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The Seljuks of Anatolia: An Epigraphic Study

Abstract

This is a study of the monumental epigraphy of the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate, also known as the Sultanate of Rum, which emerged in Anatolia following the Great Seljuk victory in Manzikert against the Byzantine Empire in the year 1071. It was heavily weakened in the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243 against the Mongols but lasted until the end of the thirteenth century. The history of this sultanate which survived many wars, the Crusades and the Mongol invasion is analyzed through their epigraphy with regard to the influence of political and cultural shifts. The identity of the sultanate and its sultans is examined with the use of their titles in their monumental inscriptions with an emphasis on the use of the language and vocabulary, and with the purpose of assessing their strength during different periods of their realm. The analysis is implemented through a chronological perspective with the attempt to establish the earlier dynastic influences affecting the choices of titles, literary styles and epigraphic formulae. The history of the Anatolian Seljuks is traced chronologically through the monumental inscriptions of the era in question, from the beginning of the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas’ud I which provides the earliest surviving Anatolian Seljuk numismatic epigraphy. The main analyses of monumental inscriptions cover the period from the reign of ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II (1156-1192) to the reign of ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus II (1246-1261). An assessment of the surviving monumental inscriptions of the wives of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad is included. The analyzed epigraphic material is linked to the development of the dynasty through its apogee until its defeat against the Mongols in the battle of Köse Dağ (1243).

The chronological connections of Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions with historical events helps to understand the ideology and political motives of the dynasty. The inscriptions provide a clearer picture concerning the influences that might have shaped the royal identity of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty. Moreover they defined the periods in which new titles were adopted by the Anatolian Seljuk sultans, and the differences that occurred in the structure, organization and vocabulary used in monumental inscriptions. The comparison of Anatolian Seljuk epigraphy with that of other contemporary and preceding dynasties enables us to detect
the most important influences. The time frame of the analyzed inscriptions also allows for a conclusion regarding the effect of the battle of Köse Dağ on the use of royal titles, as well as the development in the Anatolian Seljuk sultanate’s internal balance of power as a whole.
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Chapter I: Introduction

This sultanic round arch is the envy of Khusraw, near which the pavilion palace of Kayqubad is but an old tent.

This is a verse from a poem inscribed on the Alay Köşkü at the outer walls of the Topkapı palace. It was composed by the renowned 19th Century Ottoman statesman and poet Kecedji-Zade ‘Izzat Mulla in the reign of the Ottoman sultan Mahmud II. ‘Izzat Mulla compares the newly built pavilion to the Sasanian iwan of Kisra built in Ctesiphon by Khusraw Anushirvan and the palace of the Anatolian Seljuk sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I. The existence of such testament explains how in general the Anatolian Seljuks, and specifically the reign of Kayqubad (1219-1237), were perceived hundreds of years after the fall of the Anatolian Seljuk sultanate. The palace of Kayqubad was linked and compared in greatness to the Sasanian Taq-i Kisra built by Khusraw Anushirvan. This memory of the Anatolian Seljuks is owed first to the surviving literary sources and chronologies that narrated the reign of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty, especially from the reign of Kayqubad I who was depicted as a model ruler, and secondly to the surviving monuments of the Anatolian Seljuks.

The aim of this study is to analyze whether the epigraphy of the Anatolian Seljuks can reflect the changes and development in the history of the dynasty, or can be related to the influence of political and cultural shifts. Was the identity of the Anatolian Seljuks mirrored in the royal titles, language and the vocabulary they used in monumental inscriptions, and were the expressions and prose a measure of their strength during different periods? I will also analyze the earlier dynastic influences affecting the choices of titles, styles and other elements in their epigraphy. The history of the Anatolian Seljuks will be traced chronologically through the monumental inscriptions of the era in question.

The Formation of the Anatolian Seljuks (Map 1)

Ibn al-Athir reported that Alp Arslan heard that his cousin Shihab al-Dawla Qutlumush, son of Arslan Isra’il son of Seljuk, the eldest direct decendent of Seljuk, had rebelled against him, and he gathered large forces and marched to Rayy to seize control. When the two armies met Qutlumush realized his army was weaker, so he fled immediately to the castle of Kurdkuh, one of Shihab al-Din’s fortresses. In 1063-64 after the army made camp, Qutlumush was found dead, and was mourned for several days by the Great Seljuk sultan Alp Arslan. The claim of Qutlumush to the Great Seljuk throne was based on the ancient Turkish tradition of collective sovereignty.

The battle of Manzikert did not lead to the collapse of the Byzantine empire, but it diminished their power and control over Anatolia. One of the impacts of the Seljuk victory of Manzikert was the development of small polities, either authorized by the Great Seljuks or out of their control. The existence of these polities formed the political and competitive ground in Anatolia. The polities were the Saltukids in Erzurum, the Artukids of Diyarbakr, the Shah-i Arman in Akhlat, the Danishmand in Cappadocia and the Seljuks of Anatolia.

After the death of Qutlumush the position of his sons is very difficult to comprehend, for different accounts were given with regard to their relationship with the Great Seljuk Sultan. Some accounts state that they were banished by Alp Arslan to the Syrian Euphrates borders, while other later accounts state that Malikshah, Alp Arslan’s successor, gave them the insignia to rule Anatolia.

According to Osman Turan, Sulayman son of Qutlumush was not amongst the commanders sent by Alp Arslan to conquer Anatolia after Manzikert. Only Artuk Bey was mentioned in later sources as one of the conquerors who founded a state. Artuk Bey was called back to Rayy in the struggle for succession after the death of Alp Arslan. By this time the sons of Qutlumush began gathering the Turkmen in Anatolia, especially the tribes who had fled to Anatolia after they rebelled against Tughrul Beg and Alp Arslan.

---

2 Richards, *The Annales of the Saljuk Turks*, 151.
3 Mecit, “Kingship and Ideology under the Rum Seljuqs,” 65.
4 Hillenbrand, *Turkish Myth*, 16.
5 Turan, “Anatolia in the period of the Seljuks and the Beylik,” 234; Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Anatolia*, 74.
7 Ibid.
Sulayman son of Qutlumush, the founder of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty, appeared very shortly after 1073 in an intervention on behalf of the Fatimid vizier Badr al-Jamali against the Seljuk commander Atsiz ibn Uwaq al-Khwarazmi. Atsiz had captured Jerusalem, al-Ramla, Jaffa, and most of Palestine in 1070/1072, and thus formed a threat to Fatimid Egypt. Cahen mentions that Atsiz sent two of Qutlumush’s sons that he had previously captured to Malikshah. He continues by stating that Malikshah sent a former military governor of Baghdad with the name Barsuq against two other sons of Qutlumush in Asia Minor. Barsuq succeeded in killing one of Qutlumush’s sons, Mansur, but he neither was able to kill the other son, Sulayman, nor destroy his forces.

Regarding Sulayman ibn Qutlumush Anna Comnena recorded the following, “Sulayman the ruler of the whole of the east was encamped around Nicaea (Iznik), where he had his sultanicum corresponding to our palace.” She also stated that he used to send raiders to all around the Black Sea provinces of Bithynia and Thynia; these incursions reached as far as the Bosporus region. Sulayman I became active in Byzantine dynastic disputes. He aided Nicephorus III Botaniates to succeed to the throne, which lead to the expansion of his territories closer to Constantinople. The army of Sulayman was headquartered in Chrysopolis (Üsküdar), then later in 1080, they were settled on the Asian side of the Bosporus where they built custom houses for the ships passing by. By the year 1084 Sulayman had already established a certain dominion over the eastern lands of Anatolia with Iznik (Nicaea) as his capital. He was probably also leading the Turkmens in Anatolia, with the blessing of the Byzantine emperor Alexius Comnenus who would have been anxious to keep the raiders at bay.

Sulayman ibn Qutlumush left his capital Nicaea to his subordinate Abu’l-Qasim, and headed to the east in 1082. He captured Adana, Tarsus, Masisa, and Anazarba, and established control over Cilicia in 1083. The Armenian ruler of the area, in an attempt to save his kingdom, fled to Malikshah and declared himself a Muslim. It is then in 1084 that Sulayman received an appeal from one of the factions in Antioch against the Armenian ruler Philaretos. Sulayman marched to Antioch and entered the city without any resistance. The capture of Antioch was

---

9 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 74.
12 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 76-77.
13 Ibid., 236.
celebrated in the Muslim world, on the account of news that Saint Peter’s cathedral was converted into a mosque. Sibt ibn al-Jawzi, and Ibn al-Athir both stated that the Great Seljuk sultan Malikshah welcomed the capture of Antioch and the rule of Sulayman over it.

The prince of Aleppo, Sharaf al-Dawla Muslim, demanded that Sulayman continue to pay tribute as had been done by the Byzantines. In 1085 Sulayman marched to Aleppo, killed its governor, Malikshah’s vassal Sharaf al-Dawla, and besieged the city. When he failed to enter Aleppo, he moved south to Qinnasarin and captured the city, restored its castle, and moved into it. The nobility of Aleppo saw this as a sign of Sulayman’s determination to capture their city, thus they appealed to Malikshah to send a force and take over the rule of Aleppo from them. When Malikshah did not respond they wrote to his brother Tutush, who gathered his army and left Damascus in April 1086. The army of Tutush, under the leadership of Artuk Bey engaged in battle with Sulayman’s army outside Aleppo in May 1086. Sulayman ibn Qutlumush was killed in battle, and his son Kılıç Arslan I was handed to Malikshah as hostage by Sulayman’s vizier in Antioch.

After the death of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush, the Great Seljuk sultan Malikshah, as well as the Byzantine emperor Alexius, attempted to regain control in Anatolia. In 1092 Malikshah launched a campaign against Abu’l-Qasim. Moreover, he extended a formal offer for alliance to Alexius Comnenus. Before the ambassador arrived with Alexius’s response, he heard the news of Malikshah’s death. Upon the death of Malikshah, Kılıç Arslan I was able to escape to Anatolia.

The period of Kılıç Arslan I’s arrival was characterized by the extensive activity and development of other principalities in Anatolia (figure 1). In 1084 Malatya was attacked by Danishmand Ghazi, who also captured Çankırı, Kastamonu, Karatekin, and Sinop. Another Anatolian principality was headed by Mengüjek Ghazi, who ruled between the region of Erzinjan and Divrigi. Another principality was that of Saltuk Bey in Erzurum, which recognized the sovereignty of Great Seljuks.

14 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 77.
16 Ibid., 63.
17 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, 78.
18 Ibid., 81.
Kılıç Arslan re-established himself in Nicaea, and gained the loyalty of his father’s former officers. In 1097 in an alliance with Gümüşhtegin the Danishmand and amir Hasan of Cappadocia, Kılıç Arslan met the Crusader army at Eskishehir (Dorylaeum). Although the Crusaders prevailed, the battle is described as one where the Turks fought heroically, and Kılıç Arslan was described as a “lion rejoicing in his strength.” The defeat led to the establishment of the kingdom of Baldwin in Edessa, and Godfrey’s in Palestine. In July 1100 the Danishmand Gümüşhtegin Ghazi defeated the Crusader army advancing from Syria, where Bohemund was taken as a prisoner. In the same year Gümüşhtegin and Kılıç Arslan I annihilated two great German and French Crusader contingents. These victories helped to re-establish Anatolian Seljuk security in the region, as well as providing them with the resources to focus on the administrative and economic welfare of their state. After the fall of Iznik in 1097, Kılıç Arslan I moved his capital to Konya.

Kılıç Arslan I captured Malatya from Gümüşhtegin in 1103, and Mayyafariqin in 1106. The events that followed were a strong testament to the motives and ideology of the early Anatolian Seljuks. Ibn al-Athir recorded the events concerning the strife in Mosul between Jokirmish, and Jawli. After Jokirmish died, his men wrote to prince Sadaqa Qasim al-Dawla al-Barsuqi and Kılıç Arslan with a promise to surrender the city. Sadaqa refused the offer out of loyalty to the Great Seljuk sultan Muhammad. Kılıç Arslan marched with an army to Mosul and entered the city peacefully, since Jawli left when he was informed of Kılıç’s advancement. Kılıç Arslan was received by Zangi son of Jokirmish. In both Ibn al-Athir’s, and Bar Hebraeus’ accounts of this event they mention a very interesting term “khala’a ‘alayhum,” which means Kılıç Arslan I presented them with robes of honor, khil‘at, usually handed over by a high ruling authority to his subordinates as a form of legitimacy and sovereignty. This might be the earliest recorded testament of an Anatolian Seljuk act of sovereignty. Kılıç Arslan was then seated on the throne, and his name replaced that of sultan Muhammad in the khutba, after the Abbasid caliph. Kılıç Arslan I waited for a while to settle matters in Mosul, and for his force to increase. He then marched after Jawli, who by then had been joined by the forces of Artuk, and the two armies engaged in a battle at lake Khabur. The army of Jawli triumphed, and Kılıç Arslan drove his

horse in to the river in an attempt to protect himself while shooting arrows at the enemy. His horse was swept into the deep water and Kılıç Arslan drowned. His body was found later, and he was buried in a town known as al-Shamsaniyya.\textsuperscript{24}

The death of Kılıç Arslan I led to the division of Anatolian Seljuk territory. He had three sons at the time of his death. Tughrul Arslan, who was an infant, was in Malatya with his mother when Kılıç Arslan set out for his Mesopotamian campaign. The mother of Tughrul married his atabeg Balak, and controlled the areas around Malatya. She also tried to establish a relation with the Great Seljuk sultan Muhammad.\textsuperscript{25} The other son Shahanshah was considered the heir after the death of the eldest son of Kılıç Arslan in battle. Shahanshah was taken to Isfahan as prisoner after the battle at Khabur. He eventually returned to Anatolia, and was involved in wars against the Franks in Syria and the Byzantines in Anatolia. Shahanshah was overthrown in 1116 by the third son, Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud, who had been at the Danishmand court.

It is from the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud that the earliest epigraphic evidence for the Anatolian Seljuks survives. This should not lead us to believe that none had existed before his reign. The Anatolian Seljuks were acting as an independent ruling entity as early as the reign of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush. The siege of Nicaea, the mention of a treasury, and the move of the wife of Kılıç Arslan indicated the existence of either a pavilion or at least a reused castle. Moreover, another testament for an already developed ruling dynasty is the khil‘at distributed by Kılıç Arslan I in Mosul. There is no epigraphic evidence surviving from the era prior to the reign of Mas‘ud. Crane argued that this situation was probably due to the ongoing struggle between the Anatolian Seljuks and the Danishmandids, and the general instability that characterized this period.\textsuperscript{26}

There is an inconsistency in the accounts regarding the nature of the relationship between the Great Seljuks and the early Anatolian Seljuks. The 13\textsuperscript{th} century sources assert that Malikshah bestowed the lands of Rum (Anatolia) on his cousins, the sons of Qutlumush.\textsuperscript{27} When the movement of the Anatolian Seljuks is studied especially from the reign of Qutlumush onwards until the reign of Kılıç Arslan I, it is feasible to suggest that they were rivals of the Great Seljuks.

\begin{itemize}
\item[24] Ibid., 199.
\item[25] Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 88.
\item[26] Crane, “Notes on Saljuq Architectural patronage,” 4.
\item[27] Doran, “Saljukids,” 948.
\end{itemize}
The constant motivation to control Syria and Mosul is another piece of evidence. Turan argued that the fact that Sulayman provided aid to the Fatimids in 1074, and contacted the Shi‘i ruler of Tripoli to find him judges and religious officers, rendered the notion that Sulayman was sent to Anatolia by Malikshah as a myth.\(^{28}\) The assumption that the Anatolian Seljuks were vassals of the Great Seljuks proves doubtful when compared to the actual accounts of early movements of the Anatolian Seljuks.

In the following study I use the *Répertoire Chronologique d’Épigraphie Arabe* as my main source for monumental inscriptions.\(^{29}\)

**Note on the Transliteration/ translation:**
The transliteration in this study follows the *International Journal for Middle Eastern Studies* (IJMES). Modern Turkish names are used for the cities in modern Turkey. Unless indicated with a footnote, the translations of the Arabic inscriptions are prepared by the researcher.

\(^{28}\) Turan, “Anatolia in the period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks,” 236.

\(^{29}\) Etienne Combe, Jean Sauvaget, and Gaston Wiet, *Répertoire Chronologique d’Épigraphie Arabe* (Cairo, 1931).
Chapter II

In this chapter, I will demonstrate through historical events, and epigraphic evidence the steps by which Anatolian Seljuks gained their rights to power and evolved into a formal ruling dynasty in Anatolia focusing on the concept of legitimacy as expressed through the language and vocabulary found in inscriptions.

In order to trace the Anatolian Seljuks’ emergence and rise to power one must map out the political environment and existing ruling contenders at the time. The period in question here are the reigns of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I and his son ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II. The Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate was developing from the time of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush and it is not until the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I and Kılıç Arslan II that a certain kind of state building started to take place.

The period of research addressed in this chapter is the 11th-12th century, thus the legitimizing entity here at least for the Sunni world was the Abbasids in Baghdad whose claim to the caliphate was based on their decent from al-‘Abbas ibn ‘Abd al-Muttalib, the uncle of the Prophet. They had legitimacy through bloodlines, which was why the Abbasid caliph, whether in full power or a puppet, continued to be the most powerful “legitimiser”, if we can use this term, and the rightful heir to the Islamic caliphate. This can also be viewed as a form of an intangible competitive advantage.

Since the focus of this study is monumental epigraphy, the emphasis is on the subject of legitimacy through the use of titles. Undoubtedly the strength of a certain military power determines its need to subordinate to others, but sometimes other political and sociological factors necessitated another form of legitimacy, such as through titles. In the year 945 the Shi‘i Buyids occupied Baghdad, installed a new caliph, reduced him to a subordinate, but kept him close to avert a dangerous situation by which the caliph might relocate somewhere else outside their influence.  

The Buyid ‘Adud al-Dawla claimed the title Shahanshah without a caliphal

investiture, but his weaker successors had to seek the Abbasid caliph’s validation for the same title.  

A caliph’s recognition, investment charters, and banners etc. were considered valuable propaganda weapons. When the Ghaznavid ruler Mas‘ud son of Mahmud opposed his brother who was proclaimed sultan by the army in Ghazna, he was sent an investiture charter for the Ghaznavid empire, and the titles “al-nasir li-din Allah, hafiz ‘ibad Allah, al-muntaqim min a‘da’ Allah, zahir amir al-mu‘minin” by the Abbasid caliph al-Zahir. Once the details of the investiture diploma were publicized in Khurasan they proved valuable in helping Mas‘ud in his claim for the Ghaznavid throne.  

The common factor in the previously discussed examples is that both the Buyids and Ghaznavids were strong military entities whose objective was to establish authority over a population that recognized the Abbasids as a ruling power who had legitimacy on a religious basis. Using the Abbasid “Caliphal Fiction” was an easy means to secure the allegiance of a vast population just by receiving a title or having their name called from the pulpits of mosques. The Buyids could have disposed of the Sunni caliph, but due to various reasons they only used him as a figure while they took over secular government. This opened an opportunity for the devoutly Sunni Great Seljuks to take the role of the saviors under the leadership of Tughrul Beg, ensuring a warm welcome from the caliph.  

Geographical authority was generally first acquired by military force then later through trade control and minting of coins. The next step observed after gaining geographical rights of power is the maintenance of kingship. A certain ruler would have to maintain and protect his gained privileges, in other words, document and reinforce his present legitimate powers. Here the final and most important attribute of kingship takes place, which was the creation and maintenance of an ideology. This attribute could be enforced by two means: the first in the form of the literary works of a dynasty, books, Shahnamas, mirrors of princes and chronicles which could be passed around and travel great distances to increase the geographical reach of a ruler’s propaganda. The second was through building programs, which brings us to the subject in question, monumental epigraphy. 

---

32 Ibid., 624.  
33 Ibid., 622.  
34 Mecit, “Kingship and Ideology”, 64.
Monumental inscriptions can be considered as a testament to the existence of a ruler. They are realized either as a part of a well-thought-out building program, or by making extensions to previously existing recently-acquired edifices, e.g. the Sasanian and later Buyid epigraphic additions at Nakhsh-i Rustam,\(^{35}\) or in our case, the Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions added to the castles of Sinop and Antalya.

For the Anatolian Seljuks, the 11\(^{th}\) and the 12\(^{th}\) centuries were characterized by internal and external political chaos. They were fighting on various fronts, exchanging treaties and shifting alliances. The Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate at this time could be considered in a survival mode. After the military achievements of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush, the defeat of his son Kılıç Arslan I in the battle of Dorylaeum was considered a major setback for the Anatolian Seljuks as well as the Danishmandids.\(^{36}\) By the time Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I ascended the throne, he was under the sovereignty of his father-in-law, Danishmand Ghazi, who, according to Claude Cahen, used him to legitimize his rule.\(^{37}\) Anatolia was divided among various powers, namely the Byzantines, Crusades, Armenians, Danishmandids, Artuqids, Saltuks and the Anatolian branch of the Seljuks. Unfortunately there does not exist enough evidence for the ruling activities of Mas‘ud I, other than his campaigns, which are available principally in Byzantine sources.

**Early Anatolian Seljuk Epigraphy**

The earliest epigraphic evidence available from the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud ibn Kılıç Arslan is a copper coin bearing the simple title:

السلطان المعظم مسعود بن قلج أرسلان

The great sultan Mas‘ud son of Kılıç Arslan,

On the other side it has in the middle the bust of the Emperor Alexis I Comnenos (figure 2). In one hand he holds a orb and a labarum in the other.\(^{39}\)

---

\(^{35}\) Bloom and Blair, “Buyid,” 319.

\(^{36}\) Tamara Rice, *The Seljuks in Asia Minor*, 55.

\(^{37}\) Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 94.


\(^{39}\) Parani, *Reconstructing the Reality of Images*, 31, 33: The orb, and Labarum were a Byzantine royal insignia adopted from the Romans. Early Byzantine emperors in the footsteps of their Roman predecessors had adopted the
The minting place and date are not available, but according to the situation in Anatolia at the time, various scholars state that Mas‘ud I ascended the throne in Konya in 1116, while Alexis Comnenus I died in 1118. Following this assumption the coin could have been minted after Mas‘ud ascended the throne in Konya 1116 and before Comnenus I’s death in 1118.

It appears that from the time of Mas‘ud, the Seljuks started focusing on building and unifying their realm in Anatolia. After the death of the Danishmandid Ghazi in 1134, Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud took over Ankara from the Danishmandids, moving the Anatolian Seljuk capital from Iznik to Ankara. Mas‘ud then set out campaigns against the Byzantine emperor Ioannes Comnenus II and the Danishmandid malik Muhammad. After the death of malik Muhammad in 1142, and the Byzantine emperor in 1143, Mas‘ud marched against the Danishmandid prince Yaghibashan, and conquered Sivas and the Elbistan region in eastern Anatolia. He annexed Malatya after the death of the Danishmandid ‘Ayn al-Dawla in 1152, and engaged with the Armenians until they recognized Anatolian Seljuk sovereignty over all conquered regions. Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud died in 1156 having spent most of his reign campaigning, in the end establishing a stronger base for the Anatolian Seljuks by taking back control of Anatolia from the Danishmandids, he also established more secure boundaries for his kingdom around Konya by annexing surrounding lands as well as taking advantage of both the decline of the Great Seljuks, and the death of Danishmand Ghazi II.40

In the next section, I will study the conflict between Kılıç Arslan II and Nur al-Din Zangi in order to observe whether the Anatolian Seljuks had already developed a kingship ideology by the time of Kılıç Arslan ibn Mas‘ud. Furthermore the jihad propaganda of Nur al-Din Zangi will be used to demonstrate how kingship ideology was used as a weapon against Muslim and non-Muslim rulers.

The conflict between Nur al-Din and Kılıç Arslan II was due to their personal ambitions. While Kılıç Arslan II aspired to control Anatolia, Nur al-Din wanted to dominate Syria, transforming the northern Syrian plain to an area of dispute; consequently the Euphrates basin

orb in their official portaiture as a symbol of world dominion. The labarum is a scepter that was surmounted by an eagle in the Roman era; the eagle was later replaced by a cross.

40 Rice, The Seljuks of Asia Minor, 61.
had become their border frontier. Nur al-din Zangi established his power through the call for jihad against the Byzantines and Crusaders; jihad ideology was extensively exhibited in his literary and inscription programs. This claim was sometimes even used against other Muslim rulers such as Kılıç Arslan II. The questions which need investigation here are how strong these claims were and how the epigraphic titles were used to convey a ruler’s ideologies. This also prompts the further question, what were the ideologies of kingship in the case of Kılıç Arslan II? I will attempt to answer these questions using the inscriptions of the two minbars of Kılıç Arslan II, in Aksaray and in Konya. Moreover the inscriptions of the two minbars will allow the analysis of the style and titulature of Kılıç Arslan II and the differences that might have occurred after his ascension to the throne.

Since the early days of Islam, the khutba given from the minbar was used to announce the name of the Caliph, as well as to receive allegiance, and was therefore one of the main signs of sovereignty. The minbar of Aksaray is not dated, but there is a possibility that it was commissioned before 1155 the date of Kılıç Arslan II’s ascension. The minbar was commissioned while he was still a prince, and is today in the Ulu Cami of Aksaray built by Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey in the year 811/1408-9 (figure 3). The second minbar was ordered for the great mosque in Konya after his accession (figure 4).

The first inscription on the door of the minbar in Aksaray reads:

1. في أيام السلطان
2. المعز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين ملك بلاد الروم والأرمن أبو الفتح مسعود بن قلج
3. أرسلان ناصر أمير المؤمنين

In the days of the sultan, glory of the world and religion, pillar of Islam and the Muslims, king of the lands of Rum and Armenia Abu’l-Fath Mas’ud son of Kılıç Arslan aid of the Commander of the Faithful.

The second inscription located on the left side of the minbar door states:
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This is a construction of the prince, the general, the most glorious, the grand master, the just, the splendor of religion, the pole of Islam, supporter of the imam, pride of the people, glory of the state, grace of the faith, pillar of the Caliphate, the glory of kings and sultans, champion of the armies of the Muslims, suppressor of the infidels and the polytheists, support of borders, hero of Rum and Armenia, champion of belief, Alp Inanj Qutlugh Bilge Abu Sa’id, the conqueror Kılıç Arslan, supporter of the Commander of the Faithful, may God glorify his supporters.

The Aksaray *minbar* was constructed during the reign of Mas’ud, thus while Kılıç Arslan was still a prince. On the Aksaray *minbar* Rukn al-Din Mas’ud, who was the actual sultan at the time, was mentioned only on the shorter inscription. His inscription gives his titles as upholder of the world and religion, pillar of Islam, king of Rum and Armenia, and the supporter of the commander of the faithful. The inscription was composed chiefly of epithets of superiority and legitimacy, in which Mas’ud was portrayed as the king of Rum, namely Anatolia, the land of the Byzantines and the former Roman Empire, and the Arman, meaning Cilician Armenian lands from Kayseri to Trebizond. In 1083, Sulayman ibn Qutlumush conquered almost all of the Cilician region including Adana, Mamista, and Anazarbos i.e. the west side of the Armenian Philaretos’s sovereignty from the Taurus mountains to Urfa. This can explain Mas’ud’s claim on Armenian lands. The act of claiming titles for the collective achievement of a ruler's forefathers could be noticed on several occasions. One is the caliph investing Gümüştegin the Danishmandid with the title *malik* and the northern lands, those titles were taken by his son Muhammed after his death without any formal investiture. The building for which this *minbar* was originally commissioned is unknown; according to the *minbar*’s inscriptions, it can be
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understood that the patron was again Kılıç Arslan II, for the first inscription states “fi ayam,” signifying that this construction was commissioned during the reign of Mas‘ud, while in the second inscription we have hadhihi ‘imarat al-amir, signifying that this construction was ordered by the prince Kılıç Arslan II, son of Mas‘ud. As stated previously, the Aksaray minbar was dated to c. 1155 just before the death of Mas‘ud in April, 1155 which can be considered the terminus ante quem date for the minbar.

The brief mention of Mas‘ud in comparison to the elaborate inscription of Kılıç Arslan II might give the impression that Kılıç Arslan II was preparing for his rise in power, and that he might have been appointed by his father as heir to the throne. This conclusion is supported by the accounts of the Seljuk contemporary Armenian chronicler Gregory the priest, who states that as Mas‘ud fell sick he summoned his son Kılıç Arslan, prostrated himself before him and placed his crown on Kılıç Arslan’s head. The chronicler gives the date 1155-56 for this event.

There is no evidence to support any titles from the Abbasid caliph granted to Mas‘ud I or Kılıç Arslan II, but some of the titles in their inscriptions give such an implication. For Kılıç Arslan II, these are qutb al-islam, nasir al-imam, ‘izz al-dawla, ‘undat al-khilafa, and mu‘ayyad amir al-mu‘minin. All these titles can be considered as marks of his legitimacy. Another important aspect in this inscription is the use of Persian and Turkish names and titles, Persian titles include amir al-ispahsalar and pahlawan al-rum wa’l-arman. Pahlawan is a Persian word for hero, ispahsalar is an Arabic version of the Persian word with Sasanian origin spah-salar or spah-badh, a high ranking military officer assigned for the governance or protection of border lands. Turkish names include Alp Inanj, Qutlugh, and Bilka. The earliest example of ispahsalar is in Islamic architectural inscriptions is on the early Islamic Bavandid tomb towers in the Mazandaran region in Iran. According to Diwan lughat al-Turk the word alp means “the brave”, Inanj which is inanc in modern Turkish is “the trusted”, Qutlugh is the blessed, and
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Biłka comes from the Turkish word *bilge* meaning “the wise.” The use of Persian and Turkish titles is an association with earlier dynasties, great kings and epic heroes, a practice which was quite popular among Islamic dynasties with Turkish and Iranian origins. Turkish titles were also used by other dynasties such as the Burids and the Zangids.

Kılıç Arslan II commissioned another *minbar* for the mosque in Konya after his accession (*terminus post quem*, 1156), inscribed with the following lines:

السلطان المعظم شاهنشاه الأعظم سيد سلاطين العرب والعجم، مالك رقاب الأمم عز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين فخر الملوك والسلاطين، نصير الحق بالبراهين قاتل الكفرة والمشركين غياث المجاهدين حافظ بلاد الله ناصر عباد الله معين خليفه

The great sultan, the august shahanshah, master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, powerful over the nations, glory of the world and religion, pillar of Islam and the Muslims, pride of kings and sultans, the assistant of the truth with proofs, killer of the infidels and polytheists, refuge of the warriors of faith, protector of the lands of God, defender of the servants of God, supporter of the caliph of God, sultan of the lands of Rum (Anatolia), the Armenians, the Franks, and Syria, Abu’l-Fath Kılıç Arslan son of Mas’ud son of Kılıç Arslan helper of the Commander of the Faithful may God prolong his reign and double his power.

In the Konya *minbar* inscription the transition in the titles and use of language is evident. With the shift from amir *ispahsalar* to the greatest shahanshah, the specific title *al-sultan al-mu’azzam shahinshah al-a’zam* was used for the Great Seljuk Malik Shah in both his inscriptions on the dome of the great mosque of Isfahan and on the citadel of Aleppo. The title Abu’l-Fath is also a staple in the inscriptive titles of the Great Seljuk Malikshah. Titles such as *nasir al-ḥaq bi’l-barahin, qatil al-kafrāh wa’l-mushrikīn* are closer to the vocabulary used in Zangid
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Inscriptions. The same titles were used in an inscription for Nur al-Din Zangi in Hama dated to 1163.\textsuperscript{60}

In the Konya inscription the elevation in titles as well as geographical authority is evident. Adding the lands of the Franks and Syria points towards the ongoing competition between the Anatolian Seljuks and the Zangids.

Three years after the fall of Edessa to ‘Imad al-Din Zangi in 1144, which sparked the Second Crusade, Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud engaged with the army of the German Crusaders near Dorylaeum, nearly destroying the Christian forces.\textsuperscript{61} Hence, the mention of the Franks can be linked to the second Dorylaeum battle under the leadership of Kılıç Arslan II’s father Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I. At the time, the Great Seljuk Empire was at its end and Syria was under the control of the Atabegs. ‘Imad al-Din Zangi was then the governor of Mosul and Aleppo with an expansionist agenda for the area, which was continued by his son after his death in 1146. The early Anatolian Seljuks had the ambition of controlling northern Syrian lands. Sulayman ibn Qutlumush captured Antioch from the Byzantines in 1084. Setting his sights on Aleppo, he seized the city of Qinnasrin south of Aleppo, but he was stopped and killed by malik Tutush of Damascus in a battle outside Aleppo in May 1086.\textsuperscript{62} In 1149, Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud seized Mar‘ash, and in 1151 he annexed Kaysun, Behesni (Besni), Rab’an, and ‘Ayntab.\textsuperscript{63} These cities were in the northern Syrian frontiers, and henceforth they become the area of Anatolian Seljuk and Zangid conflict.

Concerning the use of Turkish and Persian titles, there is a notion regarding the correlation between the independence of a ruler and his use of Turkish and Persian Islamic titles.\textsuperscript{64} When a prince became a sultan, he tended to drop these titles for Arabic ones, which might be a way to link themselves to the caliphate. When Kılıç Arslan became the sultan, he dropped most of his previously used Turkish and Persian titles.

First, concerning the chroniclers, it is known that there was a jihad propaganda patronized by Nur al-Din, to the extent that it was sometimes even directly pointed at Kılıç Arslan II. For instance, at the death of Yaghibasan, Nur al-Din moved with a great army to annex Sivas and Mar‘ash meanwhile backing his actions with the claim that Kılıç Arslan II was not
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raiding Byzantine lands and that he should wage jihad with him.\textsuperscript{65} It becomes clear that jihad ideologies were used against both Islamic and non-Islamic rulers, sometimes twisted to justify a certain act. This is a situation that is controlled by the amount of surviving information regarding both Kılıç Arslan II and Nur al-Din. Without a doubt Kılıç Arslan II was viewed as a threat and a powerful opponent.

After the death of Rukn al-Din Mas’ud, during the ongoing strife between Kılıç Arslan II and his brother Shahanshah, Yaghibasan the Danishmandid supported Shahanshah who was allied with Nur al-Din. With the help of the Armenians, they attacked Anatolian Seljuk lands on the northern Syrian borders. This dispute was recorded to have been resolved with the help of religious authorities. This is an incident that was recorded by both Muslim and Christian chroniclers,\textsuperscript{66} demonstrating the complexity of the situation at hand and the difficulty caused by the lack of information concerning Kılıç Arslan II’s activities from a contemporaneous Anatolian Seljuk source.

According to Ibn al-Qalanisi, news arrived from Aleppo of the outbreak of fighting between sons of Mas’ud, Qutlumush, and Kılıç Arslan, and that Nur al-Din had intervened in order to promote peace and reconciliation and warn against a dispute which would strengthen their Greek and Frankish enemies.\textsuperscript{67} The same historian continues as follows, “in the month of Ramadan, further news arrived that al-Malik al-‘Adil Nur al-Din had descended with his army upon the territories belonging to Kılıç Arslan, son of Mas’ud b. Sulayman b. Qutlumush king of Konya and captured a number of castles and fortresses by sword, while Kılıç Arslan and his brothers Dhu’l-Nun and Dhu’l-Karnayn were engaged with the Danishmandids.”\textsuperscript{68} This account can be considered partially biased in support of Nur al-Din. It is also misinformed, for Ibn al-Qalanisi clearly mistakes the Danishmand Dhu’l-Nun and Dhu’l-Karnayn as Kılıç Arslan II’s brothers. Moreover it attempts to portray Nur al-Din as a mediator and enforcer of peace for the sake of jihad. This is a one-sided assessment of the situation, for it excludes any reference to the treaties formed by Nur al-Din with the Crusader king of Jerusalem and Antioch, that some chroniclers, such as
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Gregory the priest, viewed as a bribe to have a free hand over Seljuk lands after the death of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud.\(^69\)

There is one account of Kılıç Arslan II in \textit{Tarikh-i al-i Saljuq}, written by an anonymous Anatolian Seljuk chronicler, which can be considered as a manifestation of propaganda against the Danishmandids.

At the beginning of his reign, Kılıç Arslan founded Aksaray, caravanserais and market places. The tyranny of malik Dhu’l-Nun in Kayseri had extended all boundaries; he spent his time drinking wine. The sultan marched with his army against Dhu’l-Nun and in 560 H (1164-1165); he took Kayseri from him and seized all the fortresses of that province and put them under the commands of his amirs. The Artuqids of Diyarbakr read the \textit{khuṭba} in his name and the rulers of Amid from the house of Nisanids came to kiss the sultan’s hand. The ruler of Erzurum and Erzincan submitted to the sultan. In short, he dominated all regions.\(^70\)

The 14\textsuperscript{th} century Anatolian Seljuk chroniclers Aksarayi and the anonymous author of \textit{Tarikh-i Al-i Saljuq} presented Kılıç Arslan II as a ruler whose goal was to unite Anatolian, and northern Syrian lands under his reign, hence his main competitors were the Danishmandids and the counter-Crusaders in northern Syria.\(^71\)

Analyzing the way Nur al-Din orchestrated his powerful jihad propaganda campaign demonstrates how rulers’ ideologies were used as means for enforcing sovereignty, and legitimacy. From the available sources, and materials, it can be concluded that Nur al-Din’s jihad propaganda was a political tool used against both Muslim and non-Muslim contenders. Kılıç Arslan II was as militarily active as Nur al-Din, constantly engaging with the Byzantines and the Crusaders. Perhaps he did not publicize jihad but neither his inscriptions nor his campaigns lacked the element. He was portrayed as a warrior of religion; and a pillar of the borders (\textit{thughur}) which are known to be among the most important acts of jihad in Islam. Kılıç Arslan II might have not needed such extensive propaganda, for he already had a stronger claim to kingship than Nur al-Din. He was a descendent of the Great Seljuks while Nur al-Din could be considered as a warlord or the son of the powerful Great Seljuk Atabeg ‘Imad al-Din Zangi. Thus, the one who was actually in need of a strong legitimacy claim was Nur al-Din.

\(^{69}\) Ibid., 70.
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Regarding numismatic evidence from the reign of ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II there are three coins to be discussed in this chapter.

The first is a gold dinar minted in Konya in the year 1177 with the following inscription:

الإمام، لا لله الا الله، وحده لا شريك له، المستضيء بامر الله أمير المؤمنين، ضرب هذا الدينار بقونيه/محمد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، السلطان المعظم قلج أرسلان بن مسعود، سنة ثلث وسبعين وخمسين.

There is no Deity but God alone, who has no partner, al-Mustad’i’ bi amr Allah the Commander of the Faithful; this dinar was struck in Konya/ Muhammad is the messenger of God, prayers be upon him, the great sultan Kılıç Arslan son of Mas’ud in the year 573/1177-78.

There is a significant difference between this coin and the copper coin of Mas’ud. Here we no longer have a Byzantine emperor’s bust nor any figural representations. The material is of a much higher value, and the most important development here is the mention of the Abbasid caliph al-Mustad’i’. There is no reliable evidence regarding the relationship between the Anatolian Seljuks and the Abbasid caliphate at the time, and determining whether there was a certain endorsement of a title for Kılıç Arslan II or not is not yet possible. Although Aqsarayi briefly states that sultan Mas’ud received a caliphal recognition, unfortunately he gave no further details about the kind or conditions of this recognition.\(^{73}\) As mentioned previously, this coin is dated to 1177; by this time Anatolian Seljuk power was on the rise. Nur al-Din Zangi died in 1174 resulting in the fleeing of the Danishmandid Dhu’l-Nun and Kılıç Arslan II’s brother Shahanshah to Constantinople, leaving the Sivas garrison behind, thus giving a free hand to Kılıç Arslan II to annex their possessions and finally to destroy the Danishmandids in 1175. Although the events unfolded in Kılıç Arslan II’s favor, they did not offer a strong reason for the Abbasid caliph to recognize the dominion of Kılıç Arslan II, bearing in mind that the death of Nur al-Din would have caused difficulties for the caliphate, and that there was another powerful military leader heading the anti-Crusader campaign, namely the Ayyubid Salah al-Din. The only event that completely shifted the balance of power in Anatolia at the time was the battle of Myriokephalon in 1176, which was regarded as a second Manzikert in terms of the victory of the


Seljuks. After Kılıç Arslan II took over the Danishmandid's lands in 1175, the Byzantine emperor Manuel I Comnenus demanded a share of the Danishmandid kingdom claiming that he was entitled to this kingdom as their protector; Kılıç Arslan II refused to grant this share, hence the emperor dispatched a great army to Konya. The two armies engaged near Niksar. Kılıç Arslan II secured his victory by nightfall, when his army trapped the Byzantine troops in Myriokephalon. The victory of the Seljuks of Anatolia was so great that the Byzantine emperor himself compared it to Manzikert, and the booty was so immense that Kılıç Arslan II sent a part of it to the Abbasid caliph. Here we have evidence for a connection with the caliphate so there might be a claim for a title invested by the caliph for Kılıç Arslan II after his victory and the vast booty he sent to the caliphate.

The second coin of Kılıç Arslan II is a silver dinar minted in Konya in the year 1192 with the following inscription:

الامام لا إله الا الله وحده لا شريك له، الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين، ضرب هذا الدينار يعقوبي/محمد رسول الله صلى الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، السلطان المعظم قلج أرسلان، سنة ثمان وثمانين وخمس مائه.  

The imam there is no Deity but God alone, who has no partner, al-Nasir li-Din Allah the Commander of the Faithful, this dinar was struck in Konya/ Muhammad is the messenger of God peace be upon him, the great sultan Kılıç Arslan, in the year 588/1192.

The third and last coin is copper, undated, and with no minting place:

السلطان المعظم قلج أرسلان بن مسعود.  

The great sultan Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud  

On the other side a horseman is depicted holding a spear with his head turned to the right side of the horse.

The gold and silver coins of Kılıç Arslan II are the first surviving of their kind. Moreover the copper coin presents the development of Anatolian Seljuk figural representations, however it does not mention the Abbasid caliph. The surviving coins demonstrate a certain pattern. It seems that until then figural representations appeared only on copper coins were the ones with more...
value, gold and silver, followed a consistent epigraphic formula presented above, with the

*shahada* and the name of the Abbasid caliph, which corresponds to Abbasid coins.\(^77\)

The only monumental inscription of Kılıç Arslan II is placed on the mausoleum he built to commemorate his father. The Mausoleum was in the vicinity of the court of the ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad’s mosque in Konya:

\[
\text{امر بعمارته السلطان المعظم عز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين فخر الملوك والسلاطين، سلطان بلاد الروم والشام أبو}
\]

\[
\text{الفتح قلج أرسلان بن مسعود بن قلج أرسلان ناصر امير المؤمنين اعد... الله له...}
\]

This was ordered by the sultan ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, pillar of Islam and the Muslims, pride of the kings and sultans, sultan of the lands of Rum and Syria Abu’l-Fath Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud son of Kılıç Arslan champion of the Commander of the Faithful (…) Allah for him…

The mausoleum is no longer in its original form. It is possible that the existing mausoleum built by Kayqubad with the mosque in 1219 replaced it. According to Ibn Bibi the mausoleum included the tombs of Kılıç Arslan II, Mas‘ud I, Kaykhusraw I, and Sulayman II.\(^79\) In the *RCEA* the inscription is dated to the year 588/1192, the year Kılıç Arslan died. Comparing the mausoleum inscription with Kılıç Arslan II’s surviving inscriptions previously discussed, the first thing to notice is that the title *shahanshah* is not used and his realm is limited to the lands of Rum and Syria. It is worth mentioning that the fixed title in all the monumental inscriptions discussed in this chapter was “the king of Rum.” This suggests that the Anatolian Seljuks’ main focus at the time might have been to have a formal unified realm in Anatolia.

**The division of Kılıç Arslan II**

In 1186 Kılıç Arslan II divided his realm amongst his sons including his brother and nephew.\(^80\) The son’s shares were as follows:

- Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah (Tokat)
- Nasir al-Din Barkiyariqshah (Niksar)
- Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah (Albistan)

\(^{77}\) Aykut, “Some Coins of Mas‘ud I, Qilijarslan II, and the Maliks,” 177.
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Nur al-Din Mahmud Sultanshah (Kayseri)
Qutb al-Din Malikshah (Sivas, Aksaray)
Mu‘izz al-Din Qaysarshah (Malatya).
Arslanshah (Niğde).
Muhyi al-Din Mas‘udshah (Ankara).
Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw (Uluborlu).

Kılıç Arslan II tried to accomplish a form of centralized state where he was still the sultan in Konya while his sons were appointed maliks, each independent in his own district, but they were obliged to join him and lead the troops once a year.\(^\text{81}\) In 1189, Qutb al-Din Malikshah, Kılıç Arslan’s eldest son, subjugated his father, took over Konya and declared himself heir to the throne. He decided to seize the inheritance of his younger brother Nur al-Din Mahmud Sultanshah the malik of Kayseri. Kılıç Arslan escaped during the siege of Kayseri, and lived a wandering life amongst his other sons trying to reconcile them and seek assistance against Qutb al-Din. Kılıç Arslan II finally reached an agreement with his youngest son Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw, who later set out to reestablish his father in Konya.\(^\text{82}\) Kılıç Arslan II died in Konya after declaring Kaykhusraw as his heir to the Anatolian Seljuk throne.\(^\text{83}\) Qutb al-Din was still the ruler of Sivas and Aksaray; he seized Kayseri from Sultanshah then died shortly afterwards. In 1197 Konya was taken by Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah malik of Tokat, and Kaykhusraw was forced to seek asylum in Constantinople.

Each of Kılıç Arslan II’s sons minted their own coins. The coins of the Seljuk princes were varied. The fact that they were semi-independent in their own province, and allowed to mint their coins led to a demonstration of various styles and approaches by which each of them presented himself. For example Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II’s coin states:

\[\text{الملك القاهر سليمانشاه بن قلج أرسلان}\]

On the reverse is a horseman holding a trident pitch fork in his hand. It has no minting place or date.

\(^{81}\) Ibid., 111.
\(^{82}\) Ibid., 114.
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His brother Qaysarshah choose the title al-malik al-mu’ayyad, Qaysarshah son of Kılıç Arslan. The inscription on his dinar is as follows:

الملك المؤيد قيصر شاه بن قلج أرسلان.  

Al-malik al-mu’ayyad Qaysarshah son of Kılıç Arslan

On the reverse is a horseman hunting an animal with a spear in his hand. No minting place or date.

The coins of Muhyi al-Din Mas’udshah malik of Ankara were the most different in style and choice of title. They read as follows:

1. مسعود بن قلج أرسلان بن مسعود سنه سبع وثمانين وخمس مائة/ العبد الضعيف المحتاج إلى رحمه الله، ضرب هذا الدينار بأنقرة.

2. مسعود بن قلج أرسلان بن مسعود سنه تسعة وخمس مائة/ العبد الضعيف المحتاج إلى رحمه الله، ضرب هذا الدينار...

1. Mas‘ud son of Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud, the year 587 (1191)/ the weak slave in need of God’s mercy, this dinar was struck in Ankara.

2. Mas‘ud son of Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud, the year 589/ the weak slave in need of God’s mercy, this dinar was struck...

The phrase al-‘abd al-ḍa‘if became a common formula used in the inscriptions of Anatolian Seljuk state amirs, who were in charge of a building project in 13th century Anatolia.

But for a royalty a similar formula is found in the inscription of Nur al-Din Zangi in the Maqam of Ibrahim in Aleppo where he is mentioned as:

الملك العادل نور الدين الفقير إلى رحمه الله

The just king Nur al-Din, the one in need of God’s mercy

Mas‘ud also used the title the conquering, al-qahir, in an inscription found on the minbar in the mosque of ‘Ala’ al-Din in Ankara which states:

---
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The omnipotent king, Muhyi al-Dunya wa’l-Din, king of the lands of the Rum and the Greeks, Abu’l-Nasr Mas‘ud son of Kılıç Arslan in the month of, Safar 594/ December-January the year 1197.

This inscription is dated to the year Sulaymanshah II took over Konya from Kaykhusraw and became the sultan, so commissioning this inscription on a minbar claiming dominion over the realm of the Anatolians and the Greeks can be viewed as a sign of ambition, as well as independence. It also justifies the determination of Sulaymanshah II to capture Ankara. Sulaymanshah II besieged Ankara for three years until his brother Muhyi al-Din Mas‘ud surrendered the city in 1204.

Sulaymanshah II while still a prince extended the borders of his principality to Byzantine lands as far as the coast of the Black Sea; during his conquests he also gained control of Samsun.90 Determined to reunite Anatolian Seljuk lands under his rule after Qutbal-Din’s death, Sulaymanshah II captured Amasya and Biksar. Before setting out on a campaign to Georgia he captured Erzurum, thus ending the Saltuk dynasty and handing it to his brother Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah who recognized his sovereignty. Unfortunately due to his short reign the epigraphic evidence for Sulaymanshah II is scarce. There remains an inscription in the fortress of Niksar, which is in a bad condition, as well as few coins. The Niksar inscription is probably the only surviving example for the use of the formula “al-Dawla wa’l-Din” in an Anatolian Seljuk royal inscription. It states the following:

عمل جمال الدين...امير هذة العمارة المباركة...القاهر ركن الدولة والدين أبو المظفر سليم بن قلج آرسلان عز نصره تاريخ محرم سنة أربع وتسعين وخمس مائه.91

The work of Jamal al-Din... this edifice was ordered by the omnipotent, Rukn al-Dawla wa’l-Din Abu’l-Muzaffar Sulayman son of Kılıç Arslan may his victory be glorified, dated Muharram 594/November-December 1198.

89 RCEA, VIII, no. 3509, 217.
91 RCEA, VIII, no. 3511, 218.
There are five coins of Sulaymanshah II after his ascension to the throne three sliver and two copper. The earliest coin is dated to 593/1197, and the latest is dated to 597/1201. The silver coins are all dated with a minting place. One of the copper coins is dated to 595/1199 however the other gives neither a minting place nor date. The silver coins have similar epigraphy with the same figural theme, an armed horseman, except for minor alterations in the decorative elements as well as different minting places.

His first silver coin was minted in Aksaray with the date 1197. Aksaray was the province of Qutb al-Din Malikshah who died after capturing Kayseri from his brother Sultanshah in 593/1196-1197. This chronology gives an indication that Sulaymanshah II annexed the lands of Qutb al-Din immediately after his death. Another silver coin with the same date is minted in Konya, 1197 is also the date Sulaymanshah II seized Konya from Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw. The third and latest silver coin was minted in Kayseri in the year 1201 (figure 5). With regards to figural representation all the coins of Sulaymanshah II feature an armed horseman (figure 6).

As noted previously Sulaymanshah II used the title al-malik al-qahir before he ascended the throne, then this title was upgraded to al-sultan al-qahir when he became the sultan. Sulaymanshah II also used a quite interesting Quranic verse “It is He who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth, to make it prevail over all religions” (48:28, 9:33, 61:9). This is the first surviving example of Anatolian Seljuk sultanic coins with verses from the Quran, which is similar to the surviving earlier coins of the Great Seljuk sultan Abu Shuja‘ Muhammad Alp Arslan who had Quranic verses as well as a full sura (that of al-Ikhlas) inscribed in his coins. Having this verse in particular can give an indication of Sulayman II’s ideology regarding conquest and jihad, for he was immersed in expanding his territory in Byzantine lands since his appointment as malik of Tokat. In addition to his campaigns in Georgia after he became sultan. Nevertheless this was not the first model for this verse on coins. The earliest example for the discussed verse can be found on a gold dinar of the Umayyad Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan, the same verse was also used by the Umayyad caliph ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Aziz. The verse is also used later on Great Seljuk Coins. The dinar of Sulaymanshah II was dated to the year 1197, thus a more contemporary parallel is the dinar minted in Cairo.

---
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(1171-72) by Salah al-Din in the name of Nur al-Din Zangi. Salah al-Din also used the verse as an independent ruler on a dinar minted in Cairo in 1174.

The conquering sultan Abu’l-Fath Sulayman son of Kılıç Arslan, champion of the Commander of the Faithful, 5..

It is He who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the religion of truth, to make it prevail over all religions, it was struck in the city of Aksaray, the year 93.

According to Aksaray Sulaymanshah II was officially recognized as sultan and received the insignia of kingship, the baldachin and the banner, three times from the Abbasid caliph. Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah died in 1204. Upon his death his three years old son ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan III was elected by his amirs as successor to the Anatolian Seljuk throne. In the meantime Kaykhusraw, who had taken refuge in Constantinople with a lord called Maurozomes, was recalled by three Danishmandid princes, to take back his throne. According to Ibn Bibi, Muzaffar al-Din Mahmud, Zahir al-Din III, and Badr al-Din Yusuf, the sons of Yaghibasan the Danishmand, did not support the accession of Kılıç Arslan III, because they were friends of Kaykhusraw. The three brothers were the commanders of the Uç Turkmen; they won over other
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amirs and sent the chamberlain Zakariyya to bring Kaykhusraw back from exile.\textsuperscript{101} Kaykhusraw I was reinstated in Konya in 1205.

In conclusion, this chapter was intended to analyze the rise of the Rum Seljuks in Anatolia using the available epigraphic sources as a guide. Studying the change in the use of language and titles helped to confirm certain events. It is concluded that starting with the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I the Anatolian Seljuks shifted their expansion motives from the old Arabian lands of Syria and Iraq to the lands of Rum (Anatolia). Focusing on uniting their territory in Anatolia and keeping their borders in northern Syria, it seems that they had relinquished the ambitious agendas of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush and Kılıç Arslan I for Syria and Iraq. The development of titles also mirrored their motives with regards to expansion as well as representing the lands under their dominion. In general the reigns of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I and ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II formed the base on which the Anatolian Seljuk ruling dynasty was built. They unified and fortified Anatolian Seljuk lands, and spent most of their reigns expanding their realm. The early coins of Mas‘ud I and Kılıç Arslan II were simple and followed Great Seljuk coin models especially those of Tughrul Beg. Later we see a surge of creativity in the turbulent times, after the division, when Kılıç Arslan II’s sons introduced a variety of coin models and titulature.

\textsuperscript{101} Öztürk, \textit{El Evamirü ‘l-Ala’iye fi’l-Umuri ‘l-Ala’iye (Selçuk Name)}, 97-100; Mecit, \textit{Evolution of a Dynasty}, 157.
Chapter III
Sultan of the land and Sea
(Sultan al-bar wa’l-bahr)

The previous chapter was dedicated to the analysis of the development of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty through the surviving epigraphy, from the earliest epigraphic evidence found in the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas’ud until the final unification of Seljuk lands, which started to take place in the reign of Sulaymanshah II. This chapter will focus on the period which marks the beginning of the apogee of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty, in other words the second reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I and the reign of ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I.

With regards to the surviving epigraphic evidence from the first reign of Kaykhusraw I (1192-1196) there are three coins that will be discussed in this chapter. Although these three coins bear no minting dates, they were classified to the first reign of Kaykhusraw in the Istanbul Archeology Museum Coin Catalogue. The first coin is silver, minted in Konya with no date, and is inscribed as follows:

لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريكله، الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين، ضرب هذا الدرهم بقونيه /محمد رسول الله، السلطان المعظم كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان.

There is no Deity but God alone, who has no partner, al-Nasir li-Din Allah the Commander of the Faithful, this dirham was struck in Konya/ Muhammad is the messenger of God, the great sultan Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan.

From the titulature and organization of the inscription this coin can be put with the previously discussed early coins of Kılıç Arslan II. It was probably minted while Kaykhusraw was in Konya before Sulaymanshah II took over. The second coin is copper, cut with neither a minting place nor date, and with the following inscription:

السلطان المعظم كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان.

The great sultan Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan.

On the other side is the bust of Alexius Comnenus.

---
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This is the second time Alexius Comnenus’s bust is found on an Anatolian Seljuk coin. However the reason for this reoccurrence is unclear; the Alexius we encounter here is most probably not the same Alexius discussed previously on the coin of Rukn al-Din Mas’ud I.

Although this incident might have an economic justification, however in Kaykhusraw’s case other circumstances must be considered. Kaykhusraw’s mother was the sister-in-law of the emperor Alexius III, which is probably why his father Kılıç Arslan II established him as the malik of Uluborlu (Sozopolis) on the western frontiers of Anatolian Seljuk territory.\textsuperscript{104} The dual identity of Kaykhusraw I could have in fact facilitated his rule over a majority of Christian subjects, and having coins with the Byzantine emperor’s bust might have contributed to strengthening his legitimacy. The Byzantine family ties appear again in the reign of Kayqubad I on the walls of Konya where there was an inscription in the name of amir “Komnenus Kaloyan Mafrozom”, possibly related to the lord Maurozomos, with whom Kaykhusraw I took refuge in 1204, and later married his daughter.\textsuperscript{105}

The third coin is also copper, minted in Malatya with no date, and inscribed with the following:

\begin{quote}
المنه لله، السلطان المعظم كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان ناصر اميرالمؤمنين/غياث الدين، ضرب، ملطيه.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{106} Favour is God’s, the great sultan Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, champion of the Commander of the Faithful/ Ghiyath al-Din, it was struck in Malatya. On the other side is an armed horseman.

This coin minted in Malatya might be dated to the early thirteenth century, because Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II captured Malatya from Mu‘izz al-Din Qaysarshah, malik of Malatya, in 1201.\textsuperscript{107} Unless Qaysarshah recognized the sovereignty of his bother Kaykhusraw before 1197, minting a coin in Malatya with Kaykhusraw’s name could not be justified. By the beginning of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century the Anatolian Seljuk realm was stabilized under one Seljuk sultan, namely Kaykhusraw I, except for Erzurum which will be discussed later.

\textsuperscript{104} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 114.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.,116.
\textsuperscript{107} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 115.
The Second Reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw

The second reign of Kaykhusraw coincided with the Latin conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of the Nicaean and Comnene empire of Trebizond.\(^{108}\) The empire of Trebizond was established and ruled by Alexius I Magnus Comnenus from the year 1204.

More coins are available from the second reign of Kaykhusraw (1204-1210), and they seem to have followed a consistent pattern with regards to their style and epigraphy, a sign which implies that there was a more organized, stable state administration and minting program. The earliest three coins are dated to the year 601/1205, two were minted in Konya and one in Kayseri. The earliest silver coin was minted in Kayseri in the year 601/1204 it contains the following inscription:\(^{109}\)

The middle section:

السلطان المعظم غياث الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيخسرو بن فلوج أرسلان بن مسعود.

Surrounding the middle section:

هو الذي أرسل رسوله بالهدى ودين الحق ليظهره على الدين كله ولو كره المشركون.

Back middle section:

المنه لله، الإمام الناصر لدين الله اميرالمؤمنين.

Surrounding the back middle section:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم ضرب هذا الدرهم بقيصريه سنه إحدى وستمائة.

The great sultan Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud. It is He (God) who has sent forth His Apostle with the [task of spreading] guidance and the religion of truth, to the end that He may cause it to prevail over all [false] religion however hateful this may be to those who ascribe divinity to aught beside God (9: 33, 61: 9),\(^{110}\) favor is God’s, the Imam al-Nasir li-Din Allah the Commander of the Faithful. In the name of God the merciful and the compassionate, this dinar was minted in Konya in the year 601/1204.

This verse was also found on the coins of Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II, but unlike Sulaymanshah II’s coins, this time the verse is more accurate and complete, narrowing down the verse choice from the three suras mentioned previously to just two. By completing the missing part of the verse (wa law karih al-mushrikun) the verse could be from either Al-Tawbah or Al-Saff (9:33, 61:9); in both chapters of the Quran the next verse after the one in discussion contains an exhortation towards jihad.\(^{111}\) It is worth highlighting the similarity of this coin with the gold coin of the Great Seljuk Tughrul Beg, minted in Ahwaz in 448/1056, which was inscribed with the same verse.\(^{112}\)

The two coins minted in Konya with the date 601/1204 are both silver, and inscribed as follows:

Middle section:

السلطان المعظم أبو الفتح كيخسرو بن قلج ارسلان

Surrounded by:

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله صلى الله عليه الناصر لدين الله

Back middle section:

المنه الله، الامام الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين.

Surrounded by:

المنه الله، ضرب هذا الدرهم بقونيه سنة احدى وستمائة.

In the two coins minted in Konya the Quran verse is replaced by the Shahada and the name of the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir. Above the back middle section inscription there is a figure similar to the bow found on the coins of the Great Seljuk Tughrul Beg, which was considered histughra.\(^ {113}\) This is not the first time this design was featured in an Anatolian Seljuk coin, it also appeared in the previously discussed undated copper coin of Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II.\(^ {114}\)

The figural representations in the coins of Kaykhusraw are found on two copper coins with no minting place or date with the following inscriptions:

المنه الله، السلطان المعظم كيخسرو بن قلج ارسلان/

- A horseman with a sword in his hand, on his upper right غياث (Ghiyath), and on his upper left الدين (al-Din).

\(^{111}\) Quran, 9:34, 61:10.


\(^{113}\) Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, I, 206; Peacock, The Great Seljuk Empire, 127.

The second coin has the same inscription, but with a different figure on the back (an armed horseman). Two other silver coins of Kaykhusraw are dated to the year 603/1206. One of them was minted in Kayseri, while the other was minted in Malatya; they both are inscribed as follows:
The middle section:
السلطان المعظم غياث الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان.
Surrounded by:
أرسله بالهدي ودين الحق ليظهره على الدين كله ولو كره المشركون.
Back middle Section:
المنه لله، الإمام الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين.
Surrounded by:
بسم الله ضرب هذا الدرهم بقيصريه سنه ثلاث وستمائة.

For the Malatya coin the only difference is in the minting inscription which skips the phrase in the name of god (b’ism Allah), and the spelling of the date is not correct: تلات instead of ثلاث

ضرب هذا الدرهم بمدينه ملطيه سنه ثلاث وستمائة.

This dirham was struck in the city of Malatya in the year 603/1206.

It is clear after analyzing the available coins from the second reign of Kaykhusraw I that there is an increase in the consistency of their style and inscriptions. It is also evident that a unique coin specimen for Kaykhusraw I was developed that included the elements observed in the previously discussed coins, which are the Quran verse (9: 33, or 61: 9), and the phrase “favor is God’s,” (al-mina l’illah). The reoccurrence of the pious phrase “al-mina l’illah” on most of the coins in Kaykhusraw’s second reign, as well as the previously discussed undated Malatya coin attributed to his first reign, and its position just before the name of the sultan indicates that it might have been Kaykhusraw’s signature (’alama), which is a characteristic religious invocation of a sultan.115

As stated previously Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I regained his throne with the assistance of the Danishmand commanders of the Uğ Turkmén. Muzaffar al-Din Mahmud was one of the Uğ Turkmén commanders mentioned by Ibn Bibi; apparently Danishmand princes continued to rule their land under Anatolian Seljuk suzerainty. This statement can be attested by the inscription on the grand mosque in Kayseri:

في أيام السلطان المعظم كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان عز نصره، عمره مظفر الدين محمود بن ياغيباسان في سنه اثنين وستمائة

In the days of the great sultan Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan may his victory be glorified, constructed by Muzaffar al-Din Mahmud son of Yaghibasan in the year 602/1205.

Kaykhusraw assigned to his sons the cities of Malatya and Tokat, the former to ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus, and the latter to ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad. Cahen mentions another son named Kayfaridun Ibrahim, who was in Antalya at the time of Kaykhusraw’s death, but it is not clear if he was included in this division or not. According to Ibn Bibi, Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw gave Malatya to the malik ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus, and the land of the Danishmand with its territories to the malik ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad. However this statement renders some complications, since the original territory of the Danishmandids was in Cappadocia, which was the region including Sivas, Kayseri, and Malatya. Ibn Bibi’s statement implied that Kayseri was put under the rule of malik Kayqubad. He also mentions that he sent the nawwab and ma’murs (officers) to accompany his sons in their new appointed regions. Accordingly the inscription of Muzaffar al-Din in Kayseri could have been either before this allocation or because he was sent as deputy to ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad. Kayseri could also have been kept out of the equation, because at the death of Kaykhusraw I the elder princes went to Kayseri to enthrone Kaykavus.

One can also deduce from the statement of Ibn Bibi the impression that, unlike Kılıç Arslan II’s division, this time the princes were not in total control over their territories. The evidence of coins which were minted in Malatya, the province of Kaykavus in the name of Kaykhusraw reinforce the idea that Kaykhusraw retained full control as the Sultan.

---
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Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw’s Royal Patronage

Kaykhusraw founded the Çifte (Twin) madrasa, and hospital of his sister Jawhar Nasiba in Kayseri. This edifice contains the only surviving royal monumental inscription for Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I. The inscription reads as follows:

في أيام السلطان المعظم غياث الدنيا والدين كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان دامت(...) اتفق بناء المارستان وصية عن الملكة عصمه الدنيا والدين كوهر نسيبه ابنه قلج أرسلان ارضا لكم(...) الله سنة اثنين وستمائه.120

In the days of the great Sultan Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan (...) perpetuate, it was agreed to build this hospital in accordance with the will of the queen, ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din Jawhar Nasiba daughter of Kılıç Arslan may God be content (...) the year 602/1205.

In the previous inscription we encounter for the first time an inscription of a Seljuk female royal figure, i.e. the sister of the sultan with both her name and title. Jawhar Nasiba is buried in a domed mausoleum with a pyramidal exterior inside this madrasa. The titles used for Kaykhusraw are short and simple, similar to the ones used on his coins except for the lack of the title Abu’l-Fath, which is found on some of his coins. Likewise there is no mention of any titles associated with the Abbasid caliph.

In the reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I, Seljuk power was on the rise, especially after they captured the port of Antalya in 1207, and signed a trade pact with the Venetians in 1209.121 The Anatolian Seljuk empire was transforming into a commercial maritime power. The Byzantines were not as influential in Anatolia any longer; neither were the Ayyubids who were involved in internal strife after the death of Salah al-Din. The Danishmandids were now under Anatolian Seljuk sovereignty. Hence the Seljuks witnessed a flourishing and stable era. This is evident since the first grand royal example of Anatolian Seljuk patronage belongs to the reign of Kaykhusraw, and at this point it can be claimed that the Anatolian Seljuks had developed a stabilized realm.

120 RCEA, X, no. 3616, 10.
Anatolian Seljuk Royal Identity: “May Khusraw be just (Khusraw ba dad bad)”

May Khusraw be just (Khusraw ba dad bad) is the repeating final rhythm (radif) from the 30 couplet poem written by al-Rawandi for Kaykhusraw I, which employs a play on the name Khusraw to associate Kaykhusraw to the Sasanian king Khusraw Anushirwan. The work of Ibn al-Rawandi raises the question of the Anatolian Seljuks’ adoption of Persian royal culture, a culture that was brought to its peak by Firdawsi’s epic the *Shahnama*, and was also adopted by the Great Seljuks during the 11th century.

Most of the surviving Anatolian Seljuk history-chronicles belonged to the 14th century under Mongol rule in Anatolia. The 14th century sources and chronologies for Anatolian Seljuks some times implied an aim to position them as Persian kings, and heirs to the Great Seljuk throne, as a way to revive and conserve the glory of a defunct dynasty. This is among the major reasons why these sources should be treated with caution. The difference here is that *Rahat al-sudur* was a contemporary work dedicated to Kaykhusraw I. Although it does not describe any details regarding the Anatolian Seljuks, its contribution in understanding the effect the political situation in Mesopotamia at the fall of the last Great Seljuk and the beginning of Khwarazmi rule had on the Anatolian Seljuks cannot be denied. *Rahat al-sudur* was a mirror for princes dedicated to Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw after the death of the Last Great Seljuk sultan Tughrul III in 1194. Rawandi attempted to place the Anatolian Seljuks as the rightful heirs to the Great Seljuk throne.

Comprehending the composition of the Anatolian Seljuks’ royal identity is quite difficult, fora variety of elements contributed in the development of the dynasty. Furthermore it is very important to bear in mind the lack of sources prior to the 13th century. Did a Persianization movement really start in the reign of Kaykhusraw I? Or was it a matter of having more evidence at the start of his rein, allowing a greater view of what was already existent. The discussion of Anatolian Seljuk royal identity should not be limited to the topic of Persianization, which is the transformation that occurred to the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty as a result of Persian royal traditions being adopted by the Anatolian Seljuk court. The Anatolian Seljuks were neither

---
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secluded from Byzantine nor Persian influence. In fact the existence of a dual identity should be considered, as well as the use of both identities to conform to the requirements of the geopolitical situation at a certain point in time.

There are recorded incidents proving Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I spoke both Greek and Persian. One of them is Ibn Bibi’s account of the visit of chamberlain Zakariyya to the court of Manual Maurozomos where Kaykhusraw was a refuge in 1204. It is stated that Kaykhusraw spoke to Maurozomos, most probably in Greek, before addressing Zakariyya in Persian.\(^{126}\) Ibn Bibi recounts another incident during Kaykhusraw’s refuge in Constantinople. In an encounter with the Byzantine Emperor, Kaykhusraw stated that he was a descendant of the house of Alp Arslan and Malikshah,\(^ {127}\) thus he emphasized that Anatolian Seljuk identity was connected to the Great Seljuks.

Persian influence already existed in Anatolia since the early Turkmen Ruling principalities, such as the Saltukid, the Shah-i Arman and the Danishmandids who adopted the Perso-Islamic model of government.\(^{128}\) This was also observed in Kaykhusraw’s coins discussed in the previous sections, as well as being implied by the names Kaykhusraw picked for his sons, Kaykavus, Kayqubad, and Kayfaridun, which were all derived from the heroes of Firdawsi’s *Shahnama*. The political turbulence of the late 12\(^{th}\) century, especially the advent of the Mongol invasion led to the flocking of Persian intellectuals, craftsmen, and religious scholars to the Anatolian Seljuk court; al-Rawandi was an early example of this. Though not excluding the Byzantine influence on the Anatolian Seljuks, we can infer that the political situation in Mesopotamia may have strengthened the influence of Persian royal culture on the development of the Anatolian Seljuk court. Carole Hillenbrand provides a very interesting insight on the subject of al-Rawandi and the Persianization of the Anatolian Seljuk Court by stating that al-Rawandi wouldn’t have presented his work to the Anatolian Seljuk Sultan unless he knew that it would have been well received and comprehended.\(^{129}\)

According to Osman Turan, Kaykhusraw I planned his campaigns around commercial and economic policies.\(^ {130}\) The Latin conquest of Constantinople, and the new empire of the Commene in Trabzon threatened the security of the Mediterranean and Black Sea commercial

\(^{126}\) Shukurov, “Harem Christianity,” 130.
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\(^ {129}\) Ibid., 160.
\(^ {130}\) Turan, “Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks,” 254.
routes established during the reign of Kılıç Arslan II. The Comnenes blocked the roads to the Black Sea ports of Samsun and Sinop. Samsun was the first coastal outlet for the Seljuks, occupied by the Turkmen of the Tokat region in 1194. Before Kaykhusraw’s second ascension the Turkmen occupied Isparta, north of the Samsun-Antalya route. After receiving complaints from merchants from Egypt who were maltreated by the Franks in Antalya, Kaykhusraw I decided to head towards the town, capturing it in 1207 from the Tuscan adventurer Aldobrandini, formerly in the service of the Byzantines. Kaykhusraw established the province under the governorship of Mubariz al-Din Ertokush. In 1211 Kaykhusraw engaged with the Lascarids; he attacked Antioch after Alexios III asked for his aid. The Anatolian Seljuk army triumphed, but Kaykhusraw died in obscure circumstances.

‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I

According to Ibn Bibi after the death of Kaykhusraw the amirs of the sultanate agreed upon choosing ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus as the next Seljuk sultan. They immediately left Konya to Kayseri, and in five days Kaykavus was brought from Malatya to Kayseri and crowned as the sultan. Meanwhile ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad refused to recognize his brother as the sultan. He besieged Kayseri with the support of Mughith al-Din Tughrul of Erzurum (his uncle), the Danishmand Zahir al-Din Ili (pervane), and the Armenian Leo I. Ibn Bibi recounts that Kaykavus was preparing an army to take Konya, nonetheless he was advised by amir Jalal al-Din Qaysar to resolve the matter otherwise. The agreement between the allies did not last, and Kayqubad was forced to flee to Ankara. Kaykavus besieged Ankara, the town resisted, then finally agreed to surrender on the conditions that they would be pardoned for their resistance and Kayqubad should be sent to confinement, not killed. After arriving at Konya Kaykavus rewarded the amirs who supported him, by granting them high offices. Jalal al-Din Qaysar was appointed pervane, the sultan’s personal assistant who conveys his messages and distributes

131 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 119.
132 Ibid.
133 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 120.
134 Öztürk, *El Evamirü ‘l-Ala’iye fi’l-Umuri ‘l-Ala’iye (Selçuk Name)*, 133.
135 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 121.
136 Öztürk, *El Evamirü ‘l-Ala’iye fi’l-Umuri ‘l-Ala’iye (Selçuk Name)*, 154-61.
favor.\textsuperscript{137} Zayn al-Din Bishara as the governor of Niğde, Husam al-Din Yusuf as the governor of Malatya, and Mubariz al-Din Jawli as the governor of Elbistan.

In 1211, after the battle of Alaşehir, Kaykavus signed a peace treaty with the Laskarids. Once ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus succeeded in putting down Kayqubad’s rebellion, he started a series of annexations. First he expanded north and besieged Sinop, which surrendered on the 1\textsuperscript{st} of November 1214, after a two months long negotiation. The city was won over by the Seljuks, probably due to the fact that the frontier Turkmen had captured the emperor of Trabzon Alexius Comnenus, he was released in exchange for the surrender of the city.\textsuperscript{138}

Scott Redford argued that Sinop marked the beginning of Anatolian Seljuk architecture, because it provided the first evidence for an organized state building project with architects, scribes, supervisors, and a hierarchy of amirial patrons.\textsuperscript{139} The city was refortified from April to September 1215 under the supervision of several of Kaykavus’s notables and governors.\textsuperscript{140} Fifteen inscriptions were added on the walls of the city.

The inscriptions of Sinop provide the greatest early evidence for the administration as well as hierarchical organization of the Anatolian Seljuk sultanate. It could be the epigraphic version of the imagery usually found on metalwork where the sultan is seated and surrounded on both sides by courtiers organized according to their different ranks.\textsuperscript{141} The placement of the inscriptions helped determine the hierarchy of the amirs involved in the building program. The hierarchy was determined on the basis of placement with regards to visibility, as well as proximity of their location to sultanic inscriptions, the titles and the decorative elements. One problem is that some epigraphic panels have been removed, their original location being unknown.

There is one sultanic inscription located on the tower next to one of the two entrances to the citadel. Although this inscription is short, and lacks any grandiose sultanic titles, its prominence is due to its location, and the existence of the pious phrase “gratitude is to God, sovereignty is to God” (\textit{al-hamd l’illah, al-mulk l’illah}) at its end, which Redford proposed the likelihood of it being Kaykavus’s \textit{tawqi’}.\textsuperscript{142} The unusual location of the phrase might be the
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reason why it was thought to be Kaykavus’s signature, *tawqi‘*. Those pious phrases were usually added to the beginning of the inscriptions. But the material used (stucco instead of marble), and the style in which this phrase was added (cramped at the bottom) increases the uncertainty in identifying the purpose for which this phrase was added. Another indication for the importance of this inscription is that it is flanked by lions. The lions were the only purpose-made sculptures on the walls of Sinop, where the other embellishments used were predominantly spolia. The inscription states the following:

عمر هذا البرج أيام دولت السلطان الغالب بأمر الله، عز الدنيا والدين سلطان البر والبحر كيكاوس بن كيخسرو بن قلج

أرسلان برهاان امير المؤمنين، سنة أثني عشر وستمائة.  

This tower was constructed in the reign of the sultan al-ghalib bi-amr Allah, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the sultan of land and sea, Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in the year 612/1215.

There are two titles to be discussed in the previous inscription. The first is “*al-sultan al-ghalib,*” the triumphant sultan which is probably the official title of Kaykavus bestowed on him by the Abbasid caliph, since it is used as early as the year 607/1210-11, his first year as Anatolian Seljuk sultan. The earliest example of the use of this title is on a silver coin issued in Konya as follows:

لا إله الا الله محمد رسول الله، الامام الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين/السلطان الغالب بأمر الله عز الدنيا و الدين

كيكاوس بن كيخسرو، ضرب هذا الدينار بقونية، سنة سبع و ستمائة.  

There is no Deity but God, Muhammad is the messenger of God, the Imam al-Nasir li-Din Allah, the sultan al-ghalib bi-amr Allah ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw; this coin was struck in Konya, in the year 607/1210-11.

The previous Sinop inscription is also the earliest, according to Scott Redford’s reading of the illegible part, he adds the month of Muharram to the previously recorded inscription, thus

---
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dating it to the month of May. The second title is king of the land and sea (malik al-bar wa’l-bahr). The addition of this new title is evidently related to the conquest of the maritime city Sinop, which was the first Anatolian Seljuk official outlet to the Black Sea. Moreover it is observed that the pious phrase, (al-hamd l’illah, al-mulk l’illah), read by Redford is not present in the RCEA reading. As mentioned previously there were fifteen inscriptions on the walls of Sinop; they mention twelve amirs, nine provincial Anatolian Seljuk cities, a scribe, and four architects.

There is a four-line inscription above the main gate, which was probably the main inscription of ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus, because it was the longest as well as being the only inscription effaced on purpose for an unknown reason. In the analyses of Redford regarding this inscription he states that from what remains, one can notice that it contained the longest titles of the sultan. He also states that is it possible to puzzle out the name of Amir-dad Sinan al-Din Tughrul. The only part that remained in a relatively good condition mentions the architect as:

الله عمل أبو علي الحلبي الكتابي رحمه

The work of Abu ‘Ali al-Halabi al-Kitabi God’s mercy be upon him.

The architect has the nisba “al-Halabi” meaning he was from Aleppo. The same architect is also mentioned on another prominent inscription inside the citadel above the main entrance.

The inscription stated the following:

السلطان الغالب ملك المشرق و المغرب سيد سلاطين العالم، مولى العرب و العجم، عز الدنيا والدين غياث الإسلام والمسلمين، سلطان البر والبحر أبو الفتح كيكواس بن كيخسرو، برهان امير المؤمنين في ربيع الآخر سنة اثنى عشر وستمائة، من نظر سنان الدين طغرل امير داد حق من عمل هذا العبد الضعيف حسان بن يعقوب رحمه الله، من عمل أبو علي الحلبي بن الكتابي

Al-sultan al-ghalib, king of the east and the west, master of the sultans of the world, sovereign of Arabs and non-Arabs, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, succor of Islam and the Muslims, sultan of the land and sea Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in Rabi‘ II 612/October1215, with the supervision of the deserving amirdad Sinan al-Din Tughrul, the work of the weak slave Hasan son of Y‘aqub

---
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God’s mercy be upon him, the work of Abu ‘Ali al-Halabi al-Kitabi God’s mercy be upon him.

The first title that acquires attention in this inscription is king of the east and the west (malik al-mashriq wa’l-maghrib). This is a renowned title of the Great Seljuk Tughrul Beg which was bestowed on him by the Abbasid caliph al-Qa’im in 1058. The second title is mawla al-‘arab wa’l-‘ajam; both titles were used by the Great Seljuk Malikshah, the former in the great mosque in Isfahan, and the latter in an inscription in the citadel of Aleppo.

In the RCEA, the architect’s name is recorded al-Halabi al-Kitabi, but later Seton Lloyd and D.S. Rice observed the disposition of the diacritical points, which makes the reading al-Kattani beyond doubt. In this inscription there are three persons mentioned; the first had the title amirdad, an important position in the justice corps similar to a public prosecutor. Sinan al-Din Tughrul’s name is mentioned in the inscription on the main portal as a supervisor. This can be an indication that he was appointed by the sultan to supervise the whole Sinop refortification. This statement is quite probable, first because normally an amirdad might not have had the experience to design military fortifications, and he also possessed a court title which was considered the highest in the hierarchy of titles. Second the two names mentioned after him are proceeded by the word ‘amal, the work of Hasan son of Y’aqub, and Abu ‘Ali al-Kattani. Also the words min nazar imply a supervisory function. Ibn Bibi reports that before Kaykavus left Sinop he appointed a garrison commander, garrison troops, military commander and administrators. Hasan ibn Ya’qub might have been the person providing the material and workforce, while al-Kattani as mentioned was the architect, and vice versa, since the word mi’mar was not used.

Another mention of an architect is found in the inscription of Asad al-Din Iyaz al-Ghalibi the governor of Khunas; the inscription is as follows:

---
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It was settled with the support of God in the days of al-sultan al-ghalib ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, the construction of this curtain wall, the weak slave in need of God’s mercy Asad al-Din Iyaz al-Ghalibi governor of the protected Khunas and (its) provinces, the date of Rabi‘ II 612/August 1215, architect Sibastus of Kayseri.

The following inscription presents an example of the mention of a scribe:

It was settled by the support of God in the days of the al-sultan al-ghalib ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, this tower and curtain wall were constructed by the weak slave in need of God’s mercy, Badr al-Din Abu Bakr governor of Simre, in the month of Rabi‘ II 612/August 1215, written by the poor Yawash of Kayseri.

This inscription is the only bilingual inscription in Sinop, the Arabic is followed by a frame containing smaller five lines of Greek script. The inscription is located right above the main entrance of the citadel known as the Lonca Kapısı. Judging by its prime location, legibility, and the fact that we know from another inscription dated to 1218 that Badr al-Din Abu Bakr was appointed military governor of Sinop, Scott Redford argues that it might have been a kind of calling card introducing the inhabitants of Sinop to their new governor.161

It is worth mentioning that a certain freedom was observed with regards to the length and content of some of the inscriptions of the notables and amirs in Sinop. For example the following inscription demonstrates a different composition:
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The construction of this blessed tower and curtain wall was ordered with the permission of al-sultan al-ghalib, the great, the august Shahanshah, powerful over the nations, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, pillar of Islam and the Muslims, slayer of the infidels and polytheists, pride of the kings and sultans, sultan of the land of God, preserver of the worshippers of God, aide of the caliph of God, sultan of the lands of Rum, Syria, and Armenians by land and by sea Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, may God spread the banners of his sultanate and sustain his kingdom, and the order of his state, the prince, the isphahsalar Husam al-Din Yusuf al-Sultani, and the grand princes from Malatya, may their support be maintained, in the months of the year 612/1215.

Apart from the minor changes in organization and titles, the previous inscription shares many similarities with the early inscription of Kilic Arslan II on the minbar in Konya dated 1156 (see the Appendix).

The inscription of Husam al-Din Yusuf provides several elements that place it at the top of the hierarchical pyramid. The first is the initial phrase, which stated that “he ordered the building of this blessed tower and curtain wall, with the sultan’s permission;” this is the only inscription that starts with this statement. The rest of the Sinop inscriptions, whether belonging to amirs at the top or the bottom of the hierarchy, all start with the phrase, “it was settled by the support of God Most High (itifaq bi tawfiq Allah ta’ala)” The inscription occupies the tower next to the main entrance known as the Lonca Kapısı, containing the sultanic inscription with the name of amirdad Sinan al-Din Tughrul. It is also observed that Husam al-Din omitted the phrase the weak slave (al-‘abd al-da’if), a formula added before all the names of the notables in Sinop.
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The final elements are the military title ispahsalar, meaning a commander in chief in the army, which places him in second position after the court title amir-dad. Furthermore he was allowed to have another inscription adjacent to his foundation inscription, which was a Persian poem praising the conquest of Sinop. Certainly being the governor of a big city such as Malatya, as well as financing two structures, namely the tower and the curtain wall, gives an idea of the large size of his resources.

The final inscription to be discussed regarding Sinop belonged to Baha’ al-Din Qutlugha. The inscription is located below the previously discussed inscription of Husam al-Din Yusuf, which states the following:

لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له محمد رسوله صلى الله عليه، اتفق بتوفيق الله تعالى في أيام وبأمر السلطان الغالب، المعظم عز الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيكاسوس بن كيخسرو، برھان امیر المؤمنین، عمر هذا البرج والبدن العبد المحتاج
الى رحمه الله تعالى بهاء الدين قتله السوباشى بقيصريه وولايات في سنة اثنى عشر وستمائة. 165

There is no Deity but God alone, who has no partner, Muhammad his messenger, prayers be upon him. It was settled by the support of God Most High, in the days and by the order of al-sultan al-ghalib ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, this tower and curtain wall were constructed by the weak slave in need of God Most High’s mercy Baha’ al-Din Qutlugha the Subashi of Kayseri and other provinces, in the year 612/1215.

Baha’ al-Din’s inscription follows the template used in the majority of the notables’ inscriptions on the walls of Sinop. As was the case for Husam al-Din, Baha’ al-Din was allowed an additional inscription as well, this time a Qur’anic quote. As mentioned previously this inscription was in a prominent location, right below that of Husam al-Din Yusuf’s inscription. Baha’ al-Din also had a military title Subashi i.e. a garrison commander. 166

The refortification of Sinop was a sultanic edict but the actual implementation and cost fell on the Anatolian Seljuk amirs. This is evident from the inscriptions, as each one of them mentions the name of the person responsible and the part he constructed, a form of Anatolian
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Seljuk tradition that can be traced to the early 13th century, in which the earliest example is the tower in the fortifications in Konya dated to 1203-4.\textsuperscript{167} Ibn Bibi and anonymous author of Tarikh-i al-i saljuq recounted the orders of Kayqubad for the construction of several military edifices in which the cost was to be divided among the amirs of provinces each according to his wealth.\textsuperscript{168} It also seems that each amir might have supplied their own scribe, for more than one hand were recognized in the Sinop project. Additionally some scribes worked on more than one inscription, such as the case of Yawash al-Qaysarawi, who signed two inscriptions besides the inscription of his master Baha’ al-Din Qutlugha, the governor of Kayseri.\textsuperscript{169} The same applies for architects, as mentioned previously there were four architects working in Sinop. One, probably the Syrian Abu ‘Ali al-Halabi, was hired by the sultan, because his name is on both of the inscriptions in the main gate, and because of the resemblances between the gate in Sinop and the gate of the citadel in Aleppo.\textsuperscript{170} The hire of al-Halabi provides the first case of Syrian architects in Anatolian Seljuk projects.

The surviving inscriptions on the walls of Sinop demonstrate that a certain formula was developed. First was the title of Kaykavus (al-Ghalib) and second was the phrase “the weak slave in need of God’s mercy,” mentioned before the name of the notable financing the structure, in contrast to the titles of the sultan. Amongst the elements of court hierarchy provided by the inscriptions in Sinop were the references to nisbas which Rogers proposed that they may have implied slave (mamluk) origin. The nisba (al-Sultan) provided in the discussed inscription of Husam al-Din Yusuf, and (al-Ghalibi) in an inscription of amir Zain al-Din Bishara\textsuperscript{171} might refer to the possibility that they were or had been slave amirs (mamluks) of Kaykavus.\textsuperscript{172}

Amidst the chaos that followed the death of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I Seljuk rule in Antalya was overthrown by a revolt in 1212. Kaykavus recaptured the city after a one month
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The walls of the city were reconstructed and an extensive *fathnama* was added stating the following:

1. "بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم لاحول الا بالله العلي العظيم"
2.  "ونشهد ان محمدًا عبده ورسوله الكريم صلى الله عليه وعلى اهله وعلوه وسلم أفضل تسليم"
3.  "وشهد ان لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له الفتح العلم شهادة تقدير وتعظيم"
4.  "هذا ذكر ما انعم الله به على خرسانة(خدمته) وعلى (عباده) من المؤمنين منيرا"
5.  "(ونصرهم الله) نصرا عزيزا وفتح لهم فتحا يسيرا"
6.  "ورزق المسلمين فضلا كثيرا وكرم لهم تكريما يسيرا"
7.  "وأتمنى أن يحاولوا نزيه هذه البلدة عن أيدي المشركين"
8.  "وسأل الله أن يحكمهم في جنابيه"
9.  "كان قد افتتحها السلطان المغير من عياث الدين كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان تغمده الله بسوابغ الرحمة والرضوان"
10. "وبعد ارتحاله عن الدنيا سعيدا وانتقاله إلى جوار ربه شهدًا"
11. "وعصى أهل البلد وظهر الكفر فيه ثانيا وعاد الشرك إلى عادة الحادىه"
12. "جادل الدولة القاهمرة معر الملل الباهرة ومعهتم الأمة الزاهرة"
13. "مظهر كلمة الله العلي محرز الملة والدنيا"
14. "مالك رقاب الامام سيد سلاطين العرب والعجم ملك ملوك العالم"
15. "المعتصم بعصمه الله الكافي المعتضد بقدره الله الباقية"
16. "المؤيد من النسيم المتصرف للامام زل الله في الخاقين سلطان البحرين"
17. "أبو الفتح كيكاوس ابن كخسرو بن قلج أرسلان يهان امير المؤمنين"
18. "آدم الله دونه واعلى كلمته وخلد سلطانه"
19. "وضاعف قدره ويطسه فبلغه في الذارين منتهيه"
20. "وأمضى في مصالح الإسلام عزمه وكفى بلطفه كافة مهماته"
21. "فسرب العساكر المنصورة بعد غير محصور"
22. "وجرد عزيمته مجاهدة أعداء الدين وأمضى صريحته في غزوة المشركين وقتل الكافرين"
23. "ونزل على هذه الخطة المستورة في الأقطار المذكورة في الدار"
24. "أول يوم من شهر رمضان من شهر سنه الثلث عشرة وستمئة"
25. "فأحكم بها من البر والبحر وحاصرةها تمام الشهر محاصرة باقيه سمعتها على مرور الدهر"
26. "نصب عليها من جميع حوايلها المجانية واقترا من الله يحسن التوفيق"
27. "وستغرق في الجهاد كله جهده مقيقنا من الله تعالى وفاده وعده"

---

28. واستعان بالله في مداومة المجاهدة ليلا ونهارا لا يذوق نوما ولا قرارا،
29. مجاها، في سبيل الله اتبعه بنفسه لمجزاته وثقه في رحمته بتكفير سبئته وتوفيقه في جميع عزائه،
30. لي أن أتasia الله تعالى يجميل فضله وجزيل طوله انجاز المقصود وانجاح الموعود في نصره المسلمين واعلاء معالم الدين.
31. وفتح لحزمه هذا الثغر يوم الجمعة سلخ الشهير بالزلج والقهر فله في أصبح غره الدهر،
32. وظهرت فيه كلمة الله العالية جعلها الله نعمة على الموحدين باقيه وحرس هذه الحصة بقوته الواقية،
33. واتبع هذا الفتح فتوحا كثيره ومزايا خطيرة،
34. ولا اخلع هذه الدار القاهرة والأيام الزاهرة
35. عن الكرامة المتظاهرة والسعادة المتواترة
36. قام بإبتداء بناء هذه القلعة المحروسة، والغالبة لا زالت محروسة محمية
37. غره ذي القعدة، وبدل جهده في هذه العماره المحصنة المشيدة
38. وتمت القلعة المباركة غره المحرم سنه ثلاث عشرة، وهي مبرد كل أمر وهو مسهل كل عسره
39. جمع الله من المؤمنين والجهاديين طاعين ورائه في يوم واحد من الفتح والنصر عديم
40. وتمت عمارة هاتين القلعتين المحروستين يتوفيق الله في شهير
41. لم سمع انعقام مثل هذه الحسنات وهذه الخيرات
42. ونستناح الله رب العلمين وعليه نتوكل وله نستعين

This transcription of the *fathnama* inscription is a revised and corrected version by Scott Redford of the *RCEA* version which is incomplete.\(^{175}\) Also another inscription, which will be discussed later, starts at the end of the *fathnama* and was mistakenly included in the *RCEA* as a part of it.

The Antalya inscription follows the characteristics of known *fathnamas*. It defines the issue, demonizes the foe, describes the main event, and praises God for the victory.\(^{176}\) At the same time it is a monumental inscription providing details of the two ordered citadels, the name of the patron, and the date of construction.

*Fathnamas* were victory edicts sent to leading officials, principal cities of the kingdom, and foreign kingdoms for the purpose of informing them of a recent conquest or victory.\(^{177}\) The earliest known complete *fathnama* was issued by Mahmud of Ghazna after he captured the city

\(^{175}\) *RCEA*, vol. X, no. 3757, 109-111; the *RCEA* version is incomplete, for many lines are missing and some words were confused.

\(^{176}\) Redford and Leiser, *Victory inscribed*, 101.

\(^{177}\) Köprülü, *The Seljuks of Anatolia*, 25.
of Rayy from the Buyids in 1029.\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Fathnamas} were used by the Great Seljuks very early on in their reign. A letter was sent by Tughrul Beg to the Abbasid caliph after the battle of Dandanaqan to inform him of the Geart Seljuk victory. We also know that the Anatolian Seljuk sultan Kılıç Arslan II issued a \textit{fathnama} after the victory at Myriokephalon, a copy of which was sent to the patriarch Michael the Syrian.\textsuperscript{179} Noting the previous known \textit{fathnamas}, the one on the wall of Antalya is the oldest known in this medium.\textsuperscript{180}

The \textit{fathnama} of Antalya recounts the events of recapturing the city after the revolt of 1212. The inscription gives the date of the first of Ramadan in the year 1215 for the second conquest. The \textit{fathnama} of Kaykavus marks a noticeable shift regarding the organization, titles, and vocabulary of an Anatolian Seljuk inscription compared with previous ones. From line one to eight is an introduction attributing this victory to God; it states the following:

\begin{quote}
In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate, there is no strength except through God, the high, the almighty, we testified that Muhammad is his noble slave and messenger, prayers be upon him and his people and family, it is testified that there is no Deity but God alone who has no partner, the Opener (the opportunity giver), the Knowledgeable, a testimony of sacrament and glorification, this is a statement of what God had bestowed on his worshippers from the believers illuminating…. and granted them the cherished victory and facilitated conquest, and granted the Muslims precedence and veneration, and completed his blessings on the believers by wresting this land from the hands of the polytheists; this fortified port had tempered…. the chests of believers.
\end{quote}

This introduction is followed (lines 9-11) by an account of Kaykhusraw I’s conquest of Antalya, the events that occurred after his death, and the revolt of the city. Kaykhusraw is mentioned as \textit{al-sultan al-a’ zam Ghiyath al-Din}. The titles for Kaykavus start from line twelve until seventeen stating the following:

12- Splendor of the omnipotent state, the honor of the tremendous faith, savior of the flourishing nation,
13- The manifestation of the highest word of God, the possessor of the faith and world,

\textsuperscript{178} Redford and Leiser, \textit{Victory inscribed}, 80-1.
\textsuperscript{179} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 106; for the content of this letter see Redford, \textit{Victory Inscribed}, 85.
\textsuperscript{180} Redford and Leiser, \textit{Victory inscribed}, 80-1.
14- The powerful over the nations the master of the sultans of the Arabs and non-Arabs, king of the kings of the world
15- The one who takes refuge in the full protection of God, the one who is assisted by the everlasting power of God
16- The one who is supported by the heavens, the one who is victorious for the nation of Islam, the shadow of God over the east and the west, sultan of the two seas
17- Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful

The development in this inscription with regards to the previously discussed epigraphy of the Anatolian Seljuks is evident. The improvement in Arabic, the use of prose, rhythm, and the grandiose selection of titles can be an indication that the text of this stone fathnama was written by a native Arabic speaker in the sultan’s chancery. Amongst the new vocabulary are the titles al-Mu‘tasim, al-Mu‘tad, and al-Muntasir, which are all titles associated with Abbasid caliphs. Scott Redford argues that adopting those titles could have been a mean of acknowledging the spiritual authority of the Abbasid caliphs, and allegiance to Islamic orthodoxy. On the other hand assuming the same for the use of the titles, the shadow of God in the east and west (zill Allah fi’l-khaﬁqayn), and the supported from the heavens (al-mu’ayyad min al-sam’ā) is problematic. These titles imply religious authority, and independence from any entity other than God.

The complexity lies in the fact that Kaykavus was a member of the caliphal futuwwa. Futuwwa was a moral code that revolved around the concept of the ideal man, which was transformed later in to a philosophy of conduct associated with Islamic mysticism. In the 12th century Muslim scholars disowned the acts of some of the futuwwa brotherhood groups, deeming the codes of futuwwa as unorthodox. A decisive moment in the history of the futuwwa movement was the interest of the newly acclaimed Abbasid caliph al-Nasir in it. Al-Nasir was initiated into the futuwwa in 1182, two years after his investiture, and in 1207 he subordinated it to his

181 Redford and Leiser, Victory Inscribed, 111.
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185 Goshgarian, “Futuwwa,” 228.
The caliph distributed *futuwwa* garments, which were mainly *sarawil* (wide trousers) to the Ayyubid rulers as a form of an initiation into the *futuwwa*. According to Ibn al-Wasil, letters were sent in 1218 to the kings of the frontier regions inviting them to drink from the cup of *futuwwa* and wear the trousers. Ibn Bibi’s narrative of this event is quite complex, for he mentions that the embassy headed to Baghdad under the command of Majd al-Din Ishaq on the occasion of the conquest of Sinop in 1214. On the other hand, he suddenly cuts the narration with a statement that Kaykavus received the *futuwwa* in 1212, which, considering Ibn al-Wasil’s narration, was two years earlier than other frontier kings did. Osman Turan proposed a solution for this complication by stating that Kaykavus probably sent the embassy to announce his ascension to the Anatolian Seljuk throne in 1211. The caliphal *futuwwa* was probably a new form of Abbasid legitimization rite to regain some of their lost authority. The previous discussion demonstrated that the actual date Kaykavus received the *futuwwa* cannot be determined, but it can at least assert that there was still an interest in receiving Abbasid forms of legitimacy, which is also observed from the use of the title “proof of the Commander of the Faithful.” Nonetheless, the use of the two afore-mentioned titles cannot be explained. The acceptance of the title *zil Allah fi’l-khafiqayn* which is derived from Persian kingship traditions seems far from orthodox unless the work of al-Ghazali is taken into consideration. Ann Lambton states that al-Ghazali omitted any mention of the caliphate while stating that God sent the prophet to guide his servants. He chose the kings to whose wisdom he relegated the welfare of his servants, giving them high ranks as is stated in traditions “the sultan is the shadow of God on earth”, and that person is given divine effulgence, therefore he must be loved and obeyed. He then quoted Quran (4: 59). If this justification is possible, then it can provide some insight on the literary influences used to compose Kaykavus’s *fathnama*, the knowledge of al-Ghazali’s work in the Anatolian Seljuk chancery and the use of Great Seljuk titles, thus contributing to the ongoing discussion regarding Persian influence in the Anatolian Seljuk court.
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The proposed Syrian influence on Kaykavus’s fathnama is not restricted to the superior command of Arabic. Some titles and phrases which appear for the first time in Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions were also found in Zangid inscriptions. One example is the rhythmic phrase jalal al-dawla al-qahira, mu’izz al-milla al-bahira, mughith al-umma al-zahira. One of the earliest examples for these rhythmic phrases is found in an 11th century inscription of the Great Seljuk Tutush In Diyarbakr. The same style of rhythmic phrasing with very similar vocabulary was used in an inscription for Nur al-Din Zangi in the his Mosque in Hama. The fathnama titles might have also been influenced by Great Seljuk traditions. The use of the title similar to “the supported from the heavens (al-mu’ayyad min al-sam’a)” is found in an inscription for the Great Seljuk Sanjar in Mashhad, where he is mentioned as the championed from the heavens, (al-mansur min al-sam’a). Observing the title used for Kaykhusraw (line 9), the word al-dunya was eliminated, and Kaykhusraw was mentioned as Ghiyath al-Din. Bosworth argues that the title al-dawla, as in the combination al-Dawla wa’l-Din, was dropped by the Great Seljuks. Tughrul was bestowed with the title Rukn al-Dawla, but he was referred to as Rukn al-Din, and later Malikshah substituted “al-Dawla” with “al-Dunya”. This substitution, as well as dropping the phrase al-dawla, infers a certain type of independence, and universal rule.

Amongst the new titles used in the fathnama is malik al-bar wa al-bahrayn, king of the land and the two seas. This title was used in Sinop as the king of the land and sea, but in Antalya it has been adjusted to the king of two seas, as the Anatolian Seljuks owned two maritime ports, Sinop on the Black Sea and Antalya on the Mediterranean. It is quite interesting that the title of Kaykavus, al-ghalib, was not used in the fathnama. On the other hand it was probably inferred in line 36, while mentioning the citadel as al-qal’a al-mahrusa al-ghalibiyya. Here al-ghalibiyya might be confirming that the citadel belonged to the Sultan al-Ghalib ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus.

The third part in the fathnama, from line 18 to 20, is invocations and prayers for the sultan, followed by a recount of the events of the second conquest, which starts from line 21 to 35. The last part of the fathnama states the sultan’s order to build this fortress, and its completion, then the completion of the two fortresses in the period of two months (line 35 to 42).

---
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There are three more inscriptions on the citadel wall of Antalya. The first, now lost, was located on a tower on top of the citadel wall, the second is located on a tower adjacent to the first, while the third is located near the end of the *fathnama*.

The first inscription reads as follows:

 fácil 

There is no Deity but God alone, Muhammad is the messenger of God, victory and conquest are from God, al-sultan-ghalib bi’amr allah, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, at the hands of the slave in need... in the year 613/1216.

The second inscription reads as follows:

 fácil 

God the highest had conquered the protected Antalya at the hands of his slave, triumphant with his order, supported by his victory, the sultan of the two seas, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful may his victory be glorified. He commanded his slave the grand prince Husam al-Din Subashi Beg Yusuf to construct this tower in the last days of Dhu’l-Hijja 612/ March 1215.

The third inscription reads as follows:

 fácil 

197 Redford and Leiser, *Victory Inscribed*, 110.
The sultan, the triumphant by the command of God (al-ghalib bi’amr allah), the supported one by the victory of God, the glorified ruler, the august Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, the master of the sultans of the Arabs and the non-Arabs, king of the kings of the world, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, succor of Islam and the Muslims, pillar of the conquering state, the honor of the tremendous faith, rescue of the flourishing nation, sultan of the two seas Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of the martyred sultan Kaykhusraw son of the auspicious sultan Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful.

Inscription number one seems to be following the template used in Sinop by the amirs. It consists of the shahada, the simple title for Kaykavus (al-Ghalib) and the slave in need of God’s mercy before the name of the notable which is lost in this case. The difference between this inscription and the ones in Sinop is the replacement of the phrase ittifaqa bi tawfiq Allah with al-nasr wa al-zafar min allah. The second inscription belongs to the amir Husam al-din Yusuf, containing, with the exception of the fathnama, the earliest addition of the title “the sultan of the two seas” adopted by Kaykavus after the conquest of Antalya. It is also noticed that this time Husam al-Din added the word slave (‘abd) before his name. As previously mentioned this was not the case in Sinop. The question of whether this addition was related to the presence of the sultan or not cannot be answered. The third and final inscription contains similar vocabulary and follows the same rhythm as the fathnama with the addition of the title shahanshah, which is not found amongst the titles used in the fathnama.

The fathnama of Antalya demonstrated a superior command of Arabic script, including rhythm and organization which does not comply with the regular known Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions. For example the use of Aba’l-Fath instead of the usual Abu’l-Fath, and the applying of rhythmic endings such as yamin al-dawla al-qahira, mu’izz al-milla al-bahira etc. It is argued that the superior command of Arabic demonstrated in the sultanic inscriptions of Antalya is actually the outcome of Syrian scribes or native Arabic speakers working in the chancery. D.S. Rice tied the existence of a Syrian architect to the change in the inscription placed on the structure he was working on, by noting the differences between the inscriptions of Kızıl Kule,

and the rest of the inscriptions in Alanya (‘Ala’iyya). The same could apply to Sinop where the citadel’s main entrance inscriptions of the sultan were well organized, with titles that differ from other standard Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions there, noting that the Syrian who worked on the Kızıl Kule was the previously mentioned Syrian architect Abu ‘Ali al-Halabi.

In order to comprehend the difference in the inscriptions of Sinop and Antalya, three later inscriptions are presented to demonstrate whether the development witnessed in the previously discussed inscriptions continued outside those specific projects. The first inscription is from a ribat in Maraş with the same date of 1215 as most of the Sinop and Antalya inscriptions. The inscription reads as follows:

Basmala… the foundation of this ribat was commanded in the reign of al-sultan al-ghalib, the august Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, the most magnificent prince the ispahsalar, the grand, the knowledgeable, the just, may God grant him victory, the one in need of God’s mercy, Abu ‘Ali al-Hasan son of Ibrahim al-Sultani, in the date of the month of Ramadan in the year 612/1215.

The underlined word here, ispahsalar, is written with a Persian “p” rather than the version “isfahsalar” usually used for the word in Arabic inscriptions. The inscription gives a date in Ramadan at the same time as the conquest of Antalya but the title of malik al-bar wa’l-bahr was not used.

‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus modified the Konya hill mosque complex by adding a grand portal to the north façade, and a marble octagonal tomb tower (the only marble tomb tower in
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Kaykavus also added the blue tiles on the sarcophagi in the Kılıç Arslan II tomb tower in the complex. It seems that Kaykavus’s aim was to glorify the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty as well as securing a grand place for himself, judging by the isolated and prominent placing of his tomb tower. Kaykavus died in 1219 before the completion of his project, and his tomb tower was left incomplete by his successor ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad.

The second inscription is from the mosque complex in Konya. It includes simple titles for the sultan updated to include the title “king of the land and two seas (malik al-bar wa’l-bahrayn).” The inscription reads as follows:

In the name of God the merciful the compassionate, the foundation of this mosque was ordered by al-sultan al-Ghalib, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, sultan of the land and two seas Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in the months of the year 616/1219, under the administration of the slave in need of God’s mercy Iyas al-Atabaki.

This inscription, on the main portal of the mosque, was written in the same year of Kaykavus’s death; Scott Redford mentions that Zeki Oral suggested that ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad removed the name of Kaykavus from the inscriptions in the mosque of Konya. This statement is debatable, because Kaykavus’s above-mentioned inscription was placed on the main northern portal of the mosque. Why would he leave an inscription in such a prominent location, if the aim was to erase the name of Kaykavus from the building? The inscription from the mosque in the citadel in Konya applies the new formula for Kaykavus, including the title al-ghalib and “the king of the land and two seas,” but with much humbler titles, and using no rhyming prose.

---
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Another phrase, *bi-tawalli*, meaning “under the administration,”\(^{205}\) is used before the title of Iyaz al-Atabaki. In Sinop and Antalya the formula encountered for the amir in charge of the building, and the architect was introduced by respectively *‘amal* or *‘umira*. It is not clear whether the phrase *bi-tawalli* meant that this person also paid for the construction or the expenses were paid out of the royal treasury.

Inscription number three is an example of the kind of epigraphy and titulature used on portable objects in the reign of Kaykavus. It is on a wooden Quran stand, probably one of the objects commission for the remodeling of the Konya mosque complex. The Quran stand is in the Türk ve İslam Müzesi in Istanbul:

> عزا لمولانا السلطان الأعظم ظل الله في العالم مالك رقاب الامم سيد سلاطين العالم مولى ملوک
> العرب والعجم عز الدنيا والدين سلطان الإسلام والمسلمين أبو الفتح كيكاوس بن كيخسرو برهران
> امبر المؤمنين اللهم اده بجنود الملائكة المقربين كما ادت محمد خاتم النبيين.

Glory to our lord the august sultan, the shadow of God on earth, the powerful over the nations, the master of the sultans of the world, the lord of Arab and non-Arab kings, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the sultan of Islam and the Muslims, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, God support him with His soldiers of cherished angels, as He supported Muhammad the seal of the prophets.

There are two interesting features in this inscription. First the use of the phrase *‘izz li-mawlana al-sultan*, which was used by the Zangids, Ayyubids and Mamluks in their inscriptions. This phrase is used both on portable objects, such as on Mamluk talismanic bowls, and in the beginning of monumental inscriptions.\(^{206}\) It is used in an inscription of Nur al-Din Zangi in the Maristan al-Nuri in Damascus.\(^{207}\) The second feature is the invocation at the end of the inscription stating “may God support him with his troops of cherished angels, as He supported Muhammad the seal of the prophets”. This invocation can belong to the same group as the title, “the one supported from the heavens,” for it refers to the battle of Badr where the prophet was supported by a thousand angels.\(^{208}\)
Ibn al-Athir recorded the death of Kaykavus, mentioning him as the triumphant king, the glory of the world and religion: *al-malik al-ghalib* ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykavus, son of Kaykhusraw, son of Kılıç Arslan, the ruler of Konya, Aksaray, Malatya, and what lies between them in the lands of Anatolia.\(^{209}\) He continued stating that Kaykavus had gathered his army and marched to Malatya with the intention of heading to the lands of the Ayyubid king al-Ashraf Musa to stop him from advancing to Mosul, for he was coming to aid its ruler Nasir al-Din. However due to the advancement of his illness (tuberculosis) Kaykavus had to head back, and he died later in 1219. Ibn al-Athir’s account is not very clear regarding the conflict which is defined more in Ibn Bibi’s account. Ibn Bibi stated that Kaykavus planned to annex the lands of the new sultan of Aleppo al-Nasir Salah al-Din Yusuf II, who was seven years old at the time, and under the guardianship of his mother Dayfa Khatun the daughter of the Ayyubid Sultan al-‘Adil, Salah al-Din’s brother. As Kaykavus advanced from Malatya, she called for the help of her brother al-Ashraf Musa, who came with a large army and forced Kaykavus to retreat.\(^{210}\)

The final group of inscriptions to be discussed in this chapter belongs to the Shifa’iyya madrasa in Sivas. In the year 614/1217-1218 sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus commissioned the largest Anatolian Seljuk hospital and medical madrasa in Sivas. The monumental portal inscription reads as follows:

\[\text{امر بعماره هذه الدار الصحا لرضاء الله تعالى، السلطان الغالب بأمر الله، عز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين سلطان البر والبحر تاج السلچوق أبو الفتح كيكاوس بن كيخسرو برھان امير المؤمنین في تاريخ سنه اربعه عشر وستمائة.}\]

The construction of this hospital was ordered for the gratification of God the Highest, al-ghalib bi’amr allah, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, pillar of Islam and Muslims, sultan of the land and sea, the crown of the house of Seljuk Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in the year 614/1217.

A new title, the crown of the house of Seljuk (*taj Al Saljuk*) was introduced in this inscription. This is the first use of this title in Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions. There are earlier Great Seljuk examples for the use of the word *taj*, such as title “crown of the state (*taj al-

---


\(^{211}\) Yinanç, “Sivas Abideleri ve Vakıfları,” 17.
**dawla)**, used for Tutush the brother of the Great Seljuk Malikshah in the Umayyad mosque of Damascus.\(^{212}\) This title was also used in another form, “crown of the kings (taj al-muluk), in an inscription of Mahmud ibn Zangi in the Halawiyya Mosque in Aleppo.\(^{213}\)

The mausoleum of Kaykavus is located inside the hospital. It is considered as one of the most unique Anatolian Seljuk structures, for the decorative use of brick and tilework in its façade, which recalls Iranian Great Seljuk influence. The inscriptions on the façade of the mausoleum are poetic, one in Arabic while the other is in Persian. The Arabic inscription states the following:

لقد اخرجنا من سعة القصور إلى ضيقه القبور يا حسرتاه ما أغنى عنني ماليه هلك عنني سلطانيه، تحقق الانتقال وبيان الترحال عن ملك وشيك الزوال الرابع من شوال سنة سبع عشر وستمائة.\(^{214}\)

We have been expelled from the expanse of palaces to the confinement of graves. Alas, what good my fortune? My power has perished, certain is departure, and manifest is departure from a realm doomed to early ruin, in the year 617/1220.\(^{215}\)

Kaykavus was the only Seljuk sultan not to be buried in the complex in Konya. He died in 1219, while the inscription on his tomb gives the date 1220. There are different accounts regarding what happened after the death of Kaykavus. Ibn Bibi states that when the sultan died the grand amirs hid his death to ensure a favorable succession and hinder internal strife. Some amirs objected to Kayqubad’s election due to his coarse, malicious, and jealous nature.\(^{216}\) However the final vote was in the hand of Mubariz al-Din Bahramshah and Sayf al-Din Ayaba. The other account is by Ibn al-Athir, which states that since Kaykavus had no sons capable of ruling he sent for Kayqubad, or that the grand amirs selected Kayqubad. Bearing in mind the difference between the dates of the tomb and the death of the sultan, as well as the clue given by Ibn Bibi with regards to Kayqubad’s nature, it is possible Kaykavus was moved from his burial place to Sivas.\(^{217}\) This leads to two questions, why was the marble tomb tower not reused and
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secondly, was the tomb tower in Sivas already there or was it added later to house the remains of Kaykavus? Peacock derived a conclusion based on the observed itinerary of the sultans, which shows that Kayqubad possibly never visited Sivas after he became sultan. With this statement he infers that the burial of Kaykavus in Sivas was a calculated insult.\(^{218}\) Kayqubad is said to have been crowned in Sivas before heading to Konya; it might have been possible he buried Kaykavus there rather than taking him back to Konya. It is more likely that Kaykavus did not die in Konya.

The façade of the tomb tower is signed by the faience craftsman Ahmad son of Bakr with the \textit{nisba} al-Marandi, referring to Marand a small town near Tabriz:

\begin{center}
عمل احمد بن بكر المرندي.\(^{219}\)
\end{center}

The work of Ahmad son of Bakr al-Marandi.

The Persian inscription is as follows:

\begin{center}
در حجان شاهان بسي نورد كردون ملك بنكريدا كنون بنات النعش وار ازدست مرك، تير سانپروين كسل بود
وسمان حوزا شكار نيرها شان شاخ ونيرها شان تار تار.\(^{220}\)
\end{center}

The existence of a Persian poem on the tomb of Kaykavus is very unusual, for it does not comply with the surviving models of 13\textsuperscript{th} century Anatolian Seljuk royal burial inscriptions. A comparable specimen is found on the Great Seljuk tomb tower of Mu’mina Khatun.\(^{221}\) There is not enough evidence available to determine the identity of the poet. Regarding the inscriptions in Sinop and Antalya, there is the idea of connecting the superior Arabic inscriptions to the origin of the architect working on the building. But the buildings encountered were all fortifications with semi-royal patronage, as most of them were financed by notables. In this situation we have the tomb of a sultan. Also there is the association of the word \textit{‘amal} with the architects. Oktay Aslanapa mentioned al-Marandi as the faience craftsman,\(^{222}\) but there might be a possibility he was the builder of the tomb tower. The Persian poetry doesn’t have to be necessarily connected to al-Marandi. Ibn Bibi mentions in his account of the death of Kaykavus that among the figures involved in the succession decision process was Hamza ibn Mu’ajjad al-Tughra’i, who in the art
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of writing and poem composition had reached great heights, and amir-i ‘Arid who was a second Firdawsi in the composition of *mathnawis*. The Tughra’i was the head of the chancery, and bearing in mind that the official language of the Anatolian Seljuk court administration was Persian, and with the importance of the patron’s status, the possibility of the poetry being written by a member of the chancery should not be ruled out.

As a result of the geographic authority the Seljuks of Anatolia attained during the second reign of Kaykhusraw there was a boost in their patronage. Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw sought to maintain his authority by controlling trade routes. This plan was continued by ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus through the annexation and conquest of the maritime cities and the formation of trade pacts with entities such as the Venetians. By the end of the reign of Kaykavus the Seljuks of Anatolia were a strong maritime power. We witnessed the development in titles from the reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw to the beginning of ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus, then the change that occurred after the conquest of Sinop with the culmination of the use of grandiose universal titles in Antalya. Inscriptional evidence from Sinop and Antalya showed an improvement in the language and organization of sultanic inscriptions, which might have indicated the movement of scribes and architects from Syria. The Anatolian Seljuk standard formulae of inscriptions returned gradually after Antalya with minor changes viewed in both the inscriptions from the mosque in Konya and the hospital in Sivas.
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Chapter IV

The Golden Reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad

لم تحمل الأرض ملكا مثله ولا أطلته السماوات العلي

Neither the lands have carried nor the heavens have witnessed such a king.

This verse is from a poem written by Ibn Bibi in his chronicle *al-Awamir al-‘ala’iyya*, describing the Anatolian Seljuk sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I. Ibn Bibi narrated Anatolian Seljuk history with a focus on the reign of Kayqubad, designating him as a model Seljuk sultan. Kayqubad’s reign was portrayed as one of military conquests and expansions, including campaigns in Crimea and the Cilician Armenian territories. The reign of Kayqubad also witnessed a flourishing cultural sphere; he welcomed refugee poets, scholars, and supported literary patronage. A testament to this is the thirty volumes *Saljuqnama* written by the court poet al-Qani’i, today lost apart from the extracts found in Ibn Bibi’s work. Kayqubad also commissioned the poet Dahhani to write a *Shahnama* modeled on Firdawsi’s. Both al-Qani’i and al-Dahhani came as refugees to the court of ‘Ala’ al-Din fleeing from the Mongol invasion, as they clarified in the introductions of their works or in narratives of other surviving accounts. Another example is the father of the renowned chronicler Ibn Bibi, who was received in the court of Kayqubad after the fall of the Khwarazmshah Muhammad. Kayqubad also extended invitations to Islamic scholars and preachers, such as Baha’ al-Din Muhammad Walad, and his son Jalal al-Din al-Rumi.
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‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I

The stability and the acquisition of commercial ports attained during the reigns of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw and ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus paved the way for the increase in commerce, which provided the resources for expansion, as well as architectural patronage. Kayqubad is represented in later medieval chronicles as the most distinguished Anatolian Seljuk ruler. Claude Cahen argues that this reputation is owed in part to the fact that Kayqubad was the last independent powerful Anatolian Seljuk sultan, who fortunately died before the Mongol advance on Anatolia, and the Seljuk defeat in the battle of Köse Dağ under the leadership of Kaykhusraw II.229 Kayqubad completed the plan carried out by his father and later by his brother Kaykavus of securing commercial routes both on land and sea.

Ibn Bibi mentions that in the beginning of Kayqubad’s reign, he sent amir Husam al-Din Chupan to Crimea, and Mubariz al-Din Chavli and Comnenus on a campaign to Cilicia.230 Moreover Mubariz al-Din Ertukush was dispatched on a campaign to attack the coastal region east of Antalya which ended with the capture of forty castles.231 The campaign in Crimea was to secure the trade route to Russia, while the campaign on the coast of Antalya was to acquire the port of Kalon-oros, later renamed al-‘Ala’iyya.232 Ibn Bibi testified that during an excursion around Konya, Kayqubad commanded that the cities of Konya and Sivas should be fortified. He then rode around the town with his amirs inspecting and giving instructions regarding where the towers, moats, gates, and curtain walls should be placed. Kayqubad announced that four towers would be financed by the treasury, and the rest of the expenses would be divided amongst state amirs. Ibn Bibi continues by adding that a farman, royal edict, was to be sent to the amir-i majlis in Sivas informing him that with the support of the amirs of the region, Sivas would be fortified.233 One hundred and forty amirs, governors, and state officials provided the walls of Konya with one hundred and forty towers.234

The walls of Konya were decorated with verses from Quran, hadith, and quotations from the Shahnama.235 Moreover the walls were adorned with Hellenistic statues, a sarcophagus with
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a scene of Alexander in Skiros, twenty lion figures, as well as double headed eagles. The entrances were flanked at the top by two angel figures. The winged figures are comparable to the victories flanking the arch of Constantine, but in terms of style and dress they carry a much greater resemblance to the angels depicted in Persian manuscripts. Few of the decorative elements, such as the angels now housed in the Ince Minare Madrasa Museum (figure 7), and a lion in the Islamic Art Museum in Istanbul (figure 8), have survived. The combination of the elements used on the walls turns it into a very interesting blueprint for Anatolian Seljuk royal identity.

‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad completed the Great Mosque complex in Konya, which was started in the second half of the 12th century by Kilic Arslan II in the year 1220, as stated in the inscription above the main portal. The inscription reads as follows:

بسم الله ورسول الله، تم هذا بيت السلطان المعظم علاء الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيقباد بن السلطان السيد
الشهيد كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان بن مسعود، ناصر أمير المؤمنين علي يد عبد الفقير المنتحل إلى رحمه الله أياز متولي
الاتابكي سنة سبع عشر وستمائة.

In the name of God, and peace on the messenger of God, this house of God was completed, the great sultan ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of the auspicious, martyred sultan Kaykhusraw son of Kilic Arslan son of Mas‘ud, supporter of the commander of the faithful, at the hand of the poor slave in need of God’s mercy Iyaz mutawalli al-Atabaki, the year 617/1220.

In the previous inscription Iyaz al-Atabaki is mentioned as mutawalli, which means he was the person assigned to administrate the construction project. It’s not clear if the word mutawalli here meant a position due to its location in the inscriptions, as it usually comes before the name of the person, and in the form bi-tawalli. However the use of the phrase, at the hand of (‘ala yad), which implied the active participation of Iyaz in the construction, probably as contractor, strengthens the probability that mutawalli was meant here as a position. Moreover
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Iyaz al-Atabaki was also mentioned as the *mutawalli* in the previously discussed Konya inscription from the reign of Kaykavus.

The Kayqubad Konya complex project provides another example of a Syrian architect who was employed in the construction of the mosque. The architect’s name is Muhammad ibn Khawlan al-Dimishqi, whose name is recorded in an inscription on the main portal. The inscription reads as follows:

المتولي اياز الاتابكي، عمل محمد بن خولان الدمشقي.\(^{240}\)

The administrator Iyaz al-Atabaki, the work of Muhammad son of Khawlan of Damascus.

Kayqubad fortified the cities of Sivas and Kayseri as well. The main portal inscription of the citadel of Sivas reads as follows:

امر بعماره هذه القلعة المباركة السلطان علاء الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيقباد ابن كيخسرو برھان امير المؤمنین في تاريخ سنه احدی وعشرين وستمانة.\(^{241}\)

The foundation of this blessed fortress was commanded by the sultan, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful in the date of the year 621/1224.

The inscription on the citadel of Kayseri reads as follows:

تمت هذه العمارة المباركة بأيام السلطان المعظم الشاهنشاه الأعظم سيد سلاطین العالم، علاء الدنيا والدين ابی الفتح كيقباد بن كيخسرو، برھان امير المؤمنین في شهر سنه احدی عشرين وستمانة.\(^{242}\)

The construction of this blessed edifice was completed in the reign of the exalted sultan the august Shahanshah, the master of the sultans of the world, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in the months of the year 621/1224.
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Ibn Bibi mentions that Kayqubad began the conquest of the world with Kalon-oros.\textsuperscript{243} In 1221 ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad captured the city of Kalon-oros, modern Alanya. Alanya was an important maritime port; the surrender of Alanya was negotiated just like the case of Sinop and it was later renamed “al-‘Ala’iyya,” after ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad. Mubariz al-Din Ertukush negotiated with Kir Fard, the lord of the town, and reached a consensus for surrendering the city. Kir Fard was allotted an \textit{iqta} ‘ by Kayqubad in 1223.\textsuperscript{244} The Seljuks began rebuilding the walls of Alanya five years after the surrender of the city. The construction was concentrated in the port area, where a \textit{tersane}, a ship yard, was built. A triangular area between the base of the castle and the sea was enclosed by walls with a massive red tower known as the Kızıl Kule. The architect of this tower was the Syrian Abu ‘Ali al-Kattani al-Halabi.\textsuperscript{245} Apart from a few exceptions, the inscriptions in Alanya were carved on reused antique marble slabs, and sawed-off columns.\textsuperscript{246} Compared to Sinop and Antalya, there are no Seljuk inscriptions on the walls of Alanya; they are found only on the tower and in the enclosure area which contains ten inscriptions in the name of Kayqubad.\textsuperscript{247}

The inscription on the Red Tower states the following:

\begin{quote}
امر بعماره هذا البرج المبارك مولانا السلطان المعظم الشاهنشاه الأعظم، مالك رقاب الامم، سلطان سلاطين العالم حامي بلاد
الله، حافظ عباد الله، علاء الدنيا والدين غياث الإسلام والمسلمين محي العدل في العالمين، منصف المظلومين من الطالبين،
ظل الله في الأرضين جلال الدولة القاهرة مغيث الامه الباهرة محي العدل والانصاف، سلطان البر والبحرين، كهف التقلين
محز الخاقنين نازع ال سلوق سيد الملوك والسلاطين أبو الفتح كيقباد بن كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان، بران امير المؤمنين خلد
الله سلطانه في غرة ربيع الآخر سنن ثث وعشرين وستمائة.
\end{quote}

The foundation of this blessed tower was commanded by our lord the great sultan the august Shahanshah, powerful over the nations, sultan of the sultans of the world, defender of the lands of God, protector of the worshippers of God, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the succor of Islam and the Muslims, reviver of justice in the worlds, equitable to the oppressed against the oppressors, the shadow of God in the two lands, the glory of the

\textsuperscript{243} Mecit, \textit{Evolution of a Dynasty}, 202
\textsuperscript{244} Ibid., 203.
\textsuperscript{245} Redford, “Medieval Arsenals in Anatolia,” 551.
\textsuperscript{246} Lloyd and Rice, \textit{Alanya (‘Ala’iyya)}, 50.
\textsuperscript{247} Redford, “Medieval Arsenals in Anatolia,” 552.
\textsuperscript{248} Lloyd and Rice, \textit{Alanya (‘Ala’iyya)}, 50.
conquering state, rescuer of the glorious nation, reviver of justice and equity, sultan of the
land and two seas, refuge of all creations (men and spirits), the guardian of the East and
West, the crown of the house of Seljuk, master of the kings and sultans, Abu’l-Fath
Kayqubad, son of Kaykhusraw, son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the
Faithful, may God perpetuate his rule on, the 1st of Rabi‘ II 623/March 31st 1226.

The inscription is meticulously organized and well written with a superior command of
Arabic. The choice of titles and invocations used for the sultan are quite elaborate. The
inscription also employs some of the vocabulary and titles previously observed in the
inscriptions of Kaykavus in Antalya and Sinop. Some titles were used in the Antalya fathnama,
such as “the shadow of God in the two worlds, the sultan of the land and the two seas.” The same
words al-bahirah and al-qahira were used as rhythmic phrases in Antalya. Also the use of the
phrase “the crown of the house of Seljuk” (taj al saljuq) was initially used in the portal
inscription of the hospital of Kaykavus in Sivas dated to 1220. The prose in this inscription is
skillfully developed and involves some creativity that distinguishes it from the rest of the
inscriptions in Alanya. The title “refuge of all creations” (kahf al-thaqalin) was used by the Great
Seljuk Muhammad son of Mas‘ud in the tomb of the Imam Rizain Mashhad.250

In the previous chapter a comparison highlighted the similarities between the Konya
minbar inscription of Kılıç Arslan II dated to 1156 and the inscription of Husam al-Din Yusuf
for ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus in Sinop dated to 1215. The resemblance is also observed here in the
Red Tower inscription of Alanya, where the titles used for Kayqubad again correspond to the
titles and formula from the inscription of Kılıç Arslan II. For example the title, “the protector of
the lands of God” (hami bilad allah) corresponds to the title, “preserver of the lands of God”
(hafiz bilad allah) in the inscription of Kılıç Arslan II. The two phrases are followed by “hafiz
‘ibad allah” in Kayqubad’s inscription, and “nasir ‘ibad allah” in Kılıç Arslan II’s. The two
inscriptions start with the title that became a principle element in Anatolian Seljuk royal
inscriptions, which is “the great sultan the august Shahanshah” (al-sultan al-mu’azzam al-
Shahanshah al-a’zam).” This form of titulature was common in the inscriptions of the Great
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Seljuk sultan Malikshah in Isfahan, as well as in Aleppo, and Diyarbakr. In the same inscription of Malikshah in Aleppo he is mentioned as Jalal al-dawla, a title which was also used in this inscription for Kayqubad. The titles in the Kızıl Kule inscription also correspond to some of the titles used in an inscription for Nur al-Din Zangi in the mosque of Hama. The reciprocal titles between the two inscriptions are “reviver of justice in all creation” (muhyi al-‘adl fi ‘l-‘alamīn), “refuge of the oppressed against the oppressors (munsif al-mazlumin min al-zalimin),” and a very similar rhyming phrase, “glory of the conquering state, succor of the glorious nation (jalal al-dawla al-qahira mughith al-umma al-bahira).” The previous analysis of the Red Tower inscription and the inscription of Kılıç Arslan II, as well as earlier Great Seljuk and Zangid inscriptions highlighted certain influences on Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions. The previously discussed resemblance between the early Anatolian Seljuk titles present in the Konya minbar inscription of Kılıç Arslan II to the Great Seljuk Malikshah’s inscriptions from Syria could be an indication of a much earlier Anatolian-Syrian influence.

There is a plaque to the south of the single entrance to the tower with the name of the architect:

عمل أبو علي بن ابی الرخا بن الکتاني الحلبي رحمه الله.

The work of Abu ‘Ali son of Abul’-Rakha son of al-Kattani of Aleppo may God grant him mercy.

In the previous chapter, the appearance of the superior command of Arabic, developed vocabulary and titles used in the sultanic inscriptions of Sinop and Antalya were discussed in the context of the involvement of architects and scribes from Syria, or with Arabic as their native tongue. The same argument is emphasized here with the fact that the only building with the highly developed Arabic inscriptions also had the signature of a Syrian architect, namely Abu ‘Ali al-Halabi. This was analyzed by D.S. Rice, who concluded that the style of the inscription and the quality of the craftsmanship in the Red Tower was superior to any other structure in Alanya, with the addition that the Syrian origin of the architect was certain.
The similarities between the previous inscription from Alanya and the inscriptions in Antalya make further analysis essential. It is worth mentioning that before building the wall in Alanya Kayqubad built a fortification wall in Antalya in the year 1225. The constructions in Alanya took place five years after the surrender of the city, and they all date from 1226-1228.\textsuperscript{255} It was observed that some of Kayqubad’s earlier Antalya inscriptions were influenced by Kaykavus’ inscriptions there. This influence might have been extended to Alanya, affecting the choice of vocabulary and titles.

The inscriptions of Kayqubad featured new additions as well as demonstrating an interesting mix of titles borrowed from all previous Anatolian Seljuk epigraphic titles. This observation might actually allow the development of the idea concerning the existence of a developed court chancery which preserved previous work. This is also strengthened by the fact that the Anatolian Seljuk formulae for titles were similar to those of the Great Seljuks, found in Syria from the time of Kılıç Arslan II.

Kayqubad adopts in his inscriptions in Antalya the title “king of the lands and the two seas,” as well as the pious phrase “favor is God’s” (\textit{al-mina l’-illah}). This phrase was used on most of the coins from the second reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I, a phenomenon discussed in chapter three.

On the north entrance to the shipyard an inscription is carved under a pointed arch. The inscription reads as follows:

\textit{المنه لله، السلطان الأعظم شاهنشاه المعظم علاء الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيقباد ابن كيخسروابن قلج أرسلان قسيم امير المؤمنين.}\textsuperscript{256}

Favor is God’s, the august sultan the great Shahanshah, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, the partner of the Commander of the Faithful.

In the inscription on the entrance of the shipyard presented above Kayqubad used the title, “partner of the commander of the faithful (\textit{qasim amir al-mu’minin}),” which was a change from the usually applied “proof of the Commander of the Faithful (\textit{burhan amir al-mu’minin})”,
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or “champion of the Commander of the Faithful (nasir amir al-mu’min).” Al-Qalqashandi arranged the titles connected to the Abbasid caliph that were adopted by or bestowed on sultans and kings, such as “proof of the commander of the faithful,” with regards to their hierarchy of status. In his arrangement the title “qasim amir al-mu’min” was the highest, and could only be borne by a son of the caliph or certain neighboring Muslim princes. \(^{257}\) Anatolian Seljuk ties with the caliphate could be considered closer from the 12\(^{th}\) century onwards. Ibn al-Athir mentions that the caliph al-Nasir was married to a daughter of Kılıç Arslan II, Saljuqa Khatun, of whom he was very fond. \(^{258}\) Ibn Bibi stated that when the news of Kayqubad’s ascension reached the caliph, he sent the renowned Sufi sheikh al-Suhrawardi to Anatolia with the sultan’s diploma for the lands of Rum and insignia of rule. \(^{259}\) The Abbasid caliph al-Nasir later sent another envoy asking for one thousand Anatolian Seljuk warriors to aid against the Mongol forces, who had defeated the Khwarazmshah and were heading towards Baghdad. \(^{260}\) Kayqubad accepted the caliph’s request, and sent five thousand fully equipped Seljuk soldiers with provisions to last a year to Baghdad. The fact that Kayqubad sent four thousand troops more than what was requested with provisions could be viewed as a demonstration of power, as well as loyalty to the Abbasid caliph. Lastly, should the events mentioned be confirmed, they could all contribute to validate the possibility of the bestowal of the title “partner of the Commander of the Faithful (qasim amir al-mu’min).”

There is a fragment of a fine inscription in Persian reused in a fountain south west of the Kızıl Kule, with the following:

(الس) لطان الأعظم شا (هنشاه...)، (س) لطان الحق كشوار كشای.

The august sultan Shahanshah...the sultan of justice, the conqueror of the regions.

This inscription contains the title “kishvar gushay,” which Lloyd and Rice suggested corresponded to muhrizz al-khafiqayn observed earlier in the Red Tower inscription. \(^{262}\) In the previous chapter Persian influence in Anatolia was discussed in the context of the intellectual
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migration that occurred from Iran and Mesopotamia to Anatolia. The example given then was the author of the mirror for princes Rahat al-sudur, al-Rawandi, who dedicated his work to Kaykhusraw I. In a poem written to praise Kaykhusraw al-Rawandi addresses him in Persian as the conqueror of ten lands: “dah kishvar gushay.”

The extent of the availability of Rahat al-sudur in Seljuk Anatolia, which might affirm its influence, cannot be confirmed, but there is a possibility it was acknowledged at least in the Anatolian Seljuk court milieu. The only surviving copy of Rahat al-sudur was copied in mid-April 1238 by al-Hafiz Hajji Ilyas, whose son Abu Sa‘id ibn Ilyas al-Hafiz was noted amongst the witnesses of the waqfiyya of the state vizier Jalal al-Din Karatay dated 1253-4. The mirror for princes was copied in the troubled times of the reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II, which will be discussed later in detail.

Although the pious phrase repeated in the inscriptions of Kayqubad in Antalya and Alanya is “favor is God’s” (al-mina li’l-lah), the likelihood that this was Kayqubad’s signature (tawqi’) cannot be concluded. In the two citadels in Alanya there was only one inscription added on one of the citadels, which reads as follows:

المستند على الله، السلطان المعظم علاء الدنيا والدين سلطان البرين والبحرين أبو الفتح كيقباد بن كيخسرو برھان امیر المؤمنين.

The one dependent on God, the great sultan ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the sultan of the two lands and the two seas, Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the commander of the faithful.

The appearance of another pious phrase in an inscription placed alone on the citadel in Alanya raises the option of assuming that it might have been the signature of Kayqubad. The phrase al-mustanid ‘ala Allah is also a bit closer to the composition of signatures used by the Great Seljuks in their tughras. For example Malikshah used the phrase “I adhered to God”
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(i’itasam bi’llah), while Sultan Sanjar’s signature was “in the name of God I rely on God” (bism allah tawakalt ‘ala allah).268 Unfortunately not much is known about the signatures of the Anatolian Seljuks, except that they probably did not continue the figural tradition of tughras i.e. they did not use symbols.269 From the few available sources, we know that the signature of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II, found in one of the waqfiyyas, might have been “huwwa al-‘ali,” while Ibn Bibi stated that it was “al-mulk li’llah.”270 Moreover Osman Turan mentioned that the word sultan in red ink functioned as a tughra in Anatolian Seljuk documents, especially on letters sent to Christian rulers.271 A poetic letter (mathnawi) sent by Kaykhusraw I to sheikh Majd al-Din Ishaq to summon him to his court was headed by the phrase “mufattih al-bab.”272

Caravanserais

The increase of Anatolian Seljuk commercial outlets and routes was accompanied by the emergence of royal caravansaries on the main roads, between the ports as well as in internal Anatolia. ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad founded the Alara Han in 1231; on his return from Alanya to Antalya Kayqubad noticed the castle of Alara, which belonged to a brother of Kir Fard. The castle surrendered to Kayqubad, then the city was fortified, and a han was built in 1231.

The Alara Han bears this inscription:

العظم(...) شاهنشاه المعظم مالك رقاب الامم، سيد سلاطين العرب والعجم سلطان الحق، كشار كشاي جهان سلطان البر والبحر الروم و الأرمن و الفرنج، علاء الدنيا والدين كيقباد بن كيخسرو بن فلوج أرسلان، برها ن أمير المؤمنين في تاريخ سنه تسع و عشرين وستمائة.273

The great...the exalted Shahanshah, powerful over the nations, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, the sultan of truth, the conqueror of the lands of the world (kishvar gushay jahan), the sultan of the land and sea, of Rum, the Armenians and Franks, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the commander of the faithful, on the date of the year 629/1231.
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Kayqubad built two other caravansaries, the Sultan Han on the road between Konya and Aksaray (1228-9), and the Sultan Han on the Kayseri-Sivas road (1236-8). The interior court portal inscription of the Sultan Han on the Konya-Aksaray road is as follows:

الله امر بعماره هذا الخان المبارك السلطان المعظم شاهنشاه الأعظم مالك رقاب الامم، سيد سلاطين العرب والعجم سلطان بلاد الله حافظ عباد الله علاء الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيقباد بن كيخسرو، برهان امير المؤمنين، شهر رجب سنه ست وعشرين وستمائة. 274

The foundation of this caravanserai was commanded by the exalted sultan the august Shahanshah, powerful over the nations, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, the sultan of the lands of God, the protector of the worshippers of God, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, in the month of Rajab 626/ May-June 1229.

The inscription in the main portal reads as follows:

امر بعماره هذا الخان المبارك السلطان المعظم شاهنشاه المعظم سيد سلاطين العرب والعجم علاء الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح كيقباد بن كيخسرو قسيم امير المؤمنين سنه ست وعشرين وستمائة. 275

The foundation of this caravanserai was commanded by the august sultan, the great Shahanshah, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, partner of the Commander of the Faithful, in the year 626/1229.

‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad was focused on improving the defenses of his territory. He fortified walls around Konya and Sivas, and restored the wall in Akhlat and other fortresses in Armenia. 276 Kayqubad also restored the fortresses of Amasya, Erzincan and Kayseri. He sent a naval expedition to Crimea, and built and fortified a ship dock in Alanya to secure the Anatolian Seljuk Mediterranean front. He subjugated the Armenians, the Mengüjeks and later the Georgian queen. He captured the fortresses of Hisn Mansur, Kahta, and Chemishgezek from the Ayyubids and the Artukids. This active fortification program was probably a pre-calculated precaution as a
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result of the Mongol advances.\textsuperscript{277} While taking his precautions against the Mongols, he signed a peace treaty by sending an ambassador to the great Khan Ögedei, thus saving his sultanate and dynasty from a Mongol invasion for some time.\textsuperscript{278}

**The wives of Kayqubad**

The coming section in this chapter is dedicated to the analysis of a selection of the surviving inscriptions of the wives of Kayqubad.

As mentioned above Kayqubad had three wives, Mah-Peri Khatun, the Ayyubid princess al-Malika al-Adiliyya, and the daughter of the Anatolian Seljuk ruler of Erzurum, Kayqubad’s uncle Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah, known only by her title ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din.

Mah-Peri Khatun was the daughter of the governor of Alanya (Kalon-oros) Kir Fard. The origin of Kir Fard is disputed. He is mentioned by Claude Cahen as Greek, but Eastmond argues that Sumbat the constable recorded that the coastal town of Alanya was under the Armenians at the time of Kayqubad’s conquest.\textsuperscript{279} Mah-Peri was the most distinguished in terms of patronage. She founded the Khawand Khatun complex in Kayseri, although it has been debated that it was actually the foundation of Kayqubad, and as it was completed one year after his death she put her name in the inscription as the sole founder.\textsuperscript{280} Mah-Peri was powerful for a short time, but only after her son Kaykhusraw II became the sultan. Her political weight and influence could not be matched by that of the other two wives who belonged to powerful ruling houses (Ayyubid and Anatolian Seljuk). ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din and al-Malika al-‘Adiliyya had independent resources and power as deduced from their inscriptions.

The Khawand Khatun complex is located in city center of Kayseri. It consists of a large hypostyle mosque, a school, and a bathhouse. The portal inscription of the mosque reads as follows:

\textsuperscript{277} Turan, “Anatolia,” 246.
\textsuperscript{278} Ibid., 248.
\textsuperscript{279} Eastmond, “Gender and Patronage,” 78.
\textsuperscript{280} Ibid., 80.
The foundation of this blessed Friday mosque was ordered in the days of the august sultan Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqbad, the just, learned, pious queen Safwat al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the commencer of virtues, his mother, may God preserve the shades of her glory and double her worth, in the month of Shawwal of the year 635/May-June 1238.

Above another entrance carved in a marble slab there is another inscription that reads as follows:

The foundation of this blessed Friday mosque was ordered in the days of the august sultan Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqbad, the grand queen, Safwat al-Dunya wa’l-Din Mah-Peri Khatun may God preserve the shades of her glory, in the year 635/1238.

In the first inscription Mah-Peri is just referred to as the mother of the sultan, while in the second inscription she is mentioned by name. The second inscription contains shorter titles, but similar invocations.

The following inscription belongs to the second wife of Kayqbad, known as ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din. As mentioned above she was the daughter of Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah of Erzurum. Tughrul was one of the sons of Kılıç Arslan II. He became the malik of Erzurum during the reign of his brother Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II. From the year 1201 to 1203, during Sulaymanshah II’s campaign against Georgia and Trabzon, the Saltukid ruler of Erzurum refused to follow Sulaymanshah II’s policy. Sulaymanshah II along with Tughrulshah who headed a
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Turkman army contingent, and with Bahramshah of Erzincan, ended the Saltukid reign in Erzurum. When Kaykhusraw I regained his throne, Tughrulshah recognized his sovereignty, and he remained the ruler of Erzurum all his life.

Erzurum remained independent until the battle of Yasi Çimen when Jahanshah, Tughrulshah’s son and the ruler of Erzurum at the time, allied with the Khwarazmshah Jalal al-Din Mangüberdi against Kayqubad and the Ayyubid al-Ashraf Musa ibn al-‘Adil. The Khwarazmshah was defeated and Erzurum was annexed. Bar Hebraeus stated that Kayqubad wanted to marry ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din previously, probably as a form of alliance to gain control over the area of Erzurum, and eliminate the only competitor with a legitimate claim to the Anatolian Seljuk throne. Although she was not mentioned by Ibn Bibi, there is a surviving inscription of ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din on the ‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque in Uluborlu. ‘Ismat al Dunya wa’l-Din is recorded as the patron of the mosque; the inscription on the main portal reads as follows:

bitrarymos behi sleya eya. Alayna ulayna ulayna Uluborlu. ‘Ismat al

This blessed mosque was built in the days of thereign of the august sultan, the exalted Shahanshah, the shadow of God in the world ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, from the wealth of the learned, just queen ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the finest of Islam and the Muslims, daughter of the martyred king Tughrulshah son of Kılıç Arslan may her fortune be preserved, in Rajab 629/April-May the year 1232.

The striking element in this inscription is the phrase “from the wealth of” (min mal). This phrase indicates that the queen had independent sources of finance, and gives a suggestion of the amount of power she had. There aren’t any other female patronage examples from the house of Seljuk except for the previously discussed inscription of Jawhar Nasiba, the daughter of Kılıç Arslan II in Kayseri. But in Jawhar Nasiba’s inscription she was a little overshadowed, and nothing was mentioned regarding her financing the building. The lineage added in this
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inscription put ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din equal with Kayqubad in terms of legitimacy. She also emphasized her lineage by the mention of her father as the martyred king Tughrulshah son of Kılıç Arslan II.

The final inscription regarding Seljuk women is in the mausoleum of the third wife al-Malika al-Adiliyya, which I will compare to the mausoleum inscription of Mah-Peri Khatun. Al-Malika al-’Adiliyya was the mother of Kaykubad’s designated heir to the throne, Kılıç Arslan III. She was murdered in the events that followed Kaykhusraw II’s coup, after the death of Kayqubad I in 1237. In 1247 her daughters built her a pyramidal domed mausoleum in Kayseri, ten years after her death, and two years after the death of Kaykhusraw II. The tomb tower, known as the Çifte Kunbed, is in the middle of a mosque, madrasa and bath complex built by al-Malika al-’Adiliyya in Kayseri. The inscription on the tomb tower reads as follows:

هذا مشهد الملكة السعيدة الشهيدة العالمة الزاهدة عصمه الدنيا والدين صفوه الإسلام والمسلمين سيده النساء في العالم زبيدة الزمان، صاحبة الخصال الفاخرة خاتون الدنيا والأخرة الملكة الملكات منشأ اليمن والبركات بنات الملك العادل أبى بكر بن أيوب نور الله قبرها وعطر روحها وريحها، أمرت بعمارته بناتها المخدرات بلغها الله امالها وحسن حالها في سنه خمس و أربعين وستمائة.286

This is the martyrium of the auspicious, martyred, learned, pious queen, ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din, finest of Islam and Muslims, mistress of the women in the world, the Zubayda of the time, possessor of the outstanding qualities, the Khatun of the world and the afterworld, the queen of queens, the origin of fortune and blessings, the daughter of the just king Abu Bakr son of Ayyub, may God illuminate her grave, and perfume her soul and essence. Her sheltered daughters ordered its foundation, may God aid her to reach her hopes, and improve their state, in the year 645/1247.

The style of prose in this inscription is sophisticated, and the titles are grandiose. The inscription also applies rhythm, such as in al-‘alima, al-zahida, al-fakhira, al-akhira, and al-malikat, al-barakat. The first thing to observe in the content of this inscription is the total lack of the mention of Kayqubad or the relation of the queen to the Anatolian Seljuks; she only emphasized her Ayyubid lineage. The titles used are unique and majestic, especially the phrase
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“the mistress of the women in the world, the Zubayda of the time.” The choice of the person with whom she associates herself with is very distinctive, Zubayda, the wife of the renowned Abbasid Caliph Harun al-Rashid, who was known for her patronage of “Darb Zubayda” the pilgrimage route from Baghdad to Mecca. This choice emphasized her Arab origin, and connected her to the Abbasids. Al-Malika al-‘Adiliyya is mentioned in this as a martyr, which is also stressed in the inscription where the place is identified as a mashhad.

The inscription on the mausoleum of Mah-Peri Khatun in Kayseri is as follows:

"هذا قبر السيدة الستيرة السعيدة الشهيدة الزاهدة العابدة المرابطة المجاهدة المصونة الصاحبة العادلة الملكة النساء في العالم العفيفة النظيفة مريم اوانها و خديجة زمانها صاحبه المعروفة المتصدقة بالمال الوف صفوه الدنيا والدين ماه بري خاتون والده السلطان المرحوم غياث الدنيا والدين كيخسرو بن كيقباد رحمهم الله اجمعين."

The is the grave of the mistress, the shielded (behind a veil), the auspicious, the martyred, the brilliant, the worshipper, the warrior, the champion of the faith, the chaste, the owner, the just, the queen of the women of the world, the virtuous, the pure, the Mary of her time and Khadija of her era, the fair, the princess known for her charity, Safwat al-Dunya wa’l-Din Mah-Peri Khatun, the mother of the late sultan Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad, may God have mercy on all of them.

The inscription does not give a date. Bar Hebraeus stated that after the defeat in Köse Dağ in 1243, Mah-Peri sought the protection of Baron Constantine, the ruler of Cilicia, but he later handed her to the Mongols. The chronicler also remarks that she remained as a prisoner until that day, this being the 1250s when Bar Hebraeus was writing.288 The titles used are mostly pious attributes, and they are not as balanced and rhythmic as the ones in the inscription of al-Malika al-‘Adiliyya. It is intriguing how she also chose model figures to be associated with, this time with a religious context. Mah-Peri associates herself with the Virgin Mary, possibly due to her Christian origin, and this was balanced by the second choice, Khadija the wife of the prophet Muhammad.
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It is clear that there was a difference between Mah-Peri and the other two wives of Kayqubad, in terms of independence and political influence. It is also evident because the marriages were the outcome of political alliances or acquisitions. Mah-Peri’s position and political strength shifted after the death of Kayqubad, and the investiture of her son as the sultan. There is one apparent difference in their titles. Mah-Peri was addressed as Safwat al-Dunya wa’l-Din in her inscriptions, while the other two wives of royal descent assumed the title ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din. Possibly this was connected to the royal descent of patron queens, since it was also used on other inscriptions of women of royal descent in Syria, as well as for the Anatolian Seljuk Jawhar Nasiba. Although the word ‘isma implies authority, we cannot confirm which title is higher, since it is probable that Mah-Peri assumed total power as a walida sultan (queen mother). On the other hand ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Kayqubad’s cousin, used both titles in her Uluborlu inscription discussed earlier.

The titles used in the inscriptions of Seljuk women are similar to those used in Syria and Iran. Both the mausoleum of the Khatuniya Madrasa in Damascus, and the Great Seljuk inscription in the tomb of Imam ‘Ali Riza for Turkan Khatun used the title ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din, with the difference that the Great Seljuk queen eliminated the phrase al-Dunya, being just ‘Ismat al-Din.289 This was the case with the Great Seljuk inscriptions as discussed in the previous chapter, which had titles ending with only the phrase al-Din.290

The Seljuks of Erzurum (Mughith al-Din Tughrul-Shah son of Kılıç Arslan II)

The situation with the Seljuks of Erzurum is not clear. It is not known whether they functioned as a totally independent entity from the family branch in Konya or not. Tughrulshah minted coins in Erzurum, one of them reading the following:

الامام لا إله الا الله وحده لا شريك له الناصر لدين الله امير المؤمنين، ضرب هذا الدينار بارزروم/ محمد رسول الله مغيث
الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح طغرل بن قلج أرسلان، سنه ثمان وستمائة.291

The Imam, there is no Deity other than God alone who has no partner, al-Nasir l’-Din Allah the Commander of the Faithful, this dinar was struck in Erzurum/Muhammad is the messenger of
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This dinar was struck during the second reign of Kaykhusraw I (1205-1211), although it is also possible that it was minted after Kaykhusraw I’s death. The act of minting a coin itself shows a certain degree of independence. Tughrulshah also added neither the title malik nor sultan before his name as mentioned above, but he used the formula al-Dunya wa’l-Din, which is used in most of the sultanic inscriptions. The style of the coin itself does not comply with the type used for a malik (royal prince), which usually had no mention of the Abbasid caliph, and had an armed horseman on the back.292 The inscriptions of Tughrulshah at the fortress of Bayburt show the use of both of the titles king and sultan. The following are two inscriptions from Bayburt.

The first inscription in the tower reads as follows:

The blessed auspicious edifice came to pass in the reign of the great king, the learned, the just, the vanquisher, the triumphant, the champion of the faith, the warrior, savior of Islam and the Muslims, master of the kings and sultans, the perfection of the house of Seljuk, the king of the lands of Rum and Armenia Abu’l-Harith Tughrul son of Kılıç Arslan son of Sulayman, champion of the Commander of the Faithful (…) al-Malaki al-Mughithi, at the hand of the slave in need of God’s mercy Lu’lu’, in the middle of Rabi‘ II 601/September 1213.

In this inscription Tughrul is mentioned as “the master of kings and sultan, the king of the lands of Rum (Anatolia) and Armenia.” This inscription is dated to 1213, which corresponded to the reign of ‘Izz al-din Kaykavus I, who also proclaimed himself the sultan of the lands of Anatolia and Armenia in the land and the sea. The formula and organization of the titles used by Tughrul is similar to the ones used by the Seljuk sultans at the time; the difference is that he was
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mentioned as a king, but a king who is a master of sultans. The choice of words in this inscription, for example the word “auspicious,” *maymuna*, was not encountered in any of the surviving Anatolian Seljuk royal inscriptions in the early 13th century. Moreover the use of the two titles “the learned” and “the just” are not common in Anatolian Seljuk sultanic inscriptions, but they are found in the inscriptions of the Seljuk queens, including the ones that belong to Tughrul’s daughter ‘Ismat al-Dunya wa’l-Din in Uluborlu. The formula used with titles such as *al-mujahid, al-murabit, al-‘alim*, and *al-‘adil*, is more similar to Zangid inscriptions from Syria.294 The same formula seen in the inscriptions on the walls of Sinop, “the slave in need of God’s mercy,” is used for the notable in charge of constructing the building. There are two noteworthy terms used in the inscription, *al-malaki*, and *al-mughithi*. The context in which those two terms are placed in the inscription is not clear, and so it is difficult to tell whether the terms refer to the notable in charge or the edifice itself. Since it is placed before the term “at the hand of (*‘ala yad),” it seems to be signifying the building as belonging to the king (*al-malaki*), and Mughith al-Din (*al-mughithi*).

A similar term was encountered in the reign of Kaykavus I, where the citadel of Antalya was referred to as *al-ghalibiyya* in the *fathnama*, meaning that it belonged to the Sultan al-Ghalib Kaykavus.

The second inscription for Tughrulshah in Baiburt reads as follows:

This construction in the reign of the great sultan the august Shahanshah, Mughith al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the one who bestows honor on Islam and the Muslims Abu’l-Harith Tughrulshah son of Kılıç Arslan son of Mas‘ud, champion of the Commander of the Faithful, at the hands of the prince, the ispahsalar, the just, Diya’ al-Din Lu’lu’, the architect, the prince...

In the second inscription of Tughrulshah he is addressed as “the great sultan, the august Shahanshah,” with the same formula used by the Anatolian Seljuk sultans of Konya (*al-sultan al-mu’azzam al-shahanshah al-a‘zam*). Overall using non-princely type of coins, and sultanic titles as well as Abbasid granted titles is considered a sign of independence. Moreover
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emphasizing his pedigree by tracing his ancestors until Sulayman ibn Qutlumush might be considered as a form of challenge to the Anatolian Seljuk branch in Konya.\textsuperscript{295}

Cahen stated that Tughrulshah recognized the suzerainty of Kaykhusraw I.\textsuperscript{296} The fact that the Seljuks of Konya did not try to annex the lands of their cousins in Erzurum means there might have been a certain kind of accommodation. The situation may have been connected to the Turkish tribal ideology of collective sovereignty, which included allotting land to relatives, where they acted as independent rulers. The only recorded clash between the two branches occurred in the time of Kayqubad when Jahanshah seriously challenged the Seljuk state by allying with the Khwarazmshah against Kayqubad I.

**Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II**

Kayqubad died in 1237. He was poisoned after a banquet in the Kayqubadiyya palace near Kayseri. A plot was formed by Kaykhusraw II’s atabeg Shams al-Din Altin Aba the Jashangir and his imperial tutor (lala) Jamal al-Din Farrukh the uestadar to proclaim him sultan. The amirs moved quickly while the court was still in the Kayqubadiyya to the palace in Kayseri and proclaimed Kaykhusraw II sultan. Kayqubad had appointed his younger son ‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan as heir to the throne.

An early inscription from the reign of Kaykhusraw II on the walls of Antalya reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
 عمر هذه العمارة المباركة في أيام السلطان الأعظم ظل الله في العالم سلطان سلاطين العرب والعجم غياث الدنيا والدين

أبو الفتح كيخصور بن كيقباد قسيم امير المؤمنين في سنة ست ثلاثين ستمائة.
\end{quote} \textsuperscript{297}

This blessed foundation was ordered in the reign of the august sultan, the shadow of God in the world, the sultan of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad partner of the Commander of the Faithful in the year 636/1238-39.
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Another inscription of Kaykhusraw II on the Injir Khan reads as follows:

The foundation of this caravanserai was ordered by the august sultan, the exalted Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, the sultan of the land and two seas, Dhu’l-Qarnayn of the time, the second Alexander, the crown of the house of Seljuk, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, partner of the Commander of the Faithful, in the year 636/1238-39.

Another inscription in the Egherdir Han reads as follows:

The foundation of this blessed caravanserai was ordered by the august sultan the great Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, sultan of the land and two seas, Dhu’l-Qarnayn of the time, the companion of Khusraw the just (Anushirvan), the second Alexander, sultan of the sultans of the world, the supported from the heavens, the triumphant over the enemies...the vanquisher of the infidels and polytheists, suppressor of the heretics and the insurgents and the terminator of Kharijites and aggressors, the pillar of justice, vigilance of the people, aide of the caliph of God, rescuer of the caliph of God, the sultan of the lands of Rum, Armenia, Syria, Diyarbakr,
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and the Franks, the crown of the house of Seljuk Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad son of the auspicious sultan Kılıç Arslan, son of Mas‘ud, son of Kılıç Arslan, partner of the Commander of the Faithful, may God perpetuate his rule in the eastern and western lands in the year 635/1237-38.

This inscription is another demonstration of Anatolian Seljuk power; it describes the territories and scope of the Anatolian Seljuk suzerainty. At the time of this inscription the Seljuks controlled most of Anatolia including Diyarbakr, and they had the allegiance of the Ayyubids in Aleppo and the Georgians as well as the Armenians. Kaykhusraw is compared to Dhu’l-Qarnayn, who was a legendary king mentioned in the Quran (18:82), who went from the eastern parts of his kingdom to the far western territories, and blocked the way on the invincible nation of Gog and Magog. The mention of Dhu’l-Qarnayn might be an inference related to the Mongols. The Seljuk sultan is also portrayed as the companion of the great Sasanian king Khusraw the just i.e. Anushirvan. The inscription has strong Sunni revival notes, especially because of the mention of the Kharijites and heretics. Furthermore the mention of infidels and polytheists infers Islamic orthodoxy, which was mostly absent in the Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions, except for the fatihnama of Kaykavus and the inscription on the minbar of Kılıç Arslan II. This kind of terminology with Islamic orthodox characteristics had a stronger presence in the Ayyubid and Zangid inscriptions. The titles, “the vanquisher of the infidels and polytheists, suppressor of the heretics and the insurgents and the terminator of Kharijites and aggressors” are closer to the titles of Nur al-Din Zangi in the mosque of Raqqa, and the al-Nuri mosque in Hama.300

As discussed earlier in this chapter Ibn Bibi stated that the signature, tawqi’, of Kaykhusraw II was “al-муlk l’Ilah,” this pious phrase being used in some of his inscriptions. The first is from the madrasa of ‘Ala’ al-Din in Antalya, which reads as follows:

الملك لله وحده، امر بعماره المدرسة المباركة في دوله السلطان الاعظم ظل الله في العالم غياث الدنيا والدين أبو الفتح

Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad, crown of the house of Seljuk, son of Kılıç Arslan, partner of the Commander of the Faithful, may God perpetuate his rule in the eastern and western lands in the year 635/1237-38.
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Sovereignty is God’s alone; the foundation of this blessed school was ordered in the reign of the august sultan, the shadow of God in the world, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad, partner of the Commander of the Faithful God preserve his dominion, the weak slave in need of the mercy of his God, atabeg Armaghan in the year 637/1239-1240.

The second inscription of Kaykhusraw II, which begins with the same pious phrase, is the portal inscription of the Karatay Khan. The inscription reads as follows:

الملك لله الواحد القاهر الباقي الدائم هو الله، السلطان الاعظم الشاهنشاه المعظم ظل الله في العالم غياث الدنيا والدين ابى الفتح

Kaykhusraw II was still powerful as a Seljuk sultan, with the Greek emperor of Trebizond, the Armenians of Cilicia and the Ayyubids of Aleppo acting as his vassals. The previously planned marriage of Kaykhusraw II and the Georgian princess was concluded. Kaykhusraw also tried unsuccessfully to gain back the Khwarazm troops, then he entered a Syrian coalition against al-Salih of Cairo, and participated in retrieving Harran from the Khwarazmis back to the control of the Ayyubids of Aleppo. He later besieged the fortress of Diyarbakr, which surrendered in 1241.

In 1243 the Mongol invasion of Anatolia began with an army of 30,000 under the command of Bayju Noyon. They were countered by the Anatolian Seljuk army of 80,000, reinforced by their vassals, under the command of Kaykhusraw II. The two armies met in Köse Dağ, a province of Erzincan. Bayju succeeded in confounding the Anatolian Seljuk army using the old military tactic of retreat and sudden attack. On the eve of the 26th of June in the
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year 1243 the Anatolian Seljuk army was scattered, and the sultan fled either to Ankara or Antalya.\textsuperscript{306} Luckily the Mongols were not ready to eradicate the Anatolian Seljuks entirely, perhaps as a means to avoid chaos in the region. The Anatolian Seljuk vizier Shams al-Din al-Isfahani reached an agreement with the Mongols, and henceforth the Anatolian Seljuks were reduced to Mongol vassals.

**Post-Köse Dağ**

The Sırcalı Madrasa is one of the non-military buildings in Konya, founded at the time of the Mongol invasion (figure 11). The portal inscription reads as follows:

السلطاني، رسم بعماره هذه المدرسة المباركة في دولة السلطان الأعظم ظل الله في العالم غياث الدنيا والدين علاء

الإسلام والمسلمين، ابى الفتح كیخسرو بن کیقباد قسیم أمیر المؤمنین، الفقیر الى رحمه ربه بدر الدين بن مصلح ادام الله توفیقه

وقفها على الفقهاء والمتفقهہ من أصحاب ابی حنيفة النعمان رضی الله عنه في سنه أربعین وستمائة.\textsuperscript{307}

Al-Sultani, the foundation of this blessed school was decreed (ordered by a royal decree) in the reign of the august sultan the shadow of God in the world, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the supreme of Islam and Muslims, Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad, the partner of the Commander of the Faithful, the one in need of his God’s mercy, Badr al-Din son of Muslih, may God maintain his success. He endowed it for the jurists and scholars of law for the followers of Abu Hanifa al-Nu‘man, may God gratify him, in the year 640 hijra/1242-43.

The Sırcalı madrasa was commissioned by Badr al-Din Muslih, who was the imperial tutor, lala and guardian (atabeg) of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad II, the youngest son of Kaykhusraw II. The foundation inscription states that this school was dedicated to the students and scholars of the Hanafi Sunni school of law. It also mentions that the madrasa had an endowment deed. It is not quite clear whether the madrasa was founded before or after the Battle of Köse Dağ, for only the year is provided.

\textsuperscript{306} Sources are not clear.
\textsuperscript{307} *RCEA*, vol. XI, no. 4211, 140.
The following inscription is located on a tower in Antalya that was built after the defeat in Köse Dağ, at the end of the reign of Kaykhusraw II. The inscription is now located in the museum of Antalya, and it reads as follows:

امر بعماره هذا البرج المبارك في أيام دوله السلطان الأعظم شاهنشاه العظم مالك رقاب الامام سلطان سلاطين العالم ومولا ملوك العرب والعجم، مرزبان الاقف غياث الدنيا والدين علاء الإسلام والمسلمين ظل الله في الأرضين أبو الفتح كيخسرو بن كيقباد بن كيقباد بن كيقباد بن كيقباد بن كيقباد بن كيقباد بن قسيم اسمعيل 308

The foundation of this blessed tower was ordered in the reign of the august sultan, the great Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, the sultan of the sultans of the world, the lord of the Arab and non-Arab kings, the guardian of the horizons, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, the supreme of Islam and the Muslims, the shadow of God in the two lands, Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad son of Kaykhusraw, partner of the Commander of the Faithful in the year 642/1244-45.

Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II died in 1245. The period right after Kaykhusraw II’s death is quite complicated; he left three minor sons Kaykavus II, Kılıç Arslan IV, and Kayqubad II. Kaykhusraw II’s throne was disputed amongst the state amirs supporting the three young princes. He was succeeded by his eldest son ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus II, who was brought to the village of Altuntaş near Karahüyük where he was seated on the throne and received the allegiance of his half-brothers. 309 ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus did not assume real power before 1261. 310 In the year 1245 Mongol envoys arrived with the request of Kaykavus’s attendance in the Mongol court. He instead sent his brother Kılıç Arslan IV with the excuse of impending danger from the Greek and Armenians, who would seize his land if he left the court. Three years later in 1248, the Mongol Khan Güyük appointed a new Mongol ruler for Anatolia, Mosul, and Syria, who in turn decided to oust Kaykavus II and assign Kılıç Arslan IV ruler instead. Kılıç Arslan arrived to Konya with his atabeg Baha’ al-Din al-Tarjuman accompanied by a thousand Mongol soldiers. The vizier Shams al-Din al-Isfahani attempted to relocate the sultan, Kaykavus II, to one of the fortresses by the sea to prepare for regaining the throne. 311 Jalal al-Din Karatay, the atabeg of Kaykavus II,
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found out about Isfahani’s plot, and he captured him and handed him to Baha’ al-Din. Isfahani was killed by the Mongol troops in 1249. Afterwards Jalal al-Din met Baha’ al-Din and they decided to divide the Anatolian Seljuk territories amongst the three young sultans.312

This era provides unique epigraphic samples, because coins and monumental inscriptions were written in the name of the three sultans. An example is provided in a marble inscription from Tokat, which reads as follows:

وفق لأنشاء هذه القنطرة المباركة في أيام دولة السلاطين الاعظم عز الدنيا والدين، وركن الدنيا والدين وعلا الدنيا والدين. وركن الدنيا والدين. وعلا الدنيا والدين. وعلاء الدنيا والدين بني السلطان غياث الدين كيخسرو بن السلطان علاء الدين، كيقباد امير المؤمنين اعز الله انصارهم، وكان الموفق لهذه العمارة هو الأمير الاستفيسلاهر الكبير المؤمن المقبل ملك الأمراء سيف الدولة والدين، مفخر الخواص الأمير الاعظم بروانه حميد بن أبي القاسم ابن علي الطوسي، جده تغمدهم الله، وقد أسس بنبئتها على التقوى من الله عز وجل، الواقع في خمسة صفر في شهر سنته، ثمان وأربعين وستمائة، وكان معمارها وواقفها على عمارتها هو الأمير المنتجا إلى رحمه ربه الاعز الأخص. الموفق المقبل بهاء الدين ضياء الإسلام تاج الأنام وحيد الملوك، والسلطانين محمد بن الفرج المعروف بابن الحكيم، اعجل الله توفيقه وسهل خيراته وضاعف اجلاله.313

The construction of this blessed bridge was achieved in the reign of the exalted sultans ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din and Rukn al-Dunya wa’l-Din and ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din the sons of the sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw son of the sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad, proofs of the Commander of the Faithful, may God strengthen their supporters. The accomplisher of this foundation is the prince, the isphahsalar, the grand, the believer, the appointed, king of the amirs, Sayf al-Dawla wa’l-Din, pride of the courtiers, the exalted amir the *pervane* Hamid son of Abu’l-Qasim son of ‘Ali al-Tusi, his grandfather, may God immerse them with his forgiveness. It was founded on the respect of God the Mighty and Majestic, on 5 Safar 648/8 May 1250. The architect and contractor overseeing this foundation was the prince in need of his God’s mercy, the most glorious, the exceptional, the felicitous, the effective, grace of religion, splendor of Islam, the crown of creation, the unique among kings and sultans, Muhammad son of Faraj known as the son of al-Hakim, may God make abundant his fortune, ease his good works, and double his magnificence.

312 Ibid., 258-9.
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The increase in the titles and extent of praise for the state officials in contrast to that of the sultans is evident in this inscription. The functions of the amirs involved in the construction are also specified in detail. It is also obvious that the order of the names of the princes responsible for the foundation and construction was hierarchical. The founder of the bridge is mentioned as the king of the princes; he was the pervane of the sultans, which as mentioned previously was one of the highest level occupations in the Anatolian Seljuk court. The second person mentioned in the inscription is the architect, who seems to have had a high position as well judging by his titles. The use of the titles mafkhar al-khawass for the pervane and al-akhas for the architect could mean that they were both princes of the diwan-i khass i.e. the imperial council of the sultans. Ibn Bibi used the terms bargah and dargah to refer to the inner or outer courts of the imperial complex.\textsuperscript{314} The inner court was only for the harem, the entourage of extended family members, servants, young noblemen in attendance, ghulams, military retainers, and favorites (khawass).\textsuperscript{315} Thus in this context both the founder and the architect might have been members of the diwan-i bargah, meaning they were among the favorites or khawass.

The coins minted in the reign of the three sultans read as follows:

\begin{footnotesize}

لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله الامام المستعصم بالله امير المؤمنين ضرب هذا الدينار بقونية سنة ثلث خر.STEMANIA/السلطانين

الاعظم، عز الدنيا و الدين كيکاوس و ركن الدنيا والدين قلج أرسلان و علا الدنيا والدين كيقباد، بنو كيخسرو براهین امير

المؤمنين.\textsuperscript{316}

\end{footnotesize}

There is no Deity but God alone, Muhammad is the messenger of God, the Imam al-Musta'sim the Commander of the Faithful. This dinar was struck in Konya in the year 653 (1255-56)/ the august sultans, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykavus, and Rukn al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kılıç Arslan, and ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kayqubad, the sons of Kaykhusraw, the proofs of the Commander of the Faithful.

In 1254 the Mongol Khan, again, sent for ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus II to be present at his court. On his way to Sivas, Kaykavus II out of fear that the state amirs would declare Kılıç Arslan IV as sultan while he was away, decided to return to Konya. This time he sent his youngest brother Kayqubad II instead with a letter stating that he could not leave due to the death

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{314} Peacock and Yildiz, \textit{The Seljuks of Anatolia}, 13.

\textsuperscript{315} Ibid.


\end{footnotesize}
of his atabeg, and that his kingdom was threatened by enemies from the west. Kayqubad II died on his way to Möngke Khan’s court. Bar Hebraeus records that after the death of Kayqubad II, Kaykavus II plotted to kill Kılıç Arslan IV. When the state amirs found out, they helped Kılıç Arslan IV to escape to Kayseri and there he gathered more amirs and marched to attack Konya. Kaykavus II met him with an army, and Kılıç Arslan IV was defeated, captured and imprisoned. In 1259, the Mongol Khan Hülagusent for the two Seljuk sultans. They obeyed and went to his court, where they were well received, and greeted. Hülagu then gave Kaykavus II the lands from Kayseri to the borders of great Armenia, and Kılıç Arslan IV the lands from Aksaray to the sea borders of the lands of the Franks.

Due to the success of the negotiations with the Mongols, the Anatolian Seljuks were able to survive as a semi-independent state. This led to the preservation and continuation of Anatolian Seljuk architectural patronage. Moreover, the defeat at Köse Dağ seems to have not affected or reduced Anatolian Seljuk royal titles. Titles with strong implications were still being used for the sultans, which could be in this case a substitute for their weak position. The reason for this could be that there was a long period of partial Mongol control. Some incidents show that the Anatolian Seljuks were not as submissive to the Mongols as it might seem. In 1245 after the Battle of Köse Dağ, Kaykhusraw II declared jihad against the Mongols, but it was shifted to a campaign against Cilicia after his vizier returned with the Mongol settlement. Peacock following Aksarayi’s account, stated that Kaykavus II was exiled as a result of plotting a rebellion against the Mongols, with the aid of the Turkmen.

The extent of royal patronage was affected due to the large annual tribute that had to be paid from the Anatolian Seljuk treasury to the Mongol overlords. State amirs were no longer burdened by the expenses of royal fortifications or patronage programs, hence they became financially more capable of funding their own buildings. They were still loyal to the Seljuk sultan, but they were no longer totally under his control. The most powerful and influential state amirs who practically ruled in Anatolia after the Mongol invasion were Jalal al-Din Karatay, Mu‘in al-Din Pervane, and Sahib ‘Ata Fakhr al-Din.
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Jalal al-Din Karatay was one of the powerful state amirs who served three Anatolian Seljuk sultans namely, Kayqubad I, Kaykhusraw II and Kaykavus II. Karatay ruled as a regent between the years 1249 and 1254 for three minor Anatolian Seljuk sultans. He was known for his piety, abstinence, and was almost regarded as a mystic saint or wali in the surviving chronicles. He founded the Karatay Madrasa in Konya, which also contains his mausoleum. The Karatay Madrasa was associated with Sufis, for instance Jalal al-Din al-Rumi taught there according to the waqfiyya of the Madrasa. The inscription program of this building is quite particular, especially when viewed with regard to the identity of the patron (figure 10). The portal inscription of the madrasa reads as follows:

قَالَ اللَّهُ الْإِلَٰهُ الصَّاحِبُ الْكَبِيرُ مَعَهُ، وَالْحَيَّ الْإِيَّامِ الْبَرِّيَّةِ، وَالْمَكْرَمُ، وَالْمَحْنُوتُ، وَالْمَلِكُ الْيَتِيمُ، وَالْمُحْسِنُ، وَالْمُعاَمِنُ، وَالْمُحْسِنُ، وَالْمُجاَهِدُ، وَالْمُهَيْرُ، وَالْمُهَيْرُ.

God the Highest said, God does not waste the compensation of the charitable. The foundation of this building was ordered during the reign of the august Sultan, the shadow of God in the world, ‘Ala’ al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus, son of Kaykhusraw, son of Kayqubad, son of the martyred sultan Kaykhusraw, son of Kılıç Arslan, son of Mas‘ud, son of Kılıç Arslan, by Karatay son of ‘Abd Allah in the months of the year 649/1251-52, may God pardon its founder.

The door frame is carved with twenty-two vegetal leaf forms, filled with short religious wisdoms and moral precepts. The portal is also flanked by a Quranic invocation which starts from the right side and is continued on the left side, as follows:

رب أوزعني ان أشكر نعمتاك التي انعمت علي وعلى والدي وان اعمل صلحا ترضيه وادخلني برحمتك في عبادك الصالحين.
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Lord, enable me to be grateful for Your favor which You have bestowed upon me and upon my parents and to do righteousness of which You approve. And admit me by Your mercy into the ranks of Your righteous servants.

The portal inscription of the Karatay madrasa is from the reign of Kaykavus II son of Kaykhusraw II. The formula of the order of foundation shows that Karatay was the founder of this madrasa. The titles of the sultan did not follow the usual formula: they were short, and only mentioned him as “the August sultan the shadow of God in the world.” The title Shahanshah was omitted, and there were no invocations for the sultan or mention of the Abbasid caliph. On the other hand the foundation document of the Karatay Madrasa follows the norm of Seljuk foundation inscriptions, which give praise to God, then the caliph in Baghdad, followed by praise, and titles for the Seljuk sultan. In another foundation by Karatay, on a mosque in Antalya (1250-51), the sultan is mentioned with his full titulature, “the august sultan the exaulted Shahanshah, the shadow of God in the world, the powerful over the nations, the sultan of the Arab and non-Arab kings and sultans, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, succor of Islam and Muslims Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus.”

The invocation added is from Quran 27:19, which is an invocation of the prophet Sulayman. Redford argues that it adds to the connection of the building with Sufism, since Sulayman held an important place in mystical Islam, because God bestowed him with esoteric knowledge, and unusual supremacies. Blessings states in a footnote that Crane points out that the title and name in the portal inscription of the Karatay Madrasa are not consistent, and that it mixes the laqab of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad II with the ism of his co-ruler Kaykavus II. Rogers stated the same argument adding that, at the time it was impossible to tell which sultan controlled Konya or Karatay. Following the narration of Bar Hebraeus, the only time Kayqubad II might have ruled in Konya jointly with Kaykavus II would have been before the division of the Anatolian Seljuks territories between the three young sultans, mentioned above. This was probably starting from the years 1246-47 when Kılıç Arslan IV was sent to the Mongol court to serve the Khan. Rukn al-Din Kılıç Arslan IV returned to Konya in 1248-49. The portal

---

328 Redford, “Intersession and Succession,” 164.
329 RCEA, no. 4328, 218.
330 Redford, “Intersession and Succession,” 150.
331 Blessing, Rebuilding Anatolia, 26.
inscription of the madrasa gives the date 1251-52, by that time it is possible that the three sultans were ruling, but in the division Konya was allotted to ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus II.333

The analysis of this case is complicated further by the argument that the portal façade of the madrasa itself might have had an earlier date since it stylistically belongs to the earlier portal added by ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I to the citadel mosque in Konya. If this argument is accurate, then perhaps the inscription originally belonged to Kayqubad I and a mistake was made while adjusting it for Kaykavus II.334

When Jalal al-Din Karatay died in 1254, two new powerful patrons emerged. They were Sahib ‘Ata Fakhr al-Din, and Mu‘in al-Din Sulayman, also known as Pervane. Those two powerful patrons contributed to the transformation that occurred in Konya after the Mongol invasion.

Sahib ‘Ata Fakhr al-Din is known for his complex in Konya, which included a khanqah, whose inscription reads as follows:

حسبي الله، بني وانشا هذه الخانقاه المباركة منزلاً لعباد الله الصالحين ومسكنًا لأصحاب الصفة المتقين في أيام دولة
السلطان المعظم ظل الله في العالم غياث الدنيا والدين ابى الفتح كيخسرو بن قلج أرسلان برهمان امير المؤمنين خلد الله ملكه وأيد
دولته العبد الضعيف الراجي رحمه ربه اللطيف علي بن الحسين بن الحاج ابى بكر تقبل الله منه في شهر سنه ثمان وسبعين

Allah is sufficient for me. This blessed khanqah was built and constructed as a shelter for God’s righteous servants, and as a dwelling for the pious worshippers of God and a habitation for the God-fearing “People of the Bench,” in the reign of the great sultan the shadow of God in the world, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykhusraw son of Kılıç Arslan, proof of the Commander of the Faithful, may God perpetuate his sovereignty and extend his rule, the weak slave hoping for the mercy of his kind God, ‘Ali son of al-Husayn son of al-Hajj Abu Bakr, may God accept it from him, in the months of the year 678 hijra/1279-80.

Another foundation inscription of Sahib ‘Ata in the name of the Anatolian Seljuk sultan Kaykavus II is on the Ishaklı Caravanserai. It reads as follows:
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The foundation of this blessed caravanserai was in the reign of the great sultan the august Shahanshah, the powerful over the nations, the master of the Arab and non-Arab sultans, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din, succor of Islam and the Muslims, Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw son of Kayqubad, partner of the commander of the faithful, may God perpetuate his rule, the weak sinful slave in need of God the Highest’s mercy ‘Ali son of al-Husayn, may God reward him favorably, in Jumada II 647/ September-October 1249.

In the two inscriptions presented for Sahib ‘Ata his titles are somewhat modest and short, and follow the usual formula applied for state officials in Seljuk Anatolia. A slightly different, and more informative set of titles for him is presented in the portal inscription of the Taş Madrasa in Akşehir. It reads as follows:

The foundation of this blessed school was ordered in the reign of the august sultan the exaulted Shahanshah the shadow of God in the world, ‘Izz al-Dunya wa’l-Din Abu’l-Fath Kaykavus son of Kaykhusraw, proof of the Commander of the Faithful (...), the weak slave hoping for the mercy of his Kind God, Abu’l- Ma’ali, the pride of the state and religion ‘Ali son of al-Husayn Amirdad, may God grant him pardon as well as all the Muslims, on the date of Muharram 648/May 1250.

In this inscription, Sahib ‘Ata’s title is mentioned as “Amirdad.” He is also mentioned as “the pride of the state,” which recalls again the case of the change undertaken by the Great
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Seljuks in changing their title from *al-Dawla wa’l-Din* to *al-Dunya wa’l-Din*. The title *al-Dawla wa’l-Din* was not used for royal patrons in Seljuk Anatolia. Moreover there are several examples of Great Seljuk viziers and state officials using the title “*dawla*” such as, for example, “‘Amid al-Dawla.”

The second patron was the extremely powerful Mu‘in al-Din Pervane. Mu‘in al-Din Sulayman Pervane ruled on behalf of two Seljuk sultans between 1256 and 1277. He got the limelight in the hagiography of Afraki, *Manaqib al-’arifin*. He was presented as a powerful political figure, and praised for the atmosphere of security and justice provided during his reign. Pervane’s close connection to Jalal al-Din al-Rumi and the Mawlawi order was also highlighted. Although Pervane was one of the most powerful patrons in Anatolia, few of his foundations have survived; in addition there does not exist any surviving inscription for him in Konya. Afraki reports that Mu‘in al-Din and his wife Gurji Hatun, the widow of Kaykhusraw II, were involved in the construction of the mausoleum complex of Jalal al-Din al-Rumi. Blessing stated that the reason for the lack of inscriptions or foundation for Mu‘in al-Din in Konya is perhaps due to *damnatio memoriae*, the condemnation of the memory of a certain figure as a punishment and degradation, after his execution by the Mongols in 1277. This also applies for the renowned Mongol vizier Ata Malik Juvayni whose foundations were demolished by the Mongols when he was convicted of treason.

A surviving inscription of Mu‘in al-Din is located on the main portal of the ‘Ala’ al-Din Madrasa in Sinop. It reads as follows:

بيون الله وحسن توفيقه لما تيسر فتح مدينة سينوب حماها الله عن البوار من ايدي الكفار الفجار بسعي العبد المفقر
الى عفو الله المستمك بالعروة الوثقى المعتصم كلمه المتنى ابني المعالي والمفاخر سليمان بن علي بن محمد أحمد الله عرائه
أمر بعماره هذه المدرسة المباركة واتفق اتمامها في شهر سنه أحدى وستين وستمائة.

With the support of God and His good guidance, the conquest of Sinop, may God protect it from being destroyed at the hands of the insolent infidels, was facilitated by the effort of the slave seeking God’s pardon, who has grasped the trustiest handhold, the one seeking refuge in God’s strong words, Abu’l-Ma‘ali wa’l-Mafakhir Sulayman son of ‘Ali son of

---
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Muhammad, may God bless his end. He ordered the foundation of this blessed school. Its completion was in the months of the year 661 hijra/1262-63.

This inscription doesn’t resemble any other Anatolian Seljuk inscription. It starts by expressing gratitude to God for the conquest of Sinop, then praises the patron with titles that are of a religious nature. The phrase “the foundation was ordered (umira bi ‘imarat) is followed directly by the name of Mu‘in al-Din, and not the usual phrase “in the reign of.” The previous inscription reflects the independence and power of Pervane.

With regard to the connections of both Mu‘in al-Din Pervane and Jalal al-Din Karatay to the Mawlawi order, a certain correlation is noticed in their inscriptions. This Sufi connection might have influenced the choice of the style of some of their inscriptions. An inscription for Mu‘in al-Din above a portal in the great mosque of Sinop begins with the same verse from the Quran (27:19) found on the portal of the Karatay Madrasa in Konya, which was an invocation of the Prophet Sulayman. The rest of Mu‘in al-Din’s inscription follows a unique structure; it is written in the form of an invocation from the patron to God. It reads as follows:

Quran 27:19, through joining the path of religious calling, practiced by your slave Sulayman, prayers be upon our prophet and him, The Merciful, The Responsive to prayers. It is accomplished through Your favor, O God, as You have joined our prophet with the name of the Apparent do not separate us from the pure of heart since Your mercy is greater than all the requests asked of You. Your weak slave, turning towards You, Sulayman son of ‘Ali son of Muhammad, may God glorify his end and his orders. He who expressed his desire for Your mercy, and dedicated his incentives, and deeds to Your mercy, his desire is certain, he hopes for Your mercy, he is sincere towards Your mercy in intention and action, in the months of the year 667 hijra/ 1268-69.

343RCEA, vol. XII, no. 4605, 137.
The inscriptions of Mu'in al-Din are probably the only surviving examples of epigraphy of Anatolian Seljuk state officials that did not mention the Seljuk sultan. They do not follow the usual structure and organization of Anatolian Seljuk monumental epigraphy. Nevertheless they are not numerous enough to provide an hypothesis for a characteristic style.

Blessing argues that there was a boost in the patronage of madrasas after Seljuk Anatolia fell under the control of the Mongols. The question whether this boost was related to fear of the non-Muslim Mongols is still debated. This boost is evident from the beginning of the 13th century, through the number of scholars, poets, and craftsmen arriving at the Seljuk court. Carole Hillenbrand attributes this scholarly revival, the spread of caravanserais, and the overall spread of Islam in Anatolia to the occurrence of this migration. The fact that the emergence of the madrasas coincided with the Persian religious scholar influx was not an accident.

This chapter was dedicated to the analysis of the inscriptions from the reign of Kayqubad onwards. The development and the invention of new formulae for inscriptions were noted, as well as the continuation of certain titles from the reigns of the previous sultan. The effect of the Mongol invasion was not substantial with regards to the change in the magnitude or strength of the titles. This was concluded by observing post-Mongol inscriptions from the reigns of Kaykhusraw II and Kaykavus II. An analysis of inscriptions of the wives of Kayqubad I was used to determine the varying power associated to each of them with regards to their familial background, and the political circumstances surrounding marriage. The position of the Anatolian Seljuk branch of Erzurum was questioned through the titles used by Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah. The inscriptions of ruling state officials of the late 13th century were analyzed in contrast to the inscriptions of the sultan at the time.

---
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The purpose of this research was to track the development of the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate through inscriptional and numismatic evidence and to note the influences and changes that affected the titles adopted by the Anatolian Seljuk sultans. Numismatic evidence was utilized in the cases where the available evidence of monumental inscriptions was not sufficient.

We begin to see Anatolian Seljuk monumental inscriptions during the reign of Kılıç Arslan II. The analysis of the three inscriptions for Kılıç Arslan II showed that they were neither primitive in their style nor lacking in structure or vocabulary. The inscriptions are similar in structure and sometimes to the vocabulary of Zangid and Great Seljuk inscriptions located on monuments in Syria.

It is very important not to view the Anatolian Seljuks as an underdeveloped dynasty that suddenly transformed into a sultanate in the 13th century. The Anatolian Seljuks were active in Syria since the early reigns of Sulayman ibn Qutlumush and Kılıç Arslan I. Kılıç Arslan I’s arrival in Mosul and distribution of *khil’at* (robes of honor) provided evidence of a developed ruling power by the 12th century. It is also possible to assume that Kılıç Arslan I asked for artisans and court chancery from Mosul to be sent to his capital. The Anatolian Seljuks were exposed to both Arab and Persian influences through the northern Syrian borders, especially through the city of Malatya, which was considered as a portal to the east as early as the reign of Kılıç Arslan I (12th century). They were also exposed to Byzantine influence since their initiation in Anatolia, especially by marriages and treaties.

The real challenge concerning research on the Anatolian Seljuks is the scarcity of contemporary Anatolian chronicles. To be able to comprehend the transformation and development of Anatolian Seljuk identity, all the existing influences in Anatolia should be mapped out. We can view the identity of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty in the form of layers that were developed through exposure to various influences through time. For example, in the early 12th century during the reign of Sulayman son of Qutlumush, it seems that the *ghazi* culture was predominant, due to the fact that the first introduction of the Seljuks to Anatolia was through the
early raids of the Turkmen. Instability and their limited geographical authority necessitated this way of life. As they became more established they were able to expand and establish a ruling body. This stage was demonstrated by the reign of Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I and Kılıç Arslan II. The surviving epigraphic evidence for Mas‘ud I and Kılıç Arslan II is scarce, but the analysis of the surviving material provided many interesting facts that could be linked to the ongoing dynastic competitions and influences.

The next stage is characterized by the commercial outlets attained in the reigns of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I and ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I by capturing the ports of Samsun, Sinop, and Antalya. These commercial conquests signaled the beginning of the Anatolian Seljuks as an established state. The commercial gains led to prosperity and stability, allowing the boost in architectural patronage that occurred in the 13th century, which in turn led to the apogee of the dynasty with the period known as the “Golden Reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I.” The period of expansion and stability coincided with the turmoil occurring in Central Asia and Mesopotamia due to the Mongol invasions. This was a main factor behind the movement of numerous scholars, craftsman, and sufi sheikhs from there to Anatolia. This scholarly migration probably had a profound effect on the establishment of religious learning centers such as madrasas, as well as on the formation of the identity and ideology of Seljuk rulers. There have also been discussions regarding the existence of traffic of scholars and architects between Syria and Anatolia which might have had an effect on the style and vocabulary used in inscriptions.

During the reign of ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I, a certain progress in the style and quality of inscriptions occurred with regard to the superiority of the Arabic, especially seen in the fathnama of Kaykavus I on the walls of Antalya. The on-going discussion concerning the skills involved in writing this long inscription (see Chapter 3) suggests the presence of either Syrian or other Arab native scribes in the chancery of Kaykavus. There is only one idea which was not given much attention, but before discussing it one also has to consider the message presented by this fathnama. It was probably the only surviving Anatolian Seljuk inscription with such strong Sunni and jihad connotations. The quality and expertise of its Arabic is unmatched by any surviving Anatolian Seljuk inscription, not even being encountered again in the reign of Kaykavus I. If the Seljuk chancery acquired such skills, why were they not used by other Anatolian Seljuk sultans? Especially in the reigns of Kayqubad I and Kaykhusraw II, where boastful titles occurred frequently. The existence of distinguished figures such as Muhyi al-Din Ibn ‘Arabi and Majd al-
Din Ishaq in the court of Kaykavus I should be contemplated. Ibn ‘Arabi was in Anatolia in 1205 then resumed his travels in 1206. He returned to Malatya in the winter of 1211, and was present at the enthronement of Kaykavus in Konya in July 1211. Ibn ‘Arabi stayed with his close acquaintance and disciple Majd al-Din Ishaq in Malatya for six years (1206-1212). Muhyi al-Din left Anatolia for Damascus in 1222.

In chapter four, I mentioned the letter Kaykhusraw I sent to invite Majd al-Din Ishaq to his court. Ishaq later became the guardian and tutor of Prince Kaykavus I. Majd al-Din and Ibn ‘Arabi were among the entourage sent with the then Prince Kaykavus to Malatya. There was intimate correspondence between Ibn ‘Arabi and ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I, demonstrated by a letter incorporated in Ibn ‘Arabi’s *al-Futuhat al-makkiya*. This letter demonstrate how Ibn ‘Arabi guided Kaykavus I spiritually. He also sent a letter dated to Ramadan 1216, informing Kaykavus I of a dream he had foretelling his re-conquest of Antioch, at the time when Kaykavus besieged Antalya. In this letter Ibn ‘Arabi gives the exact date he wrote the letter while in Malatya in Ramadan 1216. He also sent an earlier letter in 1212 at the time of the revolt in Antalya, giving Kaykavus advice concerning the importance of reviving the religion and Quran, how to deter the Christian influence, and discussing *dhimmi* regulations. The previous incident allows us to speculate that Ibn ‘Arabi might have contributed to the ideological and structural composition of the *fathnama*. The conquest of the maritime ports also led to the introduction of a new title of the Anatolian Seljuk sultan, which is the “king of the land and the two seas (*malik al-bar wa’l-bahrayn*).”

The reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I was characterized by prosperity and expansion. In the inscriptions from the reign of Kayqubad I, new bombastic titles of mainly Persian origin started to be seen more frequently. The reign of Kayqubad I can be contrasted with the turbulent reign of his son Kaykhusraw II that led to the catastrophic defeat by the Mongols at Köse Dağ (1243), and the transformation of the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate into a Mongol protectorate. The interesting fact is that the titles of Kaykhusraw II were not affected or diminished after the defeat in Köse Dağ. After the death of Kaykhusraw II, we are provided with a unique sample of inscriptions and coins that mention the names of the three underage sultans who ruled at the same time under the regency of Jalal al-Din Karatay. In the inscriptions of the three sultans, we start to notice the change in the titles of the sultans contrasted by that of the amirs in charge of
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the construction. The three sultans are provided with short and simple titles and a short lineage, while the amirs in charge of the construction were given many more invocations and exaltations. The inscriptions change once more in the reign of Kaykavus II where the principal formula of Anatolian Seljuk sultanic inscriptions, “al-sultan al-mu’azzam al-shahanshah al-a’zam” was reinstated, and the sultan retained his previous weight in the structure of inscription.

The majority of non-military architectural patronage was undertaken by state officials and elites connected to the Anatolian Seljuk court. Crane noted that the monumental epigraphy from the 13th century shows that 90 of all 133 recorded buildings were built by state official and court elites. The mid- to late-13th century was characterized by the change of the role of the Anatolian Seljuk sultan with regard to patronage. Royal patronage ceased to exist after the Battle of Köse Dağ probably due to the large tribute which had to be paid to the Mongols from the royal treasury. The same era witnessed the boost in the patronage of state amirs and governors who reached a certain consensus with the Mongols, and occasionally ruled as regents. A selection of the inscriptions of the most powerful state amirs of the period, Jalal al-Din Karatay, Mu‘in al-Din Pervane, and Sahib ‘Ata Fakhr al-Din was discussed. The inscriptions of these state officials had a different structure than the ones usually found in Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions. They are more inclined towards invocations, and they frequently included verses from the Quran.

In the broader perspective, it is evident that the bulk of Anatolian Seljuk royal patronage was dedicated to military projects. These were mainly fortresses, walls, and caravanserais. It is true that caravanserais are more connected with commercial prosperity; however, they also proved worthy as fortified edifices. Anatolian Seljuk caravanserais were well fortified with metal-reinforced gates. They proved their importance at the time of the Mongol invasion, when a Mongol commander failed to capture a Turkish leader who hid inside the Sultan Han built by Kayqubad I on the Konya-Aksaray Road. The building was besieged by 20,000 men for two months, but the siege ended without success.

As the Anatolian Seljuk sultanate became more powerful and stable, we start to see more powerful titles. Titles infering world rule were introduced during the reign of Kaykavus I. The use of these titles increased in the reign of Kayqubad I, then became established in the inscriptions of Kaykhusraw I and later rulers. They should not be confused with phrases such as

---

“Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, Rukn al-Dunya wa’l-Din.” The titles only contain the phrase in the world (fi’l-‘alam), for example “the sultan of the sultans of the world” “the ruler of all creation in the world,” “the shadow of God in the worlds” etc. The use of the title “king of Rum, Armenia, and Syria” became scarce, it being replaced by titles more general and inclusive. The use of the phrase “fi’l-‘alam” is unique to the Anatolian Seljuks. By the end of the reign of Kaykavus I the formula “al-sultan al-mu’azzam al-shahanshah al-a’zam,” became standard. This formula was stabilized with minor alterations and the addition of “the shadow of God in the world” (zil allah fi’l-‘alam) during the reigns of Kayqubad I and his son Kaykhusraw II. The majority of Anatolian Seljuk sultans used the title “Abu’l-Fath,” a staple of the Great Seljuk Malikshah, except for Mughith al-Din Tughrulshah who occasionally used the title “Abu’l-Harith,” and Sulaymanshah II who used “Abu’l-Muzaffar.”

The disintegration of the Great Seljuk Empire did not affect the influence of its inscriptions on that of the Anatolian Seljuks’. Vocabulary and titles, especially of the inscriptions of Malikshah in Syria, continued to be used during the reigns of Kaykavus I, Kayqubad I and later. Moreover, the similarities with Zangid and Ayyubid inscriptions continued and increased in this period. The Great Seljuks and the Zangids monumental inscriptions, especially those of Malikshah and Nur al-Din Mahmud, were the two main influences observed in Anatolian Seljuk inscriptions. This might have been due to the fact that these inscriptions were in the close proximity with the Anatolian Seljuk territory.

Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence which would have allowed a more profound analysis of the inscriptions of Anatolian Seljuk royal women, but it seems that their background had an input in the style of titles and vocabulary used in their inscriptions.

Finally, the chronological analysis of the Anatolian Seljuk epigraphy helped to determine the periods in which new titles were adopted by the Anatolian Seljuk sultans (Appendix), and the differences that occurred in the structure, organization and vocabulary used in monumental inscriptions. The assessment of the Anatolian Seljuk style of epigraphy against the monumental inscriptions of other contemporary and preceding dynasties allowed for detecting the existing influences. Some insciptional titles and Formulae were matched with that of the Zangids and Great Seljuks’ inscriptions, while others were an original creation of the Anatolian Seljuk dynasty. The time frame of the analyzed inscriptions also allowed for a conclusion regarding the
effect of the battle of Köse Dağ on the use of royal titles, as well as the development in the Anatolian Seljuk sultanate’s internal balance of power as a whole.

Unfortunately, the early readings provided in the RCEA were occasionally recorded incorrectly. This is only revealed when a new analysis is made, for instance in the case of the fathnama of Kaykavus discussed in chapter three. This situation makes the compilation of a digitized visual record of high quality images of vital importance.
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Plates

Photographs of Anatolian Seljuk monuments, sites, and museum objects were taken by the researcher.

(Map 1) Anatolia in the 12th century (*Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 139).
(figure 1) Anatolian Seljuk genealogical chart starting from the reign of Kılıç Arslan I (The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East, 276).
Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I, with emperor Alexius I Comnenus’ Bust (*A Handbook of Islamic Coins*, no. 169, page 111).

(figure 3) The minbar of Kılıç Arslan II in Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey mosque in Aksaray (side view).
(figure 4) The minbar of Kılıç Arslan II in the mosque of Kayqubad I in Konya (side view).
The minbar of Kılıç Arslan II in the mosque of Kayqubad I in Konya (frontal view).
Sulaymanshah II silver dinar, minted in Kayseri 597/1200-1

(A Handbook of Islamic Coins, no. 172, page 113).
Malik Sulaymanshah II prince of Tokat’s coins (A Handbook of Islamic Coins, no. 170, 171, page 112).
(figure 7) Angel figure from the walls of Konya.

(figure 8)
(figure 9) Kubadabad Saray, Beyşehir.

(figure 9.1) Kubadabad Saray, Beyşehir.
(figure 10) The Karatay Madrasa portal, Konya.

(figure 10.1) The Karatay Madrasa portal inscription (Close up).
(figure 11) Sırçalı Madrasa portal inscription.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kılıç Arslan II Konya minbar</th>
<th>Hussam al-Din Yusuf for Kaykavus in Sinop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المعظم شاهنشاه الأعظم</td>
<td>المعظم شاهنشاه الأعظم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مالك رقاب الامم</td>
<td>مالك رقاب الامم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين</td>
<td>عز الدنيا والدين ركن الإسلام والمسلمين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فخر الملك والسلطانين</td>
<td>فخر الملك والسلطانين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قاتل الكفرة والمشركين</td>
<td>قاتل الكفرة والمشركين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الله حافظ بلاد الله</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>معين خليفة الله</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سلطان بلاد الروم والأرمن والافرنج والشام</td>
<td>بلاد الروم والشام والأرمن وبحرا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ابی الفتح</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Sultan</td>
<td>Royal Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukn al-Din Mas‘ud I (1115-1156)</td>
<td>• al-Sultan al-mu‘azzam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abu’l-Fath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II (1156-1192)</td>
<td>prince • al-amir al-ispahsalar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abu-Said ghazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan • al-Sultan al-mu‘azzam al-shahinshah al-‘azam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abu’l-Fath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah II (1196-1205)</td>
<td>prince • al-Malik al-Qahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan • al-Sultan al-qahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abu’l-Muzaffar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abu’l-Fath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I (1192-1196)(1205-1211)</td>
<td>Sultan • al-Sultan al-mu‘azzam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• al-Ghalib bi‘amr Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• al-sultan al-mu‘azzam al-shahinshah al-‘azam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Malik al-Masriq wa’l-Maghrib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sayyid salatin al-‘alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus I (1211-1219)</td>
<td>Sultan • al-Ghalib bi‘amr Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• al-sultan al-mu‘azzam al-shahinshah al-‘azam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Malik al-Masriq wa’l-Maghrib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sayyid salatin al-‘alam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I (1219-1237) | Sultan | • Abu’l-Fath  
• Sultan al-bar wa’l-bahr (post Sinop)  
• Sultan al-bar wa’l-bahrayn (post Antalya)  
• Taj al-i saljuq  
• Zil allah fi’l-khaﬁqayn  
• al-mu‘ayyad min al-sama’  |
|---|---|---|
| Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II (1237-1246) | Sultan | • al-sultan al-mu’azzam  
• al-sultan al-mu’azzam al-shahinshah al-’azam  
• Sayyid salatin al-‘alam  
• Abu’l-Fath  
• Sultan al-bar wa’l-bahrayn  
• Taj al-i saljuq  
• Kishvar gushay  |
| | sultan | • al-sultan al-’azam al-shahinshah al-mu’azzam  
• Zil Allah fi’l-‘alam  
• Abu’l-Fath  
• Sultan al-bar wa’l-bahrayn  
• Taj al-i saljuq  
• Iskandar al-thani  
• Dhu’l-Qarnayn  
• Marziban al-afaq  
• Sahib khusraw al-‘adil  |
| | | • Nasir amir al-mu’minin  
• Burhan amir al-mu’minin  
• Qasim amir al-mu’minin  
• Qasim amir al-mu’minin |
| ‘Izz al-Din Kaykavus II (1246-1261) | Sultan | • al-sultan al-‘azam  
• Zil allah fi ‘l-‘alam  
• Al-sultan al-mu‘azzam al-shahinshah al-‘azam  
• Abu‘l-Fath | • Burhan amir al-mu‘minin  
• Qasim amir al-mu‘minin |