

## ROYAL CARAVANSARAYS AND ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS IN SELJUK ANATOLIA

J. Michael ROGERS

The American University in Cairo  
The British Museum

Richard Ettinghausen's review of Erdman's **Das Anatolische Karavansaray des 14. Jahrhunderts** (1) refers in passing «the public system of caravansarays run by the Sultan». Since the contemporary historians fail to mention them and only a few **waqfiyyas** of **khāns** (all private foundations) survive, foundation inscriptions are the essential evidence for deciding which, if any, of the ninety eight caravansarays recorded by Erdmann West of Sivas formed part of the public system (2). Indisputably Royal foundations, with inscriptions clearly demonstrating that the Sultan alone was responsible, are exceptional. There are only five (3), which is certainly an inadequate basis for a «public system»; so how are the other to be identified? It is tempting to identify some of them by the inscription **al-sultānī** («Royal»), not known outside Anatolia, which appears on a number of Seljuk buildings.

- 
- (1) (Berlin 1961). *Der Islam* XLI (1965) 294.
  - (2) The present article presupposes some of the conclusions on Royal and individual foundations in Seljuk Anatolia reached in the author's «Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia. The Epigraphic Evidence» *Anatolian Studies* (1977) 69-103.
  - (3) *Ibid.* 82, note 37. The Two Sultan Hans (Kayqubād I); the Emdir Han (Kaykā'ūs I, probably 611/1214-15); the Alara Han (Kayqubād I 627 or 629/1329-30 or 1231-32); and the Incir Han (most probably Kaykhusraw II 636/1239).

1. The Kadın Han on the Konya-Akşehir road (620/1223-24) built by Raḍiyya Khātūn bint Maḥmūd (4);
2. The Ertokuş Han on the Eğridir-Aksaray road (620/1223-24) built by Mubārız al-Dīn Ertokuş (5);  
(both of these have **al-sultānī** in bolder script).
3. The Çardak Han on the Denizli/Toñuzlū - Dinar road (Ramadān 627/summer 1230) built by Ayāz/Iyāz b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Shihābī under Kayqubād I, (6);
4. The Zazandın Saʿd al-Dīn Han on the Konya-Aksaray road (633/1235) built by Saʿd al-Dīn Kubak/Köpek, the **miʿmār** and **amīr-i shikār** of Kayqubād I, (7);
5. The Hospital at Gangra/Çankırı (633/1235) built by the Atābak Farrūḥ under Kayqubād I, (8);
6. The Sırçalı Medrese at Konya (640/1242) built by the **lālā**/tutor, Badr al-Dīn Muşliḥ under Kaykhusraw II, (9);
7. A **Dār al-Ḥadīth** (for the teaching of Islamic tradition) and cemetery (?) at Gangra/Çankırı (640/1242), presumably also built by the Atābak Farrūḥ (10);

---

(4) Erdmann *op. cit.* 50 No. 10, correcting the reading «Ruqiyya» given in *RCEA* 3896.

(5) *Ibid.* 53 No. 11. Cf. O. Turan «Selçuk devri vakfiyeleri. II. Mübârizeddin Ertokuş vakıflar ve vakfiyeleri» *Bulleten XI* (1947) 415-30.

(6) *Ibid.* 61 No. 5. *RCEA* 4021 describes the caravansaray as being at Hanabad, but it is unclear whether the settlement was mediaeval.

(7) *Ibid.* 106 and references.

(8) *RCEA* 4089. The inscription has evidently been hacked about since the date comes right at the beginning, even before **al-sultānī**. See also Y. Önge «Çankırı Darüşşifası» *Vakıflar Dergisi V* (1962) 252.

(9) *RCEA* 4211 and references.

(10) Y. Önge *art. cit.* 253.

8. A **khānqāh** at Ishaklı (647/1249) built by Fakhr al-Din °Alī under Kaykā'ūs II, (11).
9. The Ak Han on the Denizli/Tonuzlū - Dinar road (Rajab 651/October 1253) built by Qarāsunqur b. °Abd Allah (12);
10. A pair of stone reliefs, now in the Ince Minareli Medrese at Konya (Inventory No. s 88081), with **al-sultānī** in bold script between a pair of eagles facing outwards. Undated and of unknown provenance, though very probably from Konya. Their profiles suggest that they were panels at the apex of arches (13).

The list which, to the best of my knowledge, is complete, is undeniably diverse. The fact that **al-sultānī** is a **nisba** adjective in the masculine means that it cannot imply **°imāra, madrasa, dār al-hadīth, dār al-°āfya**, etc., all of which occur in the above inscriptions, or **bināya**/building in general. Adjectives applied to Muslim foundations are customarily in the feminine, even when the institution - **jāmi°e, khānqāh, ribāt** - is masculine, possibly, Van Berchem has suggested, because the more general term, **°imāra**/foundation, which is feminine, is implied (14). There is even a tendency in Turkish and Persian epigraphy for **khān, ribāt** and **khānqāh** to adopt standart Arabic feminine plurals in -āt, despite Arabic **ribāt/rubut** and **khānqāh/khawāniq**, and for their singulars then to take the femine adjective as well. **Al-sultānī**, therefore, cannot here refer to the foundation or institution, and the only grammatically appropriate term for it to qualify would be **inshā'**/erection, though one cannot infer from this possibility that the building costs were paid by the Sultan.

- 
- (11) *RCEA* 4312. **Al-sultānī** does not appear in the inscription of the caravansaray which Fakhr al-Din °Alī built at Ishaklı in the same year (*RCEA* 4313).
  - (12) Erdmann *op. cit.* 67-72 No. 19, correcting the reading given by *RCEA* 4316.
  - (13) F. Sarre *Seldschukische Kleinkunst* (=Erzeugnisse Islami-scher Kunst II) (Leipzig 1909) 8 and Fig. 6; M. Meinecke «Zur mamlukischen Heraldik» *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Kairo* XXVIII/2 (1972) 220 note 54.
  - (14) *CIA* Egypte I (Paris 1894-1903) 161 note 1.

**Al-sultānī** could, of course, relate to the status of the founder a **mamlūk**, **ghulām** or **‘atīq**/freedman of the Sultan, as those emirs whose inscriptions on the walls of Sinop refortified by **al-Sultān al-Ghālīb**, Kaykā’ūs I (612/1215-16) describe them as **al-sultānī** or **al-ghālībī** evidently were (15). However, no actual slave could endow **awqāf** (16); few emirs are mentioned by either Ibn Bībī or Āqsarā’ī with the **nisba al-sultānī**; some, like Jalāl al-Dīn Qaratay (17), who are known from the sources to have been **ghulāms** by origin, do not use the **nisba** on their building inscriptions; and No. 8 of the above list, Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī, was a vizier (**ṣāhib diwān**). **Al-sultānī** cannot, therefore, refer to foundations by **mamlūks** or **ex-mamlūks** of the Sultan.

The list is not, however, merely bewilderingly diverse. It only covers the period 620-51/1223-53. The buildings are all near Konya, in Central or South-West Anatolia. And, with the exception of the Ak Han (No. 9) they are all minor: a **madrasa**, a **khānqāh**, a hospital, a cemetery and a **dār al-ḥadīth** and a handful of caravansarays make curious, as well as a poor, showing for thirty years of Royal patronage in Seljuk Anatolia. Furthermore, except for No.s 3-6 and No. 8, where the Sultan’s name is given, the inscriptions contain neither Royal **ism** or **laqab**, in spite of the convention that, even on foundations as private as emirs’ mausolea, the Sultan’s name and titulature should occupy the greater part of the foundation inscription. Paradoxically, therefore, five of them could not have been attributed even by a contemporary to any particular Royal founder. Such discretion is out of keeping with the Seljuks’ ideal of the glorious Sultan.

Supposing still, against the evidence, that **al-sultānī** records that the Sultans ordered caravansarays, as Kayqubād I ordered

---

(15) J.M. Rogers «Waqf and Patronage» art. cit. 89.

(16) *Ibid.* 88-89.

(17) Ibn Bībī MS Aya Sofya 2985 595 ff.; *Mukhtaṣar* 269 ff.; H. Buda *Die Selttschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi* (Copenhagen 1959) 257; Āqsarā’ī MS Aya Sofya 3143 87; edited O. Turan *Müsâmeret ül-ahbâr. Moğollar zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları Tarihi* (Ankara 1944) 36-37; *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l-Faraj/Bar Hebraeus* translated E. Wallis Budge I II (Oxford 1932) 413.

his emirs to fortify Sivas, with or without the grant of a subsidy, to fill in strategic gaps, the areas chosen were not those where gaps are apparent: there were many parts of the Seljuk domains, particularly South and East of Sivas, which would have benefitted much more from the institution of a «public system» of caravansarays. **al-sultānī** also appears on these five caravansarays, not on the main entrance, surely its proper place on a State foundation, but, relatively inconspicuously, on the entrances to their covered halls. This inconspicuousness; the absence of **al-sultānī** from the two Sultan Hans near Kayseri and near Aksaray built by Kayqubād I; and the lack of even the Sultan's name in three cases are all sufficient demonstration that if there was a public system of caravansarays run by the Sultans **al-sultānī** did not identify them or even show Royal intervention. In any case, the addition of a mere five caravansarays to the five demonstrably Royal foundations would still have constituted a lamentable proportion of the total caravansarays recorded to date and would still have been far from adequate for a **system**.

These paradoxes however suggest a limited interpretation of the force of **al-sultānī**. Erdmann's work has demonstrated that the vast majority of Anatolian Seljuk caravansarays consist of two separable parts - a covered space, and a courtyard from which it was generally entered. The two, as many dated inscriptions attest, were often built separately, the covered area invariably first, occasionally with a complete foundation inscription to mark its erection so that even should there be no money or opportunity to add the standard courtyard, the caravansaray should be in working order. Opportunities might be lost. In the case of the Karatay Han the curious discrepancy between the inscription of the covered space, which bears only the name of Kayqubād I, and of the main entrance, finished as much as ten years later in the reign of Kaykhusraw II, which commemorates Qaratay, suggests that, as in the case of the Büyük Karatay Medrese at Konya (18), Qaratay took over, completed and endowed a foundation begun by Kayqubād I, interrupted by the disorders of the first years of Kaykhusraw II's reign and left abandoned thereafter.

Even though these courtyard-covered hall caravansarays were very probably conceived as entities, the covered hall invariably

---

(18) «Waqf and Patronage» *art. cit.* 77-80.

took precedence. In less ambitious ventures than the Karatay Han, therefore, the expense may have been less and the money available for completion of the courtyard but some temporary obstacle - perhaps even the early onset of winter - may have put off work. Since the amenity a caravansaray principally offered was shelter, a covered area, particularly if charges were made for lodging travellers, needed some inscription to deter unscrupulous strangers from appropriating it for themselves. However, since it was intended to build the courtyard there was no point in erecting more than an interim inscription. Thus, none of the inscriptions prefixed by **al-sultānī** allots the full conventional titulature to the reigning Sultan. On the completion of the courtyard the principal foundation inscription with standard **official** titulature reflecting individual Sultans' peculiarities or even the political events of a reign simultaneously in buildings all over Anatolia would be placed above the main entrance, into the courtyard. Interim inscriptions probably had no official forms. Since the building was theoretically incomplete it could not be declared waqf, the usual protection against confiscation or illegal appropriation, and **al-sultānī** was most probably chosen in the case of the five caravansarays to demonstrate that at least the prior formalities were complete. The land was held to be the Sultān's property, and private property could only be granted in special circumstances; since private property is a prerequisite of **waqf**, the Seljuk Sultans had to issue deeds/**tamlīknāmes**, of which at least one has survived. Copies of these deeds would be lodged in the Royal Chancery, guaranteeing those in private hands. It is, therefore, not improbable that **al-sultānī** had the force of «guaranteed by Royal deed», which would demonstrate the founder's title to the building-lot and act as a warning to others not to appropriate the building. This suggestion relies upon the assumption that Seljuk caravansarays were generally pious foundations and thus made **waqf**; this will be considered below, but whether or not they were is perhaps not very important.

The principal foundation inscriptions of the Kadın Han and the Ertokuş Han, both with complete courtyards, have disappeared. That of the Ak Han, dated a year later than the modest inscription above the entrance to its covered part, is still in position bearing the full panegyric titulature of Kaykā'ūs II in whose reign it was erected (652/1254). The short interval seems characteristic. It is,

however, rather the exception in Anatolian Seljuk building works and it is worth emphasising that since the dates in foundation inscriptions, though commemorating the ordering or the commencement of works (19), are potentially misleading, since the inscriptions were only erected on the completion of the building. Though it seems possible that the Gök Medrese at Sivas was conceived first, and the Çifte Minare was therefore an imitation, or a riposte, to it, and the Buruciye Medrese/Madrasa of Muzaffer Burūjirdī a pale imitation of it, all bear the foundation date 670/1271-72, and the crucial architectural question,-which was finished first? is extremely difficult to answer.

One result of this dating practice is that the explanation of **al-sultānī** suggested above fits the other foundations of the list much less well than the caravansarays. The plan of the Sırçalı medrese at Konya, for example, is too simple for its structural history to have been obviously complicated; nor is its foundation inscription abbreviated. However, in towns, where building space was at a premium unforeseen delays, for example, the absence of the founder on a campaign, made it all the more essential for him to establish a claim to the incomplete foundation which, not being **waqf**, was still not inviolate. The Sırçalı Medrese is so highly decorated inside that its erection and decoration plainly covered the years following the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243, when, to judge from Ibn Bibī, Badr al-Dīn Muşlih rose to power (20). Here again, therefore, **al-sultānī**, implying a Royal gift of land guaranteed by a deed, seems adequately explained. The reconstruction of the structural history of the remaining buildings is impossible since we know too little of them or of their founders' activities; so here the claim must rest. What can, in any case, be said, is that **al-sultānī** is not the mark of a Royal foundation.

So much for the epigraphic evidence for «the public system of caravansarays run by the Sultan». Apart from Pegolotti's

---

(19) *Ibid.* 72-73.

(20) *Mukhtaşar* 277; Duda 264. Badr al-Dīn Muşlih is mentioned first just after Qaratay's death (therefore *circa* 1252-52), as one of the delegation of high-ranking emirs and notables sent to the Great Khān, presumably to the **quriltay** held after the death of Mōngke in 1252.

**Pratica della Mercatura** (21), written circa 1340, which sometimes writes as if local rulers controlled and levied dues in the caravansarays on the route from the Mediterranean towards Erzurum and Tabrīz, there is really nothing else. Pegolotti is writing of Anatolia under fragmented rule, moreover, and his observations cannot be read into 13th century Anatolia without the danger of serious anachronism. But should the Seljuk Sultans have done better? Consideration of Īl-Khānid Persia, which almost certainly modelled its patronage upon that of the Seljuks in Anatolia (22) suggests that the former were not guilty of culpable omission. Ghāzān Khān, despite his administrative reforms, like his successors, seems to have been principally concerned with his own funerary foundation (23). The Ghāzāniyya at Shanb included a Friday mosque, a **dār al-siyāda** (abode for sayyids), an observatory, a hospital, a library, a covered cistern, a **bayt al-qānūn** (? school of administrative law?), a free bath and a school for orphans, with (unspecified) funds to be spent on the poor of various classes. Though doubtless built and initially endowed from the Crown revenues (**injū**) it was financed in a novel way, partly by dues from Byzantine and Frankish caravans, which were obliged to pass by the Ghāzāniyya on their way into Tabrīz (24). Even apparently unconnected foundations, like the restoration of the tomb/shrine of Mawlānā Abu'l-Wafā' at Ma'badīyya in Iraq and the reclamation of the desert round it by a canal dug from the Euphrates (25) contributed: a few **faddāns** were made **waqf** to the

---

(21) Edited A. Evans (Cambridge, Mass. 1936) particularly 28-29 and Glossary 389-91; R. Kiepert «Über Pegolotti's vorderasiatisches Itinerar» *Monatsbericht der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1881) 901-13.

(22) Ample evidence of this is given by the **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī**, or Letters of Rashīd al-Dīn, edited by Muḥammad Shaffī (Lahore 1947) and translated by A.I. Falina as *Rashid al-Din. Perepiska* (Moscow 1971).

(23) Rashīd al-Dīn **Jāmi' al-Tawārikh** edited °Abd al-Karīm Oghli °Alī-Zāde and A.K. Arends (Baku 1957) text 416-25; translation 235-41.

(24) *Ibid.* Text 414; translation 235.

(25) *Ibid.* Text 411-12; translation 233. Abu'l-Wafā' al-Hulwānī, the Ṣūfī mystic, was a contemporary of Suhrawardī's.



foundation, but the rest he **bought** as endowments for the Ghāzāniyya. Rashid al-Dīn, despite his panegyrics of Ghāzān, mentions virtually no other Royal foundations, except a **khānqāh** evidently for the Suhrawardiyya, at Baghdad (26), and Ghāzān, who died heirless, must have been concerned otherwise with a vast family foundation (**waqf ahli**) (27). The reigns of Öljeytü and Abū Saʿīd are documented in less detail, but the presumption is that, as in contemporary Mamlūk Egypt, their pious foundations were similar, and that **waqf khayri** (ious foundations for the general good, not family trusts) was left to their viziers.

The Anatolian Seljuks were presumably Hanafī, like the other Turkish dynasties, though none of the sources says anything definite about this: if so, then **waqf ahli** was recognised. However, there is no Seljuk Royal foundation like the Ghāzāniyya, or even the funerary foundations of the early Mamlūk Sultans. But neither did they resemble their Shāfiʿī Zengid and Ayyūbid contemporaries in the Jazīra, North Syria and Damascus in endowing pious foundations for their own sake. One striking exception appears to be hospitals, doubtless on the original inspiration of Nūr al-Dīn's re-foundation or re-endowment of the Aleppo Hospital (569/1174) or the even more famous Māristān al-Nūrī at Damascus (549/1154) (28), notably that of Kaykā'ūs I at Sivas (614/1217-18) and that of Ahmad Shāh at Divriği (626/1228 onwards), though this latter was built well before the absorption of the Mangūjūkid principality by the Seljuks. Kayqubād I also restored or rebuilt the Citadel Mosque, though whether this was because it was already the Royal cemetery, or because he determined that it

---

(26) **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** Letter 14. Text 35-40; translation 102-108.

(27) A.K.S. Lambton *Landlord and Peasant in Persia* 2nd edition (Oxford-London 1969) 87 points out the dubious legality of the **waqf** since, according to the **sharīʿa**, **waqf** cannot be made for unborn children of the first generation.

(28) For Aleppo see J. Sauvaget «*Les tresors d'or*» **de Sibt b. al-ʿAjami** (Beirut 1950) 132-33; id. «*Les perles choisies*» *d'Ibn Ach-Chihna* (Beirut 1933) 168-69 *RCEA* 3312 For Damascus see E. Herzfeld «*Damascus. Studies in architecture I*» *Ars Islamica* IX (1942) 2-14; *RCEA* 3164.

should be, or for some undisclosed reason remains to be decided. **Madrasas** and the like, other hospitals, **khānqāhs** and other foundations were left to their emirs or their viziers; carelessness rather than policy, at least in the light of the evidence to date.

Even so, caravansaray foundations should have been an exception, since, whether **waqf** or not, they all produced revenue, and in the often preached, if rarely practised, instructions to rulers of Nizām al-Mulk, the vizier of the Great Seljuk, Malikshāh, are included within the ruler's direct responsibilities. Malikshāh's one known foundation, Ribāṭ Jalūla in Iraq, was, admittedly, an ordinary stage by the time Ḥamdullāh Mustawfī Qawīnī mentioned it in his **Nuzhat al-Qulūb** (circa 1340) (29), but this, like Ribāṭ-i Sharaf in Khurāsān, restored by Sanjar's wife, Turkān Khātūn (549/1154-55), might have been a recognition of Nizām al-Mulk's principle. On the other hand his principle may have been prompted by the consideration that caravansarays were Royal staging places, which is strongly suggested by the Royal restoration of Ribāṭ-i Sharaf since this lay on the Royal Seljuk route from Merv via Nīshāpūr to Iṣfahān (30). This raises the question why Kayqubād I built his two Sultan Hans, on the Aksaray and the Kayseri roads. These were certainly used occasionally as Royal lodgings, and the former was even used, and damaged, as a redoubt in a battle (654/1256) (31) between Bāyjū's Mongol troops and the Seljuks. Other caravansarays were used by Royalty: the **waqfiyya** of the Karatay Han, stipulates that although in general food should be free to all comers this provision did not apply when the Sultan and his attendants were in residence, since this would constitute an excessive charge upon the revenues (32). However, this is no evidence that such Anatolian caravansarays were intentionally built as palaces, or fortresses.

---

(29) G. L. Strange *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulūb* (=GMS XXIII) (London-Leiden 1915) text 162; translation 165.

(30) *Pronyläen Kunstgeschichte. Islam* edited J. Sourded-Thomine and B. Spuler (Berlin 1973) 291-93 No. 242.

(31) Ibn Bībī *Mukhtaṣar* 287; Duda 272.

(32) O. Turan «Selçuk devri vakfiyeleri. III. Celâleddin Karatay vakıflar ve vakfiyeleri» *Belleten* XII (1948) 86 ff.

It is actually no easier in Ī-Khānid Persia to decide the purpose for which caravansarays were erected and whether they were at State or private expense. Ghāzān's road reforms, as described by Rashīd al-Dīn, omit reference to buildings, and the belief the Ghāzān erected chains of caravansarays on the main routes of Persia must, I think, be a false deduction from his institution of the *yām* or posthouses, which, there is every reason to think, he executed. On the contrary (33) banditry and brigandage on the roads were to be quelled by draconian punishments; and by the appointment at dangerous sectors of reliable officials to collect dues from caravans passing through: in any case of robbery they were either to apprehend the criminal(s) or else be held responsible. Stone columns with inscriptions giving the number of collectors per sector, the tariffs and a stern warning against any private enterprise were also to be erected along the roads. The only reference to stages is that parties should be advised to enquire at the nearest village if there were brigands in the vicinity before setting up for the night. The village then had the responsibility for their safety, or else of sending them on. It was recognised that such regulations were unenforceable inside towns, but the list of brigands Rashīd al-Dīn gives - Mongols, Tājīks (Persian-speakers in general, but perhaps fugitive peasants in particular) (34), *murtadd*s (outlaws), Kurds, Lūrs, Shūls (presumably Persian nomads), Shāmīs (Syrians, presumably Beduin), runaway *ghulāms* and urban rabble - is so diverse as to have made them probably unenforceable in the country as well.

Qazwīnī's survey of the Ī-Khānid routes in the *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* appears to bear this out since he names remarkably few caravansarays built by his contemporaries, and none by Ghāzān, Ōljejtū or Abū Sa'īd. Only on the return route from Derbend to Tabrīz (35) and the Sultānīye-Konya route (36) were any built at all. On the former he ascribes three to the vizier, Tāj al-Dīn 'Alī Shāh one of the vizier. Sa'īd al-Dīn al-Sāwī, and one of an emir, Nizām al-Dīn Yahyā al-Sāwī. On the latter, which was commercially

---

(33) *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* text 486, 488-89; translation 276, 278-89.

(34) V.V. Bartol'd «Tadzhiki» in *Sochineniya* II/1 (Moscow 1963) 449-68.

(35) *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* Text 174; translation 172.

(36) *Ibid.*

the most important, there was one built by ʿAlī Shāh, and there were two built by sons of Rashīd al-Dīn, one the vizier, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Amīr Rashīdī, and the other Jalāl al-Dīn, addressed as **hākīm** of Rūm in the **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī**, Letter 21. These were all stages relatively close to Tabrīz, none in specially remote or dangerous areas. The earlier geographers upon whom Qazwīnī largely draws for his description of the main routes naturally enough did not identify the immediate stages from Sultāniye, which was a Mongol foundation and had to be integrated into the pre-existing road-system. But on these he is particularly uninformative.

Nor does he mention the activities of Rashīd al-Dīn, which is particularly curious in view of the latter's own concern both for commerce and the safety of the caravan trade. Letter 21 of the **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** (37), to his son, Jalāl al-Dīn, **hākīm** of Rūm orders, particularly, the construction of fortified **ribāts** and cisterns on dangerous roads and in waterless places, in addition to a reconstruction programme of pious foundations (**abwāb al-birr**) - **madrasas**, **masjids**, **khānqāhs**, **muṣallās**, bridges and cisterns. The letter rings true, but may be programmatic, since Rashīd al-Dīn's specification of **covered** cisterns, a necessity in Persia for climatic reasons was un-Anatolian, where water is rarely a problem of such magnitude. The programme was, moreover, sensible, in view of the apparent dearth of caravansarays on the route eastwards from Sivas via Erzurum to Tabrīz, for which Qazwīnī gives stages but no indication of buildings, even though its commercial importance had grown steadily in the late 13th-early 14th centuries. However, not a single Royal foundation, nor any building in this area in the name of Rashīd al-Dīn, has been recorded. Qazwīnī shows no particular personal animus against him; but it is paradoxical that Rashīd al-Dīn should be known for his reforms yet his rival, ʿAlī Shāh, be known for putting them into practice.

One answer might be that the Mongols mulcted trade not by caravansarays but in the large commercial centres - Iṣfahān, Yazd and Shīrāz, but especially Tabrīz, the organisation of which Rashīd al-Dīn describes in great detail (38). The re-walling of the city under Ghāzān was at the charge of rich residents, many of

---

(37) **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** Text 88; translation 149.

(38) **Jāmiʿ al-Tawārikh** Text 413-14; translation 234-35.

them foreigners. Byzantine and Frankish merchants, having paid their dues while passing by the Ghāzāniyya, entered the new gates of Tabrīz, where whole commercial complexes had been built to serve them, and the Īl-Khāns : **karvansarāi-yi buzurg wa chahār bazār wa hammām binā' karde āyad wa jihāt-i kārkhānehā we mawda<sup>a</sup>-i chahārpāyān tā tamāmāt-i tujjār** (a large khān, a bazar and a bath ... with artisans' workshops and a pound for pack-animals, to satisfy the merchants). It was ideal from every respect: it served to contain merchants till they had paid the Customs dues; it kept them out of the town; and although they were forced to buy and sell at prices fixed not by local demand but by Ghāzān's officials, it was a service to merchants, even if an expensive one, rather like a modern Airport Shop. It was also simple to run and easy to control: indeed, the investment must have been so lucrative that Ghāzān and his successors doubtless concentrated on Tabīz and other towns at the expense of the caravansarays between them.

Letter 21 of the **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** raises the question of the difference the initiative - Royal, vizierial, or private - made to the type of foundation, though it cannot be properly answered without some possibility of distinguishing between, **inter alia**, staging places on the Royal roads; barracks; chains of commercial buildings, like those of the Mkhargrdzelis on the Araxes (39) designed to tap the main East-West trade; lodging for travellers, whether commercial or not; and stages on the **hajj** route. Since it is highly improbable that such precision of purpose was envisaged by the founders themselves it is fruitless to look for an answer in these terms. The initiative, however, seems to have made little difference, as Letter 33 of the **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī**, regarding urgent repairs to the great bridge at Dizfūl in Khūzistān demonstrates (40). Though bridges were State concern and the order would have been issued by the **dīwān** in the Khān's name the repairs were to be at the expense of the tax-revenues from Dizfūl, not of the central Treasury, so that the townspeople doubtless had to contribute specially and instructions are implied for a general corvée to complete the works.

---

(39) cf. J.M. Rogers «The Mxargrdzelis between East and West» *Bedi Kartlisa XXIV* (Paris 1976) 315-25.

(40) Text 182; translation 228.

Perhaps misleadingly, it has been assumed that the Seljuk **khāns** of Anatolia were either like the Karatay Han, pious foundations offering food and lodging free to all comers, or else commercial enterprises, for the benefit of their founders - which would, of course, explain the haste with which the covered areas of caravansarays were put into use. There is, however, at least a third possibility, that some pious foundations charged for lodging, which involves neither contradiction nor illegality, since running costs were inevitably a notional factor and there was no way of guaranteeing that the endowments could cover them. Such were very probably the Altunapa and the Ertokuş Hans (41) the **waqfiyyas** of which were markedly less well endowed than the Karatay Han. Against these may be set the Hekim Han (42), the only extant Christian foundation of Seljuk Anatolia which, its inscription makes clear, was intended as an investment for the founder's son. Rashīd al-Dīn also suggests that **khāns**, whether **waqf** or not, did not generally offer free accommodation, by including them among buildings and lands made **waqf** to other pious foundations (43):

**qurā wa mazāri<sup>ʿ</sup> wa aswāq wa khwānāt** (sic) **wa ṭawāhīn wa basāṭīn wa maqāṣīr wa ḥammāmāt ki dar baldā-yi Samnān wa Khuwār** (the place of that name near Rayy) **wa Dāmghān wāqī<sup>ʿ</sup> ast ...**

(villages, agricultural land, markets, **khāns**, mills, orchards, large caravansarays and baths ...)

and therefore exempt from paying certain dues. **Maqāṣīr**, the plural of **maqṣūra** (enclosure), is by no means a standard term; but large mediaeval **ribāṭs** are known on the Dāmghān-Samnān road, and the term must be used to distinguish these from **khāns** inside the towns. If so, these at least were sources of taxable revenue.

The astute commercial enterprise of Ghāzān or Rashīd al-Dīn at Tabrīz, or other town **khāns** which were considered to be simply investments, seem as far removed as possible from **khāns** like the

---

(41) See O. Turan, respectively *Belleten* XI (1947) 197-236; *ibid.* 415-30.

(42) Erdmann *op. cit.* 67-69 No. 18.

(43) **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** Letter 11. Text 28; translation 95.

Karatay Han with their over-all beneficence. But both are probably extremes. Between them was a whole series of cases, particularly since, in desolate places, the mere provision of lodging was in itself a meritorious deed, whether or not it was charged for and particularly if the principal clients were non-Muslim merchants. Charges, to judge from Sauvaget's work on the caravansarays of Central Syria (44), were the general practice. These caravansarays were on the **hajj** route and therefore poor pilgrims, or all pilgrims, paid no dues; but for the rest of the year they were paying concerns, in both senses of the term. And even exceptionally well endowed foundations, like the Karatay han, with the exceptional benefits they offered travellers must have gained considerably from the commercial exchanges which took place there when merchants or caravans crossed. The difficulty this poses is that even when we know the founder's intentions (from **waqfiyyas**) there was no guarantee that the **khān** was subsequently run according to them; and when we do not, as in Kayqubād I's Sultan Hans, it is not possible to place them at any particular point in the series.

However, the case of Ghāzān is significant. If, as seems to be the case, he concentrated upon Tabriz or the Ghāzāniyya, to the exclusion of caravansarays, then so must the Seljuk Sultans have concentrated upon the towns, particularly Sivas, the principal crossing of the East-West and North-South trade routes and a considerable entrepot in the developing slave market of the 13th century. Even of this our knowledge is inadequate. However, Anatolia knew far less centralised control than the ʿIl-Khānid State; and the Sultans were far less able to monopolise the trade in any particular commodity or in a position to tap the trade between the towns. If so, then the idea of a public system of caravansarays run by the Sultan must be dismissed as a tempting myth: why bother to build Royal **khāns**, except where they might be useful as palaces of winterquarters for permanent garrisons? The former consideration at least explains why the Sultan Hans so near Konya are on the Aksaray and the Kayseri roads.

---

(44) «Caravanserails syriens du Moyen Age» *Ars Islamica* VI/1 (1939) particularly 50-52, on the Khān al-ʿArūs, founded by Saladin in 577/1181 *RCEA* 3368 after Littmann) and visited soon afterwards by Ibn Jubayr (**Rihla** (Cairo 1326/1908) 238-39).

The elimination of Royal caravansarays still leaves the question open which other, if any, foundations were Royal in Seljuk Anatolia, since other buildings guaranteed Royal by their foundation inscriptions are also far and few. In this connexion, a variety of laconic inscriptions, often preceding statements of Royal titlature, have been recorded from Seljuk monuments, particularly in South West Anatolia (45). Except for Īl-Khānid Persia (46), which seems to have adopted Anatolian epigraphic practice as well, there is nothing comparable known outside Anatolia. Though their force is far from obvious it has been suggested that they might be Royal devices - **‘alāmas** (Royal mottos appearing on documents from many Royal Chanceries), or even **tughrās** (a characteristic Turkish device for the validation and authentication of Chancery documents) - and hence record some special Royal interest or even direct Royal intervention. Special gifts of money or land should perhaps have been recorded separately in Chancery **manshūrs** or **tamlīknāmes**, not merely in inscriptions, but they might, nevertheless, be used, in default of Chancery documents, to increase the number of known Royal foundations.

The laconic inscriptions recorded are of various types: Qur’ānic

---

(45) F.W. Hasluck (*Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford 1929) I 203) claimed that the Seljuks erected talismanic inscriptions and states, doubtless after Aflākī, that Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī was ordered to compose one, though indication is given of the form it took. Some of the laconic inscriptions may conceivably have been apotropaic: however, few of them are prayers (**du‘ā**), let alone spells, and most simply invoke a Sultan’s name and titles.

(46) Compare the restoration inscriptions of the shrine at Qaydar Payghamber (*RCEA* 5280) and the **mīhrāb** of Ōljejtü in the Great Mosque at Isfahān (*RCEA* 5219), both dated 710/1310. The former reads: **Buluqān/Būlūghān Khūtūn** (sic). **Umira bi-tajdīd hadhā’l-maqām al-mubārak al-khātūn al-mu‘azzama** ...

and is plainly an imitation of the style of the latter, which begins: **Muhammad Sultān. Hadhā’l-mīhrāb al-mustatāb min mudāfāt al-‘imārāt allatī ittafaqat i‘ādathā fī ayyām mu‘ādalat al-sultān ... Ōljejtü Khudābende** ...



āyas like *Naşr min Allāh wa fath qarīb* (Victory from God and early conquest) (LXI 13); pious ejaculations (*du‘ā*) like *Al-minnātu li’llāh* - (Grace is God’s); or the Sultan’s title or *laqab* like *Al-Sultān al-mu‘azzam ‘Alā’ al-Dunyā wa’l-Dīn*. Their variety rather recalls Ibn B‘bī’s description of the walls of Konya on their erection by Kayqubād I:

«... āyāt-i Qur‘ān we mashāhir-i hadīth-i nabawī wa amthāl wa hikam [-i] ash‘ār-i Shāhnāme ...»

(Our ānic verses, well-known *hadīths* and sayings and moral stories from the *Shāhnāme*) (47), though the reason for the choice of the *Shāhnāme* is not explained, and none of the surviving inscriptions of Konya attest that these last were actually erected. Not a few of the laconic inscriptions are given in standard manuals of Chancery practice, like Rawandī’s *Rahat al-Şudūr* or al-Qalqashandī’s *Şubḥ al-A‘shā*, as ‘*alāmas*, serving with or instead of the Royal autograph as signs of validation. Of those used by the Anatolian Seljuks, however, only those of Kaykā‘ūs I (48), Kaykhusraw II and Qilij Arslān IV are recorded respectively, *Allāh mufattiḥ al-abwāb*, *Al-mulk li’llāh* and *Al-minnātu li’llāh*. For the sake of convenience I shall term these mottos. For obvious reasons it was desirable that each should have no more than one; otherwise,

---

(47) A. Bombacı «Die Mauerinschriften von Konya» in *Forschungen zur Kunst Asiens. In Memoriam Kurt Erdmann* edited O. Aslanapa and R. Naumann (Istanbul 1969) 67-73. Aya Sofya MS 2985 254. The omission is not mentioned in Duda’s translation of the *Muktaşar*.

(48) Ibn Bībī MS Aya Sofya 91. For the standard treatment of the ‘*alāma* see S.M. Stern *Fātimid Decrees* (London 1964) 123 ff., and especially 143 ff., 149 ff. Those of the early Seljuks are given after al-Khāzini’s *Zīj al-Sanjari*, compiled under Sanjar, in O. Turan *Istanbul fetihinden önce yazılmış tarihî takvimler* (Ankara 1954) 84 ff. Stern takes the view that the ‘*alāma* (distinctive sign) was initially distinct from the *tawqī‘* (written note); though the two terms became virtually synonymous in Chancery practice *tawqī‘* is perhaps commoner under the Seljuks. «*Tawqī‘*» *Encyclopaedia of Islam*’ is not relevant to the present discussion.

instead of authenticating the documents of a particular reign, there would be confusion and forgery. This was prevalent enough, as Malikshāh's (50) then Ghāzān's regulation that no document more than thirty years old was to be admissible in land-claims (51) and Rashīd al-Dīn's order to local officials in Khūzistān (52) to disregard any documents not signed and sealed by himself demonstrate.

If the laconic inscriptions recorded have Chancery force, however, they were very haphazardly used: thus, two of the most important known Royal foundations, the Sultan Hans, bear none. Their occurrences supplement and do not replace standard foundation inscriptions; and the same Sultan employed several different ones at once, virtually none of them corresponding to the Royal **ʿalāmas** given by Ibn Bibī. The situation is further complicated by the fact that Anatolian Seljuk viziers, like their Il-Khānid successors, had **ʿalāmas** of their own. Such was probably the **Hasbī Allah**, which heads the foundation inscription of Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī's **khānqāh** at Konya (678/1278-79) (53), though a unique occurrence on his foundations, with nothing comparable recorded from the foundations of his fellow magnates, Jalāl al-Dīn Qaratay or the Pervāne, Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān. By 678/1278-79, however, Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī stood alone as the Anatolian elder statesman. The inscriptions of the Gök Medrese he founded at Sivas (670/1271-72) show him to have adopted quasi-Royal titulature. The present inscription is standard, but the situation of the Seljuk **Sultanate had deteriorated so much in the meantime that the use of an ʿalāma**, a reminiscence of either the Great Seljuk viziers or

---

(49) Ibn Bibī MS Aya Sofya 466, 624. The scribe of the Berlin MS of Yazıcı Oğlu ʿAlī (MS Or. Quart. 1823), written, it is now believed, in 840/1436-47 (B. Flemming *Türkische Handschriften* (=Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII/1) (Wiesbaden 1968) 76 No. 101), on one occasion rubricates the **ʿalāma** (in the text, folio 283a, termed **tawqīʿ**) of Kaykhusraw II.

(50) A.K.S. Lambton *Landlord and Peasant in Persia* ed. cit. (London 1969) 69.

(51) **Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh** Text 451-52; translation 255.

(52) **Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī** Letter 33 text 182; translation 228.

of Anatolian Royal practice under Kayqubād I, was clearly nostalgia for the zenith of the Seljuk State.

Though Ibn Bībī neglected to give his **‘alāma** Kayqubād I is known to have built so much in Anatolia that the laconic inscriptions associated with these deserve the most detailed consideration. The inscriptions of the fortifications of Sinop (Kaykāūs I 612/1215-16) and of Alanya and Antalya by Kayqubād I (circa 625/1227-28) indicate a similar **modus operandi**, but whereas the former are almost all in the names of emirs or their officials, the latter mostly commemorate Kayqubād himself. At Alanya **Al-minnatu li’llāh** occurs twice, in a decorative cartouche, as the prefix to inscriptions on the Tersane (625/1227-28 and 626/1229) (54) and twice plain (both inscriptions dated 625/1227-28), on the perimeter wall near the Tophane and on the Orta Kapı (55). It also appears on the walls of Antalya (622/1225-26) (56) together with the abbreviated titles of Kayqubād I; while on the Tophane at Alanya these are preceded by **Naşr min Allāh wa fath qarīb** (Qur’ān LXI 13) and dated 625/1227-28 (57), which, though breaking the uniformity, is an appropriate reminiscence of the acquisition of Alanya and follows Ibn Bībī’s description of the diverse inscriptions erected by Kayqubād I at Konya. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that **Al-minnatu li’llāh**, despite its absence from the Sultan Hans, or even the citadel mosque at Konya which he restored or rebuilt in 616-617/1219-21, was the **‘alāma** of Kayqubād I.

Such is the inconsistency of his successors, however, that it becomes difficult to explain why he should have used his **‘alāma** at all. Kaykāūs I, whose **‘alāma** is given by Ibn Bībī as **Allāh**

---

(53) J.H. Löytved *Konya. Inschriften der seldschukischen Bauten* (Berlin 1907) 63-64 No. 57.

(54) D.S. Rice and Seton Lloyd *Alanya* (London 1958) 55 ff. No.s 4-5.

(55) *Ibid.* 58. No.s 11 and 13. The Orta Kapı is also known as the Aşağı Kapı.

(56) Ahmed Tevhid «Antalya sūrları kitabeleri» *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmu’ası* Year 15, New Series 9 (86) (Istanbul 1341/1922-23) 171.

(57) D.S. Rice and Seton Lloyd *op. cit.* 65, No. 6.

**muḥattih al-abwāb**, left no motto on his most important works, the walls of Sinop (612/1215-16), built after his capture of the port (58), or on his Hospital at Sivas (614/1217-18), and only one inscription, **duʿā** on the Citadel of Antalya (612/1215-16) **Basmala**. **Al-naṣr wa'l-zafer min Allāh** (Victory and triumph are from God). Qılıj Arslan IV, the only other Seljuk ruler whose ʿalāma is given by Ibn Bībī, apparently built nothing at all. The only case where a motto approaches the known ʿalāma of a Sultan is an inscription, **Al-mulk li'llāh waḥdah** (Power belongs to God alone) (59), on the ʿAlā, al-Dīn Medrese at Antalya, the foundation inscription of which mentions Kaykhusraw II, whose ʿalāma is given by Apsarāʾī as **Al-mulk li'llāh**. However, this was not a Royal foundation and **fī ayyām dawlat al-sultān** ... («in the reign of Sultan ... Kaykhusraw») demonstrates this (60). However, the later Seljuks present less of a problem, in fact, than Kaykā'ūs I or Kayqubād I, the most considerable Royal founders of the 13th century. The disorders which racked Anatolia on the accession of Kaykhusraw II in 1236, followed by the defeat of Köse Dağ in 1243, effectively put an end to **State** activity - bridges, roadways and fortifications. These mottos are evidently primarily for State constructions. If so, however, the practice of Kaykā'ūs and Kayqubād I should have been congruent, which it is not. This problem demands further consideration.

Others of Kayqubād I's inscriptions on the walls of Alanya and Antalya could well be interpreted as **tuḡhrās**. Though these were in origin a mark of tribal proprietorship, that of the Seljuks

---

(58) Ibn Bībī *Mukhtaṣar* 54-59; Duda 64-68. See also M. Behcet «Sinop kitabeleri» *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası* NS I/2 (1929) 35-45; I/4 (1930) 46 ff.; I/5 (1931) 57-63 and M.Ş. «Ülkütaşır «Sinop'ta Selçukî zamanına ait tarihî eserler» *Türk Tarih, Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi* V (1949) 112-51.

(59) Dated 636/1239-40. Not transcribed by RCEA 4159. See Aḥmed Tevhīd *art. cit.* 176 No. 15 and P. Wittek in R.M. Riefstahl *Turkish Architecture in South-West Anatolia* (Cambridge Mass. 1931) 87 No. 6.

(60) See J.M. Rogers «**Waqf** and Patronage» *art. cit.* 82. The inscription of Kayqubād I on the Karatay Han (RCEA 4127) reads **Huwa Allāh. Al-mulk li'llāh al-dā'im al-bāqī**.

being a bow and arrow, identified by Cahen (61) on the basis of the historians and the early coinage of the Great Seljuks, the Seljuk **tughrā**-mark had become unrecognisable by the reign of Malikshāh, and persisted into the 12th-13th centuries not on Anatolian buildings, even in the form of a mason's mark, but only in the Artuqid coinage, and rather sporadically at that (62). Its initial proprietorial force restricted it to the ruler, as Bulliet's comparative analysis (63) of the coinage of Tughril and Çağrı has shown. Despite some anomalies, evidently attempts to break Tughril's sway, the **tughrā**-mark was not used even on Tughril's own coinage, in areas where there were rulers with real local power, while Çağrı was barely permitted to use it at all. Bulliet concludes that the **tughrā**, at least initially, was not used with the force of Royal inscriptions laying claim to the Sultanate and to citation in the **khuṭba**, but to indicate the areas Tughril fully controlled.

Though Stern and Wittek (64) are doubtless correct in assuming that the full Seljuk signature consisted of the tribal mark, the ruler's name and his motto, the **tughrā** in 12th-13th century Chancery practice became an inscription, essentially a validating device, but possibly still with the implication of proprietorship. On this, al-Nasawī's testimony on the Khwārizmshāhs is of particular value. His distinction between the **ʿalāmas** and the **tughrās** of Muhammad Khwārizmshāh, his wife, Turkān/Terken Kātūn, and his son, Jalāl al-Dīn brings out the difference

---

(61) «La tuğra seljukide» *Journal Asiatique* CCXXXIV (1943-45) 167-72.

(62) Since relatively few numismatic works have been available to me I have assumed that the Seljuk coins published by I. and C. Artuk (*Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri teşhirdeki İslamî Sikkeler Katalogu I.* (İstanbul 1970) form a standard sample. For the Artuqid occurrences of double-headed eagles see 394-95 No.: 1210, 1212-13; 406-407 No. 1248.

(63) R.W. Bulliet «Numismatic Evidence for the Relationship between Tughril and Chaghri Beg» in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C. Miles* edited D.K. Kouymjian (Beirut 1974) 289-96.

(64) **Fātimid Decrees** 143-44 with full bibliography.

between them. The *ṭughrā* of the first was **Sulṭān ḡill Allāh fi'l-ʿālam Abu'l-Faḥ Muḥammed b. al-Sulṭān al-aʿzam Tukush/Tekesh burhān amīr al-mu'minīn** (The Sultan, God's shadow on earth, Muḥammed ... the glorious testimony of the Caliph). Turkān Khātūn's *ṭughrā* was **ʿIsmat al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn Ulugh Turkān malikat nisā' al-ʿālamīn** (... the Great Turkān, Queen of the women of the universe), while her *ʿalāma* was **Iṭasamtu bi'llāh waḥdah** (I held fast to God alone). As for Jalāl al-Dīn, who never actually reigned, he used only an *ʿalāma* **Al-naṣr min Allāh waḥdah** (65). This suggests that some of the abbreviated inscriptions of Kayqubād I at Antalya and Alanya may be derived from similar *ṭughrās* - for example, at Alanya, **Al-Sulṭān al-muʿazzam ʿAlāʿ al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn burhān amīr al-mu'minīn** (three times) or **Al-Sulṭān ʿAlāʿ al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn** (66) - and recall the Chancery procedures preceding the execution of the works. Some consistency was, of course, essential, but the only inconsistencies at Alanya and Antalya are the result of *ad hoc* abbreviations to fit the space available for inscription (67).

---

(65) *Ibid.* 148-49 note 2, citing the **Sīrat al-Sulṭān Jalāl al-Dīn Mangubirti**.

(66) *Alanya op. cit.* 57-59 No.s 9-11.

(67) The existence of principles governing abbreviation is not yet clear, and it is possible that it was haphazard. However, D. Sourdel and J. Sourdel-Thomine («Un texte d'invocations en faveur de deux princes Ayyūbides» in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy, and History. Studies in Honor of George C. Miles* edited D.K. Kouymjian (Beirut 1974) 347-52) comparing a rough copy of a *duʿā* for the Great Mosque at Damascus (Now in the Türk ve Islām Eserleri Müzesi at İstanbul, Inventory No. 13794) datable to 592/1196 in the name of Al-Malik al-ʿAzīz, a son of Saladin, with the only other inscription in his name (*RCEA* 3503), on a caravansaray at Dasūq in Lower Egypt, note certain significant omissions of titulature. The latter does not contain, for example, **qāmiʿ al-kafara wa'l-mushrikīn** (the suppressor of the Infidel and the polytheists) or **qāhir al-khawāriḡ wa'l-mutamarridīn** (the exterminator of heretics and the insubordinate) - less applicable to his actual deeds than to what was expected of him - which, in their view, were part of the titulature of the Syrian Counter-Crusade

However, why **authenticate** buildings, as 'alāmas or **ṭughrās** would have authenticated Royal deeds? Taking for the moment only **Al-minnātu li'llāh**, moreover, why should that appear on the walls of Antalya, presumably an operation of the Sultan in concert with his emirs, and not on the two large Sultan Hans? There obviously was some point, since, except for the 'Alā' al-Dīn Medrese at Antalya (see page 416 of the present article) and the porch of the Karatay Han (see page 401-02 of the present article), which bears the name of Kayqubād I alone, no motto appears on a private foundation, even those of Seljuk princesses, like the Hatun Han (636/1239) (68) or the Çiçinli Sultan Han (637/1240) (69), both founded by Kayqubād I's first wife, Māh-perī Khātūn. But why should there be any parallelism at all, since foundation inscriptions were not Chancery documents and required no authentication but a **qādī's** decision that the construction was not illegal (70) before they were put up.

A point for such mottos is suggested by the fortifications of Alanya and Antalya (mostly datable 625/1227-28), on which they were particularly conspicuous. Pious foundations could only be erected on private property (**mulk**), a rule which applied as much to the Sultan in his private capacity as to any of his subjects. The preliminaries to such constructions were deeds of sale, in the case of Royalty, doubtless occasionally fictitious. Fortifications, however, were State enterprises, for which the Sultan was nominally responsible. The land they occupied, if already built up at the time, as the suburbs of Konya evidently were when the walls were built (71) or the suburbs clustering outside the old gates of Tabrīz which Ghāzān brought within his new wall (72), would have been

---

and not, therefore, applicable in Egypt. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that they were merely omitted for lack of space.

(68) Erdmann *op. cit.* 138-39 No. 36; *RCEA* 4158.

(69) *Ibid.* 142 No. 37 - in fact, two inscriptions, possibly from two different foundations, but both in the name of Māh-Perī Khātūn.

(70) «Waqf and Patronage» *art. cit.* 71, 83-84.

(71) See note 47 of the present article; Ibn Bībī *Mukhtaṣar* 104-106; Duda 110-11.

(72) **Jāmi' al-Tawārikh** text 413-14; translation 234.

expropriated, and for this a ferman or other Chancery document would have been issued. The Antalya and Alanya inscriptions are thus a permanent record of the Royal deed of expropriation.

There are, admittedly, insufficient parallels to demonstrate this completely. The walls of Sivas, Afyon Karahisar and other Anatolian towns fortified by Kayqubād I have all been destroyed, and only a few of the inscriptions from the walls of Konya remain, unpublished, in the Ince Minareli Medrese and the Classical Museum at Konya; these are mostly closer to the Antalya-Alanya inscriptions, all to the glory of Kayqubād, than to Ibn Bībī's rhapsodical description of them (see page 412-13 of the present article). Ibn Bībī's own silence is superficially surprising since he was himself a high Chancery official, the **ṭughrā'ī**; however, Muslim historians, and particularly Chancery **kātib**s, tend to comment on innovations, not traditions, so that his silence may, on the contrary, be an indication of established practice. He also suggests why Kaykā'ūs I did not similarly inscribe the walls of Sinop (73). The population was Christian, largely Greek, and the capture of Sinop could, therefore be construed as a stage in the **jihād**, an ideal of Holy War against the Infidel which had been revived by the Zengid and Ayyūbid Counter-Crusade in 12th century Syria and Palestine. Churches at Sinop were turned into **masjids**, **qādis**, **khaṭīb**s and muezzins installed, and a minbar erected to designate the Friday mosque. In these special circumstances the original law of Islam prevailed: abandoned lands fell to the community (**umma**), the population was required to pay the poll-tax (**jizya**), and no deed of expropriation would have been required to obtain the land on which the walls were built. Ibn Bībī, in fact, writes as if the fortifications were merely restored, not built (74); however, the inscriptions from them suggest otherwise (75). Sinop turned out to be a unique case. Presumably, therefore, Kayqubād's fortifications used **ṭughrās** or **'alāmas** as a matter of course, to reflect his glory and announce his proprietorship of them.

The parallel between inscriptions and Chancery practice is also, somewhat inadequately, apparent in the Seljuk coinage, though the following remarks are no more than provisional.

---

(73) *Mukhtaṣar* 58, Duda 68.

(74) *Ibid.*

(75) See note 58 of the present article.



The restricted space a coin offers for inscriptions in a Sultan's name naturally favours abbreviations, heraldic devices or the use of the proprietorial **tamghā-ṭuḡhrā**. In Seljuk Anatolia this last can be ruled out. The bow and arrow of Ṭuḡhril (76) is so far from the highly stylised flourishes to fill inconvenient gaps in Anatolian Seljuk issues that it must long previously have been abandoned and its original sense totally forgotten (77).

Representations of animals, with the exception of the common, nonheraldic device of the Lion and the Sun and a curious series of coins of Qılıj Arslān IV to which Lindner (78) has drawn attention, are surprisingly infrequent. The double-headed eagle is principally Artuqid, though again too irregular in its occurrence to permit the conclusion that it was their dynastic device, in mints between 597/1200 and 712/1312 (79), and was also used by the **atābaks** of Sinjār (mints of 584-605/1208-09). However, three tiles from the revetment, most probably of the throne-room, of Kubādābād on Lake Beyşehir, the palace of Kayqubād I ordered just before his death, show double-headed eagles bearing **Al-Sultān** on their breast (80), written from bottom to top - twice on tiles

---

(76) Cf. I and C. Artuk *op. cit.* 342 No. 1043 dated 448/1056-57.

(77) Compare *ibid.* 356-57 (Konya 601/1204-1205) No.s 1081, 1086; 361 (Kayqubād I Konya 617/1220-21) No. 1099; 372 (Kaykā'ūs II Develü 651/1253-54) No.s 1137, 1139; and 380 (Siyāwūsh/Jimrī Konya 675/1276-77) No. 1166.

(78) «The Challenge of Qılıç Arslan IV» in *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C. Miles* edited D.K. Kouymjian (Beirut 1974) 411-17.

(79) I. and C. Artuk *op. cit.* 394-95 No.s 1210, 1212-13; 406-407 No. 1248.

(80) L. A. Mayer (*Saracenic Heraldry* (Oxford 1933) Plate III) illustrates an underglaze-painted Raqqa sherd with the body of an eagle bearing **Al-Malik al-Şāliḥ** horizontally across its breast, the only inscribed eagle illustrated, except for the frontispiece of a Qur'ān with the same inscription (*ibid.* Plate XIV), which suggests that it was the personal blazon of one of the Ayyūbids or the Mamlūks with the title of **Al-Malik al-Şāliḥ**. On the other hand, the vertical in-

painted underglaze in black with turquoise and manganese staining in the glaze, and once on a larger tile-fragment, also painted underglaze in black but with cobalt staining only. The double-headed eagle and **Al-Sultān** have jointly been taken as evidence of a Seljuk sign-**tuḡhrā** (81) placed on Royal buildings. However, though enough has been said to show that the Seljuk inscription-**tuḡhrā** may have retained some element of its original proprietorial force into the 13th century (see pages 418-20 of the present article), there is no evidence for the archaistic use of a sign-**tuḡhrā** on Seljuk Chancery documents: moreover, why **validate** tiles in the throne room of a palace? - too inconspicuous for the public and **superfluous** for the ruler and his entourage. Double-headed eagles are only a minor element of the Kubā dābād repertory, which is rich in both animals and figures (82), - falcons and other birds of prey, bears, dogs panthers, peacocks, dragons, and other animals

---

scriptions on the Kubādābād fragments suggest an interpretation of Mayer's observation (*ibid.* 9) that Mamlūk eagles often have a vertical gash on the breast, so that some writers have described them as «éventré». The gash can scarcely be decorative and must be a stylisation of earlier eagles bearing vertical inscriptions.

- (81) K. Otto-Dorn and M. Önder «Bericht über die Grabung in Kobadabad (October 1965)» *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1966) 170-83; ead. with G. Öney, J. Sourdel-Thomine and F. Tunçdağ «Bericht über die Grabung in Kobadabad 1966» *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1969) 438-506. The arguments for the heraldic significance of the Kubādābād motifs have been presented by O. Aslanapa «Die seldschukischen Fliesen im Museum von Antalya» *Cultura Turcica II* (1965); id. «Türklerde Arma Sanatı» *Türk Kültürü II/16* (1964) 40-47.
- (82) K. Otto-Dorn «Die menschliche Figurendarstellung auf den Fliesen von Kobadabad» in *Forschungen zur Kunst Asiens. In Memoriam Kurt Erdmann* edited O. Aslanapa and R. Naumann (İstanbul 1969) 111-39. The animal representations are not necessarily purely **Turkish**. For a review of the evidence see J.M. Rogers «The 11th century - A turning point in the architecture of the Mashriq?» in *Islamic Civilisation 950-1150* edited D.S. Richards (Cassirer-Oxford 1973) 211-49 and especially 245 ff.

from the repertory of Turco-Iranian proper names - some of which, under the Mamlūks, at least, became heraldic emblems.

However, neither at Kubādābād, nor on any other building in Seljuk Anatolia, is there any - significant connexion between founders or the offices they held and the animals appearing on their buildings (83), though the decoration may have some general symbolic significance, as the work of Professor Otto-Dorn and Professor Öney has suggested (84). There are virtually no punning

- (83) The only consonance known to me in Anatolia between the meaning of a founder's proper name and a decorative motif on a building he founded is the eagle on the centre block of the lintel of the North porch of the Mosque of Sungur/Sunqur Ağa, a 14th century foundation at Niğde, where its position suggests that it may have been a deliberate allusion to his name (**sunqur**/falcon). Maver (*Saracenic Heraldry op. cit.* 7-10), while generally inclined to reject **armes parlantes** in Mamlūk Heraldry cites, nevertheless (71-72) the blazon of Jamāl al-Dīn **Āqqūsh** («White Germalcon», of whom two pieces of metalwork are known, each with a single-headed eagle, though from its appearance he identifies it as a griffin-vulture), **nā'ib** of Kerāk (690-708/1291-1309). This, however, may well be co-incident, since the blazon of Tuquz-Temür, a **sāqī**/cup-bearer of al-Nāsir Muhammad who died in 746/1345, was an eagle above a cup, which is consonant neither with his name nor his office. Cf. a brass vase in the Islamic Museum in Cairo, Inventory No. 15125 (G. Wiet *Objets en cuivre* (Cairo 1932) 199 Appendix No. 171; M. Meinecke «Zur mamlukischen Heraldik» *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Kairo* XXVII/2 (1972) 225 and note 8, with references. The blazon was adopted by Qūsh Temür («Falcon-Iron»), his chamberlain/**ustādār** or **ustādh al-dār**, in preference to his own blazon, which was a round shield with five bars (Mayer *ibid.* 192, 237 and Plate XLII/6. The single consonance of an eagle and the name, Sunqur, on the Sunğur Ağa Mosque at Niğde is thus inconclusive.
- (84) For example, K. Otto-Dorn «Darstellung des Turco-Chinesischen Tierzyklus in der islamischen Kunst» in *Beiträge zur*

devices, that is of animals corresponding to the founder's name Sa'd al-Dīn Kubak/Köpek, who founded the Zazadin Han (85) near Konya, left neither the animals of the hunt - horses, hounds or cheetahs - with which, as Kayqubād I's **amīr-i shikār** (Master of the Royal Hunt) he was associated, nor the dog (**Köpek**) which was probably his name, nor any conventional sign at all. Neither does the Ak Han (86), founded in 651/1253 by Qarāsungur («Black Gerfalcon») bear any representation of a bird of prey; and the foundations of emirs whose names include **Arslān** appear to lack lions. This concentration on punning devices is, of course, misleading in the context of Mamlūk heraldry, but is only invoked in the present context for the lack of conventional signs as alternatives. For example, though the Court falconers (**bāzdrārān**) may well have had the blazon of an eagle (87), no Seljuk foundations by any of these have been identified.

In Mamlūk heraldry blazons were honorific devices adopted as a badge or uniform when an emir entered one of the offices of Court, was appointed to certain offices or reached a certain rank, Mamlūk practice differed from that of the mediaeval West in that devices were typically associated with officials, not individuals. In the case of the sovereign their prime purpose was to glorify him and thus, on occasion, to commemorate him; otherwise they were primarily to identify property, as al-Qalqashandī implies (88) :

---

*Kunstgeschichte Asiens. In Memoriam Ernst Diez* edited O. Aslanapa (İstanbul 1963) 131-65, with references. She argues strongly for the use of signs from the Animal Calendar in Seljuk architectural decoration; but there is little evidence that the Seljuks used it before the Mongol invasion and she does not explain why, although each year corresponded to only one animal, the signs regularly appear all together.

(85) Erdmann *op. cit.* 196 No. 28 and references.

(86) *Ibid.* 67-72 No. 19.

(87) Disputed by Mayer (*op. cit.* 10). However, see C. Lamm «A falconer's kettledrum of Mamluke origin in Livrust-kammaren» *Livrustkammaren Journal of the Swedish Royal Armoury* VI/56 80-96.

(88) **Ṣubḥ al-A'shā'** IV 61:21 - 62:5. I am much indebted to Mrs.

wa min ʿāda kull amīr min kabīr aw ṣaghīr inn yakūn lahu rank yukhaṣṣah mā bayn hināb aw dawā aw buqja aw fransīsiyya ... bi-alwān mukhtalifa ... wa yinʿal dhālik dahānan ʿalā abwāb buyūthum wa'l-amākin al-mansūba ilayhim ka matābikh al-sukkar wa shawan al-ghilāl wa'l-amlāk wa'l-marākib wa ghayr dhālik, wa ʿalā qumāch khuyūlhum min jūkh mulawwan makhṣūṣ, thumma ʿalā qumāsh jimālhum min khuyūt ṣūf mulawwana ... (roughly, «all emirs should have a special blazon (rank) ... of different colours ... fixed to the doors of their houses in colours or their property, such as sugar factories, real estate, private property, boats, etc., and on the trappings of their horses, cut out of special coloured cloth (that is, applique-work), or on their camels, out of coloured woollen thread ...»).

The passage is somewhat problematic, since al-Qalqashandī was writing in the 15th century of practice in the 14th, without indicating that there may have been changes, and because, according to his account, blasons should have been even more frequent than they are. However, his emphasis upon property, either personal or granted to an emir in virtue of his appointment - as his further reference to «swords, bows and harnesses» in the same passage shows - is quite deliberate, and the vast majority of extant blasons occur on pottery, metalwork or textiles, either specially commissioned work or standard issue. Architectural blasons, as al-Qalqashandī says, are known in the 14th century from palaces (**dār**, **qaṣr**, **iṣṭabl**) in Cairo, baths and **wikālas** or **khāns** (both real estate), but not in or on pious foundations except, quite inexplicably, **sabils**, and on movable objects - lamps, metalwork, bronze door-facings or even wooden panelling - which, experience had shown, were easy to steal. However, pious foundations were legally not private property, since the founder's **waqfiyya** totally alienated the building and its endowments, both from the State and from himself, whatever saving clauses **waqfiyyas** might contain granting a founder some right to interference in the institution during his lifetime. This obviously had its inconveniences, and 15th-16th century **waqfiyyas** elsewhere in Islam (89) show progressively

---

Layla ʿAlī Ibrāhīm and to Dr. Michael Meinecke for discussion of this passage, though the conclusions advanced here are my own.

(89) For a review of **waqfiyya** material in 14th-16th century

more devious attempts by founders to retain control over the property they had made **waqf**. However, in 14th century Mamlūk Cairo, pious foundations, being outside the control of both the State and the founder, bear out al-Qalqashandī in only exceptionally bearing a blazon. Mamlūk heraldry was obviously a law unto itself, and it cannot be used to illuminate Anatolian Seljuk practice. However, the point regarding the ownership of property made **waqf** stands, and it would follow that animal ornament on pious foundations is not heraldic. This in contrast to the double-headed eagles from the state walls of Konya, or even the eagle on the walls of Diyarbekir (90) with an inscription dated 605/1208-09, which may well be heraldic in a sort of way, though the choice of the blazon has yet to be explained.

One further contrast which deserves mention is the increasing importance of Royal cartouche-blazons on the later (15th century) Mamlūk architecture of Cairo, on emirs', not just Royal, foundations (91). The only obvious justification for this would have been a contribution, either a gift of land or labour, craftsmen and materials from the Court, as al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (92) aided his own emirs' pious foundations, though these bear no inscription recording it, and the only buildings of his reign bearing the Royal cartouche are the official residences he built for his emirs. If this ever took place in Seljuk Anatolia the evidence is lacking. The only constructions bearing Royal mottos are fortifications, though it is unclear whether they record Royal grants in aid or merely the Royal decree; while their sporadic use demonstrates that the

---

Central Asia, particularly Samarkand, and the attempts of endowers to retain control over their foundations see J.M. Rogers «**Waqfiyyas and Waqfregisters**. New Primary Sources for Islamic Architecture» *Kunst des Orients* XIII/1-2 (1977).

(90) M. Meinecke *art. cit.* 220.

(91) L.A. Mayer «Die Sohriſtſwappen der Mamluken-Sultane» in *Beiträge zur Kunst des Islam. Festschrift Friedrich Sarre* (=Jahrbuch der Asiatischen Kunst II) (Leipzig 1925) 183-87; M. Meinecke *art. cit.* 286-87.

(92) Layla °Alī Ibrāhīm «The Great Hānqāh of the Emir Qawṣūn» *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Kairo* XXX/1 (1974) 54-55 and references.

Sultans themselves had yet to evolve a specifically Royal heraldic device.

The grounds for the supposition that the Kubādābād tiles are heraldic must, therefore, be the use of **Al-Sultān**. This was in fact the heading (perhaps the *‘alāma*) of some minor documents from the Seljuk Chancery, sometimes rubricated but always in a bolder hand than the rest of the document, and, for example, of two of the **waqfiyyas** of Jalāl al-Dīn Qaratay (93) - of the Karatay Han (645/1247), and of a **masjid** and **Dār al-ṣulahā’** (an abode for the pious) (94) at Antalya, though these are not exactly State papers; and it does not appear as the heading of the **waqfiyya** (dated 651/1253 with later appendices) of the Büyük Karatay Medrese, which he founded at Konya in 649/1251-52 (95).

**Al-Sultān** is also attested in epigraphy, One of Kayqubād I's inscriptions on the Tophane at Alanya begins with **Al-minnatu li'llāh** followed immediately by **Al-Sultān** (96): although the inscription continues, the two formulae are within a special cartouche, the latter evidently to reinforce the *‘alāma* (see pages 20-21 of the present article). **Muhammad Sultān** (97), the prefix to the

---

(93) O Turan «Selçuk devri vakfiyeleri. III. Celâleddin Karatay vakıflar ve vakfiyeleri» *art. cit.* 84 ff. The **waqfiyya** of the Karatay Han is now on exhibition in the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara. The **waqf** was founded in 643/1245-46, two years before the **waqfiyya** was drawn up.

(94) *Ibid.* 86 ff.

(95) *Alanya op. cit.* 55 No. 4; 57 No. 9.

(96) The exact classification of **Al-Sultān/Sultān** is irrelevant here. Other documents bearing it include a letter from Kayqubād I to Hugues de Lusignan, King of Cyprus (O. Turan *Türkiye Selçukluları hakkında resmî vesikalar* (Ankara 1958) 23 ff., 109 ff., 142-44) and a **tamlıknâme** (giving a title to **mulk**: see «**Waqf** and Patronage» *art. cit.* 87 and note 61) in the name of Kaykā'ūs II (O. Turan «Keykâus'a ait bir temliknâme» 60 *Doğum yılı Münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Togan'a Armağan. Symbolae in Honorem Z.V. Togan* (İstanbul 1950/1955) 166 ff.

(97) The full text of Öljeytū's inscription is as follows: (RCEA 5279) **Sultān Muhammad. Hādhā'l-mihrāb al-mustatāb min**

foundation inscription of the **mihrāb** of Öljeytü in the Great Mosque at İsfahān (710/1310) also commemorates Öljeytü's estimate of the importance of his own works, and may also be a sort of **°alāma**, since the epigraphic practice of İl-Khānid Iran was much indebted to Seljuk Anatolia. However, **Al-Sultān** cannot be generally explained in Chancery terms since it occurs once more, in quite different circumstances, which have yet to be explained, in a restoration inscription from the Great Mosque at Sivrihisar (98):

**Al-Sultan** : **juddida hadhihi'l-°imara al-masjid** (sic) **al-mubarak fī nawbat al-°abd al-°a°if Mikā'il b. °Abd Allāh aḥsana Allāh °awāqibah fī sanat 673/1274-75** (in words). There is no evidence for Royal intervention, and beyond the obvious observation that Anatolia was very different by this time from in the reign of Kayqubād I there is very little to be said. However, if no conclusion follows from the documentary or epigraphic uses of **Al-Sultān**

---

muḍāfāt al-°imārāt allatī attafaqat i°ādathā fī ayyām mu°ādalat al-Sultān ḥāmī ḥawzat al-Islām wa'l-imān Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn zill Allāh fi'l-aradīn ḥarasa Allāh bi-baqā'ihī al-Islām min fawādil ṣadāqāt al-°amīma al-ṣāhibiyya al-a°zamiyya ṣāhib dīwān al-mamālik sharqan wa gharban ba°idan wa qarīban Sa°d al-Ḥaqq wa'l-Dīn al-makhšūṣ bi-°ināyat rabb al-°ālamīn Muḥammad al-Sāwī a°azza Allāh anṣarah wa da°°afa iqtidārah. Tawallāh al-°abd al-°a°if al-rāji ilā raḥmat Allāh wa ghafarānih °Adud b. °Alī al-Māstarī aḥsana Allāh °āqibatah fī Ṣafar sanat 710/1310 (in words) ...

There is no doubt of the importance of the **mihrāb**, which was very probably part of a major restoration of the Great Mosque at İsfahān. Evidently the money came either from the private pocket of the **ṣāhib dīwān**, Muḥammad al-Sāwī, or from the public funds specially administered by him. But the honorific initial titulature shows that Öljeytü wished to appear as the prime mover in ordering the construction.

- (98) *RCEA* 4695, recorded by Van Berchem. O.Aslanapa (*Turkish Art and Architecture* (London 1971) 121 misreads it as **al-sultānī**, an unnecessary complication with an already difficult inscription.



then its sense on the three tiles from Kubādābād is also indeterminate. If, therefore, for whatever reason, the double-headed eagles with **Al-Sultān** were heraldic there is no possible way of demonstrating it.

In the Seljuk coinage there is surprisingly little congruence with architectural or documentary practice. Mottos are rare, three exceptions being two silver dirhams of Kaykā'ūs II (99) struck in 658/1259-60 at Konya and Madīnat Lu'lu'a (Loulon at the Cilician Gates North of Podandos/Pozantı) with **al-'izzatu li'llāh** on the reverse; a dirham of Kaykusraw III struck at Antalya in 675/1276-77 with **al-mulk li'llāh** (100); and a gold dinar of Siyāwūsh/Jimrī struck at Konya in the same year with **al-minnātu li'llāh** (101). None of these rulers' **'alāmas** has, however, been recorded, and their appearance may, therefore, be misleading.

The inscription-**tughrā** on the lines of that given by al-Nasawī (see page 418-19 of the present article), is unsuitably long for most coins, where the **shahāda**, the Sultan's titulature, some mention of the Caliph, the mint city and the date, **inter alia**, were all desirable. The inscriptions of the coins of, for example, Kayqubād I are inconsistently formulated; while their diverse disposition suggests the lack of established practice in the Mint, - **a priori** surprising, since it was obviously convenient that Chancery practice, architecture and the Mint should harmonise as far as possible.

Most of the silver coinage of Kayqubād I and Kaykhusraw II bears minimal Royal inscriptions - **Al-sultān al-a'zam/mu'azzam** + **laqab, ism** and patronymic - on the obverse, sometimes with **al-sultān**, or even **al-sultān al-mu'azzam** separated from the rest by an asterisk of flourish (102). However, two silver dirhams of

---

(99) I. and C. Artuk *op. cit.* 373 No.s 1142-43. S.M. Stern (**Fātimid Decrees** 150) observes that rulers' **'alāmas** appear on their coins. However, too few coins corresponding to the known **'alāmas** have been recorded; and those recorded show that it was not standard practice.

(100) *Ibid.* 377 No. 1156.

(101) *Ibid.* 380 No. 1166.

(102) *Ibid.* 370-72 No.s 1130-36 (mints of 647-655/1249-57) actually have **al-salātīn al-a'zam**.

Kaykhusraw II, struck at Konya and Sivas in 642/1244-45 (103) bear **al-sultān al-aʿẓm ẓill Allāh fi'l-ʿālam Gbiyāth al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn Kaykhusraw b. Kayqubād qasīm** (104) **amīr al-mu'minīn** (co-partner of the Caliph), which is remarkably similar to the Khwārizmshāh inscription **tuḡhrā**. A silver dirham of his successor, Kaykā'ūs II (Konya 644/1246-47) (105) and a gold dinar struck their in (643/1245-46) (106), just after the latter's accession, use similar style and titles, the latter adding the **kunya** Abu'l-Faṭḥ, though this may have no official significance since the coinage of Kayqubād I appears to include it or drop it quite haphazardly. These coins with the full formula are, admittedly, exceptional; other coins bear elements of it, chosen apparently, however, at random: a silver dirham of Kaykā'ūs II (Konya 643/1245-46) lacks the **kunya**; further dirhams of the same ruler struck at Konya and Sivas in 646/1248-49 (107) lack both the **kunya**; and **qasīm amīr al-mu'minīn**; the coins of the Triumvirate struck between 647 and 655/1249-57 have room only for the **isms** and **laqabs** of the three rulers; the mints of Kaykā'ūs II between 655 and 658/1257-59 (108) retain **ẓill Allāh fi'l-ʿālam**, omit the **kunya** and replace **qasīm ...** by **burhān amīr al-mu'minīn** (a lesser title, but probably already irrelevant since during that time the last ʿAbbāsīd Caliph had been killed when the Mongols captured Baghdad); and mints of Qılıj Arslān IV (655-63/1257-64) omit evrything but **burhān amīr al-**

---

(103) *Ibid.* 365 No. 1113; 366 No. 1118.

(104) The title, **qasīm amīr al-mu'minīn** (co-partner of the Caliph), the most pretentious of the Anatolian Seljuks' titles relating to the Caliphate, had been assumed by Kayqubād I only in the latter part of his reign: it continued to be used in inscriptions during part of the reign of Kaykhusraw II, but apart from his coins and those of his successor, Kaykā'ūs II, during his rule as independent Sultan, was then abandoned for the weaker **burhān amīr al-mu'minīn** (the glorious testimony of the Caliph).

(105) I. and C. Artuk *op. cit.* 368 No. 1122.

(106) *Ibid.* 367 No. 1121.

(107) *Ibid.* 368 No. 1122; 369 No. 1126.

(108) *Ibid.* 372-74 Nos 1137-44.

**mu minin** (109). There is no subsequent reminiscence of the inscription-**tughrā**.

It has been possible to show some parallelism in Seljuk epigraphy between certain laconic inscriptions and Chancery formula and to interpret them accordingly to demonstrate a degree of interest by the Seljuk Sultans in architectural foundations. If it has not been possible to show that this went so far as the institution of a public system of caravansarays at least they differed little from their Great Seljuk forbears or their Īl-Khānid successors in Anatolia and Iran. Complete correspondence between Chancery practice and the terminology of foundation inscriptions was not to be expected, for the latter were legal Arabic and erected on the permission of a **qādī**, not the **diwān**. However, surprisingly, numismatic practice, to judge from the sample of coins discussed here, seems to have been largely independent of Chancery control. With time, long inscriptions, which were never common, were abbreviated or corrupted, though not necessarily because the coinage was obliged to reflect political changes which the Chancery could ignore. It is thus noteworthy that dirhams of Kaykhusraw II should bear an inscription-**tughrā** at all, particularly when it was not apparently used by his predecessor, Kayqubād I and when, in view of its length, **‘alāmas** or other short formulae would have been preferable as signs of authentication. Since Kaykhusraw's successors so quickly distorted it they must have been unaware of its original import, and as an innovation it must have been difficult to explain, even to contemporaries. However, any attempt to harmonise Chancery practice, the coinage and architectural epigraphy was an important rationalisation, and it remains to be seen why the Seljuks were not more consistent or successful, or, indeed, whether any other dynasty did even so well.

---

(109) *Ibid.* 374 No. 1146 (Erzincan 657/1258-59); 377 No. 1154 (Sārūs [?] 658/1259-60); 375 No.s 1148-49 (Konya 663/1264-65).