so as to allow light to penetrate the body of the church, illuminating the frescoes adorning the whole of the interior. The basis of this structure can be traced back to the early days of Christianity and the presence of centralized domes. The cohesion and elegance present in Georgian and Armenian cupolas is the result of the evolution of dome structures into an elongated drum capped with a conical roof. The area above the arcade and close to the roofline is occasionally adorned with additional decoration, be it sun motifs (*sharavandi*) (Rapp, 2012, p. 10), Biblical scenes, donor portraits, or inscriptions (Fig. 11). In general, the Armenian cupolas tend to be more decorated than those of Georgian churches. The conical roof is typically covered in ceramic tiles of varying colors. Additional decorative elements such as carvings and low-relief sculpture are typically found on the body of the church framing the windows and doors. A common feature of Georgian ecclesiastical architecture are the blind arcades which stretch the height of the exterior walls and encircle the whole of the structure.




Fig. 11. Donor portrait seen on the drum of the cupola of the Doliskana church in Tao Klarjeti, tenth century (Photo by author, 2014).

The decorative pattern which adorns many of the facades of medieval Georgian churches is a slender blind arcade. It consists of graceful elongated arches that stretch the full height of the church, from the ground level to the roof line. The colonnettes[19] can be singular or stepped and either simple or decorated with carvings (Djobadze 1992, p. 90). The effect of this uniform blind arcade creates a simplistic decor which unifies the facade. Most Georgian churches incorporate blind arcades and refined arches into their exterior decoration, whereas the motif is less frequent in their Armenian counterparts. However, if a church possesses a central dome housed within a tall cylindrical or polygonal drum and capped with a conical roof, it is almost invariably adorned with an encircling blind arcade. Provided that the use of blind arcades is common in both Georgian and Armenian architecture, it may be more appropriately identified as a Caucasian or Transcaucasian stylistic motif.

[19] Defined as "a small column especially in a group in a parapet, balustrade, or clustered column" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary).

In addition to considering their grandeur, the decorative carving and reliefs found throughout the churches tie together Georgian and Armenian ecclesiastical architecture. According to Sakvarelidze, in the eighth and ninth centuries, Georgian artistic trends shifted away from antique figures and moved towards a low-relief aesthetic (2009, p. 115). The artistic trends deviated again in the tenth and eleventh centuries when attempts were made to render sculptural reliefs as naturalistic as possible through added volume and finer detail. This movement coincided with the Byzantine "Macedonian Renaissance," or resurgence of interest in classical art and motifs (Cormack, 2000, p. 131; Hunt, 1984, p. 140). The Armenian carvings represent a similar aesthetic, but go a step beyond in embracing a more two-dimensional, bold, stylized character that is often identified in Byzantine art. In the tenth century, carved reliefs maintained a highly stylized fashion as can be seen on the Church of the Apostles in Kars. It can be asserted that the Armenian figures retain more of the Persian artistic stylization than their Georgian neighbors, a fact which is indicative of the respective political focuses and alliances.

In sum, Georgian and Armenian medieval art and architecture share many characteristics. Without context or background knowledge, monuments can easily be mistaken for one culture or the other. Between the building materials, ornamentation of the facades, and the formal structures, there are numerous elements that cross the two kingdoms. On an international scale, Armenian heritage has largely been given more attention, while Georgian art and architecture has been ignored. The connectedness of the two medieval kingdoms and their aesthetics calls for in depth

studies of their respective backgrounds and one should rarely be cited without mention of the other.

I.6 An Overview of Existing Scholarship Pertaining to Medieval Anatolia

To best understand the historical background and cultural interactions between the Georgians and the Seljuks, one needs to look at the respective literature pertaining to each group. To complete the overview of the political situation in the era, it is important to look not only at the scholarship on the Seljuks of Rum and Georgia, but also the scholarship on Byzantium, Armenia, and the Great Seljuks, as each society impacted and interacted with one another. As is common among many fields, the early literature on Georgian and Seljuk studies is marked by nationalist rhetoric, a limited scope, and the difficulty of access to many materials. In recent decades, scholarship has broadened its outlook, taken into consideration relevant contexts, and increased the utilization of primary texts. This thesis takes into account such historical and artistic studies while simultaneously drawing upon thirteenth-century contemporary sources.

Primary sources written in and about Anatolia

The individuals who wrote about the events of medieval Byzantium, Anatolia, and the Caucasus have significantly aided in our understanding of the time period. While there are few studies that pertain to the Seljuks and Georgians respectively, what has been recorded has become immeasurably important. For this thesis, the consideration

of source material is a great challenge. Not only are the works few in number, but they and many of their secondary studies are written in a multitude of languages including Turkish, Persian, Arabic, Syriac, Georgian, Armenian, and Greek. With my own shortcomings in language proficiency, this study is rather hindered. However, I have done my best with English translations of historic texts and have considered the translations of inscriptions as well as the pertinent art and architecture to garner some insight into the cultural ties of the thirteenth century. Below I will briefly address the writings of Ibn al-Athir (d. 1233), Ibn Bibi (d. 1285), Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286), and Aflaki (d. 1360) who all chronicle the Seljuk and Islamic world, the writings of Anna Comnena (d. 1153) who provides the Byzantine perspective, and the translation of the twelfth-century *Kartlis Tskhovreba* (*The History of Georgia*).

The consultation of historic sources requires the consideration of the historical contexts. Many of the authors wrote with an agenda, a fact which must not be ignored. A degree of prejudice from historic sources is to be expected, since writers who wrote from within a culture naturally tote the laudable traits of their society, while bemoaning the evils of the outsiders. The skewed nature of their works is also subject to the identity of the patron of the work, for benefactors often have a specific idea of how they want to be portrayed. Carole Hillenbrand's article "Some Reflections on Seljuq Historiography" briefly discusses this trend, although she primarily writes about the historical literature pertaining to the Great Seljuks. Nonetheless, some of these sources do have some overlap in which the authors discuss the Rum Seljuks as well. In her conclusion, Hillenbrand directly addresses the biases found within the chronicles of the Middle Ages, noting that references to the Seljuks usually stereotype the sultanate. Paraphrasing her words, they are either

depicted as too generous and good, or too evil and vicious. The extreme bias in the historical accounts of the Seljuks occurs frequently in Georgian and Syriac writings, where it has been recorded that the Seljuks constructed minarets from the skulls of enemies atop which they would recite the call to prayer (Hillenbrand, C. 1991, p. 86). This is a prime example as to why historical writings must be accepted with some incredulity and skepticism why a variety of sources should be consulted for a balanced view.

Anna Comnena's *Alexiad,* which was likely completed after 1148, is the life story of her father, the Byzantine Emperor Alexius (r. 1081–1118). While this work focuses primarily on military ventures, Anna Comnena attempts to provide an unbiased account. However, when tasked to chronicle unfavorable events in her father's life, her omission of certain facts becomes clear (p. 11-12). Included within her history are the conflicts of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries between the Byzantines and the Turks or Seljuks. This was the time period in which the Rum Seljuks were making their headway into the inner regions of Anatolia and establishing themselves as a dominant power.

Often referred to as "*The Georgian Chronicle*," *Kartlis Tskhovreba,* is a history that has been built upon over the years and consists of various parts. While they occasionally overlap, as in the case of Queen Tamar's reign, the various writers all have their own means to portray the events documented (Met'reveli, 2014, p. 9). While praise is often laid upon both the physical attributes and the political acumen of the Kings and Queens of medieval Georgia, there exist numerous passages of critique. Specifically in the recall of King Giorgi Lasha and his sister Queen Rusudan's reigns much lamenting and regret is expressed. The poor choices or

behavior of both children of Queen Tamar are attributed to the neglect of their Christian faith. The same assessment is also intermittently passed upon the Georgian people. Nonetheless, this source provides a valuable parallel history to be read alongside of the Seljuk and Byzantine histories of the time.

The work of Ibn al-Athir provides a chronology of the Crusading periods up through approximately 1230. This work, *Al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh* (*The Annals of the Saljuq Turks*, translated by D. S. Richards), written in Arabic was completed around 1231, outlines the events of the Seljuks and other regional players by year. He is a Syrian writer, but includes all important events which are under or impact Muslim rule. His bias against non-Muslims can be seen in his accounts of events pertaining to Georgians and Armenians. However, he also holds a grudge against the Seljuks of Rum. Ibn al-Athirs' description of Kutalmış' death is one riddled with a lack of respect. He dismisses the man's bravery, citing: "When the dust had settled and the army made camp, Qutalmish [sic] was found dead, lying stretched on the ground, although no-one knew how he had died. It is said that he died of terror, but God knows best" (Ibn al-Athir, 2002, p. 152). He continues to scorn the Rum Seljuks interest in astrology, noting, "This was a blow that stained their reputation for religion" (Ibn al-Athir, 2002, p. 152).

Writing after Ibn al-Athir was Bar Hebraeus, a Syriac Catholicos who died in Persia in 1286. His historical work is comprised of two parts, that of religious history and the other of secular past. Utilizing the sources that came before him, Bar Hebraeus compiled a history of the region. However, provided his remote location in

relation to Anatolia, his accounts possess inaccuracies.[20] The specifics of these inaccuracies will be illuminated later in this thesis.[21]

The historian Ibn Bibi wrote *al-Avamir al-aliyya fi'l-umur al-aliyya* (*Seljukname* / The Book of the Seljuks), which exists as the most important contemporary source on the Seljuks. His chronicle was written in Konya, the Rum Seljuk capital, starts with the reign of Kaykhusraw I (r. 1192–96/1204–10) and ends in 1282. Currently translated from Persian into Turkish and German, Ibn Bibi's work covers nearly a century and is compiled based upon what the author experienced and heard (Yildiz, 2006, p. 46). The chronicle begins prior to Ibn Bibi's life and thus he has depended heavily on the chronicles that came before him. His position in Konya was privileged as both he and his parents worked for the Rum Seljuk bureaucracy enabling him to have close access to events and sources. His writing is flowery and decorative, yet his first-hand account of many thirteenth-century events is invaluable.

Writing from a different perspective is Aflaki, the biographer of Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, also known as Rumi (of Rum) or Mevlana (Master). His work, *The Feasts of the Knowers of God (Manaqeb al-'arefin),* is a chronicle of the life of saints rather than a compilation of historical events. The character of Gürcü Hatun, who is essential to this thesis, is frequently featured in Aflaki's hagiography. She embodies the connection between the Georgians and the Seljuks, and her dedication to Mevlana affords the reader many anecdotes about her character and patronage. Aflaki's accounts enable scholars to identify and trace the movements of prominent

---

[20] He identifies Gürcü Hatun's brother as the David who accompanied her to the Seljuk court at the time of her marriage. In actuality it was her cousin (Ibn al-Athir, 2002, p. 403; Peacock, 2006, p. 140).

[21] Additional Arab and Syrian chronicles are available for this period. However, they have not been translated into English; thus, my own linguistic shortcomings hinder their usefulness in this thesis. For more information see *The Seljuks of Anatolia; Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources*, Gary Leiser and Mehmet Fuad Köprülü. 1992.

individuals in the thirteenth century in Konya as well as Anatolia. The work was likely completed in 1350 (O'Kane, 2002, p. x).

Travelers such as William of Rubruck (1253–55) and Marco Polo (1254–1324) provide additional perspectives on the events of the thirteenth century within Anatolia. They are far removed from the cultures and thus comment upon hearsay. Travelers are quick to pass judgement on the cultures foreign to them; however, their documentation of gossip informs readers of current events and contemporary perceptions. They also have the unique position to report on customs and everyday facts that locals may take for granted or as common knowledge. Such tidbits equip scholars with a better understanding of daily life.

Building inscriptions play a critical role in this study. Although often installed for propaganda or self-aggrandizing purposes, these stone documents record events, provide information about individuals and their professional roles, and mention the artisans employed. The identification of patrons listed on the facades of buildings allows family lineages to be traced and biographical timelines to be established. Additionally, inscriptions found on religious architecture and charitable foundations differ greatly from those adorning civic architecture such as city walls and fortifications. Regardless, in the thirteenth century, many of the engraved texts note the piety of a donor or foundation. All in all, the epigraphy of the thirteenth century served as a "public text" which was composed to send a message to the general population (Redford, 2014, p. 18).

Scholarship Relating to Rum Seljuks

The work of Osman Turan focused on the Seljuks of Anatolia as the manifestation of the supremacy of the Turkish race (p. 78). His first studies were published in the 1940s, and they were heavily impacted by the secular rhetoric of the early Turkish Republic. In his 1955 article, "The Ideal of World Domination among the Medieval Turks," Turan features the point that Turks understood themselves to be the "chosen people of God" (p. 78). The pan-Turkic nature of Turan's writings portrays the Seljuks as exhibiting intolerance for non-Turks and a never-ending quest to conquer the lands around them. However, were this an accurate assessment of the Seljuk mentality, the rate of intermarriage and the accommodation of Christians in and outside of the court would be much different. The publication of such materials was during a period with few studies on the topic. Turan's work subsequently contributed to the development of the field and brought the unfamiliar subject-matter to the forefront of academic attention. Turan made substantial contributions to the field through his translation and publication of numerous primary sources from Persian into modern Turkish.[22] Some of the most pertinent translations are those of *waqfiyyas;* he translated that of the Karatay Madrasa's title deed in his book *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmi Vesikalar: metin, tercüme ve araştırmalar* (1958) and the document outlining hunting practices in *Oniki Hayvanlı Türk Takvimi* (1941).

Twentieth-century western scholarship pertaining to the Rum Seljuk Sultanate and its history was largely initiated by Claude Cahen. His most significant work *La Turquie pré-ottomane* (*Pre-Ottoman Turkey,* 1968) portrays the nationalistic nature of cultural studies in the mid-twentieth century. Cohen looks to find the

[22] Turan's major works have not been translated into English.

Turkish element in each era. Until recently, it was the sole major study of the Seljuks in English. His research encompasses the period between the Battle of Manzikert (1071) and 1330, when the Mongol Empire faltered. Cahen is credited with pioneering a branch of scholarship which approached the Middle East with equal esteem and regard as seen in historical studies of Europe and the west (Lewis, 1997, p. 220). His studies provide a basis of historical information that can be used to understand the political environment of the time through the discussion of the reign of the prominent sultans.

Speros Vryonis Jr. is a significant scholar who wrote extensively about Byzantine history. In 1971, he wrote *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Anatolia* in which he looked in depth at the transformation from Byzantine Asia Minor to an Islamicized Anatolia. As his title suggests, his views on the changing political and cultural environment were quite negative. Vryonis held Hellenistic culture in high regard and, thus the incursion of Islam into Anatolia marked a significant change in his tone. He later wrote an addendum to this book which he presented at the Symposium of Byzantine Studies in Warwick in 1999. The proceedings were edited and published by Antony Eastmond in 2001. This addendum proves important to this study for its mention of Georgian and Byzantine interactions. Furthermore, Vryonis published a more specialized article in 1977, "Another Note on the Inscription of the Church of St. George of Beliserama" concerning the unique funerary chapel dedicated to St. George in the Ihlara valley in the Cappadocia region of Turkey. This article discusses the identification of the church patron who is identified by name as Tamar. Vryonis' account provides important context for the furthering of the field.

Charles Brand is a Byzantinist who in 1989 published "The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh-Twelfth Centuries." This article looks closely at how the Seljuks adapted to and infiltrated the upper echelons of Byzantine Society. Brand's article directly tackles the challenges of looking at cross-cultural dynamics. He accounts for how both Seljuks and Byzantines were able to live in each others' courts and cultures and provides an understanding of how fluid the cultural boundaries were. In looking at the intermarriages between Georgians and Seljuks, Brand's work furnishes a strong parallel examination of Seljuks and their cross-cultural relations. Brand equips the reader with an understanding of the navigation of religion, rank, and culture necessary for cross-cultural marriages and those seeking refuge in a foreign society.

Not long after, Rustam Shukurov addressed the same subject of the Byzantine and Seljuk court relations. Focussing on the idea of "dual identity" he explores cross-cultural encounters. His article titled "Harem Christianity: The Byzantine Identity of Seljuk Princes" specifically contributes to the understanding of cross-cultural marriages, religious tolerance, and the values of the court. Outlined in the article is the frequency with which Seljuk sultans married Christian brides who were allowed to maintain their native religion within the Seljuk court.

One of the most recent contributors to the historical chronologies of the Rum Seljuks is Andrew Peacock. His prolific writings address the power structure, legitimacy, and military behaviors of the thirteenth-century rulers of Anatolia. His analytical use of primary sources aids readers in understanding the context of Seljuk rule and the ideology that was present in their time of power. Peacock has contributed to the most recent Rum Seljuk studies and is among the few scholars

who have addressed the relationship with the Kingdom of Georgia and the pertinent cultural contexts.

Above I have cited some of the historians who have laid the basis of the historical studies of the Rum Seljuks. The following scholars have utilized art and architecture to further understand the Seljuks and their environment. The groundwork for much of the early Turkish art history started with the Vienna School, which rose to fame at the turn of the twentieth century. Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941), a member of the school, became a pioneer in early Anatolian and Armenian scholarship. His formalist approach stemmed from his "deep-seated suspicion of the relevance of texts and contexts (Pancaroğlu, 2007, p. 69)." The focus on the physical elements of art and architecture combined with the ethnocentric views of the early twentieth century became the defining methodology in his studies. Stryzgowski made further impact on art history through his move away from the classical European studies and instead turning his attention to the little studied arts of the Near East. Strzygowski emphasized "Turkish" art as an essential component of the Art Historical canon, thus cementing himself and his studies in Turkish art historical scholarship. Such an emphasis was readily accepted and adopted within the newly formed Turkish Republic as it contributed to a sense of nationalism. Subsequent scholarship embraced a Turk-centric approach and promoted the "Turkish" aspects of the arts within Anatolia and the surrounding regions (Bozdoğan & Necipoğlu, 2007, p. 3).

Dorothy Lamb was one of the earliest western scholars to contribute to the field of Rum Seljuk studies. Her article "Notes on Seljouk Buildings at Konia," published in 1914, examines the facades of three monuments as well as the

architectural element which has come to be known as muqarnas. The formalist methodology of the Vienna School was instrumental in Lamb's article, and she draws heavily on the work of Strzygowski. She makes connections between monuments and cultures based primarily upon shared shapes and decorations.

J.M. Rogers began his work in the mid-twentieth century. He concerned himself primarily with the architecture of the Seljuks. In his "Recent Work on Seljuk Anatolia" published in 1969 he pays tribute to the work of Claude Cahen (*Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 1968). He contests Cahen's assertion that thirteenth-century Seljuk architecture was consistently influenced by Persia and that the Mongol dominance had little effect on the Seljuk building plan (Rogers, 1969, p. 134). Unlike the formalist approaches before him, Rogers does bring into consideration inscriptions to bolster his arguments. Also considered within this thesis are his articles "The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas: A Contribution to the History of Style in the Seljuk Architecture of 13th Century Turkey" and "Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia: The Epigraphic Evidence," both of which continue his usage of inscriptions and primary texts to illustrate the political and social landscape.

Barbara Brend is a later scholar who draws heavily upon Rogers' analysis of cultural exchange. Although Roger's studies are extremely important for the field, they are not without errors. Brend does not question Roger's mistakes or inconsistencies. Her article "The Patronage of Faḫr Ad-Dīn ʿalī Ibn Al-Ḥusain and the Work of Kalūk Ibnʿabd Allāh in the Development of the Decoration of Portals in Thirteenth-century Anatolia" was published in 1975. Although it closely examines

the entryways of Seljuk Anatolia, her own observations on the portals of Anatolia are in line with the formalist methodology of the Vienna School of Art History.[23]

In 1993 Howard Crane published the valuable article "Notes on Saldjūq Architectural Patronage in Thirteenth Century Anatolia." His work compiles an extensive catalogue of Seljuk architectural work and the relevant patrons throughout Anatolia. Organized according to who sponsored the building, Crane includes all published information pertaining to the building names, dates, and locations in a list format. In the body of his work, Crane provides an overview of Seljuk patronage, identifying what types of buildings were built by what class of people. Crane addresses the role of gender in patronage as well.[24] However, while Crane's article is unique and innovative, his source material limits the value of his work. Working from published material, Crane falls victim to other scholars mistakes.[25]

A prolific Turkish architectural historian, Doğan Kuban, contributed a great number of published works pertaining to the built environment of Anatolia. However, his work is characterized by a nationalist rhetoric. While he aids in the cataloging of the extant monuments within modern-day Turkey with an emphasis on Anatolia, his overt objective is to promote Turks and Turkish art (Yalman, 2011, p. 19). Not only is this evident in the body of his writings, but in his romantic and nostalgic titles as well; *İzmir ve Ege'den Mimari Izlenimler: Kaybolan bir Geçmişten Görüntüler* (Izmir and the Aegean architecture impressions: images of a lost past,

---

[23] The inconsistencies in the relevant studies will be illuminated in Chapter III.

[24] This subject is addressed further by Anthony Eastmond in his paper "Gender and Patronage between Christianity and Islam in the Thirteenth Century."

[25] The critique of Howard Crane is discussed at length in Suzan Yalman's dissertation, *Building the Sultanate of Rum: Memory, Urbanism and Mysticism in the Architectural Patronage of 'Ala al-Din Kayqubad (r. 1220-1237)* (2010).

1994) *Ahşap Saraylar: Kaybolan Kkent Hayalleri* (Wooden palaces: the lost city of dreams, 2001), and *The Miracle of Divriği* (2001). The glorification and Turkic emphasis of Kuban's work maintains the same genre as did previous Turkish historians and art historians.

Oluş Arık and Rüçhan Arık are two more important Turkish scholars. Most recently, in 2008, they jointly published *Anadolu Toprağı'nın Hazinesi - Çini Selçuklu Beylikler Çağı*. The book provides an exhaustive catalogue of Seljuk ceramics in Anatolia. The scholars are also responsible for the excavations of the Seljuk palaces in Alanya and Kubadabad (Yalman, 2011, p. 297). While they have each made contributions to the catalogue of work on the Seljuks, they maintain the formalist approach learned from Strzygowski (Redford, 2007, p. 244).

Building upon Shukurov's work on the intermarriage of Christians and Muslims within the Seljuk court, in 2009 Tekinalp examined the archeological evidence as chronicled in "Palace churches of the Anatolian Seljuks: Tolerance or Necessity?" He further contributed to the discussion, as it has been found that a number of Seljuk palaces included churches that were maintained through the centuries (p. 148–167). This penchant for marrying across cultural lines demonstrates the degree of tolerance and acceptance that was prevalent in medieval Anatolia.

Scott Redford has been an important scholar who has greatly added to the study of Rum Seljuk art history. His numerous articles and books chronicle the start of the Anatolian building program as well as the developments throughout the years. His article "The Seljuks of Rum and the Antique" looks closely at the reuse of building material and types of constructions in Seljuk architecture. Redford looks

beyond the simple use of spolia and contemplates the meaning that certain carved elements had in the Seljuk context through the consultation of primary texts. His use of historic writings and inscriptions in his studies of the Rum Seljuk Sultanate are a common methodology seen throughout his books. Redford has managed to combine studies in history, art and archeology to further bolster his writings and analyses of artifacts and buildings.

Additionally, Redford's studies are not limited by borders. In "Portable Palaces: On the Circulation of Objects and Ideas about Architecture in Medieval Anatolia and Mesopotamia," Redford addresses the transference of artistic ideas and how small objects can relate to architectural monuments. He considers the patterns seen on clothing and ceramics and how they relate to the decorative motifs seen on building portals and facades. The points raised within this article are indispensable for the framework of this thesis and will be returned to in Chapter III. His awareness and consideration of the lands and powers outside of Anatolia significantly strengthen the studies of the Rum Seljuks. His article "Thirteenth-century Rum Seljuq Palaces and Palace Imagery" immediately recognizes the relation of the Seljuks and their architecture to other medieval dynasties. In "How Islamic is it?" an essay about the origins of the Innsbruck plate Redford branches from traditional interpretations of the unique cloisonné dish to consider the role of the Caucasus in its design and manufacture. His vast knowledge and linguistic dexterity result in carefully considered publications that advance the study of the Rum Seljuks and medieval Anatolia.

Oya Pancaroğlu has also contributed greatly to the art historical material pertaining to Rum Seljuks. In her articles "A Fin-de-Siècle Reconnaissance of Seljuk Anatolia: Friedrich Sarre and his Reise in Kleinasien" and "Formalism and the Academic Foundation of Turkish Art in the Early Twentieth Century," Pancaroğlu analyzes and critiques the early art historical scholarship on the Seljuks and criticizes its formalist nature. In practice, formalism ignores the necessity of primary sources for understanding cultural context, focusing rather on the similarities and differences seen in works of art and architecture. Pancaroğlu explains how early Turkish scholarship embraced formalism as a result of the work of Strzygowski and discusses the strengths and weaknesses of such an approach. Furthermore, in "The Mosque-Hospital Complex in Divriği: A History of Relations and Transitions," Pancaroğlu discusses at length the traveling craftsmen that contributed significantly to the built environment of Anatolia and the surrounding regions. This article delves into the difficult topic of a unique monument built by the Mengücekids, a dynasty which was absorbed into the Seljuk Sultanate the year after completing the Divriği complex. Pancaroğlu thoroughly considers previous studies and their veracity. This meticulous study results in the convincing account of design and building of the hospital and mosque. Unlike many previous scholars, Pancaroğlu considers both the Armenian and Georgian elements seen within the architecture. This contradicts the nationalist study by Doğan Kuban that claims that "Georgian and Armenian architecture are too plain to have been the source of Divriği," despite having recognized the presence of artisan marks belonging to an Armenian and a Georgian (p. 166). Pancaroğlu readily criticizes past studies and builds upon them in a productive manner.

While the likes of Redford, Peacock, and Pancaroğlu are making substantial headway in the field of the Anatolian Seljuks, the earlier literature is filled with problems. Nationalism played a substantial role in the scholarship, likely stemming from the ethnocentric educational program in the early Turkish Republic (Bozdoğan & Necipoğlu, 2007, p. 3). The national underpinnings of Seljuk scholarship can be blatantly seen in the titles of many early works. Osman Turan's writings contain nationalistic jargon. He portrays the Seljuk Turks as though they were merely fulfilling their destiny through their invasions of Anatolia. In " The Ideal of World Domination Among the Medieval Turks," he writes, "the Turks sincerely believed not only in an ideal of world domination, but also in their being a chosen people of God" (p. 78). There is no citation of a primary text to illuminate this claim. He is not alone in subscribing to a Turkocentric view.

J.M. Rogers presents different issues in his own writing. They are largely based on formalism, the early-twentieth-century method which dictates that studies should be based upon the formal properties of a work rather than the content. Additionally, the title of his article, "The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas: A Contribution to the History of Style in the Seljuk Architecture of 13th Century Turkey" is indicative of problems that arise in his publications. In the thirteenth century, the lands of the Seljuks were referred to as "Turkia" or "Turchia" by foreigners (Rubruck,1967, p. 43–44, Polo, 1958, p. 11). It was a term used to denote the Turkic heritage of the Seljuks. However, twentieth-century scholarship which ascribes "Turkey," the identifier of the modern state established in 1923, to medieval time period overlooks the contrast between the

historic fluidity of borders and the modern boundaries. This pitfall was not unique to Rogers. Cahen's *Pre-Ottoman Turkey,* also points out the common problem of subscribing to modern nation-states. Additionally, it deals with the time period between 1071 and 1330, a time frame that is much shorter than the history of Anatolia before the Ottoman reign. These underpinnings, the reliance on republished material without field work,[26] and the subscription to modern terminology plagued most of the early Seljuk scholarship. On the other hand, the more recent studies, particularly within the past decade have greatly contributed to the scholarly understanding of the Seljuks, Anatolia, and various political participants in the thirteenth century without a more overt political agenda.

Studies on the Kingdom of Georgia

The history of the Kingdom of Georgia has largely been missing in most western studies. Initial interest in Georgia began in the nineteenth century with the studies of Marie-Félicité Brosset (1802–1880) and Marjory Scott Wardrop (1869–1909); however, much of this research primarily focused on the secular literature of the early medieval kingdom, such as the twelfth-century epic poem *Knight in the Panthers Skin* (*Vepkhistkaosani*) by Shota Rustaveli. From there, scholarship jumped to an ecclesiastical focus before shifting in the mid twentieth-century to the history of Georgia.

In the mid-twentieth century, Vladimir Minorsky, a Russian scholar of the Middle East, put forth a number of works pertaining to Georgian history "Caucasia

[26] A method used by H. Crane as mentioned earlier.

in the History of Mayyāfāriqīn" (1949), "Caucasia II" (1951), and *Studies in Caucasian History* (1957). His studies closely chronicle the Persian influence in the region, and his articles are filled with individuals' names as well as Arabic and Persian translations. His historical accounts draw from primary sources, thus adding value to his work.

While Minorsky primarily focused on Persian studies, Toumanoff, another Russian-born scholar, focused more on Georgian and Caucasian studies. His many articles looked into Georgian history, summarizing the major events as well as elucidating the connections that the Georgians had with the Byzantines and Armenians. Toumanoff's studies focused on principal dynasties within the Georgian and Armenian medieval era, presenting them in an approachable manner.

More recently, in 1988, Ronald Grigor Suny wrote *The Making of the Georgian Nation,* in which he tackled the comprehensive history of the Georgian lands from 1100 BC to the present-day. Although he succeeded in compiling such a broad history, Suny has been widely criticized for writing with an alternative agenda (in conversation with David Khoshtaria). As an Armenian-American, his scholarship is said to have a heavily Armenian bias. The critique overstates the inclination towards Armenian history, but is a common concern with foreign scholars. Nonetheless, this overarching summary of Georgian history provides a simplified view of the medieval set up of the region.

Stephen Rapp Jr. faces some of the same problems as Suny. He too is a foreigner studying Georgian history and is accused of biases by contemporary Georgian scholars. Rapp aims to eliminate partialities and stereotypes that have been formed both within Georgia and from the outside (*Bumberazi: Explorations in*

Medieval Georgia and Caucasia). The controversy surrounding his work is possibly a result of his deviation from the laudatory rhetoric of Georgian scholarship. However, Rapp's work focuses on the historiography and historical documentation of the Georgians and provides valuable analyses. In Rapp's "From *bumberazi* to *basileus*: Writing cultural synthesis and dynastic change in medieval Georgia (K'art'li)," he brings together early Georgian histories from the ninth century with those that were written until the thirteenth century. By doing so, we can see the shift in identity and association from the assimilation of Persian cultural practices to an adoption of Byzantine styles and alliances.

The art historical studies of Georgia by western scholars began around the mid-twentieth century with the work of David Marshall Lang. He published such works as *Studies in the Numismatic History of Georgia and Transcaucasia* (1955), *The Georgians* (1966), and *Peoples of the Hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus* (1971). His work was a pioneering effort in an overlooked field and contributed greatly to the analysis of Georgian history, art, and culture. However, his writings can be convoluted. Nonetheless, Lang's work in cataloguing Georgian arts and numismatics as well as his translations of historic texts have greatly aided the scholars who have followed. His studies not only classify the arts, but also provide brief accounts of the context in which the objects were created (1957, p. 137–146).

One of the first western catalogues of Georgian art is *Art and Architecture of Medieval Georgia,* written and edited by Adriano Alpago-Novello, Vakhtang Beridze, and Jaqueline LaFontaine-Dosogne in 1980. Although this study is dated, it provides a basis from which scholars have been working over the years. The survey of material and the discussion of artistic elements bring forth strong points for further

study. In addition, the publication supplies a four-part parallel timeline of Georgian, Armenian, Byzantine, and Western events. Such a chronology provides an overall illustration and a better understanding of how the various dynastic powers developed.

In 1992, a Georgian scholar, Wachtang Djobadze, published the most complete and thus important survey of the medieval monasteries built in the Tao Klarjet'i region.[27] *Early Medieval Georgian Monasteries in Historic Tao, Klarjet'i* provides an in-depth look at the largest Georgian monuments of the territory which is presently located in northeastern Turkey. This publication remains the only book to look at each monument individually rather as a grouping. Although these monasteries were all built prior to the thirteenth century, Djobadze's work is important to this thesis as it studies the zenith of Georgian architecture which subsequently influenced those monuments built in the following centuries. The proximity of these buildings within Anatolia rather than the Georgian heartland also brings forth the likelihood that these monuments were ones the Seljuks of Rum and other Anatolian dynasties would have seen which in turn would have impressed them to the point of influence.

Eastmond, a western pioneer in Georgian studies, focuses on the art historical perspective of medieval Georgia in many of his writings. In his book *Royal Imagery in Medieval Georgia* (1998) he analyzes the imagery of Queen Tamar, one of the most powerful rulers of Georgia who is credited with Georgia's "Golden Age." Through the analysis of the depiction of royal garments in monumental painting in the form of church frescoes, he concludes that there are recognizable elements from both Persian and Byzantine cultures (Eastmond, 1998, p. 93). Eastmond further posits that it is evident that this imagery is used to legitimize her power as a ruler, the

[27] See Chapter III for discussion of churches in Tao Klarjet'i.

royal or imperial motifs from both the Sasanian and Byzantine Empire provide Georgian elite with an appearance of power and prestige through the association with regional dominating sources (Eastmond, 1998, p. 96). His examination of Georgian art combined with the cultural context bolsters the historic understanding of the period as well as cultural dynamics.

The proceedings of the 33rd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies at the University of Warwick, published in 2001, and entitled *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium,* aimed to look to the periphery of Byzantium and lesser studied contemporary cultures. As Anthony Eastmond emphasizes in his introduction to the volume of published symposium papers, by researching the "peoples east of Byzantium… [we] build up a greater understanding of each of these neighboring societies whose history impinged on that of Byzantium," and we can "use this knowledge to help understand Byzantium itself, by examining the nature of the encounters and exchanges" (Eastmond, 2001, p. xvi). Many of the papers that were presented at this symposium deal with both Georgia and the Seljuks respectively.[28]

Georgian National Treasures (1999), a catalogue of Georgian art and architecture, was published and edited by Ori Soltes. This independent book categorizes Georgian art taxonomically and offers brief chapters dedicated to unpacking and explaining the development of the national arts and styles through time. The majority of the book, however, is comprised of imagery to illustrate the artwork that the various authors describe.

[28] I speak specifically of the papers delivered by Bülent Işler, Elmon Hancer, and Muradiye Bursalı (2007).

Similarly, to the catalogue compiled by Soltes, the Georgian National Museum has published a catalogue of their own impressive medieval collections in 2013. *Medieval Georgian Ecclesiastical Art in Georgian National Museum* once again discusses Georgian art based on the media used and the time period in which it was created. The contributing authors are current curators at the museum and contributed the various sections according to their respective specialties. The book is published in both Georgian and English and accompanied by an excellent array of images.

The scholarship concerning the Kingdom of Georgia that were written by external scholars each possess their own problems. Much of the scholarship pertaining to the Kingdom of Georgia that is written by foreigners is often controversial because it attempts to lump Georgian history under that of Armenia or Byzantium. Additionally, as an outsider writing about a region that has largely been dominated by external powers, even the most comprehensive studies maybe perceived as colonial. Frequently, foreign scholars studying Georgia attribute Armenian influence to many monuments and fine arts. In the Caucasus the issue of nationalist sentiments and identity are frequently contested. As will be discussed later, a number of scholars have studied Armenian art without the consideration of Georgian art and consequently attribute Caucasian motifs as a purely Armenian characteristic. Similarly, the same could be stated about the scholarship on Georgia. Yet another challenge within Caucasian scholarship is the constant fluctuation of territorial boundaries, the shift of power centers, and the transfer of princes and personalities across borders an issue that results in differing claims of regional

dominance for the same time period. Such political and nationalist pride jeopardizes current studies by limiting of objectivity.

However, the scholarship that has been conducted by Georgians and translated or made accessible to a larger audience has its own faults. A sense of nationalism is present throughout much of the scholarship. This is likely a byproduct of Soviet era scholarship and the desire to regain a national identity. This prevalence is seen by merely looking at the tiles of the works *The Making of the Georgian Nation, Georgian National Treasures,* and *Treasures of Georgia.* These are all monographs that by title alone denote some superiority of Georgia and its crafts. This is a similar theme that was noted in the early scholarship of the Rum Seljuks. The art catalogues in particular are guilty of glorifying undertones surreptitiously promoting the excellence of their history and artistic traditions. Yet, these compilations and studies prove useful in that they bring forth the art of a small nation in a remote corner of the modern world. The listing of various objects, arts, and monumental structures that are compiled in catalogues such as Soltes' *Georgian National Treasures* and the Georgian National Museum's *Ecclesiastical Art* can be used in future analytical research as well as providing context and visuals to bolster historical arguments and conceptions.

Scholarship Pertaining to the Kingdom of Armenia

Similar to Georgian history, the vast majority of Armenian history has been subject to occupation and invading forces. In *The Kingdom of Armenia: A History* (1987), Chahin provides a brief overview of historical events. He organizes this work through the chronology of the numerous ruling families, creating a simplified

timeline of the Armenian region. Over half of this book is dedicated to the ancient civilization of Urartu (which preceded Armenia and existed between the 13th and 6th centuries BCE), leaving only one hundred pages to cover 1500 years. Nonetheless, in looking for a synopsis of Armenian history and its dynastic structure, Chahin provides the necessary tools.

Building upon the history of the Kingdom of Armenia, the art historical studies prove useful in better understanding the evolution of Georgian art and architecture. The Caucasus region is, and has been, comprised of various ethnicities living in close proximity, subsequently causing some overlap in their artistic culture. *Armenian Art* by Jean Michael Thierry provides a comprehensive catalogue of Armenian arts. Similar to Georgian art publications, this book surveys the arts based on the time period and medium, accompanying each chapter with elegant plates. The basis of this extensive volume is to look at the often overlooked art and culture of Armenia. However, at times the scholarship makes comparisons between Armenian and European art, a method that is reminiscent of Riegl and the Vienna School (p. 9–12).

Perhaps the best companion to the study of Armenian art and architecture is Christina Maranci's *Medieval Armenian Architecture: Construction of Race and Nation* published in 2001. Before diving into the history and stylistic devices found in Armenian architecture, Maranci looks closely at the history of Armenian historic and art historical scholarship. Her attention to the framework and methods of past scholars both strengthens and modernizes her study of the subject. The book looks closely at all preceding studies, beginning with those published in the nineteenth century. Maranci identifies how the past studies conducted by Josef Strzygowski

(1862–1941) and others have been discredited and ignored, yet she appeals for the value of their scholarship and argues that they contributed greatly to the field. These scholars were inclined to relate architectural developments to race which they deemed responsible. For instance, Maranci summarizes Strzygowski as claiming that the decline in the artistic value of monumental constructions in Armenia after the ninth century was directly related to the invading Muslim forces which impeded the great art and architecture of the superior Aryan Christians (Maranci, 2006, p. 656). A number of the early studies were written by scholars who were also closely linked to the pan-German political movements that persisted in the first half of the twentieth centuries as well as the Viennese School of Art History. As a result, recent scholarship has wholly disregarded the earlier studies merely because of their controversial authors and simplified formalist analysis. Maranci's work is similar in methodology and value to that of Pancaroğlus' work on the Rum Seljuks. She points out that the early Armenian scholars are responsible for compiling catalogues of monuments as well as documenting them in their existing condition. Another trend among early scholars was linking Armenian architectural styles to medieval churches in Western Europe. Charles Texier and Austen Henry Layard both proposed that Gothic architects were largely influenced by Armenian churches (p. 20). Oddly enough, the opposite, Armenian architecture being influenced by Gothic architecture, was not proposed. In such propositions, there were frequently issues with the chronology of the suggested connections. Even more problematic was the lack of historic documentation of the transfer of ideas from east to west. As such the scholarship was largely limited to formal analyses and surveys of historic sites.

In addition to providing a most useful analysis of past scholarship and the theories to which scholars subscribed, Maranci explains the necessity of a study such as this thesis opens up. She notes that across most scholarship there is a lack of distinction between Georgian and Armenian arts. Noting the similarities herself, Maranci calls for the art of the two cultures to be recognized as "transcaucasian" rather than nationally distinguished, explaining that for the most part nationalism is what caused trouble for past scholars (2001, p. 249–51). However, upon closer examination, there are distinct differences between the arts found in present-day Georgia and Armenia. The context in which the architecture is referred to as "transcaucasian," "Armenian," or "Georgian" needs to depend upon the amount of detail available within the study. In generalized studies and those which afford less space to the subject, it is more appropriate to apply "transcaucasian." However, those studies which can provide details as to why an object is Georgian versus Armenian should distinguish between the two. By using nomenclature which is closely associated with present-day political boundaries we risk falling into the same stereotypes as Strzygowski and other scholars following in his footsteps. Even more problematic is the anachronistic use of today's borders, which do not reflect the medieval boundaries between the Armenian and Georgian states, not to mention their constant flux. Maranci, like Eastmond, makes a call for a deeper study of the Caucasian influences on Seljuk architecture (2001, p. 251).

I.7 The Culmination of Cross-cultural Scholarship and the Direction of this Thesis

Despite the scholarship on the individual cultures, there has been very little literature that incorporates both Seljuk and Georgian societies. In 1976, Rogers published an article entitled "The Mxargrdzelis between East and West" which looks at a powerful thirteenth-century family who acted as vassals to the Georgian crown while ruling over Ani and parts of the Kingdom of Armenia. This is a rare look at the Anatolian and Transcaucasian interactions and one which is prefaced with a statement declaring the scarcity and necessity of research pertaining to Armenia and Georgia.

> Despite the lack of either historical or archaeological corroboration, the importance of Armenia and the Armenian minority in the history of Seljuk Turkey is generally taken for granted. On the other hand, Georgia and the Georgians have been totally neglected. This is particularly curious since not only is much of the area roughly described as "Armenian Turkey" actually the historical Georgian provinces of Chaneti/Lazistan, Abxazia and Samtakhe. (p. 316)

This appeal for research such as this thesis is followed by his cross-cultural analysis of Georgian and Seljuk Architecture. Rogers' aim for the article was to depict the manner in which the bordering Christian societies took and reappropriated Seljuk architecture. He closely examines architectural plans of buildings; however, though he mentions the value of inscriptions, his use of such primary source work is lacking.

Another useful tool in examining the art history of Georgia and the Eastern Anatolian region is the work by T. A. Sinclair which chronicles all historic buildings throughout Eastern Turkey. The four volumes that comprise *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archeological Survey* provide details about the locations and various characteristics of the historic buildings categorized by region. Of most value within the survey volumes of Sinclair are the few pages dedicated to addressing the

characteristics found within Georgian and Armenian styles and how the two distinct parts of Caucasia relate to one another. Sinclair aptly notes,

> As between themselves they have far more in common; yet they are distinguishable from one another both as total oeuvres and with regard to specific stylistic features and architectural elements. It is better to see Armenian and Georgian architecture as two peaks of the same mountain rather than as two different genres or one and the same architecture (1990, Vol. I, p. 28).

This sentiment will be discussed in the latter part of this thesis as well as a key rebuttal of the many scholars who haphazardly attribute Caucasian architectural influence to Armenia. Such studies would have been improved had they utilized the broad term Transcaucasian instead of grouping multiple cultures under one nationalist identity.

Most recently, in 2006, Andrew Peacock wrote an article for *Anatolian Studies* aptly titled "Georgia and the Anatolian Turks in the 12th and 13th Centuries." In the first paragraph of this article, Peacock states: "scholarship in Turkey and the west has almost entirely ignored the significant role that Georgia and Georgians played in medieval Muslim Anatolia" (p. 127). This statement not only highlights the importance of this thesis and the continuation of such research within the field, it also notes that much of the existing research about the interactions of the two societies remains one-sided.

Despite these studies, there remains a need for a comprehensive study connecting the Georgians to the Anatolian Seljuks, specifically one that explains their cultural and artistic assimilations and exchanges. Nonetheless, the scholars noted here all make a valuable contribution through their knowledge of the Georgian language and their familiarity with the source materials. The difficulty of the

language and the alphabet has restricted the access that scholars have to Georgian material, especially the scholarship conducted within Georgia.

While there have been many appeals for a closer examination of Georgian-Seljuk relations, few have come to fruition. This thesis is an effort to take one step closer to filling a portion of the substantial gap in the political and artistic landscape of the thirteenth century. It will draw upon various categorical studies, primary texts, patronage patterns, and finally the art and architecture of the Georgians and Rum Seljuks to prove the close cultural contact and exchange. The synthesis of texts, patronage and monuments is important to move away from nationalist paradigms and to look beyond twentieth-century borders. Furthermore, upon establishing the connections between the Seljuks of Rum and the Georgians, this thesis proposes closer artistic connections and areas for future studies.

CHAPTER II

PATRONAGE: A WEB OF POLITICS AND INTERMARRIAGE

II.1 Patronage: Its Meaning and Relevance to Medieval Anatolian Studies

The patronage of monumental building projects served many purposes in medieval Anatolia. Royal and elite members of society put forth monetary capital to sponsor large constructions in an effort to promote a name, be it that of a family or that of an individual (Westbrook, 2005, p. 210–11). Acting as the patron of a prominent building allowed one to make a public representation and statement about personal morals and values. The following quote from Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi,[29] the thirteenth-century Sufi mystic living in Konya, describes the contemporary sentiment well: "Every man puts up these sacred edifices with a particular intention: either to display his generosity or for the sake of fame or to gain a reward in heaven" (Rumi, 1993, p. 82). In medieval Anatolia, patronage of architectural monuments frequently centered around religion, and the structures built were viewed as charitable contributions to society. The philanthropy of funding a building and the accompanying organization validated and enhanced a donors' reputation as a pious individual.

[29] For the purpose of consistency, from here on out, Celaleddin Muhammed Rumi will be referenced as Mevlana. Mevlana translates to "master" whereas Rumi pertains to "of Rome." Many residents of Anatolia included "Rumi" in their name and tiles, thus the subsequent use of Rumi can be confusing (Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed. "Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān Parwāna"). In his life, Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumi was not referenced as Rumi, however, in the writings of Hamdullah al-Mustawfi, he was called "our master [who is] of [the lands or eastern] Rome" or "Mevlana-i Rum" (Kafadar, 2007, p. 11)

Medieval communities have strong associations with certain buildings types and architectural styles that connect to their identity and especially their religious beliefs. Churches and mosques by definition house a community. Those who frequent such institutions, who enter a specific building type and are loyal to a particular congregation create and maintain a strong relationship with a single physical building. As a result of this close association, architecture can be viewed as developing and fostering a regional or national identity. Even today, the remains of historic buildings provide scholars with clear clues as to what group of people lived in particular regions and who was in power based upon the styles of buildings and the manner in which they were constructed.

This chapter looks closely at the relations between cultural frameworks, patrons, craftsmen, and the architecture of the thirteenth century. The following analysis demonstrates how the various elements played together to shape the buildings in the Anatolian and Caucasus regions. Furthermore, this chapter expounds the family ties which further bolster the close connectedness of the Georgians and the Rum Seljuks. The examination of the patronage practices of both the medieval Georgians and Rum Seljuks through the use of contemporary thirteenth-century written sources provides insight into the relationship between these powers and how their architecture reflects the cultural contact. Regardless of which society one discusses, it is evident that in the medieval era, patronage was overtly tied to piety and demonstrating political power.

Medieval patronage varied depending on the time period and region. The type of construction, the location of the building, and the documentation of the donor(s) are telling facts about both the prominent individual(s) who commissioned the work

and the cultural climate in which a monument was built. It is also a universal theme that links and allows comparisons between two or more cultures. In the context of this thesis we see that the documented medieval patrons of the Kingdom of Georgia were almost always of the royal household. Meanwhile, in thirteenth-century Anatolia under the Seljuks of Rum, the patronage patterns shift mid-century, and considerable differences can be noted before and after the Mongol conquest (Crane, 1993, p. 21). Aflaki, Ibn Athir, Ibn Bibi, Bar Hebraeus, and the anonymous *Georgian Chronicle* provide valuable insights into the world of thirteenth-century royal political and social affairs in and around Anatolia. From these sources we also learn about the process and bureaucracy that accompanied the founding and construction of monumental buildings in the thirteenth century.

II.2 The Patterns of Patronage within the Kingdom of Georgia

To understand the issue of patronage in the Kingdom of Georgia, once again the context becomes important. When they embraced Christianity in the early fourth century, Georgia moved away from the long-established connection with Persia and Persian cultural influences.[30] Although they did not immediately associate themselves with Byzantium, in the ninth and tenth centuries there was an influx of Georgian monasteries in Byzantine lands. Not unrelated, at this time the political ties between the states began to strengthen (Matchabeli, 2000, p. 188–197). The close relationship came to the forefront after the tenth century once the Kingdom of

[30] The Kingdom of Georgia had been dominated by the Sasanians for an extended period, during which they adopted similar court titles and structure of governance (Rapp, 2001, p. 116).

Georgia unified and was ruled by one king (Rapp 2001, p. 116). The privileged youth of Georgia were sent to Constantinople to study and learn about the ways of Byzantium and the church. Subsequently they were exposed to the literature and art of the powerful Empire. Around 1065, the Georgian princess Mart'a, more commonly know as Mary "of Alania" married into the Byzantine royal house creating a stronger, more direct tie with Byzantium (Rapp, 2012, p. 23). This political alliance was just the second foreign imperial marriage within the Byzantine Empire in approximately 340 years (Rapp & Garland, 2006, p. 97). A century later, under the reign of Queen Tamar (r. 1184–1213), the Kingdom of Georgia worked with Byzantium to establish the province and vassal state of Trebizond (Eastmond, 2004, p. 18).

With this added connection between Byzantium and the Kingdom of Georgia it is reasonable that the churches in Georgia would adopt traits that are traditionally identified with the contemporary churches in Byzantium (Eastmond, "Royal Renewal" 339). The power and allure of Byzantium was sensed by many, and it was






Fig. 12. Jvari Monastery, located outside of Mtsketha and built between 586–604 is an example of early monumental church construction in Georgia. (Matchabeli 189–190; Photo by author, 2013, plan Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 64).




Fig. 13. Samtavisi Cathedral (1030), 45 km from Tbilisi. The facade is exemplary of the Georgian use of blind arcades and a mix between geometric and vegetal motifs to create a unified, elegant surface. (Photo by author, 2013, plan by Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 161)

not just the Georgians who emulated Byzantine artistic and architectural practices. Byzantine styles can be seen spread across Europe as well as into the Levant (Magdalino 169; Matchabeli 195). Georgian churches were once almost exclusively cross-in-square plans with a high, central dome, although they slowly began to transition and incorporate the elements of a Byzantine basilica (Fig. 12, 13). Such basilica-type structures were adapted and modified according to local traditions (Matchabeli, 2000, p. 193). The areas within the interior of the church came to resemble aisles. The Georgian churches adjusted certain proportions of the basilica plan to create a more centralized space than their western counterparts.

The external structure and decoration of the churches built in the eleventh and twelfth century remained distinctly Georgian, following patterns and architectural

traditions that had been established in the centuries prior (Lomouri, 2000, p. 182). Byzantine churches were not outwardly decorated, and the heavenly elements were reserved for the interior which was often adorned with frescos and detailed mosaics according to the financial position of the patrons. Contrarily, the Georgian religious buildings possessed facades that were adorned with carved vegetal and geometric motifs as well as biblical references and other decorative elements. Symmetry was an important factor in Georgian architecture and any decoration was arranged in such a manner. For a typical eleventh to thirteenth-century church facade see that of Samtavisi Cathedral (1030) (Fig. 13). Here we have established a very preliminary idea and setting of traditional Georgian monumental buildings, but the question remains as to who were those responsible for contributing to the built environment (Lomouri, 2000, p. 186).

In addressing the matter of patronage in Georgia, it is important to consider the patterns prior to the thirteenth century so that we may understand the foundation upon which patronage in the 1200s developed. The majority of constructions that have survived to the present day and that are attributed to the patronage of the Kingdom of Georgia are churches. Since the conversion of King Mirian III to Christianity, this religion has been a defining factor in Georgia. Subsequently, identifying ruined monuments such as palaces and fortifications as secular is incongruous since religious connotations were usually present. The discussion of patronage can therefore not be separated from religion and the piety of patrons.

The tenth-century Bagrat king, David III (r. 978–1000), the leader who made it feasible for his adopted son Bagrat III (r. 978–1014) to unify the fragmented parts of Georgia, initiated a monumental building campaign in the region of Tao-Klarjeti



Fig. 14. A window on the west end of Oshki Cathedral (963–973). The painted pattern above the windows of the alternating red and white has been seen in Syrian churches as is the carved "brow" (Djobadze, 1992, p. 123–124, Photo by author, 2013)

(Fig. 3). This area, now a part of northeastern Turkey, is home to numerous great churches and monasteries tucked in the wilderness upon steep mountainsides. These constructions commissioned by David III include Oshki (Öşk Vank, 973), Khakhuli (Haho, tenth century), Parkhali (Barhal, 973) and Otkhta (Dörtkilise, 965). David III's rule and his focus on monumental architecture marked the start of the Georgian "Golden Age." His constructions were larger and more ornate than previous Georgian ones (Djobadze, 1992, p. 90). Following his efforts we see the Kingdom of Georgia opening its borders and beginning to draw upon other regional influences. The churches and monasteries commissioned in the time of David III encompassed styles that were commonly seen in Syria and Constantinople; regions which were predominant Christian centers. These outside elements can be seen in the layouts of the churches as well as the structures of windows (Fig. 14) (Rapp, 2011, p. 89–91 & 232–2; Djobadze, 1992, p. 91).

After the influx of building in the region of Tao-Klarjeti, the Gelati Monastery, located outside of Kutaisi in western Georgia, provides a well-documented example of royal patronage (Fig. 15). The monastery became a renowned center for religious study and closely connected to the Bagratoni family. Deemed the "second Athens" or the "second Jerusalem," the monastery was founded in in 1106 by King Davit IV Aghmashenebeli, known popularly as David the Builder (Bulia & Mzia, 2006, p. 23). King David passed away before he could see the completion of the complex, and his son Demetrius I completed the project in 1130, enabling it to become the dominant religious center in Georgia (Derlemenko, 1982, p. 7). The monastery maintained its status for much of history with many royals buried on the property. Subsequently the complex was kept in good repair. The frescoes that adorn the interior of the three churches on the property have been updated through the centuries and have come to include a number of additional donor portraits to represent those who funded the additions and restorations. It was a given that if an individual contributed to the building or renovations of a church in any way, they were entitled to place their name or likeness where they pleased within the artistic program (Eastmond, 1998, p. 4). Donor portraits took the form of either a carved stone relief or fresco images adorning the interior of the church (Fig. 16).

The nature of the Gelati complex is relatively unusual within the geographical boundaries of Georgia. For many centuries prior to Gelati's construction, it was expected that Georgian ascetics would travel to monasteries abroad. Georgian monasteries were established on Mount Athos and in Jerusalem, and there exists extensive documentation and artistic evidence that there was a




Fig. 16. The donor portrait on the south wall of the Oshki Cathedral (963–973). The donors are seen flanking the Deesis scene. Christ appears in the center with David, Magistros on the far left, behind St. John. Bagrat, Duke of Dukes, is positioned on the far right beside Mary. Both donors offer model church to Christ (Top photo from Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 140, bottom photo by author, 2014, drawing by Djobadze, 1992, p. 113–117).

continuous presence of Georgian monks at St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai.[31] The result of the foreign exposure can be seen in the layout and design of the complex. Gelati Monastery is closely modeled on Byzantine philanthropic establishments and monasteries (Eastmond, 2011, p. 285/339). The main cathedral, the Church of the Nativity of the Virgin, carries the strongest Byzantine influence among the numerous structures of the Monastery. It contains an apse mosaic, a decorative element rarely seen in Georgia, and the frescoes contain clear references to Byzantium in style and content (Eastmond, 2011, p. 285–286/ 339–340). The main church is surrounded by an academy building where both religious studies and the sciences were taught, a bell tower, and to the north a hospital situated outside of the walls, as well as two smaller churches (Eastmond, 2011, p. 286/340; Derlemenko, 1982, p. 11). The Gelati

[31] A study of graffiti at St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai was carried out by Negev in 1977. Georgian inscriptions were found and dated to the 7th century (Tchekhanovets, 2011, p. 461). Numerous icons containing Georgian script have been located at St. Catherine's. Furthermore, it is known that David the Builder (r. 1089–1125) commissioned icons specifically for the monastery (Eastmond, 1998, p. 70).



Fig. 15. An aerial picture of Gelati Monastery looking North. The monastery is located northeast of Kutaisi in Western Georgia. The main cathedral of the Virgin is central with the Church of St. George to the right and the Church of St. Nicholas on the left. on the far left beyond the Church of St. Nicholas, is the academic building. (Photo from Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 182, plan from Alpago-Novello, 1980, p. 328)



Monastery continued to evolve into the late thirteenth century when the church of St. George and the church

of St. Nicholas were added. The specific influences and unique artistic details of these churches will be discussed in greater depth in the following chapter.

Returning to the end of the twelfth century, when the Kingdom of Georgia was ruled by Queen Tamar, the patronage of monumental architecture reached a new and unique urgency. There were questions among the Georgian population about the ability and right of a woman to single-handedly rule a kingdom. Buildings sponsored by the Queen were designed to address these questions and to eliminate doubts in her ability to handle the politics of a kingdom and the challenges of international negotiations. In his studies, Antony Eastmond has looked closely at the artistic trends that surrounded the reign of Queen Tamar (1998 and 2011). He notes that, in addition to being frequently portrayed in wall paintings, Queen Tamar is often portrayed in conjunction with St. Nino, the female saint who is credited with converting Queen



Fig. 17. These portraits of King David VI Narin are from his funerary chapel in the southern annex. On the left he is seen in monks robes, while the right has him in royal garb. A third portrait of his is badly damaged (Mepisashvili, 1979, p. 186).

Nana and King Mirian III of Iberia to Christianity in 339 CE.[32] Through the association with St. Nino, Queen Tamar gained a sense of authenticity and authority. This connection between sainthood and the legitimacy of rulers is seen in the fresco depictions of many Bagratid Kings. It is not uncommon for their images to contain halos, a motif typically reserved for the saints (Fig. 17) (Eastmond, 1998, p. 162, 198). Queen Tamar is also depicted with a halo in her church of Kintsvisi (Q'inc'visi) (Fig. 18). The particular reference to Nino, a figure who is recognized throughout the region as a key figure in the history of the Georgian people, aids Queen Tamar in defying the gender stereotypes. If St. Nino is capable of persuading King Mirian III to convert to Christianity, an extremely significant and defining point for the people of Georgia, then it is plausible that Queen Tamar is capable of



Fig. 18. The donor panel located in the north transept of Kintsvisi (Q'inc'visi). From left to right, Giorgi III, his daughter Queen Tamar, and her son Giorgi IV Lasha (Photo by author, 2013).

[32] Iberia was the eastern region of the lands that would eventually comprise the united Kingdom of Georgia. See Chapter I for further explanation.

successfully running a country. With the close proximity between the two women in regional imagery, the Georgian citizens were able to associate one woman with the other. The questions that once persisted pertaining to legitimacy and ability faded into the background. Further doubts were assuaged by Queen Tamar's numerous military conquests. The example of her patronage demonstrates the importance and the purposes that are associated with public patronage. Although not every ruler had as much to prove and as much to gain from building a church for his or her people, the example of Queen Tamar makes it very clear how building campaigns solidify the authority and validity of a ruler.

II.3 The Patronage of the Rum Seljuks

The Seljuks, on the other hand, had a different structure for their building program. The patronage of monumental architecture was not limited to the royal house. Seljuk elites and military commanders could contribute to the built environment, but the type of building that they were permitted to commission was guided by a strict hierarchy. Most royal patronage focused on structures such as Friday mosques, madrasas (religious schools), and caravanserais (a type of fortified guesthouse) (Crane1993, p. 17). Military and urban constructions such as city walls, towers, and gates, however, were a responsibility that involved the emirs (Crane, 1993, p. 11–15). The military commanders were charged with supporting the sultan, which they did by contributing to the building program. The fact that the costs of such projects were out-of-pocket was a means by which the sultan was able to check the wealth and power of the upper-class (Redford, 2014, p. 86–87). Not only was the initial

construction of a monument an important aspect of patronage, but rebuilding and restoration was another valued element of benefaction during Seljuk rule (Redford, 2014, p. 64).

Similar to the patronage seen in the Kingdom of Georgia, piety and religious foundations were the compelling factor in the establishment and endowment of institutions. Mosques and madrasas were popular foundations throughout the rule of the Rum Seljuks, and the respective inscriptions and *waqfiyyas*[33] maintained their pious tones. The connection between religiosity and patronage cannot be separated within the Seljuk context. The Great Seljuk vizier Nizam al-Mulk describes patronage as follows: "By such action his name will be remembered and he will receive the reward of that action in the next world and prayers for his well-being will be continually offered" (*Siyasat-Name* 94; Rogers, 1976, p. 75). Thus, while certain constructions, such as walls and fortifications, may be considered civic or secular architecture, they were frequently adorned with religious quotes. Patronage can therefore not be separated from religion.

While in most cases the Seljuks made use of the city walls that predated their rule, they rebuilt and maintained walls while synchronously adding their own monumental inscriptions. The walls of Konya, Alanya, Antalya, and Sinop all posses numerous inscriptions which can be read like public documents expounding the qualities of rulers, noting the generosity and piety of donors, and chronicling important events (Redford, 2011). Similar inscriptions can be found on palatial structures, caravanserais, mosques, madrasas, hamams, *türbes* (tomb towers) and

[33] *Waqfiyyas* are the documents which detail and govern charitable foundations in Islamic societies. They will be discussed in greater depth later.

other Seljuk constructions throughout Anatolia. They are typically written in Arabic, the language reserved for the official transactions and religious purposes (Redford, 2008, p. 77).[34] Seljuk epigraphy aids scholars in understanding the patronage practices and building processes related to the planning, development, and construction of monumental architecture.

In inscriptions, the use or conversely the omission of specific titles and names provide indications of the political and elite social environment during the thirteenth century. The walls of Sinop (1215) provide a unique and detailed description of who contributed to their reconstruction. Twelve emirs and nine regional governors are listed as taking part in the project. Terms such as "military commander" *subashi / isfahsalar,* "notables" *umara' wa akabir,* and "governor" *sahib* distinguish the identities of contributors, while "architect" *mi'mar,* "supervisor" *nazar* or *tawalli*, "designer" *rassaman*, "master builder" *banna,* and "master craftsman" *ustadh* were used to indicate the duties of individuals (Redford, 2000, p. 67–75 and 2011, p. 262–270; Rogres, 1976, p. 101; Crane, 1993, p. 9). The walls of Sinop provide the most detailed account of the patronage scheme. After their completion, such accounts and details of governorships are absent from most inscriptions (Redford, 2011, p. 266). Inscriptions can also be utilized to track the careers of the Seljuk elite. The Emir Ayaz, for instance, is mentioned as the *tawalli* (supervisor) on the walls of the Alaeddin Mosque in Konya, while his title on the walls of Antalya (1225) is *sharabsalar* (keeper of the royal wine cellars). While Redford identifies these names as belonging to the same emir, Yalman discusses the possibility of the inscriptions

[34] Persian, the official language of the Seljuk court, was reserved for documents and chronicles (Köprülü, 1992, p. 9–13).

referring to two different people (Redford, 2011, p. 266; Yalman, 2011, p. 213). She points out that while the titles are the same, Ibn Bibi differentiates between the two individuals, with Fakhr al-Din Ayaz possessing the title of *sharabsalar* and Asad al-Din the *tawalli*. Nonetheless, such inclusion of roles tell us exactly who was building what and how the roles changed throughout the centuries.

As mentioned earlier, inscriptions highlight the ways and frequency with which the sultan would often dictate what was to be built and by whom. Whether or not the sultan was a presence at the building site is another issue. According to Rogers, the sultan would order a building project from his emirs and then let them carry the financial and practical burdens of the project (Rogers, 1976, p. 82). In the construction and the repair of the walls at Sinop the sultan was removed from the building process. As a result the city walls of Sinop name numerous emirs who were responsible for various sections, yet it is still the sultan's name which is featured most prominently (Redford, 2014, p. 84–6). A similar situation is chronicled for the walls of Alanya. The anonymous historian who wrote the *Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq* of 1283 describes the sultan's actions in relation to the construction of the Alanya walls in 1226,

> He said, let a city be founded on this site. He ordered the emirs to erect as many towers there as at Konya. He ordered numerous palaces (*sara*), and pavilions (*koshk*), whose descriptions is impossible. Because of this, the remainder of the wealth of the emirs was expended (Redford, 2000, p. 30).

The construction of the Konya walls was a different matter. Ala al-Din Kaykubad played an integral role in the design and supervision of the construction. By design, the walls connected the Rum Seljuks to their Persian heritage. Inscriptions containing

fragments of the *Shahname*[35] and other Persian words of wisdom were included in the decorative scheme in addition to references of the sultan (Redford, *Landscape* 60).

For smaller monuments and ones which likely did not involve the sultan on any level, it was still common for his name to be mentioned in building inscriptions. Furthermore, the Seljuks of Rum considered that all land that was not included within a charitable foundation belonged to the sultan (Cahen, 2001, p. 103; Crane1993, p. 6; Redford, 2000, p. 87; Rogers, 1976, p. 86). For this same reason, the language used within an inscription was extremely important to identify to whom and how the property was to be attributed.

An important element of Seljuk patronage are *waqfs* or charitable foundations. These endowments were accompanied by detailed documents, *waqfiyyas,* which related their establishment and how they were to be managed. Mosques, madrasas, baths, hospitals, and caravanserais were among the institutions considered *waqfs* and ultimately governed by *waqfiyyas* to ensure that they would run smoothly and successfully.[36] The establishment of *waqfs* was one way to ensure that personal property would not fall into the hands of the sultan upon the passing of the patron. Despite their integral role in the governance of foundations, it was not uncommon for the *waqfiyya* documents to be drawn up years after the physical completion of the building (Rogers, 1976, p. 70). Nonetheless, they provide clues as to who was responsible for the building of a monument and how they accomplished

[35] The *Shahname* or "Book of Kings" is a pre-Islamic Persian epic story (Encyclopedia Iranica "ŠĀH-NĀMA").

[36] The *waqfiyyas* also allowed patrons to write themselves into the pay schedules of the foundations, guaranteeing themselves and their family an income (Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed. "Wakf").

the feat. They outlined what was included within the charity, how many staff were to be employed, the relevant salaries, the financial organization and the funds that were allotted for general building care and maintenance (Crane, 1993, p. 2). *Waqfiyyas* also identify the founders and emphasize the individuals piety stressing their charitable good deeds and devotion to God (Karatay Vakfiye). As can be seen in the *waqfiyya* of the Sivas medical complex or *darussihha* (1217) built by Kaykaus I (r. 1211–1220), the document begins by citing the goodness of God and requesting His benevolence on the institution and its patrons (Üçer , 2012, p. 111). It continues on to identify the exhaustive properties and items that fall within the charitable foundation.

> This benevolent foundation hereby donates the land of five villages, 108 shops, seven fields and vegetable gardens, mills, stud farms, stables, storehouses, seed business, land, buildings, ruins… (Üçer, 2012, p. 112).[37]

The severity and binding nature of *waqfiyyas* was often spelled out within the document. The same *waqfiyya* from the Sivas medical complex states:

> The donations that Sultan Izzeddin Keykavus I made were done so without any kind of obstacle, in line with all the conditions and in a permanent manner. Under no circumstance can his donations be bought, donated, divided among heirs, transferred, spent unnecessarily, or bartered. The conditions of the *waqf* shall remain in force and cannot be changed. The passing of days, months and years shall not change or diminish it, and it will remain in effect until the Last Day. It is illegal for any caliph, sultan, vizier, governor, chief, qadi, mufti, commander, auditor, etc. to derogate, corrupt, modify, abolish, suspend, or neglect this charter (Üçer, 2012, p. 114).

From this excerpt it becomes clear that *waqfs* were meant to last indefinitely and that their *waqfiyyas* were as irrevocable as possible. Charitable foundations were intended to last long after a patron's life allowing his or her name, piety and good

[37] The Sivas medical complex's *waqfiyya* continues: "…upper areas, lower areas, houses and mansions, haylofts, oases, meadows, residential areas, trees, vineyards, fields, orchards, rented places, timber and wood storehouses, rivers, irrigation channels, wells, gardens, forests, ponds, pools, springs, flat lands, hills, mountains, all related rights to water, dumping grounds, prosperous and unprosperous locations, along with all the rights pertaining to the them, to the Darussihha, which upon the command of the sultan will be constructed at the beginning of Tokat Street outside Sivas." The sheer extent of items covered within the document displays its importance within society.

deeds to be remembered by successive generations. By making the charters near impossible to change or dissolve, the patrons had to guarantee their legacy.

Armed with the tools of epigraphy, the few remaining Seljuk *waqfs* and historical chronicles, scholars have built up an understanding of the trends of patronage in Anatolia in the thirteenth century. The building program gained momentum soon after the turn of the century under the reign of Sultan Kaykhusraw I (1204–1210). With the expansion of Rum Seljuk territory and the relative peace with Nicaea, the Seljuks were able to focus on trade and building the necessary components to support the added people and commerce. During this time period and before the the fall to the Mongols at the battle of Köse Dağ, patronage was often initiated by the sultan as well as his family and high ranking emirs. To be a patron was to claim royal connections and the acts of such were carried out by the society's elite, including royal women, emirs, and viziers (Crane, 1993, p. 12). However, under the rule of the Mongols, the power dynamic in Anatolia changed, which in turn changed the patronage construct. Fewer commissions were made by sultans and the court. Instead, the undertaking of building programs deviated to solely the upper echelons of the military and other wealthy members of society (Wolper, 1995, p. 40, 43). This shift in the patronage pattern demonstrates yet another fluid aspect of thirteenth-century Anatolian politics. It bears weight and consideration within this thesis, for it helps to frame the societal traditions in which art and architectural monuments were constructed.

II.4 Intermarriage between the Georgians and the Anatolian Seljuks

The marriage alliances that were conducted between the Georgians and the Seljuks include examples of both a Seljuk prince marrying into the Georgian court, as well as of a Georgian princess marrying a Seljuk sultan. It was the practice of the Seljuk court to allow foreign brides to maintain their native religion or to convert to Islam according to their personal preference (Shukurov, 2012, p. 121, Peacock, "Georgia"140). The Georgians on the other hand were not so flexible.

In 1224, the daughter of Queen Tamar, Queen Rusudan (r. 1223–1245) married the son of the Seljuk Emir Mughith al-Din Tughrilshah of Erzurum (Ibn Bibi, 1959, p. 177).[38] The nature of this relationship will be further expounded upon shortly. The pair had two children, David and Tamar whom would eventually rise to prominent positions of power. Rusudan's son, David VI Narin became the ruler of Georgia in 1245. Her daughter Tamar, on the other hand, married from the Georgian court into that of the Rum Seljuks in 1237. Her marriage to Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II (r. 1237–1246) soon after the death of his father, Sultan Kayqubad I (d. 1237), was part of an alliance against the Mongols (Bar Hebraeus, 2003, p. 403). Tamar was allowed to maintain her Christianity, arriving at the Seljuk court with priests, texts, and icons in tow (Peacock, "Georgia" 140, Eastmond, 2013, p. 163). Soon after her marriage, she became known as Gürcü Hatun, which translates as "Georgian Lady." Henceforth in this study, Tamar will be referred to as Gürcü Hatun.

---

[38] The name of the son of the Emir of Erzurum who married Queen Rusudan is missing from historical records. Judith Kolbas names "Mughith al-Tughrilshah b. Qilij Arslan of Arzan al-Rum," a brother of the Rum Saljuq sultan cited from Henry Howorth's *History of the Mongols* published in 1888 (Kolbas, 2006, p. 80). However, as this is the only mention of the name it stands to reason that it is a mistake. This is also the name of the Emir of Erzurum and not his son. The omission of the name is not unexpected as his conversion to Christianity was likely viewed as disgraceful by contemporary Muslim writers. Ibn al-Athir and Aflaki do not mention a name and the Georgian Chronicle lists Rusudan's husband as the son of "Ort'ul" (p. 324).

This marriage is an indicative representation of the Seljuk attitude towards religion and their cultural tolerance. Her husband Kaykhusraw II died in 1246 after which Gürcü Hatun remarried within the Seljuk court. Her second husband, Mu'in al-Din Suleyman (d. 1277), was appointed Pervane, a title which directly translates into English as "butterfly" (Encyclopedia of Islam). However, under the Mongol rule, the name refers to the position of chancellor, an appointment which allowed Pervane Mu'in al-Din Suleyman to assume the role of acting sultan of the northern regions of the pre-Mongol Seljuk territory (Cahen, 2001, p. 138).[39] Both Gürcü Hatun and Pervane were eminent patrons within Rum Seljuk society and their contributions are explored further within this chapter.

II.5 Prominent Patrons of Thirteenth-century Anatolia and their Contributions

Looking beyond the patterns that governed patronage of the Seljuks, let us turn to examine specific patrons and how their personal stories contributed to their benefaction. The use of case-studies such as Mahperi, Gürcü Hatun and Pervane exemplify the act of patronage and the personalities who facilitated the artistic and built environment of the thirteenth century. Credited as the greatest female patron of architecture in thirteenth-century Anatolia, Mahperi Hunad Hatun[40] was the daughter

[39] According to Sara Nur Yıldız's "The rise and fall of a tyrant in Seljuq Anatolia: Sa'd al-Din Köpek's reign of terror, 1237–8," the rule of Pervane was tyrannical.

[40] Hunad is the modern Turkish for the title, "Khwand Khātūn" with Khātūn meaning "lady." (Blessing, 2014, fn 475)

of the Armenian governor of Alanya, Kyr Vard.[41] She entered into the Rum Seljuk court through marriage when Seljuk Sultan, Kayqubad I (r. 1220–1237) conquered Kyr Vard's territory in 1221 (Eastmond, 2007, p. 78). Mahperi Hatun is known to have built the monumental Hunad complex (1238) in Kayseri, consisting of a hypo-style mosque, madrasa, hamam, and mausoleum (Crane, 1993, p. 49). She is also credited for at least two caravanserais and is speculated to have acted as patron for approximately five others.

The building program of Mahperi Hatun took place within the nine-year reign of her son, Kaykhusraw II (r. 1237–1246). The reasoning for the timing of her patronage is likely the result of her low status in the harem and being a minor wife of Sultan Kaykubad I. During his lifetime she was overshadowed by his other wives who were born of higher rank and who had greater personal wealth (Eastmond, "Gender" 78). After the death of Kayqubad I (d. 1237), it is probable that Mahperi Hatun was part of a conspiracy to ensure that her son, Kaykhusraw II, would become sultan (Bibi, 1959, p. 203–204; Eastmond, 2007, p. 79).[42] Her overtly Islamic architectural monuments may have thus been a way for her to claim a predominant role and to gain popularity and favor in the public eye (Eastmond, 2007, p. 83).

Mahperi was born a Christian and whether she maintained her faith is of some debate. Based upon the architectural patronage executed in her name, it appears that she had completely abandoned her native religion in favor for Islam. There are

---

[41] The background of Mahperi is debated, but Eastmond ("Gender" 78) and Redford (1993, p. 149) speak of her and her father as Armenian. However, Cahen (*The Formation of Turkey* and *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*) and Shukurov ("Harem Christianity") identify Kyr Vard as being Greek. Their argument rests on the fact that the if Mahperi and her father were Armenian, it would be unlikely that the Armenian King would hand off Mahperi to the Mongols in 1243 (Blessing, 2014, p. 482). Eastmond, however, counters this by referring to a record provided by Constable Smbat (1208–1276) which stated that the region was under Cilician Armenian control at this time (2007, p. 78).

[42] Kaykhusraw II was approximately 15 years old upon his rise to Sultan (Yıldız, "The Rise and Fall" 94).

no apparent decorative elements or architectural styles upon these monuments that indicate her heritage or that are derived from Armenian or Christian architecture. A letter sent between Baldwin II and Blanche of Castille discusses the arranged marriages between Christians and Seljuks. Baldwin II, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, explained that the mother of Kaykhusraw II, Mahperi Hatun, was allowed to remain a Christian for her entire life.

> For the Sultan himself is the son of Christian woman, whom his father kept in the Greek Christian faith [lit. 'law'] for the whole of her life. Many of the pagan nobles in those parts have Christian wives, who preserve in their own faith [lit. 'law'].

Despite this indication that Mahperi was a Christian until her death, as Eastmond points out, this statement could be the result of diplomatic fallacy as a method of persuasion (Eastmond, 2007, p. 84).

As mentioned previously, Mahperi's daughter-in-law, Gürcü Hatun, was also a foreign-born Christian bride. While Gürcü Hatun was an important female patron in her own right, her childhood and family background cannot be ignored. She was a Georgian princess born to Queen Rusudan and the son of a Seljuk Emir of Erzurum, a marriage that had been formed for political strategy. In 1224 the Georgian Queen Rusudan married the son of Tughrilshah, the Emir of Erzurum. It was made clear that the Georgian court would not accept a Muslim king and, as a result, Tughrilshah dictated that his son convert from Islam to Christianity (Peacock, "Georgia" 138). It is noted in historical sources that Rusudan was not faithful and that her husband was not well regarded in the Georgian Court (Ibn al-Athir, 2002, p. 244). The event was described by historian Ibn al-Athir:

> The lord of Erzurum at this time was Mughith al-Din Tughril Shah ibn Qilij Arslan ibn Mas'ud [ibn] Qilij Arslan, a member of the celebrated family of great princes of

> Islam, the Saljuq rulers. He had a grown-up son and he sent to the Georgians, requesting that his son might marry the queen. They refused to agree to this and said, 'We cannot do this because it is impossible that a Muslim should rule us.' He replied, 'My son will become a Christian and then marry her.' They accepted this, so, on his orders, his son converted and professed Christianity. He then married the queen, went to live with her and remained among the Georgians, ruling in their lands and continuing as a Christian (p. 244).

He suggests that the marriage was an attempt on the part of the Seljuks to protect Erzurum from Georgian encroachment, as it was Tughril Shah who suggested the union. Meanwhile he displays his disdain concerning the Georgians by reporting that Rusudan was a salacious woman who was ruled by lust. Under the subtitle "A Strange Turn of Events Without Parallel," he chronicled her marriages, affairs, and divorces and the subsequent displeasure she caused her court and countrymen (Ibn al-Athir 244). The Georgian Chronicle *Kartlis Tskhovreba* bemoans the queen's behavior in a unique moment of internal criticism:

> But then people began to display insatiability and idleness, and everybody turned to evil. And because they had forgotten God, the Lord subjected them to obscene outrages and massacres at the hands of the heathens. Queen Rusudan adopted her brother's habits and indulged herself in idleness and amusement, from which originated the great evil (Jones & Met'reveli, 2014, p. 323).

The marriage was not a happy one and the Seljuk prince was removed from the court by Rusudan, eventually returning to Erzurum after his father's death in 1230 (Jones & Met'reveli, 2014, p. 324–325; Ibn al-Athir2002, p. 254).

Gürcü Hatun, like her mother and mother-in-law, was married as part of a political alliance. However, she quickly became an important character in thirteenth-century Anatolia, and one who allows us to examine the cultural exchange between the Georgians and the Seljuks of Rum. At the age of thirteen she was married to the Seljuk Sultan Kaykhusraw II and moved to Konya in 1237 (Vryonis, 1977, p. 17). Although she married into a Muslim dynasty, Tamar was allowed to maintain her



Fig. 19. Coin minted by Kaykhursraw II in 1241. (The Barber Institute Coin Collection, University of Birmingham, TK533; P.D. Whitting Collection, no. 4563).

Christian religion and was even accompanied to the Seljuk court by a Georgian Catholicos and religious icons (Jones & Met'reveli, 2014, p. 324–325; Bar Hebraeus, 2003, p. 403).

The writings of Bar Hebraeus of the thirteenth century identify the favoritism bestowed upon Gürcü Hatun by Giyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II. He allegedly minted coinage with the imagery of a sun resting above the outstretched profile of a lion (Fig. 19). Bar Hebraeus wrote:

> He (Kaykhusraw) married the daughter of the Georgian monarch, with whom he was infatuated. He was so enamored of her that he wanted to depict her on dirhams, but he was advised to instead have the image of a lion against a sun to refer to his good fortune and achieve his aim (Peacock, 2006, p. 141).

That this motif is meant to represent Gürcü Hatun as the sun and Kaykhusraw II as the lion portrays the notion that she was held in the highest regard and could be seen to exert control over her husband, the sultan (Bar Hebraeus, 2003, p. 487). The same motif seen on the dirhams also occurs on the portal of the İncir Caravanserai located on the road between Antalya and Isparta and built in 1238/9 (Fig. 20). Were this interpretation of the imagery accurate, its use would serve as a type of public text to introduce Gürcü Hatun to the Anatolian public and include her in the court culture.[43]

[43] 'Public text' refers to inscriptions that are meant to be read by the general public (Redford, 2014, p. 18).



Fig. 20. A detail of the lion and sun motif adorning the portal of the Incir Han built by Kaykhusraw II in 1238–1239 and located north of Antalya (Branning, "İncir Han").

Nonetheless, we need to take this narrative with some circumspection. Bar Hebraeus was born in Anatolia, but moved eastward to Syria where he would complete his writings (Bar Hebraeus, 2003, p. xv-xxxi). Additionally, the mention of the sun and lion imagery on dirhams used as the representation the sultan and his bride is not mentioned in the older Syriac versions of the manuscripts (Peacock, 2006, p. 141). However, her favor in Seljuk history is further illustrated by the fact that her son with Kaykhusraw II, 'Ala al-din Kayqubad II (r. 1243), although quite young, took the throne with his brothers.[44]

Although Kaykhusraw pledged that his new wife need not convert to Islam, in a moment of rage he is reported to have demanded that Gürcü Hatun convert (Vryonis, 1977, p. 15). This dramatic account is reported in the Georgian Chronicle (Brosset, 1857, p. 525), yet it is not mentioned elsewhere. It is within the realm of possibility that the author of the Georgian chronicle did not want to admit that a Christian would voluntarily convert to Islam. It is not possible to ever definitively

[44] At approximately nine years old, the son of Gürcü Hatun and Kaykhusraw II, Kayqubad II, assumed the throne with his two brothers, Kaykaus II and Kilij Arslan IV. When the Mongols summoned the Seljuk leader, the three decided to send Kayqubad. Soon after embarking on his trip he was killed while on the road, possibly by those in his accompanying party (Bar Hebraeus, 2003, p.425).

know whether Gürcü Hatun converted to Islam. It is more probable that she related to both religions, validating what Shukurov terms a "dual identity." Explained as "supposing that one of the two identities is in active mode while the other is in deferred mode," dual identity applies to Gürcü Hatun's possible flux between religions (2012, p. 133–134). Along with the reports of her adoption of Islam and her documented dedication to Mevlana and Sufism, it is also presumed that late in her life she maintained affinity for her Christian heritage through the foundation of a church in Cappadocia (Aflaki, 2002, p. 182; Vryonis 1977, p. 16–22). Among her biological family, Gürcü Hatun's brother, David Narin, became King of Georgia upon their mother's death. Thus, each sibling was in a position of power within two different courts. It is reasonable to assume that Gürcü Hatun remained in contact with her family as she is recorded to have gifted Georgian crafts to friends (Aflaki 506).

Sultan Kaykhusraw II died just nine years after they wed (1237), yet Gürcü Hatun continued to function in the upper echelons of the Seljuk court and went on to have an illustrious impact on Anatolian arts. As mentioned previously, Gürcü Hatun married Mu'in al-Din Süleyman, who was appointed the Pervane in 1256 (Crane, 1993, p. 45).[45] The exact date of this union is unknown; however, it definitely happened years prior to the death of the great mystic, Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi in 1273.[46] The Mongols had defeated Kaykhusraw II and the Seljuks at the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243, which resulted in the Rum Seljuks acting as vassals to the

[45] Pervane's family was in the service of Kaykhusraw II, although he is recognized as having Persian heritage (O'Kane, 2002, p, xiv).

[46] The marriage between Pervane and Gürcü Hatun was not a happy one, and Gürcü Hatun pleaded with Pervane for a divorce. After consulting with Mevlana, Pervane told Gürcü Hatun he would grant one in time. Nonetheless, she only was released from the marriage when he was killed in 1277 (Aflaki, 2002, p. 298).

Mongols. Pervane began to operate as a *defacto* governor in Konya and Kayseri, taking on a sultan-like role within the northern Seljuk territory and acting as an intermediary between the Mongols and the Seljuks (Crane, 1993. p. 45).

Much of what we know about the patronage of Gürcü Hatun and Pervane comes from the writings of Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad al-ʿĀrifī Aflaki (d. 1360), hagiographer of the renowned mystic and poet Mevlana.[47] The couple were devout followers of Mevlana, and Aflaki references them and their actions at length in his mid-fourteenth-century biography of Mevlana, *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn*. Pervane is recorded frequently visiting Mevlana and hosting Sufi *sama* ceremonies in his palace (Aflaki, 2002, p. 566).[48] Gürcü Hatun is even more closely associated with the mystic and her devotion to Mevlana is demonstrated through frequent mention of her in the biography as well as tales of her patronage.

Aflaki includes an interesting anecdote about Gürcü Hatun and the attachment that she felt for Mevlana. Reportedly, Gürcü Hatun was scheduled to relocate to Kayseri for an extended period of time, meaning that she would be separated from her spiritual guide for longer than she wished. Emotionally distraught at the thought of this, Gürcü Hatun commissioned the renowned painter Eyn al-Dowla-ye Rumi to draw a sketch of Mevlana on a piece of paper so that she would be accompanied by his likeness wherever she went.[49] Mevlana acquiesced and agreed to sit for the portraits. Artist Eyn al-Dowla sat with the mystic and began his

---

[47] Mevlana is often known as Celaleddin Rumi or simply Rumi. See footnote 30 on page 64.

[48] The *sama* is the iconic whirling dance performed by dervishes of the Sufi order (Wolper, 2003, p. xiv).

[49] It should be noted at this point that the idea of portraiture in an Islamic society is limited as ascribed by a *Bilderverbot* (Pancaroğlu, 2010, p. 232-3) It is explicit that the worship of images is forbidden. Figural imagery outside of a religious context is appropriate.

work. The first portrait turned out well; however, after finishing the work, Eyn al-Dowla looked back up at Mevlana only to find that his form had changed. Thus the artist set the paper aside and began a second portrait. Once again, upon looking up from his work, the subject had shifted. This sequence continued until the artist had twenty different portraits at hand. At last he removed himself and took all the artworks to Gürcü Hatun. She liked them all and kept them in a chest that she could take with her wherever she went (Aflaki, 2002, p. 292–293).

This narrative could imply that Gürcü Hatun maintained her Christian identity and appreciation for figural images. As a religious figure, a portrait of Mevlana could be construed as the reverence of an image, thus not appropriate in an Islamic context. It is also possible that she had converted, yet was comfortable with portraiture considering her childhood in Georgia and the importance of icons in Christianity. Furthermore, there is the potential that such likenesses were not condemned within Anatolia, illustrating the religious flexibility experienced under Rum Seljuk rule. However, yet another possibility lies in the fluid borders and degree of acceptance experienced within the Seljuk court. The painter from whom Gürcü Hatun commissioned the portrait, Eyn al-Dowla-ye Rumi, was likely to have been a Christian. The "Rumi" in the name indicates that Anatolia was his birthplace. Provided the diverse context of the region, there is a strong possibility that the painter was a non-Muslim. An additional anecdote by Aflaki notes that Eyn al-Dowla-ye Rumi stole a much lauded icon from Constantinople. He showed it to Mevlana who then inquired as to why an object with no soul should be worshipped. It is said that upon consideration of this question, Eyn al-Dowla-ye Rumi converted to Islam (Aflaki, 2002, p. 580). This story of the artists' religious conversion

provides an explanation as to the acceptance of portraiture within a Muslim court. Gürcü Hatun's familiarity with icons and portraiture from her Christian past further validates this story. Nonetheless, the story emphasizes Gürcü Hatun's devotion to the saint Mevlana and her piety; a virtue which greatly influenced her patronage.

Other examples of Gürcü Hatun's patronage are documented in Aflaki's work. In her pious and philanthropic ways, Gürcü Hatun often made gifts of crafts, be they robes, rugs, or metalwork (Aflaki, 2002, p. 506–507). A woman in Mevlana's circle was of the age to be married. Her father, too poor to afford her dowry, brought his problems to Mevlana, who in turn passed the word along to Gürcü Hatun. She took it upon herself to commission a full wardrobe of clothing for the young woman, along with household necessities. Kitchen utensils and fine jewelry were prepared by her court artisans as well as the gift of curtains and carpets from Georgia (Aflaki, 2002, p. 506–508). Gürcü Hatun must have maintained a relationship with her home country if she were to be in possession of such goods. Seljuk textiles were of great quality and widely admired. Carpets from Anatolia have been found as far away as Tibetan monasteries and were regularly traded to various parts of Europe (Polo, 1958, p. 47; Branning). According to Ibn Said, these textiles were typically woven in southeastern Anatolia, near to the revered Caucasian workshops (Redford, 2005, p. 302). Marco Polo states, "the best and handsomest carpets in the world are wrought here [Turkomania], and also silks of crimson and other rich colors (p. 47)." Nonetheless, Gürcü Hatun honored her familial contacts back in Georgia. It must not be forgotten that, although the Kingdom of Georgia was dominated by the Mongols, her brother, King David VI Narin, maintained the unified vassal state (Eastmond, 2013, p. 156).

Throughout Aflaki's documentation of late-thirteenth-century Seljuk life in his biography of Mevlana, Gürcü Hatun appears as perhaps the most prominent benefactor of the arts. If we follow the mention of Pervane throughout the biography, one senses that Mevlana and Pervane are not as close. More frequently he is credited with hosting *sama* ceremonies in his palace for important dignitaries and religious men, rather than bestowing gifts and money (Aflaki, 2002, p. 566). Nonetheless, Aflaki includes the following as some examples of his generosity: "The Parvana gave out presents of fine robes of honor and expensive mules. He conferred gifts on the companions and rendered various services (p. 569)." In a more common anecdote,

> The Parvana, out of extreme joy that Mowlana had uttered these kindnesses on his behalf, kissed Mowlana's blessed feet and made prostrations and gave thanks. He bestowed around two thousand Dinars on the disciples and ordered silver coins to be given to all the religious scholars, shaykhs and the righteous, and robes and shirts to be made for the orphans and poor of the city (p. 111).

Meanwhile, Gürcü Hatun was more frequent in her benefaction. She gifted valuable objects, horses, and monies. Gürcü Hatun often provided gifts to women, a gesture which may have stipulated objects rather than cash and one which may have been inappropriate for Pervane. The reason for these different types of philanthropy likely pertains to gender roles of the time and region as well as to whom the gifts are given. Gifting money may have been deemed less appropriate for a woman, whereas crafts and household goods may have been out of character for male benefaction.

Pervane's patronage also included various architectural monuments and took the form of mosques, madrasas and a caravanserai. Given that he governed the northern areas of Anatolia under the Mongols, this is the area in which he conducted

his building projects. He built the Süleyman Pervane Medresesi (1262)[50] and repaired the Alaeddin Camii (1268) in Sinop, the Durak Han (1265) on the Boyabad-Vezir Köprü road, and the Gök Madrasa (1275) in Tokat. He is also credited with building a mosque in Merzifon (1264) and a madrasa in Kayseri, both of which are no longer standing (Crane, 1993, p. 45–46). Although many of these fell into disrepair, those standing have been heavily restored and adapted for modern uses.

Gürcü Hatun's only known act of architectural patronage was in conjunction with Pervane. Together, their most important contribution to the built environment was the mausoleum of Mevlana (Fig. 21, 22). When Mevlana passed away in 1273 Pervane and Gürcü Hatun came together to finance and establish his tomb. This is a site that has been enlarged and renovated over the centuries and still proves a popular pilgrimage and tourist destination today. As a result of the centuries of modification it is difficult to assess the elements which might be reminiscent of the original construction. Nonetheless, the patronage of such a site is extremely important and constitutes a gesture wrought with symbolism. Aflaki's account of the commission of the original mausoleum for the Mevlana hints at how patronage was structured in regards to the role of the architect and the financial commitment of the patron. He describes the efforts of the emir 'Alam al-Din-e Qeysar to carry out the project:

> Likewise, it is transmitted from the deceased companions-- God have mercy on them-- that after Mowlana's departure from life 'Alam al-Din-e Qeysar-- God have mercy on him-- devoted his aspiration and desire exclusively to building up the sanctified sepulchral shrine and bringing forth a rare mausoleum. He consulted with Valad to learn what he might indicate. Valad asked: 'What cash do you have from worldly possessions?' He replied: 'I have thirty thousand dirhems.' Valad said: 'Then how can this be accomplished?' …

[50] The Süleyman Pervane Medresesi (1262) is also known as the Ulu Cami Medresesi or Alaiye Medresesi (Crane, 1993, p. 45–46).

It appears that ‘Alam al-Din-e Qeysar, likely a very close confidant of Gürcü Hatun and Pervane, is responsible for the details of the project.

> Then the Parvana and Gorji Khatun became so filled with joy and shed so many tears that it cannot be expressed in words. The next morning (*sabah*) they sent a handsome (*sabih*) servant and summoned ‘Alam al-Din. After praising him greatly, they bestowed on him a sum of eighty thousand soltani dirhems and dressed him in robes of honor. In addition, they assigned him another fifty thousand dirhems from the revenue of Kayseri. In absolute joy and serenity of heart he occupied himself with building the blessed sepulchral shrine- God sanctify us with the innermost secret of its residents and, having started the sepulchral shrine through the favor of that sanctified patronage (Khodavandgar), he brought it to completion (p. 552–553).


The emir, ‘Alam al-Din-e Qeysar, consulted with Valad, the son of Mevlana, in anticipation for the commission. The cost of construction, approximately 160,000 dirhams, was a sum which was found sufficient to build a mausoleum and shrine for a contemporary saint. Aflaki’s account of the events that lead to the establishment of such an important architectural monument clarifies that a patron was the individual who supplied the money. The story does not describe the level of input which a patron may have employed in the style and design of the building, yet it proves useful in identifying the individuals responsible for initiating a construction project.

The followers devoted to Mevlana were many and varied. Not only Muslims, but also Christians and Jews were admirers of Mevlana and his teachings. Accordingly, when Mevlana passed away, his far-reaching appeal was described by Aflaki:

> Likewise, all the religious communities with their men of religion and worldly power were present, including Christians and the Jews, the Greeks, the Arabs and the Turks, and others as well. … And they recited verses from the Psalms of David, the Torah and the Gospels, and made lamentation. … The prominent monks and priests were summoned and told: ‘What does this event have to do with you? This king of religion is our chief, imam and guide.’ They answered,



Fig. 21. An view of the Mevlana Mausoleum complex as seen from the south (Photo by author, 2014).



Res. 2 — Türbenin plânı ve kesiti (Plânda, kıble tarafındaki ayakların arası hatalı olarak açık gösterilmiştir).

Fig. 22. The plan and cross-section of the dome of Mevlana's Mausoleum, originally built in 1273 in Konya (Karamağaralı 1966, p. LXIX).

> ‘We came to understand the truth of Moses and the truth of Jesus and of all the prophets because of his clear explanation, and we behold in him the behavior of the perfect prophets we read about in our [sacred] books. If you Muslims call Mowlana the Mohammad of your time, we recognize him to be the Moses of the era and the Jesus of the age. As much as you admire him and are devoted to him, we are his bondsmen and disciples a thousand times more so.’ (p. 405–406)

The documented appeal of Mevlana, regardless of religion, emphasizes the idea that Gürcü Hatun possessed the dual identity discussed earlier. Whether she maintained her Christian beliefs after reportedly being forced to convert to Islam by Kaykhusraw II or whether the supposed conversion ever happened, the varied following of Mevlana allows for ambiguity in Gürcü Hatun’s religious persuasion. Through the endowment of the tomb of such a beloved saint, Pervane and Gürcü Hatun solidified their prominence in Seljuk culture and for the centuries to come. Mevlana’s tomb has remained an important monument to a world-renowned saint and a popular pilgrimage destination. For this reason many individuals throughout history have taken it upon themselves to renovate and add to the existing tomb and complex of Mevlana. As a result, the original structure built by Pervane and Gürcü Hatun can no longer be identified (Archnet, “Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi Türbesi ve Dergahi”).

After the death of Pervane (d. 1277) and between the years 1282 and 1308, the Church of Saint George at Belisırma, a cave mortuary chapel, was founded in Cappadocia. While the inscription containing the precise date is no longer extant, the inscription mentions that it was completed “under the highest and noblest grand Sultan Mesut, while Lord Adronikos reigned over the Romans,” a statement which aligns with the years mentioned above (Suzek, 2008, p. 79). Covered entirely in frescoes and adorned with numerous unique niches, this church has many striking characteristics that distinguishes it from the other cave churches in the region. Today



Fig. 23. The donor portrait from the Church of St. George (Kırk dam altı) in the Ihlara Valley near Belisırma. (Suzek, 2008, p. 145).

the church is known as the Kırk Dam Altı Kilise (translated as "church under forty roofs"). One of the most remarkable features of this church is the donor portrait of a woman and man in a turban on either side of St. George (Fig. 23). The woman is portrayed handing a small model church to Saint George. According to the accompanying inscriptions the donor is Tamar, a name that is distinctly Georgian. It is stated that she paid for the church with her own finances, particularly those gained through the sale of a vineyard. Tamar is dressed in robes of the Seljuk court (Badamo, 2011, p. 166). The man with a turban stands out, as a turban is a head piece associated with Muslim beliefs or Islamic heritage. He is identified as Basil Giagoupes and holds the title of Emir Ariz, indicating that he managed the demands of the Seljuk military (Vryonis, 1977, p. 12; Suzek, 2008, p. 79).[51] Considering the

[51] In a paper given at the 2014 "Cultural Encounters in Anatolia in the Middle Age: The Kingdom of Georgia and Georgian Art," Zurab Batiashvili argued that the Tamar mentioned in the inscription and donor portrait is possibly the daughter of the Georgian King Ulu David VII (r. 1247–1270), meaning a cousin of Gürcü Hatun. His argument is based primarily on the advanced age of Gürcü Hatun at the time of the founding of the chapel, she would have been between 59–71. The paper, "St. George Church in Cappadocia Built by Thamar" is forthcoming in the proceedings.

Byzantine dress of St. George, his Arab-type weapons, and the Seljuk courtly dress of the patrons, it stands with good reason that the patron is the same Tamar as Gürcü Hatun (Vryonis, 1977, p. 13; Badamo, 2011, p. 165–167). There is no other woman named Tamar who entered the Seljuk court in the thirteenth century.

In his 1977 article about the inscription found at the Church of Saint George at Belisırma, Vryonis pieces together the timeline and exhaustively debates the identity of the Tamar named in the inscription accompanying the donor portrait. He delivers a step-by-step argument as to why the Tamar who married Kaykhusraw adopted the nickname Gürcü Hatun, and that the woman who later married Mu'in al-Din Pervane is likely to be the same Tamar as the one is identified in the church donor portrait. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, it is not definitive whether Tamar converted to Islam or not. However, we know that she became a devoted disciple of Celaladdin Mevlana, the Sufi mystic who appealed not only to Muslims, but to Christian and Jews as well (Aflaki, 2002, p. 405.). Hence, scholars remain unsure as to which religion she maintained. Given that Tamar was born into a Christian household and had a continued connection with her homeland, commissioned portraits, and was a devout follower of Mevlana, it is not out of the question that she could have founded a church. While her religious trajectory may never fully be understood, I believe that Gürcü Hatun maintained some affinity for her Christian roots. The lack of mention of an additional Tamar in the Anatolian region as well as the Seljuk robes of the Tamar depicted in the Church of Saint George at Belisırma support the idea that Gürcü Hatun can be best understood through Shukurov's "dual identity" principle.

To summarize Gürcü Hatun's patronage in the thirteenth century and to emphasize her popularity within her lifetime, one needs only to look to the primary sources. Nearly every anecdote written or compiled by Aflaki regards Gürcü Hatun as the "Queen of queens," or the "lady of the world." (Aflaki, 2002, p. 182, 292).[52] These sentiments speak to her popularity and prominence both in the Seljuk court and with the general public. She represented a personality much like a modern "first lady." Given that Aflaki was compiling his work nearly half a century after a plausible life span of Gürcü Hatun, it further attests to the fact that her reputation was a lasting one. Historic sources seem to agree that Gürcü Hatun wielded a large degree of influence within the Seljuk court and local politics. Returning to Aflaki and the passage regarding Gürcü Hatun's commission of portraiture of Mevlana, Aflaki states: "As it happened, she had the intention of going to Kayseri, and the sultan could not do without her because she was a distinguished person with firm opinions" (p. 292). According to all sources, Gürcü Hatun was a force to be reckoned with; she successfully navigated her way through the upper echelons of Seljuk culture and subsequently wielded a significant amount of influence. Her patronage and her sway within Seljuk society must be recognized.

Through this analysis, the similarities and differences in the patronage process between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Seljuks of Rum are apparent. While the Georgians were primarily engaged in royal patronage, the Seljuks shifted to elite patronage upon the conquest of the Mongols after 1243. Mahperi Hatun, Gürcü Hatun, and Pervane are influential characters that bridge the cross-cultural

---

[52] "Queen of Queens" is a title adopted from the Persian "King of Kings" a title utilized for their leader. The adoption of the Persian nomenclature was a common trend in Anatolia and the Caucasus (Korobeinikov, 2013, p. 75; Jones, 2014, p. 180).

relations of thirteenth-century Anatolia. Both women are foreign-born, yet still occupy privileged positions of power within the Rum Seljuk society enabling them to act as patrons of art and architecture. Gürcü Hatun is a character with a unique background. Although she was born in the Georgian court, her father was the son of a Seljuk prince and thus she also had Seljuk blood. Despite the origins of these individuals, in the latter half of the thirteenth century Anatolia and the surrounding lands came under Mongol rule and were thus encompassed within one empire. Gürcü Hatun and Kırk Dam Altı provides us with an example of Georgian-type donor portraits with the inclusion of Seljuk identity. Equipped with an understanding of patronage, patrons and the political climate in Anatolia and the Caucasian region, we can move on to consider the exchange of architectural concepts in Anatolia and its periphery.

CHAPTER III

TRANSFERABILITY AND THE EXCHANGE OF ARTISTIC AESTHETICS

III.1 The Ideas of Influence, Exchange, and Cultural Identity

The overarching goal of this thesis is to highlight and analyze the connectedness of the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuks Sultanate. The artistic and architectural undertakings of each society provides visual proof of the dynamic relationship between the two in the thirteenth century. The important political powers and influential patrons in the Seljuk and Georgian courts have been previously identified; thus, this chapter turns to look at the artistic relations, the notion of artistic influence, and the creative exchange that occurred as a result of the political ties and connections between the two cultures.

The mobility of people and objects in and around Anatolia in the thirteenth century was common and enabled the sharing of cultural aesthetics and motifs that can be recognized in the art and architecture of the time. Transportable objects reveal cultural contact which can again be seen in monumental architecture and ornamentation. Through an analysis of these arts, this chapter will discuss the entwined relationship of the Georgians and Rum Seljuks beyond political ties. However, the subject of cultural influence and exchange presents multifaceted challenges. Drawing conclusions about cultural identity and regional styles is often subject to biases, stereotypes, and misappropriation of stylistic origins. I will discuss

such hazards here and subsequently strive to avoid far-reaching conclusions that are based upon mere conjecture rather than historical evidence. The following study examines portable objects and architecture in relation to their construction methods, materials, and the traveling craftsmen who contributed to the visual culture. Many portable objects such as coins, manuscripts, metalwork and textiles moved between cultures, providing proof for the cultural connections between the Georgians and the Rum Seljuks. The most prevalent artistic evidence that remains from thirteenth-century Anatolia is architecture. It is these monumental constructions that embody shared cultural imagery also present in mobile arts. Thus, throughout this study architecture will be used as a case study. The chapter culminates in the consideration of monumental constructions in the Caucasus that exhibit similar architectural elements seen in Anatolia.

When discussing the interactions of two or more cultures, the term *influence* is frequently used to describe the comparison. Defined as "the capacity to have an effect on the character, development, or behavior of someone or something, or the effect itself," *influence* implies negative undertones in regards to one or more of the societies (Oxford Dictionary). It attributes one culture as possessing a dominant power, while simultaneously placing the other in a subordinate position. Influence is an easy term to describe the transference of ideas between cultures and peoples, yet it comes laden with the connotation of superiority. Rather than to succumb to such biases, this paper suggests a cultural exchange between Anatolian and Caucasian cultures. By utilizing the term *exchange*, defined as "An act of giving one thing and

receiving another," the unfavorable associations of "influence" are avoided and cultural interactions are not labeled as a one-directional transaction.

The use of art and architecture as a means to understand and connect various cultures can be troublesome when trying to further interpret and clearly pinpoint cultural identity. Arts act as a physical manifestation of ideas present in a time and place, usually framed by regional and cultural context. A given motif, be it an embellishment in a manuscript or a portion of a decorative program of a building, may be comparable to a familiar shape or pattern seen elsewhere. Identifying two similar stylistic devices can enable one to jump to conclusions that the two instances are related and how; either by who created the design, where the artist had been previously, and what they might have seen. If not backed with historical evidence, hasty conclusions can be perilous and lead to the unsubstantiated perpetuation of misleading information. This formalistic approach has played a substantial role in the academic studies of Seljuk and Georgian art, as has previously been discussed in Chapter I in relation to the work of Lamb, Kuban, and Chubinashvili. When such connections are followed up and supported by historical textual evidence, they can lead to new understandings of past events and cultural encounters. It is this latter method that this thesis aims to accomplish.

Along the same lines, we must also assess the value of determining the origins of an artistic element or architectural feature. Is it possible to ever really know where an original idea occurred or how it was shaped and moulded by surrounding cultures? Why does finding the origin of an idea matter? Within the context of this thesis, it is not the origins which are important, rather it is the cultural

contacts and relationships that are paramount. Searching for originality and the sources of ideas, aesthetic or otherwise, resorts to the nationalistic discourse which was so prevalent in early art historical studies. The goal is to move away from the strict nationalistic discourse that has tainted past scholarship and to account for the fluidity of states and ideas. Within this thesis, it is not the origins of the given motifs that are debated, but rather the identification of a shared usage of artistic elements. The similar aesthetics of Georgian and Armenian art and architecture is such an example. The modern state boundaries are markedly different from those of history. In such an instance, when pinpointing the locality of an motif or idea present in Georgia or Armenia, the term "Transcaucasian" can be more practical in its reach beyond twenty-first century borders.[53] I advocate in Chapter I that for this thesis, as I am looking primarily at the Georgian interactions with Anatolia, Transcaucasia does not fit within the context of the close study of Georgia. Rather, I suggest it be used for general studies and unsubstantiated studies that are not grounded in context. In hindsight it would have been a useful term for the many articles that have attributed any Caucasian elements to Armenia. In this chapter, the focus is on the common cultural aspects which illuminate the societal setting of the time, as these cultural exchanges enable an understanding of the fluidity of ideas and the societal perceptions of foreigners and their ideals. This chapter will expound the exchanges and not the origins of artistic ideas between thirteenth-century Georgia and the Rum Seljuks.

---

[53] The term "Transcaucasia" was discussed in Chapter I. For more on its use, see Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture: Constructions of Race and Nation.*

Medieval political relationships were often dictated by the group who exhibited a greater display of power. When the Byzantines were defeated at Manzikert in 1071, the Seljuks were able to move in and claim the lands. However, in the establishment of their sultanate, they too had to observe the power of another. The caliph, or ruler of the Islamic world, was frequently identified on the Anatolian coinage in acknowledgement of his superior role and power in the region. Under the reign of King Giorgi (George) III (r. 1156–1184), Georgian coinage also paid tribute to the caliph. At this time the unified Kingdom of Georgia had regained control over the city of Tiflis after en extended period of Muslim domination. The same gesture of tribute ensued when the Seljuks and Georgians were vassals to the Mongols and the Mongol ruler was noted on the contemporary coins. The display of appropriated cultural motifs carried into other aspects of society as well. Liz Jones eloquently explains the relationship between power and cultural depictions, stating that "by accepting titles from Byzantium and the robes that went with them, the Bagrationis were acknowledging their subordinate position in the Christian world presided over by the Byzantine emperor " (p. 166).

Keeping in mind the challenges of influence, identity, nationalism and power dynamics, this chapter emphasizes the connectedness of the Seljuk and Georgian cultures through the examination of instances of cultural exchange. It builds upon the points of contact between the Georgians and Rum Seljuks outlined earlier in this thesis to highlight the need for future studies. Tomb monuments built in the neighboring region of Erzurum exhibit structural correlations to the ecclesiastical monuments in Georgia. The cultural contact between Anatolia and Transcaucasia is

further exemplified in the mosque and hospital complex at Divriği. The complex has been studied at length due to its unique decorative program and scholars have searched for the source of "influence" for its wild and ostentatious stone carvings. Utilizing this example as a case study highlights many of the issues that pertain to cultural exchange in the thirteenth century. The discussion of the monument brings forth issues such as the movement of craftsmen and objects as a means for the portability of ideas. From there, the chapter examines the more concrete examples of cultural exchange before proposing a direction for future research.

III.2 Kümbets: Familiar Tomb Structures in Northeastern Turkey

In Chapters I and II it was explained that the two ruling powers of the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuk Sultanate had clear, extended contact throughout the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The architecture of the era reflects the relationship and provides further evidence of the connection and fluidity of cultures.

The most frequent architectural comparison between the Anatolia and the Caucasus are the kümbets or tomb-towers built in Anatolia and the cupola structures of the ecclesiastical architecture in Georgia and Armenia (Fig. 24). In his 1965 article "The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas," J.M. Rogers mentions the similarities between kümbet architecture of Anatolia and that of the Caucasus. Forty years later, in 2006, Peacock observes similar connections between the regional monumental architectural in his article "Georgia and the Anatolian Turks in the 12th and 13th Centuries." These constructions were initially built by the Saltukid dynasty in Erzurum (1071–1202), but adopted into the Rum Seljuk




Fig. 24. Sitte Melik Kümbet located in Divriği, 1150–1160 (Pancaroğlu, "Sitte Melik tomb, entrance view," Kümbet- Medieval Anatolian Tombs).

repertoire. In identifying the relations between the Georgian Kingdom and its Anatolian neighbors, Peacock states:

> There are clear Caucasian influence in the Saltukid tomb towers of Erzurum and other monuments there (Rogers 1976: 316) but this may be the work of local Armenian or Georgian craftsmen, given Erzurum's proximity to Tao, rather than illustrative of the links with the Kingdom of Georgia (2006, p. 133).

The Saltukids who established their capital at Erzurum came into existence under a commander of the Great Seljuk army, Amir Salduq, in 1072 (Şentürk, *Asya'dan* 10). Their proximity to Tao-Klarjeti, a prominent region of the Georgian Kingdom, led to many skirmishes regarding territory (Sinclair, *Vol II,* 1990, p. 185).

According to multiple accounts by Ibn al-Athir, the Georgians managed to sack Erzurum and make off with the Saltukid ruler. In 1153/4, "During this year there was a pitched battle and fierce fighting between the Georgians in Armenia and the Saltuq lord of Erzurum. Saltuq was defeated, taken prisoner by the Georgians but then released" (Part 2, p. 65–66). Similarly, in 1161,

> This year there was fighting between the Georgians and Prince Saltuq ibn 'Ali, lord of Erzurum, in which Saltuq and his troops were defeated and he was taken prisoner. His sister Shah Bahwar had married Shah Arman Sukman ibn Ibrahim ibn Sukman, lord of Khilat. She sent a present of great value to the king of the Georgians and requested him to take it as a ransom for her brother. He was freed and resumed his position as ruler (Part 2, p. 130).[54]

Intermarriage and gifting as described above was a common practice in the political landscape of medieval Anatolia and Transcaucasia. It exemplifies how both people and material goods were mobile, a point which becomes important later in this chapter. Peacock further points out that Ibn al-Athir makes it clear that at a later point, the Saltukids become vassals to the Georgians (Peacock, 2006, p. 130). To further exemplify the encounters and connectedness between the Georgians and the Saltukids, it is reported that around the time of 1188, the Georgian Queen Tamar contemplated taking Muzaffar al-Din of the Saltukid court as her husband (Jones,

[54] Within this quote, Khilat refers to the Armenian city of Ahlat. The connections between the Saltukids and the Armenians is one of the early examples of a cultural crossroads in which visual culture was exchanged.

2014, p. 246).[55] Even though the Saltukids were absorbed into the Rum Seljuk Sultanate at the turn of the thirteenth century, the Kingdom of Georgia maintained a connection with Erzurum. As was noted in Chapter II, Georgian Queen Rusudan married the son of the Emir of Erzurum in 1224. The children from this marriage, Gürcü Hatun and David VI Narin, became prominent personalities in the thirteenth century and maintained both a Seljuk and Georgian perspective. The city of Erzurum is an important city in regards to this thesis. Its geographic position between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Muslim principalities of Anatolia facilitated cultural contact in the region. The Muslim city was home to a number of Armenians and Georgians, thus creating a population which subscribed to a degree of dual identity.

The "influence" that is acknowledged in the passage above refers to the cylindrical tombs which are capped by a conical roof, built by the Saltukids and adapted by the Seljuks. These constructions therefore bear substantial structural similarities to the cupolas of Georgian and Armenian churches (Fig. 15, 18, 19).

---

[55] Hearing of her, Saldukh's grandson, Mut'apradin, refusing to listen to the opposition expressed by his kinsfolk, rejected the false faith of Mohammed, which attracts people by its peculiar teaching of the worldly life. Won over by her beauty and burning with love, he came from his motherland before the highest of all the Kings, the sovereign Tamar, with a great army, numerous princes, eunuchs, guards, slaves and bondswomen. He brought with him many rich royal presents, precious stones, pearls, hunting dogs and horses. He was met according to the established order in the royal court, and was brought to the palace with honors and love. The Queen's grandfather, the great and glorious Demet're, the knight who resembled Gorgasali, brought over his grandfather, Saldukh-Ezdin, to his side, but with great difficulty; Tamar, not wasting a word, brought Mut'apradin over to her rule as a slave and tributary. He remained at her side calmly and quietly for a long time, while from the very first glance he cast at her he began, like Ramin, to shed torrents of tears. She honored him with a seat on a chair next to her throne. And there was unspeakable joy, which befits a generous feast of didebulis and knights at a king's court. Diverse sights, singers, players, presents and dresses – all these things were there without number. Among such honors and gifts, and surrounded with love, Mut'apradin spent the winter in Somkhiti and Tbilisi. He liked the hunting places and the tavadis, and he was content with the patroness, perfect like a goddess. In the spring they took him to the camps, the hunting fields, the lands, and the counties of K'akheti and Ran. The tavadis, knights and soldiers of the patroness, all rejoiced and enjoyed themselves, and lauding their immortal patroness, waited for her decision. Tamar, proud and haughty, directed up to heaven the wings of her mind, but did not find this suitor right for her. He had to give up his hopes and return to the metropolis of his own country. The Seljukid found himself in a situation quite opposite to the one of Saul: the latter, looking for the donkeys of his father, found a kingdom, while the former, looking for a kingdom that excelled all the others, found the fortune that was quite like the one lost by Saul.

Furthermore, the tomb towers are frequently adorned with blind arcades which encircle their facade; this is a design pattern very commonly seen in Caucasian architecture. In Caucasian architecture, the cupola can be found as early as in the sixth century in churches such as Jvari near Mtskheta, Georgia (Fig. 4). This early form of the cylindrical cupola is a squatter, more angular version than the elegant tenth-century structure that would adorn many churches in the Tao region. The elemental form as seen at Jvari predates Seljuk culture and even the emergence of Islam.

Hailing from the Great Seljuks, the Saltukids would be culturally familiar with the Kharraqan towers in Northern Iran (Fig. 25). These towers are free-standing cylindrical towers with domes (Blair, 1992, p. 132). While these towers do differ



Fig. 25. Kharraqan Towers located in Northern Iran and built between 1067 and 1093 (muslimheritage.com).

substantially from those found in northeastern Anatolia in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they do share many qualities so as to not be completely disassociated. In establishing their own practices for the burying of their dead, the Saltukids likely appropriated the idea of the tomb tower in combination with local structural practices as seen in the constructions of the Georgians and the Armenians. Kuran also notes the adaptation of the cupola structure by the Saltukids, this time in the Citadel of Erzurum. The dome of the masjid is "encased inside a high drum whose surfaces are decorated by blind arches and topped by a conical cap, not unlike those of the Armenian or Georgian churches in the region" (p. 82). The incorporation of such a dome can be seen in many Seljuk kümbet constructions across Anatolia; the Alaeddin Mosque in Konya, the Great Mosque of Divriği, the Sultan Han near Kayseri, and many more.

The Mama Hatun Kümbet is an exceptional example of Saltukid mortuary architecture. Located in Tercan, not too far from Erzurum, and built in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, the mortuary monument is encircled in an ambulatory space not seen elsewhere (Pancaroğlu, 2009). The monument is dedicated to Mama Hatun, a Saltukid princess. She was buried in the kümbet while the wall surrounding the central structure housed niches possibly meant for her family members. Although the layout and design of this monument is quite unique, the geometric decoration on the walls is an excellent example of craftsmanship and Islamic patterns. Peter Lu extensively studied such patterns and has determined the breakdown of the complex intertwined patterns into *girih* tiles (Fig. 26) ("Decagonal"). This method of design composition has been applied throughout the




Fig. 26. The geometric pattern adorning the walls of the Mama Hatun Türbesi, late twelfth-early thirteenth century (Lu, 2007, p. 1108).

Islamic world. The tomb of Mama Hatun is not only an example of geometric precision, it exemplifies a cross-road of cultures. It resembles the Kharraqan Towers in Iran, yet this tomb was constructed of stone. The architect, Mufaddal the Cross-Eyed, originated from Ahlat, a town in Eastern Anatolia with close connections to Armenia. Provided that the architect was of Armenian origin, he would have been familiar with stone construction. This monument thus becomes a marker in cultural transitions and demonstrates a societal hybridity. The probable use of Armenian architects and craftsmen by the Saltukid dynasty would have been, in many ways, the beginning of a cross-cultural trend (Yetkin, 1957).

Rather than clarifying the origins of the kümbet-style tomb, it may be accepted that the cupola-style structure is a shared architectural element in multiple Anatolian and Caucasian cultures. The early Saltukids likely knew the concept of the tomb tower from Iran and found similar structures within the architecture of the Caucasus. Whether they drew direct inspiration from one or another has not been proved through textual evidence, although the formal similarities exist. The cultural connectedness in the region has been expounded by the chronicles of both Georgians

and Seljuks. Furthermore, intermarriage between Georgians and the ruling families of Erzurum was considered more than once.

III.3 The Divriği Complex: A Case Study for Traveling Ideas, Objects, and Artisans

A specific example of the adoption of cross-cultural artistic elements and the subsequent scholarship of particular monuments is the Divriği hospital-mosque complex (Fig. 27). This monument provides a striking example of appropriation, as can be seen in the bold décor adorning the portals. Built in 1228–1229, this monument was constructed by the Mengücekids (1180–1228) (Pancaroğlu 2009, p. 173, Kuban, 2001, p. 11). The Mengücekid dynasty is little known, but they are thought to have been established by a military leader of the Great Seljuks soon after



Fig. 27. The hospital and mosque complex at Divriği as seen from above (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 195)



Fig. 28. The Divriği hospital portal. (Pancaroğlu, "The Hospital-Mosque Complex" 196).

the Battle of Manzikert.[56] Prior to being absorbed as vassals into the Rum Sultanate, they ruled over the lands surrounding the upper Euphrates and present-day Erzincan (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 173; Cahen, 1968, p. 108–112). At the time of the Mengücekids' submission to Rum Seljuk power, the political gesture was accompanied by a royal wedding between the two families. The leader of Erzincan,

[56] Claude Cahen disagrees with the idea that the Mengücekids were established soon after the Battle of Manzikert, arguing instead that they did not come into being until 1118. Cahen explains that the mention of the name Mengücek arrises first with the Armenian move to take Malatya (1967, p. 108).

Bahramshah, was married to the daughter of Kiliç Arslan II, Ismati Khatun (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 174).

The hospital-mosque complex at Divriği has attracted a great amount of scholarly attention on account of its ornate and highly stylized portals (Fig. 28). The doors to the hospital are situated under a high pointed arch protruding from the facade. The arch is built away from the facade using clustered columns that extend above the door and culminate in the point of an arch. Between the top of the door and the point of the arch is a window surrounded by numerous geometric and floral designs. It is the ornate and decorative carvings of the portal arrangement which distinguishes it from the rest of the building facade. The geometric patterns are varied and executed in a larger scale than seen in other monuments. An unusual, continuous band carved in high relief winds across geometric patterns directly adjacent to the door. Interspersed with the angular designs are bold, stylized vegetal motifs which occur on the most exterior plane of the portal. Two roundels containing patterned carving are positioned on either side of the window. The latter two elements add an organic element to the overall carved composition. The Great Mosque portal at Divriği exaggerates the same bold, stylized decoration. High-relief carvings of organic shapes and vegetal themes dominate the portal structure. In addition to plant varieties, figures and animals are incorporated into the designs. Very little space is left unadorned, and the symmetry of the designs is approximate. The extensive use of bold stylized stone carving seen in the hospital-mosque complex of Divriği is unmatched elsewhere. However, the use of decorated entryways on otherwise austere buildings is an architectural style which became widely used in




Fig. 29. The Armenian Gospels of 1253 which both Rogers and Brend mention in connection with the hospital-mosque complex of Divriği. (Brend, 174, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., Ms. 44. 17. tables 4 and 5).

medieval Islamic architecture. It is largely understood to have been adopted into Anatolian and Seljuk architecture by way of Syria.

Given the unusual design adorning the façade, scholars have searched far and wide to find similar iconography and engaged in debates regarding the origins for such unique composition of stone carving (Fig. 28).[57] Theories have likened the ornately carved portals of the complex to Armenian manuscripts and Hindu temples (Brend 173). Kuban proposes that the influence was not Caucasian, but rather

[57] Rogers compares the portal to the Gospel book no. 44.17 in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington in his article "Seljuq Architectural Decoration at Sivas" (1973, p. 25)

stemmed from Southern Asia (p. 162). He says, “under the conditions of the time, it is more logical that this lexicon spread with wandering artists rather than through written or illustrated documents,” in an attempts to disarm the argument for the influence of illustrated manuscripts (p. 169). However, Sakisian, Saladin, Rogers, and Brend claim that the inspiration for the wildly ornate and fanciful portals of Divriği comes from Armenian manuscripts (Brend, 1975, p. 173). Brend bolsters her own assertion by citing Rogers to support her claims (Rogers, Sivas, p. 16-8). He too is intent on identifying Divriği styles and décor with those seen in Armenian manuscripts, and unlike many other scholars, provides a tangible example of the Gospel book identified as no. 44.17 in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington (Fig. 29). However, noting the date of the manuscript, Rogers overlooked a key element of cultural exchange: that of chronology. Divriği was built in 1228 to 1229, whereas the manuscript cited by Rogers was completed in 1253.

The decorative carving adorning the portal of the Divriği complex is unparalleled in any other regional architecture. As a result, many scholars have made an attempt to identify how the craftsmen came to create such an ostentatious and unique monument. The buildings have been subject to much speculation in past studies. It has become clear through more recent studies that a special environment of mobility, power assertion, and artistic agency combined to create an extraordinary display of architectural accomplishment. It demonstrates that the powers in Anatolia and the contributing craftsmen had their own artistic agency and the ability to imagine and create an exceptional edifice (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 189).

III.4 Traveling Craftsmen and Objects: Their Contribution to the Cultural Landscape

The rapid expansion of the Rum Seljuks dictated an expedited building campaign. Walls and monuments acted as a type of propaganda, publicizing the dominance and resources of the new power in Anatolia. To enable the quick construction, the Seljuks utilized local as well as foreign craftsmen. Much to their advantage, many populations were displaced as a result of the tumultuous political relations and warring kingdoms of the era. This led to many peoples avoiding conflicts and settling in new regions, consequently creating an environment for shared ideas. Artisans from Iran and Syria are frequently documented in their contributions to monumental constructions, such as the walls of Sinop, gates of Konya, the mosque and hospital of Divriği, and the Aksaray Sultan Han among many others (Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 184; Redford, 2014, p. 85; Yalman, 2011, p. 272).[58] Further complicating matters, many emirs were born outside the Rum Sultanate, and thus their patronage can be scrutinized for various cultural elements.

The complex at Divriği (Fig. 27, 28) also proves an excellent example for the documentation of traveling craftsmen within Anatolia in the thirteenth century. Two specific artisan names have been identified, both of which were foreigners to the area. Twice the name Khurramshah ibn Mughith al-Khilati, or Kurramshah, born to Mughith of Ahlat[59] (or Khorshah of Helat) can be found inscribed on the masonry of

[58] A few of the documented Syrian craftsmen active in Anatolia include: Abu Ali of Aleppo who contributed to the walls of Antalya (121) and the Red Tower (1226) (Redford, 2008, p. 115), Najm al-Din Yavash who contributed to the walls of Antalya (Redford, 2008, p. 116), and Muhammed bin Khawlan ad Dimashqi and who played a key role in the Alaeddin Mosque of Konya (1219–1220) and the Sultan Han near Aksaray (1229) (Redford, 1992, p. 56, Branning).

[59] Today Ahlat is located in Turkey on the northwest shore of Lake Van. In medieval times, the city was largely controlled by the Kingdom of Armenia and was called Khilat.

the complex: once upon the mosque and once upon the hospital (Kuban, 2001, p. 158, Pancaroğlu, 2009, p. 184). Ahmad ibn Ibrahim al-Tiflisi, a Muslim from Tbilisi carved his name on the ornate wooden minbar constructed in 1240–1.[60] These two names are evidence that traveling craftsmen were not necessarily restricted by their religion, and their contribution to the construction of Divriği is a direct example that craftsmen from Christian regions were included in the construction of Muslim monumental buildings (Pancaroğlu, 2012, p. 33). It is worth noting, however, that for nearly four centuries Tbilisi was a Muslim city and upon its return to the Christian Georgians in 1122, it remained extremely hospitable to the Muslim population. When it was taken back into Georgian and thus Christian control, the provisions for local Muslims were so accommodating that historic sources are quoted as saying "He [David] had more respect for the Muslims than the peers of Islam" (Asatrian & Margarian, 2004, p. 35). Regardless of whether the particular artisan whose signature remains on the minbar was a Christian or a Muslim, the two names that are attached to the Divriği complex clearly show that skilled labor forces were imported. Thus we can surmise that artisans would travel and subsequently bring with them their regional styles and techniques.

In addition to Divriği, a number of other monuments built in Anatolia by the Seljuks have documented contributions by "foreign" or "Transcaucasian" architects. The Alay Han, reportedly the oldest Rum Seljuk caravanserai, has an inscription on the side of the portal with the name of the architect, Tutbeg bin Bahram al-Khilati. The last portion of his name, al-Khilati, indicates that he hailed from the historically

[60] Tbilisi had been under Muslim rule between the eighth and twelfth centuries (Asatrian & Margarian, 2004, p. 32).

Armenian city of Ahlat (Branning, "Alay Han"). This same architect is also credited with building one of the earliest Rum Seljuk kümbets, the Sitte Melik Tomb in Divriği. The elongated niches on either side of the portal are reminiscent of those found in both Georgian and Armenian churches (Pancaroğlu, "Kümbet"). Similarly, the earliest inscription found within the Alaeddin Mosque complex is inscribed on the minbar. It clearly documents the work of another craftsman hailing from Ahlat. His name, al-Khilati Hacı Mengum Berti, indicates that he was certainly a Muslim, as "Hacı" reveals that he previously completed the Hajj. The importance of the Alaeddin Mosque is indisputable, as nearly all sultans prior to the Mongol invasion were buried within the complex (Ertug, 1991, p. 219). The fact that there are multiple instances in which an artisan from Ahlat is present on a monumental Seljuk construction further proves that the employment of foreign craftsmen was not an anomaly. The numerous documented instances of craftsmen from Ahlat in the employment of the Seljuks support the strong link between the Caucasus region and Anatolia, with the border region being particularly important.

The backgrounds of the foreign artisans are documented not only in the inscriptions adorning the monuments, but also within the thirteenth-century historical texts. In hiss hagiography of Mevlana, Aflaki states:

> Mowlana said: "… when it is time for building, one must engage Greek laborers and when it is time for destroying something, Turkish hirelings. Indeed, the building of the world is assigned to the Greeks, whereas the world's destruction is reserved for the Turks (p. 502)."

This controversial statement reflects a high esteem of local "Greek" craftsmen. The translation of Greek likely comes from "Rumi" which has been previously identified with those living in the lands of the Eastern Roman Empire, or Anatolia. While this

cannot be interpreted as a universal mindset within Anatolia, it provides an interesting perspective in respect to non-Seljuk craftsmen. The "Turkish hirelings" mentioned in the quote most likely refer to the nomadic Turkmen who lived throughout Anatolia at the time. Nonetheless, the statement clearly reflects a high degree of esteem held for Greek craftsmen and laborers.

In addition to the craftsmen contributing in a direct way to Seljuk constructions, ideas traveled with people as they moved. Traveling or displaced individuals took with them small possessions that were either of practical or sentimental use in an effort to remind them of places left behind. Familiar objects and motifs created a sense of home in a foreign land. A much studied example of a portable object with a unique artistic program is the Innsbruck plate, a small copper dish with elaborate enamel work and dated to 1150–1160 (Fig. 30, 31). The interior



Fig. 30. The interior of the Innsbruck Plate twelfth-century (Redford, 1990, p, 120, 122).



Fig. 31. The exterior of the Innsbruck Plate (Redford, 1990, p. 120, 122).

of the plate is comprised of six roundels surrounding a larger central circle containing the image of Alexander the Great in a scene of his ascension. He is holding two scepters which are crossed in front of his lap and extend above his shoulders. A griffin is seated on either side of Alexander supporting his throne. The roundels positioned around the central figure contain animals engaged in combat alternating with birds. The stylized combative scenes include a lion and cow, an eagle with a snake, and a pegasus overtaking a lion (Hoffman, 2001, p. 39–40; Redford, 1990, p. 119). Between the roundels are palm trees, courtly entertainers, and a twisting vegetal motif. The rim of the plate is adorned with an Arabic inscription detailing the name and titles of an Artuqid ruler.[61] The cursive inscription has been translated by van Berchem as follows:

[61] The Artuqids were a small dynasty in southeastern Anatolia who broke away from the Great Seljuks around 1102.

> The amir, chief of armies (*al-isfahsalar*), the great, the fortified by God, the victorious, Nasir al-Din, Rukn al-Dawla, saber of the community, luster of the nation, leader of armies, crown of kings and sultans, slayer of infidels and polytheists, Alp Sawghan Sunqur Bak Ata Sukman Dawud son of Artuq, sword of the Commander of the Faithful (Redford, 1990, p. 121).

The obverse of the plate maintains the same elements of design complete with an inscription running around the rim and a series of six roundels. Unlike the interior inscription, the exterior text is in Persian and much of it is illegible (Redford, 1990, p. 124). The exterior roundels contain a series of repeated scenes and are situated around the unadorned base. Two of the scenes contain human figures: one of a pair embracing and the other of a man playing a lute to an admirer. There are also two eagles and two combat scenes with winged horses and another animal. Once again, the space between the roundels is filled with palm trees, entertainers and vegetal motifs. The imagery included on the plate encompasses both Islamic and Christian iconography, and as a result the origin of the plate has long been debated. Scott Redford discusses the unique object at length in his article "How Islamic Is It?" and proposes that the mixed characteristics of the imagery and the overtly Byzantine style and medium likely mean that the plate was made in the Caucasus or present-day Georgia (p. 119–135). The history that Georgia has with Islamic cultures and domination as well as their close appropriation of Byzantine styles accounts for the unique imagery (Lomouri, 2000, p. 184; Redford, 1990, p. 119–135). The Innsbruck Plate is an item meant for a royal house or royal gift; however, similar exchanges may have been present on a proletariat level (Redford, 1990, p. 126–127). It also serves as an exceptional example of how imagery from two distinct cultures can be combined in a single instance.

Eva Hoffman compares the Innsbruck plate to the frescoed interior of the Norman Reception Room in Palermo, decorated between 1150–1200 (p. 33). Although many of the images adorning the walls are familiar to Christian audiences, a number of similar motifs to those seen on the small Innsbruck Plate are identified and can be interpreted in an Islamic context. The decorated architectural space corresponds to the paradisiacal theme consisting of flora and fauna. Along the length of the upper walls animals flank palm trees, a motif that corresponds with the scenes between the roundels on the Innsbruck Plate. The use of roundels, analogous to those seen on the dish can be seen on the vaults of the ceiling. Like the Innsbruck plate, they are filled with eagles with spread wings, lions and and other mythical creatures. The reception room was built in a Christian context, and the inclusion of iconography closely resembling that found in islamic monuments and arts clearly



Fig. 32. The reception room in the Norman Palace in Palermo. Built between 1150 and 1200, this Christian space contains a number of references to Islamic art (Hoffman, 34).

points to the presence of traveling ideas and artisans (Fig. 32). The motifs of flora and fauna in a paradisiacal setting as well as the use of roundels in decoration were also present in Byzantium.[62]

The similarities between the imagery in both the Islamic and the Christian contexts also relates to a shared "chivalric culture" (Redford, 2000, p. 78, 108). Game animals, especially those of lions and eagles are present in royal iconography throughout time and across geographic boundaries, as they are perceived to be animals of domination. Explaining his usage of the term, Redford states:

> Without implying total equivalence, I would like to stress common elements of sitting, and function and utility to the ethos of the ruling elites of the medieval Islamic world, Byzantium, and Norman Sicily and southern Italy (2000, p. 108).

Although these common motifs are present, it is the manner in which they are presented that provides insight into cultural exchange. On the exterior walls of Oshki, a hunt scene is depicted in high relief (Fig. 33). An archer is present on the left, aiming his bow towards two deer flanking a tree. The animals located on either side of the tree and the representation of the popular pastime of hunting are motifs that are a part of chivalric culture. These same elements can be seen in the Innsbruck plate and the Norman Reception Room in Palermo. They too use roundels containing animals on the vaults combined with the alternating birds and trees on the upper walls, and this provides a strong correlation pointing to cultural contact and the exchange of ideas.

The Seljuks also favored the game animals and roundel motifs. A building fragment dating to the thirteenth century and currently located within the İnce

---

[62] For further reading see Lucy-Anne Hunt's "Comnenian Aristocratic Palace Decoration: Descriptions and Islamic Connections."



Fig. 33. A high relief depicting a hunting scene on the external wall of Oshki Cathedral (963–973) (Photo by author, 2014).

Minareli Medrese Museum in Konya depicts both game animals as well as fantastical ones framed in concentric circles (Fig. 34). The tiles of the Kubadabad Palace (ca. 1230) further exemplify the idea of a shared concept of kingship through the representation of mystical animals, game animals, entertainers, favored activities such as hunting as well as leaders (Fig. 35). These elements build upon the common ideas of kingship and chivalric culture.

Looking beyond animal motifs, frescoes located in Tao-Klarjeti also provide substantial evidence of cultural interaction, more specifically between the Byzantines and the Georgians. The painted depictions of Georgian royalty and elite as donors which frequently adorn the walls of churches throughout Georgia can usually be classified into two sub-categories; those depicting the donors in Sasanian regalia and those showing them in Byzantine dress (Eastmond, 1998, p. 110). According to Antony Eastmond's extensive study in his *Royal Imagery in Medieval Georgia*, this

was likely an attempt by the society's elite to further establish themselves as regional leaders (p. 89). The Bagratonis attempted to associate themselves with those regional societies that were viewed powerful, authoritative, wealthy, and commanding. From the time of the influx of the Georgian building program in Tao-Klarjeti, cross-cultural references can be seen. The donor portrait of David III at Oshki (973) depicts him in a robe adorned with palmettes and pearls, a pattern and style which is seen on Byzantine fabrics (Djobadze, 1992, p. 116). Similarly, his donor relief on the exterior of the church details the same type of intricate robes (Fig. 16). The Church of St. Nicholas at Kintsvisi built in the thirteenth century by Queen Tamar houses an impressive array of frescoes that adorn the interior walls. The donor portrait depicts Tamar and her son Giorgi III in classically Byzantine garb (Eastmond, 1998, p. 144) (Fig. 18). The robes are long, flowing, and decorated with roundels and geometric patterns that can be seen in contemporaneous frescoes in the Chora Church in Constantinople (c. 1070–81/ c. 1315–21) (Fig. 36). The prevalence of Byzantine textiles in the frescoed depictions of Georgian royalty intimates the knowledge of such clothes in the imperial household. Textiles and clothing are some of the more portable arts that would accompany craftsmen, travelers, and royal emissaries. Architecture often mimicked the designs of textiles in the decor of facades. Structural features referenced hangings, curtains, and carpets. Once again, the connection between smaller objects possessing mobility and monumental art can be seen.

The clear examples of the Innsbruck plate and the Palermo reception room as well as the examples in Konya and Tao-Klarjeti indicate that ideas were not static. It



Fig. 36. The figure of the St. John Chrysostom from the Chora church in Istanbul (José Luiz Bernardes Ribeiro, 2011).

is equally feasible that small portable objects such as the Innsbruck Plate, as well as the presence of traveling artisans in and around Anatolia were responsible for spreading iconography and cultural aesthetics. Rather, it proves that there was an exchange of artistic convention and close contact between societies and a common idea of kingship, taste, and self-fashion. The acknowledgement of the various reasons for travel such as pilgrimage or threats to freedom and the frequency with which it occurred helps to build an understanding of how differing cultural ideas were transferred between regions. People were fleeing from invading powers or looking for the next commission. The mobility of people and craftsmen was facilitated by need and by survival.



Fig. 34. Thirteenth century Rum Seljuk building fragment from the Ince Minarele Museum in Konya (Photo by author, 2014).



Fig. 35. Kubadabad Palace tiles, ca. 1230 (Photo by author, 2014).

III.5 Constructions Materials and Motifs in Medieval Anatolia and Caucasia

As mentioned above, the architecture of Caucasia has long been executed in stone. The churches built in the fifth and sixth centuries are made of a fine ashlar construction (Marsagishvili, 1999, p. 100). Ashlar is a type of masonry in which large stone blocks are laid in horizontal rows creating a smooth facing and the seams between blocks are minimal. This method and tradition eventually gave way to a building technique which utilized a rubble core faced with cleanly cut and squared blocks in the tenth and eleventh centuries in Tao-Klarjeti (Djobadze, 1992, p. 90). In this construction, walls would be built with a rubble core and faced with fine-cut rectangular tiles that would create the appearance of ashlar blocks.[63] The majority of the Tao-Klarjeti churches are constructed using this method. While the smooth exterior provided a harmonious surface adorned with carvings, the interior walls were roughly hewn stones. The texture allowed plaster to better adhere to the walls in preparation for the program (Djobadze, 1992, p. 93).

The typical construction material that was utilized by the Great Seljuks was brick. A notable example can be seen in the Friday Mosque of Isfahan (Seljuk elements, 1086–87) (Fig. 37). However, the Seljuks of Rum constructed many of their monumental buildings from stone, which can be seen in the multitude of extant buildings throughout the Anatolian landscape. Given that the early Seljuks of Rum were more familiar with the building methods employed by the Great Seljuks, in particular brick, it stands to reason that stone was a building material with which

[63] Rubble masonry was common throughout Anatolia and the Caucasus. As a result of its nature and popularity, constructions using this technique can be difficult to date. It was not only the Georgians, Armenians, and Rum Seljuks who utilized such practices, but the Byzantines as well (James Crow lecture, November 5, 2014 at the Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations)




Fig. 37. The north dome of the Great Mosque at Isfahan (J. Powell, archnet.org).

they were not familiar. Subsequently, stone construction must have been a material with which the Anatolian Seljuks became familiar in the context of their new geographic boundaries. The Seljuks entered a land that had previously been occupied by the Greeks and Romans who were masters of stone building. Furthermore, in the movement from Iran to Anatolia, Seljuks would have had to pass through the Southern Caucasus region.[64] Anatolian lands were home to the Byzantines, as well as Armenians and Georgians; as these were societies who excelled in stonework and maintained the tradition. The primary contributing factor to the extensive use of stone as a construction material is the simple fact of supply. Much of Anatolia and the surrounding lands have plentiful stone and bedrock that can be quarried and

[64] There were other routes into Anatolia. For more information see Peacock's *Early Seljuq History*.

easily shaped into building blocks. Deteriorated Hellenistic and Roman monuments also provided ample supply of spolia.

With the onset of the Rum Seljuk building campaigns in the twelfth century, the Seljuks had yet to establish a preferred construction method. The Alaeddin Mosque in Konya was begun under the rule of Kiliç Arslan II (1156-1192) and finished under Kaykubad I in 1220 (Fig. 38). The use of fifth-century Byzantine spolia as well as the piece-meal archeological records which uncovered additional walls make it apparent that the construction of the mosque depended to some extent on materials likely belonging to a Byzantine church (Redford, 1992, p. 57). Found not only in the outer walls of the complex, the Byzantine spolia makes up a substantial portion of the columns supporting the indoor section of the mosque. The chronology of the development of the complex can be determined through the



Fig. 38. The Aladdin Mosque in Konya, 1155-1220 (Richard Brotherton, Aga KhanVisual Archive, 1984).

sections that utilized pre-existing building materials and those parts that are constructed in a uniform manner. The inscription records also provide further clues to the development of the complex. Redford proposes that there were two distinct stages. The first stage of construction is indicated through the use of Byzantine spolia. Prior to being a mosque, there was a byzantine church on the site which was repurposed after it either collapsed or intentionally demolished. The use of spolia and existing buildings helps to explain why there is little known about Seljuk architecture in their first hundred years in Anatolia. The second building stage of the mosque is marked by Alaeddin's black and white marble portal in the Syrian style and dated to 1219–1220 (1992, p. 60).

Another example of Seljuk construction techniques includes the presence of plaster facing on rough masonry. Examples such as the Kale Kapısı (1220s) and the Kızıl Kule (1225–6) were built using rough stonework which was plastered over and painted to resemble the Ashlar technique. Redford proposes that this technique was used to mask the unpolished aesthetics of the stonework (1993, p. 149–150). Tekinalp further discusses the plasterwork of the Rum Seljuks and its use on the facades of churches incorporated in the Seljuk palatial complexes. Red pigment residue can be seen in a pattern that would have resembled the layout and seams of ashlar masonry.

> Such plaster decoration, which can reasonably be assumed to have been applied to the facades of the church as well, is a distinctive feature of the citadel at Alanya during the period of 'Ala' al-Din Kai-Quabdh I. Similar applications may have been seen within the Seljuk palace at Aspendos and at the lower walls of the Alara castles in the same region. The same type of imitation of stone blocks was painted on the lower walls of Konya Alaeddin kiosk and on the east wall surfaces of the crypt of Eyyanli mausoleum located

within the Afyon Boyalikoy Khanqah dated to around 1206 (Tekinalp, 2009, p. 152-153).

The mimesis of the local construction methods may have been an effort to appropriate an identity and legitimacy within the geographical context of Anatolia (Redford, 1993, p. 155). With stone being a more difficult medium, it was likely considered the most lavish material. The use of plaster and ashlar to represent solid stone construction speaks to this hierarchy.

It is well known and has been discussed in Chapter I that both the Georgians and the Seljuks of Rum had inseparable connections with Iran. The Georgians were dominated by Muslim forces from Iran between the eight and twelfth centuries (Asatrian, 2004, p. 29). The connection between the Seljuks and Iran may have been even stronger as they were an offshoot dynasty from the Great Seljuks who ruled Iran. Connections aside, Sasanian plasterwork is comprised of elegant vegetal motifs that curl and wind throughout a decorative band. It is easy to see the similarities between this plasterwork and the stonework completed by both the Seljuks and Georgians. However, there are minor differences that should be noted (Hillenbrand, R, 1994, p. 59-78). In the stucco work of pre-Seljuk Iran, the palmettes and scrollwork act harmoniously together with the architecture to decorate and emphasize portals. When a similar motif was adopted by the Mengujekids of Divriği (Fig. 27, 28), the palmettes and certain vegetal motifs were singled out and accentuated (Blessing, 2012, p. 239). This results in oversized plants surrounded by an entwined vegetal or a geometric background. While the hospital-mosque complex of Divriği takes these motifs to an extreme, the incorporation of accentuated vegetal

on building facades became more common in the latter part of the thirteenth century under the Ilkhanids (Blessing, 2012, p. 309–310).

Similarly, both the Georgians and the Seljuks framed their monumental facades to create a cohesive and harmonious visual display of power. In Seljuk designs, often the decoration was limited to the portal. Yet solid bands of moulding is frequently seen along rooflines and corners. The Georgians also used moulding, although perhaps more liberally. The moulding tends to meld into blind arcades that arch across monumental walls. This will be examined further within this chapter. However, this framing technique that the two cultures share transfers into other arts. Many of the coins are framed with a simple border as well. The sense of balance spans the two powers.

III.6 Tied Economies: The Sharing of Numismatic Iconography and Metals

This idea of shared "chivalric court cultures" is exemplified by the numismatic imagery of the Georgians and Seljuks. Coins are a medium that is essential to the discussion of the Georgian and Rum Seljuk relationship and one which illustrates the definite cross-cultural exchange of artistic motifs and iconography. Currency has never been solely about commerce, but has also proved an effective means for expressing political power and propaganda through carefully designed imagery. The coins that were in use during the thirteenth century in both the Kingdom of Georgia and the Anatolian Seljuk Empire shared many similarities. Recent numismatic scholarship suggests that in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century there was a



Fig. 39. Copper coin from King Giorgi III from between 1156-1184. We see the king seated on one side and an Arabic inscription paying tribute to the caliph on the reverse. (Lang,1957, p. 9)

degree of shared coinage between the Georgians and Seljuks. Coins minted from copper originating from Georgian mines were found throughout Anatolia, while Seljuk silver coinage was found within the boundaries of the Kingdom of Georgia. These finds suggest that the coins likely participated within the same currency system (Kolbas, 2006, p. 123). The iconography of these coins further identifies the duality of cultures included within the currency system. The shared metals, the iconography, as well as the presence of inscriptions denoting outside powers such as the caliph and the Mongol overlords further unite the Georgian and Rum Seljuk cultures.

Beginning with the reign of King Giorgi (George) III (r. 1156-1184), Arabic inscriptions were included on one side of Georgian coins, while the reverse depicted the Georgian King seated cross-legged, holding a falcon, and accompanied by Christian symbols (Fig. 39). The reverse of the copper coin reads: “King of Kings, Kiurki (Giorgi) son of Dimitri, Sword of the Messiah” (Paghava and Novak, 2013, p. 46-7) in Arabic. Once again, the title “King of Kings” stems from the Persian title *shahanshah* meaning just that. Yet another coin from his reign recognized the caliph with Arabic text stating “Al-Muqtafī, li´amr, Allāh, Amir, of the Faithful” (Paghava



Fig. 40. The seated figure of King Nineveh can be seen upon the walls of Aghtamar church on the island in Lake Van (Mnatsakanian, 2012, p. 135)



Fig. 41. A silver medallion depicting Caliph al-Moqtadir (Jones, L. 2007. p, 59)

and Novak, 2013, p. 47). The imagery of King Giorgi seated cross-legged and accompanied by the inscriptions recognizing Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtafi (r. 1136–1160) have other parallels in the region. On the church of Agh'Tamar on Lake Van, the King of Nineveh is depicted sitting cross-legged (Fig. 40). His position among the other low-relief decor is a part of a compilation of the most pious rulers (Jones, L., 2007, p. 95). The dress and pose of King Nineveh is remarkable as it directly mirrors the image of Abbasid Caliph al-Muqtadir (r. 908-932). Both rulers wear simple robes while seated cross-legged on a pillowed throne and holding a goblet



Fig. 42. Tiles from the Seljuk Kubadabad Palace (ca. 1230) depicting seated rulers. They are currently housed at the Müze Müdürlüğü in Konya (Photos by author, 2014).

(Fig. 41). This is seen again in Armenian art at the mausoleum church of Gandzasar in Artsakh (Eastmond, 2013, p. 158), as well as on the tiles from the Seljuk Kubadabad Palace (Fig. 42). However, rather than attributing the similarity of the seated king to the imagery of the caliph, Eastmond states: "This garb and pose owe everything to Seljuk concepts of royal presentation and power" (p. 158). These representations of seated powers span centuries. While the meaning shifted from representing the caliph, the imagery remained resonant within the region and were adopted by succeeding rulers.

This connection between the Georgians and their Muslim residents and neighbors was furthered by Queen Tamar (1184-1213). One copper coin minted under her command had Arabic script on one side, which translates as "The great Queen, Glory of the Worlds and Faith, Tamar daughter of Kīūrkī [Giorgi], Champion of the Messiah, God increase [his] victories" (Paghava and Novak, 2013, p. 47) (Fig. 43). The obverse contains a symbol recognized as Queen Tamar's monogram and abbreviations in Georgian of her and her second husband David Soslan's (d. 1207) names along with the date when the coin was minted.

Regardless of which language is present on the Georgian coin of the thirteenth century, a cross is consistently present on the side paying respect to the contemporary ruler. Aside from the coinage of Queen Tamar marked with her monogram, each ruler of the thirteenth century minted figural imagery on at least one side of their currency. Giorgi IV Lasha (r. 1212-1223) minted a copper coin that depicted a standing figure holding a long staff topped with a small cross in the figure's right hand (Fig. 44). In the figure's left appears to be an orb. The figure possesses a nimbus, identifying the figure as Jesus Christ. On the reverse, there appears a four-petal design containing Arabic script reading "The King of Kings, Glory of the worlds and faith, Kiuki [Giorgi] son of Tamar, Sword of the Messiah." Placed in the areas around the petals is additional writing in Asomtavruli script declaring him "Giorgi son [of] Tamari" (Paghava & Novak, 2013, p. 48-49). The silver coinage of Queen Rusudan (r. 1223-1245) also embraces Christian iconography (Fig. 45). Christ Pantocrator appears on one side of the coin, an iconic image in which the bust of Jesus appears holding a Bible in one hand and making a gesture of blessing with the other. The image of Christ is encircled with a solid border topped with a cross. The Georgian script around the image states: "This silver coin was struck in the year 450 [Koronikon] in the name of God" (Markowitz, p. 14).

However, in looking at the coins that were minted by the Seljuks, we again witness one culture paying tribute to another. In different periods the Rum Seljuks acknowledged the Byzantines, the caliph and the Mongols on their coinage. The early imagery on Seljuk coins borrowed directly from the Byzantines. A copper coin minted under Mesud I (r. 1116–1157) portrayed the Byzantine emperor Alexius I



Fig. 46. The coin of Seljuk Sultan Mesud I (r. 1116–1157) (Aydın, 1994, p. 22).

Comnenus complete with the Byzantine royal dress and crown with *pendillia* (Fig. 46). The other side of the coin states Mesud's name accompanied by the words "the exalted sultan" (Aydın, *Doğu-Batı Arası* 22). The early date of this coinage likely points to the gradual claim of legitimacy within the lands of Anatolia.[65]

The characteristics of Rum Seljuk coinage changed in 1185–6 under Kiliç Arslan II (r. 1156–1192), when he included an inscription on the coin recognizing the caliph en-Nasir Lidin'llah (r. 1180–1225) and a "Confession of Unity" on a copper coin (Aydın, 1994, p. 23; Parlar, 2001, p. 30–31) (Fig. 47). Although the caliph was recognized through the inscription, the association with power and the divine relates to the seated figure of Caliph al-Muqtadir, which was quickly adopted by sultans. The inclusion of the caliph's name on Seljuk coinage became a common occurrence and according to Judith Kolbas, this change reflected a change in symbolism as well. She states that "eventually, the caliph began to be considered a symbol for the divine order as God's shadow on earth while the sultan was

[65] It was not the last time the Byzantine Emperor would be depicted on the coin. In his second reign, Kaykhusraw I (1205-1211) minted a coin with Alexios III's image appearing on the obverse. Although this was likely a tribute to his adopted father during his exile in Constantinople as well as recognition of the assistance in regaining his throne (Korobeinikov, 2013, p. 102-104; Yalman 2011, p. 99–101)



Fig. 43. Copper coin of Queen Tamar minted circa 1200 (Lang 2004, p. 11, pl.11, 8).

considered the symbol of the political order" (Kolbas, 2006, p. 15). Not only is this a



Fig. 44. Georgian copper coin minted under King Giorgi Lasha IV in 1210 (Lobja, 2003).

change of tribute away from the Byzantines and towards a Muslim power, but this



Fig. 45. Silver coin minted under Georgian Queen Rusudan in 1230. Christ is seen on the left while the reverse has both Georgian and Arabic script (Lobja, 2003).



Fig. 47. Coin minted by Kiliç Arlsan II, 1156–1192 (sticc.edu).

coinage also foregoes any figural imagery, possessing inscriptions on both sides.

However, at the turn of the thirteenth century, imagery returns to one side of Seljuk coinage. While it is not consistent on all coins, the obverse of a coin will frequently contain an image while the reverse is reserved for an inscription denoting the ruling sultan and his piety. The coin of Kiliç Arslan II (r. 1156–1192) adopts the popular image of a horse and rider in profile. The equestrian figure was present on Islamic coinage within Anatolia as early as the 1170s. Under the Danishmendid ruler of Malatya, Nasir al-Din Muhammad (r. 1162–1170, 1175–1178), copper coinage depicted a rider spearing a serpent writhing before his mount (Fig. 48). This example closely resembles the imagery associated with St. George (Pancaroğlu, 2004, p. 156–7). Nonetheless, the imagery of horse and rider on Anatolian coins persisted into the 1240s (Şentürk, 1994, p. 69). Hunting was a popular past-time for the Seljuks. Stemming from their nomadic and Central Asian roots, hunting motifs were popular in palace imagery (Redford, 2000, p. 78–81). Whether this derives from their horsemanship or the appropriated iconography of St. George it is likely that the



Fig. 48. The obverse of a coin minted by the Danishmendid ruler of Malatya, Nasir al-Din Muhammad (r. 1162—1170 and 1175—1178) (Pancaroğlu, 2004, p. 157).

iconography was appropriated from one or the other. The image could be interpreted in a number of ways, be it a reflection of the penchant for hunting possessed by the Rum Seljuk sultans, a show of dominant horsemanship, or an adoption and Islamization of Christian warrior-saint iconography. The embracement of the varying visual cultures reflects the dual identity discussed in the previous chapter.[66]

The inclusion of horse and rider imagery on coins is not unique to the Seljuks. Perhaps the most remarkable coinage to come out of thirteenth-century Georgia was minted after the Mongol invasions. Under David VI Narin (r. 1245-1293), the brother of Gürcü Hatun and son of Queen Rusudan and the son of the Seljuk emir of Erzurum, a silver coin was minted with the imagery of a rider on horseback and an inscription on the reverse reading "By the power of God, slave of Kuyuk (or Guyuk) qā'ān's rule – King David" (Dundua, 2014). The equestrian image has a Star of David above the riders' right shoulder, while above his left is the royal monogram that symbolizes the rider being identified as the king. Below the horse are five-pointed stars and the date 467 (=1247) (Fig. 49). These stars further connect the above-mentioned Georgian coin to that of the Seljuks. The copper coin minted by

[66] See Shukurov, "Harem, Christianity" 133–134.



Fig. 49. A silver coin from King David VI Narin dating from 1245-1293 (Lang, 2004, p. 16)

Mu'izz al-Din Kaykhusraw (r. 1186-1201), son of Kiliç Arslan and the prince appointed to the governorship of Malatya after its conquest, depicts a mounted rider with a number of stars filling the space around the figure. Nonetheless, the image of the horse and rider is reminiscent of and closely connected to the imagery of St. George, a saint who was greatly regarded within Georgia (Pancaroğlu, 2004, p. 157). Considering the chronology of the Seljuk and Georgian coinage, it is clear that the horse and rider motif did not appear on Georgian coins until much later than their Anatolian counterpart. Additionally, it was David Narin's coin alone that possessed such imagery. Despite the popularity of St. George in the Kingdom of Georgia, the late appearance of the motif suggests that its was borrowed. This sentiment is shared by the *English-Georgian Catalogue of Georgian Numismatics* published by Tbilisi State University, as it states:

> The depiction of a horseman on the coins struck in Georgia first appeared in A.H. 642 [1244] on Ulus(h) Bek's money and afterwards – on David Narin's coins. It is a copy of a horseman depicted on the 12th c. Seljuk coins. This, in turn, attests to close contacts existing between Georgia and the sultanate of Rum. (Dundua, 2014)

We know of the close contact between the Mongols and their subservient states, the Georgians and Seljuks. The Mongols exerted control over the Kingdom of



Fig. 50. Minted under King Dimitri II between 1280-1289, this copper coin has both Arabic Uiguric-Arabian script. (Paghava and Novak, 2013, p. 254-256, Lobja, 2003)

Georgia in 1236 and soon after the Rum Seljuks fell under their control at the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243. Both the Georgian and Seljuk states began paying tribute to the Mongol overlords in an effort to retain a degree of autonomous rule (Kolbas, 2006, p. 80). Their vassal status may also be observed in their coinage. Coins minted by the Mongol ruler Arghun (1284-1291) and the Georgian King Dimitri II (1271-1289) had Arabic on one side and the Mongol script on the other. The Arabic states: "In the name of the Father, and the Son and the Spirit, Holy-God" and "Of the Kagan, in the name, by Arghun, struck, Arghun" (Fig. 50) (Paghava and Novak, 2013, p. 254-256). As for the Rum Seljuks, they began to mint a specific coinage for the sole purpose of paying tribute to their overlords (Kolbas, 2006, p. 123). However, they did not give to specific reference to the Mongols on their currency. Instead, they referenced other Mongol coins by continuing to utilize the horse and rider imagery, yet adapting it to differ from Mongol symbolism by employing their own signifiers (Kolbas, 2006, p. 137). The examination of coinage and the context in which it was minted provides great clues as to the cultural relationships of an era. With the above examples we can see the reference to power dynamics as well as cultural appropriation.



Fig. 51. A silver dirham minted in Tiflis by the Mongols in 1244 (Lang, 2004)

The incoming Mongols minted their own local coins as well. In the mid-century in Tbilisi, the Mongols minted a silver dirham with a horse and rider on the obverse and "There is no God but / Allah. Muhammad / is the Messenger of Allah" inscribed on the reverse (Lang, 2004). Despite the presence of an equestrian symbol on this coin, it is unique in that the rider is rotated to face behind the horse and has a bow drawn aiming at a bird (Fig. 51). This pose is known as the "Parthian Shot." A very similar coin can be seen minted in Sivas at approximately the same time under Kiliç Arslan IV. This silver coin again has a mounted rider equipped with a drawn bow; however, in this case the rider faces forwards. This is unprecedented in regional numismatics predating the Mongol invasion. Instead, this iconography may be a direct reference to an earlier coin of the great khans (Broome, 1985, p. 116). The coins minted under the Mongols utilize the shared chivalric iconography of a kingly mounted rider. The drawn bow and arrow that is incorporated into the coins minted after the Mongol conquest point to the Mongol overlordship and identity.

III.7 From Anatolia to Caucasia: A Suggestion for Further Studies



Fig. 52. The Church of St. Nicholas of the Gelati Monastery near Kutaisi in Western Georgia. On the left it is viewed from the north (Photo by author, 2013), the image on the right is the view from the south. The academic building can also be seen in the background (Davreshidze, Nikoloz, panoramio.com).

The Great Seljuks are widely acknowledged for their mark on Caucasian society and culture through their architecture, art, and numismatics; however, their cousins, the Seljuks of Rum are not often factored into the story. The cultural impact of the Rum Seljuks on the Kingdom of Georgia and the Caucasus is a subject area which requires further in-depth study and is beyond the scope of this thesis. Following are two architectural examples which may have drawn inspiration from Seljuk constructions. The two unique church buildings of St. Nicholas (late thirteenth century) of Gelati monastery located in Western Georgia and the church of Amalu Noravank (1339) in Central Armenia, share a common feature which is unprecedented in local ecclesiastical architectural traditions. Both were built after the mid-thirteenth century and after the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuk Sultanate reached their peak

of power. These buildings are a potential example of the lasting impact of the close political relations between the Georgian Kingdom and the Rum Seljuks.

The church of St. Nicholas located in the Gelati Monastery near Kutaisi is a highly unusual example of Georgian Christian architecture (Fig. 52). The monastery was established by King Davit IV Aghmashenebeli, or King David the Builder (r. 1073-1125) in 1106, although it was not completed until 1130. The churches of St. George and St. Nicholas were built in the mid-to-late thirteenth century and differ in style from the rest of the monastery; yet, they simultaneously fit into the overall scheme of the complex. The Church of St. George, built to the south of the main cathedral in the mid-thirteenth century, is a miniaturized and more proportionate version of the main cathedral (Fig. 15). The church of St. Nicholas, on the other hand, was built to the west of the main cathedral in the late thirteenth century and is a unique two-story construction with the prayer space on the second floor. A specific date does not exist for the small additional churches, but their attribution to the mid-to-late thirteenth century likely places their construction under the patronage of King David VI Narin (r. 1245–1292). It was under this same king that coins were minted with an equestrian figure resembling motifs seen on twelfth-century Seljuk coins. The monastery was designated as the burial place of the Bagratid Kings and thus any construction on the property would be of royal patronage (Derlemenko, 1982, p. 8). King David Narin was buried in the southern chapel within the main church, documenting his connection to the site. There are three portraits of him located in his funerary chapel dated to 1291–1293. Two of the images depict the king in full Byzantine royal regalia, while the third shows David in monk's robes (Fig. 17)

(Eastmond, 2004, p. 157; Derlemenko, 1982, p. 20). The manner in which he is dressed connects him and other Georgian rulers to their powerful Christian counterparts, thus establishing a sense of legitimacy by association for viewers. The small additional churches were built during a time when the Kingdom of Georgia had been absorbed into the Mongol protectorate and was more susceptible to external influences. Thus, attempts to identify the royal Georgians with their Byzantine neighbors reflects an effort to mitigate the Mongols' dominance and maintain their Christian and identity.

The church of St. Nicholas, however, was built in the late thirteenth century as one of the last additions to the monastery. Despite its uniqueness, the church of St. Nicholas works well within the spacial and aesthetic context of the monastery as a whole (Derlemenko 9). Built as a two-story construction along the central axis of the main Gelati cathedral, the Church of the Virgin. The ground level of the church of St. Nicholas is rectangular in shape with one or two large arches on each wall. As such, there is very little differentiating the interior and exterior spaces of the structure and the construction as a whole is similar to that of an open pavilion. The whole church can be passed under as one walks westward from the main church of the Virgin to the academy building via this ground floor space. To reach the second floor and the sacred space of the church, one must climb a narrow stone stairway located on the northern side of the structure (Fig. 52). The second story appears as a miniature, polyhedral church sitting upon a platform comprised of the first story. The drum of the dome and conical roofline appear to be disproportionate and oversized for the small church-like structure, but nonetheless together with the church creates a higher,

lofty and sacred space. Whether or not this was the purpose of the patron or architect, the church has quite literally been placed upon a pedestal. The little cohesion between the two segments of the church is lacking, and the ground floor appears to have little if any rituals function aside from allowing one to pass from the main cathedral under the church of St. Nicholas to the academic building.

The literature regarding the small church of St. Nicholas at Gelati unanimously recognizes its unique character. Derlemenko specifically refers to the church as “peculiar” (p. 10). The reason that this church is markedly different from others of its time and region is the two-storied nature of its structure. Georgian churches are typically a single-story chamber with high, vaulted ceilings suspended above the heads of the pious. This type of construction alludes to the small nature of the individual and the greatness of the respected deity. These cathedrals with their great heights instill awe in those who behold them and are imposing to those who are not like-minded. While these are broad generalizations, one cannot deny the power that buildings of a grand scale have on their users. The church of St. Nicholas ascribes to the above ideas of monumental architecture, but on a smaller scale it manipulates the gaze in a different manner. By having the church space raised above the heads of the visitors, the church is figuratively and quite literally closer to the higher power. It redirects the gaze upwards towards the heavens and subsequently towards the divine. The pedestal construction that is used for the church of St. Nicholas is a means to connect a smaller, secondary church with the height of the heavens and to move it closer to God.



Fig. 54. The Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Aksaray built in 1229 by Kaykubad I. The left image is the facade seen upon entering the caravanserai. To the right is the back side of the kiosk masjid with the stairways to the second floor prayer space (Branning, "Sultan Han, Aksaray").

Regardless of the ideology behind the construction of the church of St. Nicholas at Gelati, those who built the structure are likely to have seen similar types of construction elsewhere. The "kiosk masjids" that are located within the two Sultan Hans outside of Kayseri (1232) and Aksaray (1229), respectively, are extremely evocative of the shape and function of the St. Nicholas Church (Fig. 53, 54). It is still uncertain why the Seljuks of Rum built second-story prayer spaces with the ground floor open on all sides, such as this kiosk masjid and others seen in a number of caravanserais that dot the Anatolian landscape (Yalman, 2011). It is an unusual construction which has not been seen in any preceding or contemporary culture within the region. Such raised masjids, found in caravanserais, are not found in other locations within the architectural repertoire of the Seljuks of Rum. More often than not, masjids consist of smaller rectangular buildings with a minimal decorative band around the portal. Due to the highly decorated nature of kiosk masjids and their



Fig. 55. The carved detail of two serpents tops each arch on the ground floor of the Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Kayseri (Branning, "Sultan Han, Kayseri").

unique architectural structure, it is hypothesized that they were used to promote the image of the ruler and his power (Önge, 2007, p. 59). This argument is furthered in that they exist in buildings that were established by well-to-do patrons, primarily located in caravanserais established by sultans and known as Sultan Hans.

Monumental portals aside, the kiosk masjids are one of the most highly ornamented structures that remain from the Seljuks of Anatolia. Using the example of the kiosk masjid at the Sultan Han outside of Kayseri, the extensive use of geometric bands to encircle the entire structure framing the rooflines, corners, doorways and windows is evident. The arches and columns of the ground level are edged as well and capped with an animal motif. In this particular example the decorative band which frames the arches includes the body of a twisting serpent with their two heads meeting at the apex (Fig. 55). The structures of the kiosk masjids and that of the church of St. Nicholas at Gelati are both distinct. Considering the chronology of the constructions, it should be noted that the Seljuk masjids predate the Georgian church at Gelati. As such, there is the distinct possibility that the architect and /or patron of the Church of St. Nicholas was familiar with the kiosk

masjids built in Anatolia by the Seljuks given the previous connections between the two cultures. We must remember that David Narin, whose donor portrait appears in the church of St. Nicholas, also minted a coin with a rider on horseback, a motif that closely resembles that on neighboring islamic coinage.

A particular fourteenth-century church that possesses a structure similar to the church of St. Nicholas and the "kiosk masjids" is that of Surb Astvatsatsin in the Amalu Noravank complex (1221-1339) located in Eghegnadzor, Armenia (Fig. 56). Rogers writes in a footnote: " Contrary to general supposition, typically Anatolian Seljuk architectural decoration only appears fully developed in Armenian monuments of the 14th century, for example the church at Amalu-Noravank' (1339)" (1976, p. 322). Similar to the St. Nicholas church at Gelati, the small church of Surb Astvatsatsin was a later addition to the monastic complex. It too is comprised of two stories, with the primary sacred space located in a miniaturized cathedral placed on a substantial cubic base. The base structure is an enclosed room,



Fig. 53. The Kiosk Masjid from the Sultan Han near Kayseri, built between 1232–1236 by Kaykubad I. The image on the left is the kiosk masjid seen from behind, looking towards the entrance of the caravanserai from within. The right image shows the stairs needed to get to the second floor (Branning, "Sultan Han, Kayseri," right photo by author, 2013).



Fig. 56. The church of Surb Astvatsatsin at the Amalu Noravank monastic complex in Armenia as seen from the west. First established in 1221, additions to the complex continued until 1339. (Keefe, "Amalu Noravank'")

and for this reason it is different from the Georgian structure of St. Nicholas and the Seljuk kiosk mescids. It functions as a mausoleum (Keefe). The enclosed ground floor and its funerary function and the second-floor prayer space is instead reminiscent of the kümbet structures discussed earlier. Although this church does lack the open-pavilion-type space on the ground level, the stairs that lead to the second floor are perhaps even more reminiscent of Seljuk construction than those seen on the church of St. Nicholas at Gelati. They evoke the same symmetry and shape as the stairs of the kiosk masjid at the Sultan Han outside of Kayseri (Fig. 45, 46). Two sets of stairs start on the ground level at opposing corners of the structure and climb at a steep angle to meet in the center directly in front of the door to the

chapel. The church of Surb Astvatsatsin dates from 1339 and was designed by Momik Vardpet (1260? – 1333/1339), the renowned medieval Armenian craftsman. The same elements of the Georgian Church of St. Nicholas in Gelati that are reminiscent of Seljuk architecture are present in the Armenian Surb Astvatsatsin church at Amalu Noravank.

The two churches of Amul Norvank and Gelati are examples of how Caucasian contact with the Rum Seljuks could have made an impact in the architecture of the Caucasus. To better validate this theory more research is needed. It is particularly important to consider the primary sources found in both the Georgian languages as well as those written by historical Seljuk writers. It is necessary to track down the names of craftsmen, artisans, and patrons mentioned in these historical writings and to connect them to the monuments for which they were either responsible or to which they contributed. Ideally, one would be able to track these skilled workers from site to site and to consequently understand the travel patterns of these men. Equipped with such information, the connections between buildings, styles, and decorative motifs could be identified and better understood. Scholars could more accurately use the term “influence,” and the academic record could incorporate a detailed understanding of how ideas transversed the Anatolian landscape. However, this is a start. Pinpointed are two architectural structures that potentially resulted from traveling craftsmen and portable arts. To further validate the cultural transfer in these two examples, a complete understanding of the Georgian, Armenian, and Persian languages is necessary.

As stated at the outset of this chapter, tracing the flow of artistic ideas throughout history is a problem faced with numerous challenges. Not only is it imperative to address the relationship between Georgian and Armenian art and architecture when discussing the Caucasian region, but the nationalistic tones that accompany such scholarship must also be acknowledged. The cultural contact between the Christian Georgians and their Muslim Anatolian neighbors can be seen in the common visual language present within transportable objects, numismatics, and monumental architecture. The kümbets built by the Saltukids and Seljuks embody a structural similarity to the cupolas of Georgian and Armenian churches providing a visual connection between the cultures. Meanwhile, the hospital-mosque complex at Divriği provides clues as to the building processes in the region and the use of traveling craftsmen for monumental constructions. The shared culture of chivalry was a factor contributing to the inclusion of similar iconography in the regional arts. The numismatic record of the Seljuks and the Georgians clearly illustrates common ideas of kingship and power through the circulation of coins. While the scope of this thesis is limited, the discussion laid out above displays the clear connectedness of the two cultures and has highlighted the importance of further study on the topic.

CONCLUSION

The consideration of the history of the Anatolian region and that of the Caucasus in the thirteenth century generates an understanding that the translation and movement of cultural ideals from one dynasty to another was commonplace. These regions were a melting pot of ethnic diversity, resulting from relative instability and repeated foreign invasions. The influx of the Seljuks into Anatolia, the displacement of the Byzantines by the Fourth Crusade, the fluctuating borders due to warring kingdoms, as well as the domination by the Mongols facilitated a great exchange of ideas. While each culture maintained a degree of their own cultural identity, there was the simultaneous circulation of various external motifs.

One of the means to understand the cultural encounters of a society is to examine their art and architecture. In an effort to better understand the visual culture, it is important to consider how these objects and monuments came into existence. Patronage and the practices surrounding it illustrate the politics, traditions, and social constructs that regulated the visual culture of a time and place. The examination of patronage in Chapter II provides the documented proof of contact between the Georgian and Rum Seljuk cultures. Patronage and the subsequent recognition of such allows scholars to analyze the patterns in which power was displayed. When looking at the intermarriage between cultures, the use of the documentation of patronage demonstrates the flow of ideas and traditions.

The fluidity of artistic motifs can be observed in numerous media including architecture, frescoes, manuscripts, and portable objects. The painting program of a culture provides visual evidence of the adaptation and exchange of artistic characteristics (Hoffman, 1986). The examples of royal donor portraits in Georgia clearly depict the adoption of Byzantine imagery within the culture. Similarly, small objects such as the Innsbruck plate that served either as gifts or personal accoutrements aided in the transference of ideas across dynastic borders. The mobility that existed in the thirteenth century must not be neglected in the examination of cultural artistic expressions. While architectural monuments are immobile, they often incorporate the trends within their more itinerant counterparts as seen through the example of Divriği. Georgian and Seljuk architecture share more similarities than may be accounted by coincidence. Although it is difficult to pinpoint the derivation of ideas, the common design elements of the cupolas of Georgian churches and Anatolian kümbets provide just one example which prompts the study of the cross-cultural connections. Tied into the examination of architectural practices across Anatolia and the Caucasus is the discussion of traveling craftsmen and artisans. In addition to the political relationships and histories, the possibility of influences stemming from traveling labor must also be accounted for.

The numismatic history of the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuks further unites the two cultures both politically and artistically. Coins minted in both polities shared metal sources, but also utilized a common chivalric iconography (Redford, 2000, p. 78). The spread and modification of the mounted horseman imagery in Anatolia and the Caucasus illustrates the movement of ideas and

aesthetics. Similarly, the tribute that is included in the inscription record of numismatics is a clear illustration of societal dynamics and power relations. However, this is also the demonstration of the exchange of artistic ideas and iconographic understands.

Although cultural exchange in the thirteenth century is a fascinating topic, it is by no means a clear and easy picture to paint. Many issues arise in respect to terminology, methodology, and nationalistic scholarship. A foremost example of this challenge is the differentiation of Caucasian cultural elements. Though it has been touched upon in this thesis in an effort to lay the groundwork for examining Georgian and Seljuk artistic relationships, the question of the ways in which Georgian and Armenian art and architecture can be distinguished from one another is a topic deserving of its own thesis. Many scholars have singularly credited Armenia as the far-reaching factor of Caucasia. Sinclair points out:

> As between themselves they have far more in common; yet they are distinguishable from one another both as total oeuvres and with regard to specific stylistic features and architectural elements. It is better to see Armenian and Georgian architecture as two peaks of the same mountain rather than as two different genres or one and the same architecture (*vol. 1*, 1990, p. 28).

Following Sinclair's words, this thesis argues for Margarian and Maranci's term of "Transcaucasian" to take the place of Georgian or Armenian in studies not specifically focused on the region (Margarian , 2001, p.75). This simple use of nomenclature would minimize the misattribution of cultural influences to any of the countries within the Caucasian region.

The examples pinpointed in the previous chapter, that of the church of St. Nicholas as well as that of Amala Norvank, are curious architectural occurrences which allow for the entertainment of the notion that they may have been inspired from Rum Seljuk kiosk masjids. To answer all these questions in a satisfactory manner, this thesis should be expanded into a doctoral dissertation. It must also be noted that proficiency in the numerous languages, especially Georgian, Arabic, and Persian, are necessary to take this study to the next level. Despite its limitations, this thesis has demonstrated the detailed relationship between two dynasties often placed in the peripheries of history and scholarship. The examination of the political and artistic connections between the Kingdom of Georgia and the Rum Seljuks contributes to the overall interpretation of medieval Anatolia in a period of transition. As it stands, this thesis may be taken as a preliminary study which entertains new ideas and which hopefully will be developed further.

Bibliography

Al-Athir, 'Izz al-Din Ibn, *The Annals of the Saljuq Turks: Selections from al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rīkh of 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr*. trans. D.S. Richards. London: Routledge Curzon, 2002. Print.

- - -. *The Chronicle of Ibn Al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from Al-Kāmil Fī'l-Ta'rīkh.* 3 vols. trans. D.S. Richards. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Aflaki, Shams al-Din Ahmad-e *The Feasts of the Knowers of God (Manaqeb al-'arefin).* trans. John O'Kane. Leiden: Brill, 2002. Print.

Alasania, Giuli. "Women in Georgia." *International Refereed Multi-diciplinary Scientific Journal*. 1 (2006): 108–116. Print.

Album, Stephen. *A Checklist of Islamic Coins*. 2nd ed. Santa Rosa, CA: S. Album, 1998. Print.

Alpago-Novello, Adriano; Beriże,Vaxtang; and Lafontaine-Dosogne, Jacqueline. *Art and Architecture in Medieval Georgia*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Supérieur D'archéologie Et D'histoire De L'art, Collège Érasme, 1980. Print.

Altun, Ara. *An Outline of Turkish Architecture in the Middle Ages*. Istanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 1990. Print.

Asatrian, Garnik and Margarian, Hayrapet. "The Muslim Community of Tiflis (8th -19th Centuries)." *Iran & the Caucasus*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (2004): 29–52. Print.

Aslanapa, Oktay. *Turkish Arts: Seljuk and Ottoman Carpets, Tiles and Miniature Paintings*. Trans. Herman Kreider. Istanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınları, 1961. Print.

Atıl, Esin. "Islamic Women as Rulers and Patrons." *Asian Art*, 6 (1993): 3–12. Print.

Aydın, Şennur; Samih Rifat, and Uğur Ataç. *Doğu-Batı Arası Bir Gökkuşağı : Selçuklu Sikkeleri / A Rainbow Linking East and West : Coins of the Seljuks*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Merkezi, 1994. Print.

- - -. Kudret Ve Hüner: Sikke'nin Iki Yüzü / Power and Skill : The Two Faces of a Coin. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Merkezi, 1994. Print.

Badamo, Heather. "Image and Community: Representations of Military Saints in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean." Diss. U of Michigan, 2011. Print.

Bailey, H.W. "Caucasia." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 1 (1943): 1–5. Print.

Bates, Ülkü Ülkusal. The Anatolian Mausoleum of the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Centuries. Diss. U of Michigan, 1970. Print.

- - -. "Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey." *Women in the Muslim World* Cambridge, Harvard University Press. (1978): 245–260. Print.

Bayram, Fahriye. Artvin'deki *Gürcü Manastırlarının Mimari*. Hamur Ciltli. İstanbul, (2006). Print.

Bedrosian, Robert. "Armenia during the Seljuk and Mongol Periods." *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern times*. Ed. Richard G. Hovannisian. Vol. 1. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, (1997): 241–71. Print.

Beihammer, Alexander D. “Defection across the Border of Islam and Christianity: Apostasy and Cross-Cultural Interaction in Byzantine-Seljuk Relations.” *Speculum* 86 (2011): 597–651. Print.

Beridze, Vaxtang; Alibegasvili, Gaiane; Volskaja, Aneli; and Xuskivadze, Leila *Treasures of Georgia*. London: Century Publishing. 1984. Print.

Bībī, Ibn. *Die Seltschukengeschichte Des Ibn Bībī*. Trans. Herbert W. Duda. Kopenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959. Print.

Blair, Sheila. *The Monumental Inscriptions from Early Islamic Iran and Transoxiana*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992. Print.

Blessing, Patricia. "Building a Frontier: Islamic Architecture, Mongol Rule and Local Patronage in Medieval Anatolia." Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Berkeley. 2013. Video lecture.

- - -. "Reframing the Lands of Rum: Architecture and Style in Eastern Anatolia, 1240–1320." Diss. Princeton U, 2012. Print.

- - -.“Women Patrons in Medieval Anatolia and a Discussion of Māhbarī Khātūn’s Mosque Complex in Kayseri." *Belleten* LXXVIII.228 (2014): 475–526. Print.

Boase, T. S. R. *The Cilician Kingdom of Armenia*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1978. Print.

Bozdogan, Sibel, and Gulru Necipoglu. "Preface: Entangled Discoruses: Scrutinizing Orientalist and Nationalist Legacies in the Architectural Historiography of the "Lands of Rum"" *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 1–6. Print.

Brand, Charles M. "The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 43 (1989): 1–25. Print.

Branning, Katharine. "The Seljuk Han in Anatolia." *The Seljuk Han in Anatolia*. N.p., 5 Aug. 2013. Web.

Brauer, Ralph W. "Boundaries and Frontiers in Medieval Muslim Geography." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 85 (1995): 1–73. Print.

Brend, Barbara "The Patronage of Faẖr Ad-Dīn ʿalī Ibn Al-Ḥusain and the Work of Kalūk Ibnʿabd Allāh in the Development of the Decoration of Portals in Thirteenth-century Anatolia" *Kunst des Orients*, Vol. 10, H. 1/2 (1975): 160–186. Print.

Broadbridge, Anne F. *Kingship and Ideology in the Islamic and Mongol Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

Broome, Michael. *A Handbook of Islamic Coins*. London: Seaby, 1985. Print.

Brosset, Marie-Félicité, *Histoire de la Géorgie: depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIXe siècle*, Volume 2, Part 2 l'Académie impériale des sciences, Georgia. 1857. Print.

Bulia, Marine, and Mzia Janjalia. *K'ut'aisi*. T'bilisi: Bet'ania, 2006. Print.

Burchuladze, Nana. *Šua Saukuneebis K'art'uli Saeklesio Xelovneba Sak'art'velos Erovnul Muzeumši / Medieval Georgian Ecclesiastical Art in Georgian National Museum*. Tbilisi: Georgian National Museum, 2012. Print.

Cahen, Claude and Holt, P. M. *The Formation of Turkey: The Seljukid Sultinate of Rum: Eleventh to Fourteenth Century*. Harlow, England: Longman. 2001. Print.

- - -. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History, C. 1071–1330*. New York: Taplinger Pub., 1968. Print.

Chahin, M. *The Kingdom of Armenia*. London: Croom Helm, 1987. Print.

Comnena, Anna. *The Alexiad*. Trans. E. R. A. Sewter. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.

Compareti, Matteo, "The Spread Wings Motif on Armenian Steles: Its Meaning and Parallels in Sasanian Art" *Iran and the Caucasus* 14 (2010): 201–232. Print.

Cormack, Robin. *Byzantine Art*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Crane, Howard. "Notes on Saldjuq Architectural Patronage in Thirteenth Century Anatolia" *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 36. (1993): 1–57. Print.

Crowe, S. Peter, *Ani: World Architectural Heritage of a Medieval Armenian Capital.* Leuven, Belgium: Peeters. 2001. Print.

Davies, J.G. *Medieval Armenian Art and Architecture; The Church of the Holy Cross Aght'amar* London: The Pindar Press. 1991. Print.

Derlemenko, Evgenij Anatol'evič., Èduard Gigilašvili, and Nikolaj Ušangovič. Džaši. *Gelati: Arhitektura, Mozaika, Freski = Gelati: Architecture, Mosaic, Frescoes.* Tbilisi: Helovneba (Isskustvo), 1982. Print.

Djobadze, Wachtang. *Early Medieval Georgian Monasteries in Historic Tao, Klarjet'i, and Šavšet'i*. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, 1992. Print.

- - -. "Notes on Georgian Minor Art of the Post-Byzantine Period." *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 23. (1960): 87–117. Print.

Djanberidze, Nodar and Johnston, Natasha. *Architectural Monuments of Georgia.* Leningrad, USSR: Aurora Art Publishers, 1973. Print.

Dundua, Giorgi, N. Javakhishvili, A. Eristavi, and Tedo Dundua. "David Narin's Copper Coins with One Asomtavruli Letter Inscribed into Another." *Online English-Georgian Catalogue of Georgian Numismatics*. Tbilisi State University, 4 Apr. 2014. Web.

Dvali, T‘amaz. *Oshki: 10th Century Architectural Monument*. Vol. 1. Tbilisi: National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, 2009. Print.

Eastmond, Antony. "Art and Frontiers between Byzantium and Caucasus." *Byzantium: Faith and Power*. S.l.: Metropolitan Museum of Art (2013): 154–169. Print.

- - -. *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-century Byzantium: Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond.* Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate/Variorum, (2004). Print.

- - -. “Art and Identity in the Thirteenth-Century Caucasus” *Art and Identity,* Los Angeles: Center for Near Eastern Studies Colloquium Series, UCLA. (2000): 4–40. Print.

- - -. *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999. Aldershot: Ashgate/Variorum, (2001). Print.

- - -. "Gender and Patronage Between Christianity and Islam in the Thirteenth Century." *1. Uluslararası Sevgi Gönül Bizans Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildiriler İstanbul, 25–26 Haziran 2007*. Proc. of First International Byzantine Studies Symposium Proceedings İstanbul, 25–26 June 2007, RCAC. Istanbul: Vehbi Koç Vakfı (2010): 78–88. Print.

- - -. and Jones, Lynn. “Robing, Power, and Legitimacy in Armenia and Georgia” *Robes and Honor; The medieval World of Investiture*, ed. Gordon, Stewart. New York, New York: Palgrave. (2001): 147–192. Print.

- - -. *Royal Imagery in Medieval Georgia*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, (1998). Print.

- - -. “Royal Renewal in Georgia: The Case of Queen Tamar.” *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Georgian.* Farnham: Ashgate (2011): 337–347. Print.

Edgü, Amelie, Murat Ural, and Figen Kuzucu. *Kuzeydoğu Anadolu'da mimari / Architecture in Northeastern Anatolia.* İstanbul: Milli Reasürans, 2009. Print.

Edwards, Robert W. "Medieval Architecture in the Oltu-Penek Valley: A Preliminary Report on the Marchlands of Northeast Turkey." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 39 (1985): 15–37. Print.

Erdemir, Yaşar. *Alâeddin Camii Ve Türbeleri*. Konya: T.C. Konya Valiliği İl Kültür Müdürlüğü, 2001. Print.

Ertug, Ahmet. *The Seljuks: A Journey through Anatolian Architecture*. Istanbul, Turkey: Borusan, (1991): 219.

Evans, Helen C., and William D. Wixom, eds. *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261*. 4th ed. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006. Print.

Findley, Carter V. *The Turks in World History*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Flood, Finbarr Barry. *Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval "Hindu-Muslim" Encounter*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009. Print.

- - -. “Lost in Translation: Architecture, Taxonomy, and the Eastern ‘Turks,’” *Muqarnas*, 24 (2007): 79–115. Print.

Fuess, Albrecht, and Jan-Peter Hartung. *Court Cultures in the Muslim World: Seventh to Nineteenth Centuries.* London: Routledge, 2011. Print.

Garsoian, Nina and Martin-Hisard, Bernadette, “Unity and Diversity in Medieval Caucasia,” *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Georgian.* Farnham: Ashgate (2011): 49–104. Print.

Ghazarian, Armen, and Robert Ousterhout. "A Muqarnas Drawing from Thirteenth-Century Armenia and the Use of Architectural Drawings during the Middle Ages." *Muqarnas* 18 (2001): 141–54. Print.

Grdzelidze, Tamara. *Georgian monks on Mount Athos: Two Eleventh-Century Lives of the Hegoumenoi of Iviron*. London: Bennett & Bloom, 2009. Print.

Grossman, Heather E., and Alicia Walker. "Introduction." *Medieval Encounters* 184–5 (2012): 299–314. Print.

Haldon, John *The Palgrave Atlas of Byzantine History*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, (2005): 141–157. Print.

Hamilton, Bernard. "Latins and Georgians and the Crusader Kingdom." *Al- Masaq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 32 (2011): 117–24. Print.

Hebraeus, Bar. *The Chronography of Gregory Abû'l Faraj, the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician, Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus: Being the First Part of His Political History of the World*. Trans. Ernest A. W Budge. Vol. 1. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2003. Print.

Herrin, Judith, and Guillaume Saint-Guillain. *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011. Print.

Hill, Derek, and Oleg Grabar. *Islamic Architecture and Its Decoration, A.D. 800–1500; a Photographic Survey.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965. Print.

Hillenbrand, Carole. “Seljuk Women.” *The Balance of Truth; Essays in Honour of Professor Geoffey Lewis*. Istanbul: The Isis Press (2000): 145–163. Print.

- - -. “Some Reflections on Seljuq Historiography.” *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999. Aldershot: Ashgate/ Variorum, (2001): 73–88. Print.

Hillenbrand, Robert. “Creswell and Contemporary Central European Scholarship.” *Muqarnas* 8 (1991): 23–35. Print.

- - -. *The Art of the Saljuqs in Iran and Anatolia.* Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 1994. Print.

Hoffman, Eva R. “Pathways of Portability: Islamic and Christian Interchange from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century.” *Art History*. 24 (2001): 17–50. Print.

Holt, P.M. *The Age of the Crusades: The Near East from the Eleventh Century to 1517*. New York: Longman. 1986. Print.

Howorth, H.W. “On the Westerly Drifting of Nomads from the Fifth to the Nineteenth Century. Part II. The Seljuks, Ghaznevides, etc.” *The Journal of the Ethnological Society of London (1869–1870)*. Vol.1, No. 4, (1869): 378–387. Print.

Hunt, Lucy-Anne. "Comnenian Aristocratic Palace Decoration: Descriptions and Islamic Connections." *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*. Ed. Michael Angold. Oxford: British Archaeolog. Report, (1984): 138–57. Print.

James, Liz, ed. *A Companion to Byzantium*. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Print.

Jones, Lynn. "Abbasid Suzerainty in the Medieval Caucasus: Appropriation and Adaptation of Iconography and Ideology." *Gesta* 43.2 (2004): 143–50. Print.

- - -. *Between Islam and Byzantium: Aght'amar and the Visual Construction of Medieval Armenian Rulership*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

- - -. "The Visual Expression of Power and Piety in Medieval Armenia: the Palace and Palace Church at Aghtamar." *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999. Aldershot: Ashgate/Variorum (2001): 221–241. Print.

Jones, Stephen, and Roin Met'reveli. *The Georgian Chronicles of K'art'lis C'xovreba (A History of Georgia): Translated and with Commentary*. Tbilisi: ARTANUJI, 2014. Print.

Kafadar, Cemal. "Introduction: A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum." *Muqarnas* 24. (2007): 7–25. Print.

Karamağaralı, Haluk. "Mevlânâ"nın Türbesi." *Türk Etnografya Dergisi* VII-VIII (1966): 38–42. Print.

Karamaouna, Nota, Nilüfer Peker, and Tolga Uyar. "Female Donors in Thirteenth-Century Wall Paintings in Cappadocia: An Overview." *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*. Wien: Böhlau, (2014): 231–42. Print.

Keefe, Jeanne M. "Amaghu-Noravank (Amalu-Noravank') Eghegnadzor, Mikoyan Region, Republic of Armenia 1221–1339 A.D." *Amaghu-Noravank'* Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute's Architecture Library, n.d. Web.

Khoshtaria, David. "Masons at Work." *Center for Ancient Studies*. University of Pennsylvania, 2006–2013. Web.

Kolbas, Judith. *The Mongols in Iran: Chingiz Khan to Uljaytu 1220–1309*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Komaroff, Linda. "The Transmission and Dissemination of a New Visual Language." *The Legacy of Genghis Khan: Courtly Art and Culture in Western Asia, 1256–1353*. Ed. Stefano Carboni. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, (2002): 169–95. Print.

Köprülü, Mehmet Fuad, and Gary Leiser. The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources. Salt Lake City: U of Utah, 1992. Print.

Korobeinikov, Dimitri. "'The King of the East and the West': The Seljuk Dynastic Concept and Titles in the Muslim and Christian Sources." *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. Ed. A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur. Yildiz. London: I.B. Tauris, (2013): 68–90. Print.

- - -."A Sultan in Constantinople: The Feasts of Ghiyath al-Din Kay-Khusraw I." Eat, Drink, and Be Merry (Luke 12:19): Food and Wine in Byzantium: Papers of t he 37th Annual Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, in Honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer. ed. L. Brubaker and K. Linardou. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, (2007): 93-108.

Kuban, Doğan. *The Miracle of Divriği: An Essay on the Art of Islamic Ornamentation in Seljuk Times*. İstanbul: YKY, 2001. Print.

Kuran, Aptullah. "Anatolian Seljuk Architecture." *The Art and Architecture of Turkey*. Ed. Ekrem Akurgal and Léo Hilber. New York: Rizzoli, (1980): 80–110. Print.

Lamb, Dorothy. "Notes on Seljouk Buildings at Konia." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 21 (1915): 31–61. Print.

Lang, D. M. "Notes on Caucasian Numismatics." The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society 6th XVIII (1957): 137–46. Web.

Lang, D. M. "Silver Dirham, Tbilisi (Georgia), 1244 - 1245. 1922.216.222." *Numismatics.org*. American Numismatic Society/ MMA, Byzantium Faith and Power, 2004. Web.

Lange, Christian R., and Songül Mecit. *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2011. Print.

Leeuw, Charles Van Der. *Azerbaijan: A Quest for Identity.* Richmond: Curzon, 1998. Print.

Leiser, Gary. “Conclusion: Research on the Seljuks of Anatolia: Some Comments on the State of the Art.” *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP (2011): 264–275. Print.

Lewis, Bernard. “Claude Cahen (26 February 1909–18 November 1991).” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* Vol. 141, No. 2 (1997): 218–220. Print.

Lindner, Rudi Paul. "A Silver Age in Seljuk Anatolia." *Türk Nümismatik Derneğinin 20. Kuruluş Yılında İbrahim Artuk'a Armağan*. İstanbul: Türk Nümismatik Derneği, (1988): 267–74. Print.

Lobja, G. " Georgian Numismatics: The 11th to the 15th C. AD." *Tbileli*. Excite.com, 2003. Web.

Lomouri, Nodar. “The History of Georgian-Byzantine Relations.” *Perceptions of Byzantium and its Neighbors (843–1261)*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. (2000): 182–187. Print.

Lu, P. J., and P. J. Steinhardt. "Decagonal and Quasi-Crystalline Tilings in Medieval Islamic Architecture." *Science* 315.5815 (2007): 1106-110. Web.

Magdalino, Paul. "The Medieval Empire (780–1204)." *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Ed. Cyril A. Mango. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Maranci, Christina. “Building Churches in Armenia: Art at the Borders of Empire and the Edge of the Canon.” *The Art Bulletin* 88 (2006): 656–675. Print.

- - -. “Byzantium through Armenian Eyes: Cultural Appropriation and the Church of Zuart’noc.’” *Gesta* 40:2 (2001): 105–124. Print.

- - - . *Medieval Armenian Architecture; Construction of Race and Nation*. Leuven, Belgium; Peeters. 2001. Print.

- - - .“The Architect Trdat: Building Practices and Cross-Cultural Exchange in Byzantium and Armenia." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 62.3 (2003): 294–305. Print.

Margarian, Hayrapet. "The Nomads and Ethnopolitical Realities of Transcaucasia in t he 11th-14th Centuries." *Iran and the Caucasus* 5, (2001): 75–78. Print.

Marsagishvili, Gia “A Brief Introduction to Georgian Architecture” in Ori Soltes ed. *National Treasures of Georgia*. London: Philip Wilson Publishers Limited, (1999): 97–101. Print.

Matchabeli, Kitty. “Georgia and the Byzantine World: Artistic Aspects.” *Perceptions of Byzantium and its Neighbors (843–1261)*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. (2000): 188–197. Print.

Matevosian, Karen. "Noravank: Momik's Life. Momik's Work." *Armenian Heritage*. Armenian Monuments Awareness Project, 2011. Web.

Matthew. *Armenia and the Crusades, Tenth to Twelfth Centuries: The Chronicle of Mathew of Edessa.* Trans. Ara Edmond. Dostourian. Lanham, Maryland: U of America, 1993. Print.

Mecit, Songul. "Kingship and Ideology Under the Rum Seljuqs." *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, (2011): 63–78. Print.

Menna, Maria Raffaella. Tuscia University, "Decorative Motifs in the Paintings of the Tao-Klarjeti," presented at the Second International Conference 'Tao-Klarjeti', Batumi 2012. Print.

Mepisashvili, Rusudan, Vaxtang Gerontis że C'inc'aże, and Rolf Schrade. *The Arts of Ancient Georgia*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979. Print.

___ "Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi Türbesi Ve Dergahi." *Archnet*. Aga Khan Trust for Culture and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), 2013. Web.

Minorsky, Vladimir. "Caucasica II." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.* Vol. 13, No. 4 (1951): 868–877. Print.

- - -. "Caucasica III: The Alan Capital Magas and the Mongol Campaigns." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.* Vol. 14, No. 2 (1952): 221–238. Print.

- - -. "Caucasia in the History of Mayyāfāriqīn." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.* 13 (1949): 27–35. Print.

- - -. "Georgian Domination in Ani." *Studies in Caucasian History*. Taylor's Foreign Press (1953): 90–106. Print.

Mnatsakanian, Stepan. *Aghtamar: A Jewel of Medieval Armenian Architecture*. Comp. Ara Sarafian and Osman Koker. London: Gomidas Institute, 2010. Print.

Nersessian, Sirarpie Der. *Armenian Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978. Print.

Nicol, Donald MacGillivray, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.

Ödekan, Ayla; Akyürek, Engin; and Necipolu, Nevra. *On Ikinci Ve on Üçüncü Yüzyllarda Bizans Dünyasinda Deiim: Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*. Istanbul: Vehbi Koç Vafki, 2010. Print.

Önge, Mustafa. "Caravanserais as Symbols of Power in Seljuk Anatolia." *Power and Culture: Identity, Ideology, Representation* ed. Osmond, Jonathan and Cimdina, Ausma. Pisa: PLUS- Pisa University Press. (2007): 49–69. Print.

Önkal, Hakkı. *Anadolu Selçuklu Türbeleri*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 1996. Print.

Otto-Dorn, Katharina. "Figural Stone Reliefs on Seljuk Sacred Architecture in Anatolia." *Kunst des Orients* 12 (1978): 103–49. Print.

Ousterhout, Robert G. *Master Builders of Byzantium*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.

Paghava, Irakli & Novak, Vlastimil. "Georgian Coins in the Collection of the National Museum-Naprstek Museum in Prague." *Annals of the Náprstek Museum,* 34, Prague (2013): 41–82. Print.

Pancaroğlu, Oya. "Devotion, Hospitality and Architecture in Medieval Anatolia." *Studia Islamica* 108 (2013): 48–81. Print.

- - -. “Formalism and the Academic Foundation of Turkish Art in the Early Twentieth Century.” *Muqarnas*, Vol. 24 (2007): 67–78. Print.

- - -. "Sitte Melik: Architecture." *Kümbet: Medieval Anatolian Tombs*. Omeka RSS, 2014. Web.

- - -. "The House of Mengüjek in Divriği: Constructions of Dynastic Identity in the Twelfth Century." Ed. A. C. S. Peacock. *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and society in the medieval Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris (2012): 25–67. Print.

- - -. “The Itinerant Dragon-Slayer: Forging Paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia” *Gesta*, 43: 2 (2004): 151–164. Print.

- - -. "The Mosque-Hospital Complex in Divriği: A History of Relations and Transitions." *Anadolu ve Çevresinde ORTAÇAĞ*. Vol. 3. Ankara: AKVAD, (2009): 169–98. Print.

- - -. “Visible/ Invisible: Sanctity, History and Topography in Tarsus.” Presented at *Mediterranean Cities: Antiquity as Futre?* At the Center for Mediterranean Urban Studies, Mersin University. (2011): 109–121. Print.

Panagopoulos, Spyros. “Diplomatics in the Eastern Mediterranean 1000–1500: Aspects of Cross-Cultural Communication.” *Al-Masaq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean*. 26:1 (2014): 106–108. Print.

Parlar, Gündegül. *Anadolu Selçuklu Sikkelerinde Yazı Dışı Figüratif ögeler*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001. Print.

Peacock, A.C.S. “Ahmad of Nigde’s “al-Walad al-Shafiq” and the Seljuk Past.” *Anatolian Studies* Vol. 54 (2004): 95–107. Print.

- - -. *Early Seljūq history: A New Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

- - -. "Georgia and the Anatolian Turks in the 12th and 13th Centuries." *Anatolian Studies* 56 (2006): 127–46. Print.

- - -. "Nomadic Society and the Seljūq Campaigns in Caucasia." *Iran and the Caucasus* 9 (2005): 205–30. Print.

- - -. "The Saljuq Campaign against the Crimea and the Expansionist Policy of the Early Reign of 'Ala' al-Din Kayqubad." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Vol. 16, No. 2 (2006): 133–149. Print.

- - -. "Seljuq Legitimacy in Islamic History." *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP (2011): 79–95. Print.

- - -. and Yildiz, Sara Nur. *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2011. Print.

Polo, Marco. *The Travels of Marco Polo. Translated, with an Introduction, by Ronald Latham*. Trans. Ronald Latham. Penguin Books: Harmondsworth, 1958. Print.

Rapp Jr., Stephen H. "Bumberazi: Explorations in Medieval Georgia and Caucasia." *Bumberazi*. WordPress, 2014. Web.

- - -. "Byzantinization in the Context of Regional Coherence." In *Caucasia and the Second Byzantine Commonwealth*, National Council for Eurasian and Eastern European Research (2012): 1–30. Print.

- - -. and Garland, Lynda *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience 800–1200*. London: Ashgate, 2006. Print.

- - -. "From *Bumberazi* to *Basileus*: Writing, cultural synthesis and dynastic change in medieval Georgia (K'art'li)." in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium,* Antony Eastmond ed. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate (2001): 101–116. Print.

- - -. and Paul Crego, eds. *Languages and cultures of Eastern Christianity: Georgian*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011. Print.

- - -. *Studies in Medieval Georgian Historiography: Early texts and Eurasian contexts*. Lovanii: Peeters, 2003. Print.

Redford, Scott. "A Grammar of Rum Seljuk Ornament." *Mesogeios* Vol. 25–26 (2005): 283–310. Print.

- - -. "City Building in Seljuq Rum." *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP (2011): 256–276. Print.

- - -. "Constantinople, Konya, Conical Kiosks, Cultural Confluence." Ed. Ayla Ödekan, Nevra Necipoğlu, and Engin Akyürek. *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture ; Papers from the Second International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium, Istanbul 21–23 June 2010*. Istanbul: Koç UP, (2013): 41–47. Print.

- - -. "Documentation of the 613H. Inscriptions on the City Walls of Antalya, Turkey." *Articles*. Max Van Berchem Foundation, 2005. Web.

- - -. "How Islamic Is It? The Innsbruck Plate and Its Setting." *Muqarnas* 7 (1990): 119–35. Print.

- - - , Timothy Beach, and Sheryl Luzzadder-Beach. *Landscape and the State in Medieval Anatolia: Seljuk Gardens and Pavilions of Alanya, Turkey*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2000. Print.

- - -. *Legends of Authority.* Istanbul, Koç University Press (2014).

- - -. "Maurozomes in Konya." *1. uluslararası Sevgi Gönül Bizans araştırmaları sempozyumu bildiriler İstanbul, 25-26 Haziran 2007*. Proc. of First

International Byzantine Studies Symposium Proceedings İstanbul, 25–26 June 2007, RCAC. Istanbul: Vehbi Koç Vakfı (2010): 48–50. Print.

- - -. “Some Problems of Anatolian Seljuk Inscriptions From Antalya and Alanya” *Sema Doğan, ed, Bizans ve Çevre Kültürler Yıldız Ötüken Armağanı.* Istanbul, Vehbi Koç Foundation (2010): 304–310. Print.

- - -. and Gary Leiser. *Taşa Yazılan Zafer: Anatalya Içkale Surlarındaki Selçuklu Fetihnamesi / Victory Inscribed: The Seljuk Fetihname on the Citadel Walls of Antalya, Turkey.* Antalya, Türkiye: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştirma Enstitüsü, 2008. Print.

- - -. "The Alaeddin Mosque in Konya Reconsidered." *Artibus Asiae* 2nd ser. 51 (1992): 54–74. Print.

- - -. “The Seljuks of Rum and the Antique.” *Muqarnas* 10 (1993):148–156. Print.

- - -. “Thirteenth-Century Rum Seljuq Palaces and Palace Imagery.” *Ars Orientalis* 23. (1993): 219–236. Print.

- - -. "What Have You Done For Anatolia Today?": Islamic Archaeology In The Early Years Of The Turkish Republic." *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 243-52. Print.

Rice, Tamara Talbot. *The Seljuks in Asia Minor*. New York: Praeger, 1961. Print.

Rogers, J.M. "The Çifte Minare Medrese at Erzurum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas: A Contribution to the History of Style in the Seljuk Architecture of 13th Century Turkey." *Anatolian Studies* 15 (1965): 63–85. Print.

- - -. “The Mxargrdzelis between East and West.” *Bedi Karthlis; revue de karthve*. 34 (1976): 315–325. Print.

- - -. “Recent Work on Seljuk Anatolia.” *Kunst des Orients*, Vol. 6, 2 (1969):134–169. Print.

- - -. “Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia: The Epigraphic Evidence.” *Anatolian Studies* 26 (1976): 69–103. Print.

Rūmī, Jalāl Al-Dīn, and A. J. Arberry. Discourses of Rumi: Translated and with a Commentary by A.J. Arberry. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1993. Print.

Ruysbroek, Willem Van. *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253–55, as Narrated by Himself*. Trans. William Woodville Rockhill. 2nd ed. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1967. Print.

Saints Peter and Paul Serbian Orthodox Church. "Monasteries and Churches in Georgia." *Monasteries and Churches in Georgia (Gruzija)*. Lozo Web Design, 2007. Web.

Sakisian, Arménag “Themes et motifs d'enluminure et de decoration armeniennes et musulmanes,” *Ars lslamica*, VI, No.1 (1939): 66–87. Print.

Savvidēs, Alexēs G. K. *Byzantium in the Near East: Its Relations with the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum in Asia Minor, the Armenians of Cilicia and the Mongols, A.D. C. 1192–1237*. Thessalonikē: Kentron Vyzantinōn Ereunōn, 1981. Print.

Sakvarelidze, Tamaz. "Medieval Georgian Repousse Work." *National Treasures of Georgia*. London: Philip Wilson (1999): 115–16. Print.

Şentürk, Şennur, Brian David Johnson, Samih Rıfat, and Uğur Ataç. *Asya'dan Anadolu'ya Inen Rüzgar : Beylikler Dönemi Sikkeleri / The Wind Blowing from Asia to Anatolia : An Exhibition of Beylik Period Coins*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Merkezi, 1994. Print.

- - -. and Topraktepe, Ersel. *Sikkeler Ne Anlatır?: Ortaçağ Anadolu Sikkelerinde Simgeler Ve çokkültürlülük / What the Coins Tell Us: Symbols and*

Multicultural Aspects in Medieval Anatolian Coins. Istanbul: YKY, 2009. Print.

Shukurov, Rustam. "Christian Elements in the Identity of the Anatolian Turkmens (12th-13th Centuries)." Presented at *Cristianita D'Occidente e Chrisianita D'Oriente*. Presso la Sede Della Fondazione. (2004): 707–764. Print.

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

- - -. "The Oriental Margins of the Byzantine World: A Prosopographical Perspective." Ed. Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain. *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204.* Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate (2011): 167–94. Print.

- - -. "Trebizond and the Seljuks (1204–1299)," *Mesogeios,* 25-26 (2005): 71–136. Print.

- - -. "Turkoman and Byzantine self-Identity; Some reflections on the logic of the title-making in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Anatolia." Ed. Antony Eastmond. *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing. (2000): 259–276. Print.

Simēon and Bournoutian, George A. *Jambṛ / Archival chamber*. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, Inc., 2009. Print.

Sinclair, T. A. *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archaeological Survey.* Vol. 1. London: Pindar Press, 1990. Print.

- - -. *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archaeological Survey.* Vol. 2. London: Pindar Press, 1990. Print.

Soltes, Ori Z. *National Treasures of Georgia*. London: Philip Wilson Publishers Limited, 1999. Print.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. "Chapter 2: Christian Georgia: The First Thousand Years." *The Making of the Georgian Nation.* Bloomington: Indiana UP; Hoover Institution Press; Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (1988): 20–41. Print.

Suzek, Senem. *The Decoration of Cave Churches in Cappadocia Under Selcuk Rule.* Thesis. University of Notre Dame, 2008. Print.

Tcheishvili, Giorgi, "Georgian perceptions of Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*. Ashgate (2001): 199–210. Print.

Tchekhanovets, Yana. "Early Georgian Pilgrimage to the Holy Land." *Liber Annuus* LXI (2011): 453-71. Web.

Tekinalp, Macit V. "Palace Churches of the Anatolian Seljuks: Tolerance or Necessity?" *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 33 (2009): 148–167. Print.

Thierry, Jean Michel., Patrick Donabédian, and Nicole Thierry. *Armenian Art*. New York: H.N. Abrams in Association with Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America-Catholicosate of Cilicia, 1989. Print.

Toumanoff, Cyril. "Armenia and Georgia." *The Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV.* Cambridge (1966): 593–637. Print.

- - -. "Medieval Georgian Historical Literature (VIIth – XVth Centuries)." *Traditio*. 1 (1943): 139–182. Print.

- - -. "On the Relationship Between the Founder of the Empire of Trebizond and the Georgian Queen Thamar." *Speculum.* Vol 15. No 3 (1940): 299–312. Print.

Thomson, Robert. "The Eastern Mediterranean in the Thirteenth Century: Identities and Allegiances The Peripheries: Amenia." Ed. Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint- Guillain. *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, (2011): 198–214. Print.

Turan, Osman. "The Ideal of World Domination among the Medieval Turks." *Studia Islamica* 4 (1955): 77–90. Print.

- - -. Türkiye Selçuklulari Hakkında Resmî Vesikalar: Metin, Tercüme Ve Araştırmalar. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1958. Print.

Üçer, Müjgan. "The Sivas Darüssihha." Anadolu Selçuklu Ve Osmanlı Şefkat Abideleri, Şifahaneler/ The Şifahanes of Philanthropic Monuments of the Seljuk and Ottoman Eras. Istanbul: MedicalPark, (2012): 98–117. Print.

UNESCO/CLT/WHC. "Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery." *World Heritage List*. UNESCO, 2010. Web.

"VirtualANI - Everything about the Deserted Armenian City of Ani." *VirtualANI*. Network54, 1999. Web.

Vryonis, Speros. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California, 1971. Print.

- - -. “Another Note on the Inscription of the Church of St. George of Beliserama.” *Byzantina* 9 (1977): 11–22. Print.

- - -. “The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century; The book in the light of subsequent scholarship, 1971–98.” *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine*

Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry, March 1999. Aldershot: Ashgate/ Variorum (2001): 1–18. Print.

Walter, Christopher. *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate, 2003. Print.

Westbrook, Raymond. "Patronage in the Ancient near East." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.* 48.2 (2005): 210–33. Web.

Winfield, David. "Some Early Medieval Figure Sculpture from North-East Turkey." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute.* 31 (1968): 33–72. Print.

Winfield, David. "A Note on the South-Eastern Borders of the Empire of Trebizond in the Thirteenth Century." *Anatolian Studies* 12 (1962): 163–72. Print.

Wolper, Ethel Sara. "Michael Meinecke, Patterns of Stylistic Changes in Islamic Architecture: Local Traditions Versus Migrating Artists." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 31.04 (1999): 721–23. Print.

- - -."Portal Patterns in Seljuk and Beylik Anatolia." *Aptullah Kuran Için Yazılar / Essays in Honor of Aptullah Kuran*. Ed. Lucienne Thys-Şenocak, Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, and Günhan Danışman. İstanbul: YKY, (1999): 64–80. Print.

- - -. "Princess Safqat al-Dunya wa al-Din and the Production of Sufi Buildings and Hagiographies in Pre-Ottoman Anatolia." *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*. Albany: State University of New York Press, (2000): 35–52. Print.

- - -."The Politics of Patronage: Political Change and the Construction of Dervish Lodges in Sivas." *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 39–47. Print.

Yalman, Suzan, "'Ala al-Din Kayqubad Illuminated: A Rum Seljuq Sultan as Cosmic Ruler." *Muqarnas* 29 (2013): 151–186. Print.

- - -. “Building the Sultanate of Rum: Memory, Urbanism, and Mysticism in the Architectural Patronage of ‘Ala Al-Din Kayqubad (r. 1220–1237)." Diss. Harvard U, 2011. Print.

Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık. *Jules Laurens'ın Türkiye Yolculuğu / Le Voyage De Jules Laurens En Turquie*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1998. Print.

Yavuz, Ayşil Tükel, “The Concepts that Shape Anatolian Seljuq Caravanserais.” *Muqarnas* 14 (1997): 80–95. Print.

Yeomans, Richard. *The Story of Islamic Architecture*. New York: New York UP, 2000. Print.

Yetkin, S. Kemal. "The Mausoleum of Mama Hatun." *The Burlington Magazine* 99.650 (1957): 146-49. Web.

Yildiz, Sara Nur. "Manuel Komnenos Mavrozomes and His Descendants at the Seljuk Court: The Formation of a Christian Seljuk-Komnenian Elite." *Crossroads between Latin Europe and the Near East: Corollaries of the Frankish Presence in the Eastern Mediterranean (12th-14th Centuries)*. Ed. Stefan Leder. Würzburg: Ergon in Kommission, (2011): 55–77. Print.

- - -. “Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Seljuk Anatolia: The Politics of Conquest and History Writing 1243-1282.” Diss. U of Chicago, 2006. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.

- - -. “Reconceptualizing the Seljuk-Cilician Frontier: Armenians, Latins, and Turks in Conflict and Alliance during the Early Thirteenth Century.” in Florin Curta, ed. *Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis: Frontiers in Late Antiquity*

and the Middle Ages. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, (2005): 591–120. Print.

- - - "The Rise and Fall of a Tyrant in Seljuq Anatolia: Sa'd Al-Din Köpek's Reign of Terror, 1237–8." *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the History of Iran: Art, Literature and Culture from Early Islam to Qajar Persia*. Ed. Robert Hillenbrand, A. C. S. Peacock, and Firuza Abdullaeva. London: I.B. Tauris, (2014): 92-101. Print.