

PATRONS AND ARTISTS AT THE CROSSROADS: THE ISLAMIC
ARTS OF THE BOOK IN THE LANDS OF RŪM, 1270S-1370S

VOLUME ONE

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Oriental Studies

by

Cailah Marie Jackson
Wolfson College, University of Oxford

Trinity Term, 2017

To the memory of my mother, Menchie Nazareno Jackson

ABSTRACT

PATRONS AND ARTISTS AT THE CROSSROADS: THE ISLAMIC ARTS OF THE BOOK IN THE LANDS OF RŪM, 1270S-1370S

This dissertation is the first book-length study to analyse the production and patronage of Islamic illuminated manuscripts in late medieval Rūm in their fullest cultural contexts and in relation to the arts of the book of neighbouring regions. Although research concerning the artistic landscapes of late medieval Rūm has made significant progress in recent years, the development of the arts of the book and the nature of their patronage and production has yet to be fully addressed. The topic also remains relatively neglected in the wider field of Islamic art history. This thesis considers the arts of the book and the part they played in artistic life within contemporary scholarly frameworks that emphasise inclusivity, diversity and fluidity. Such frameworks acknowledge the period's ethnic and religious pluralism, the extent of cross-cultural exchange, the region's complex political situation after the breakdown in Seljuk rule, and the itinerancy of scholars, Sufis and craftsmen.

Analyses are based on the codicological examination of sixteen illuminated Persian and Arabic manuscripts, none of which have been published in depth. In order to appropriately assess the material and to partially redress scholarly emphases on the constituent arts of the book (calligraphy, illumination, illustration and binding), the manuscripts are considered as whole objects. The manuscripts' ample inscriptions also help to form a clearer picture of contemporary artistic life. Evidence from further illuminated and non-illuminated manuscripts and other textual and material primary sources is also examined.

Based on this evidence, this dissertation demonstrates that Rūm's towns had active cultural scenes despite the frequent outbreak of hostilities and the absence of an effective centralised government. The lavishness of some manuscripts from this period also challenges the often-assumed connection between dynastic patronage and sophisticated artistic production. Furthermore, the identities and affiliations of those involved in the production and patronage of illuminated manuscripts reinforces the impression of an ethnically and religiously diverse environment and highlights the role that local *amīrs* and Sufi dervishes in particular had in the creation of such material.

Cailah Marie Jackson, Wolfson College, University of Oxford
D.Phil. Oriental Studies, Trinity Term 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Notes on Translation, Transliteration and Dating</i>	<i>xi</i>

Introduction

Historiography, sources and methodology

Introduction	1
Chronological and geographical scope of the thesis	7
The Lands of Rūm, circa 1250-1400	17
Understanding Islamic visual culture in medieval Rūm: A historiographical analysis	29
Primary sources	50
A codicological approach to manuscripts	56
Outline of chapters	64

Chapter One

Patrons and artists in Konya under Ilkhanid administration, 1278- 86

Introduction	69
The illuminated manuscripts of 677/1278	71
An undated Qur'an juz' and a 1262 <i>Kalīla wa Dimna</i> : two more early manuscripts from Konya?	82
The 1278 manuscripts' artists and patrons	86
Politics and history writing in late thirteenth-century Konya	91
The cultural and intellectual landscapes of Konya: scholars, Sufis and Christians	101
Conclusion	123

Chapter Two

Illuminated manuscript production and patronage in early fourteenth-century Rūm

Introduction	126
Qaramanid and Ashrafid manuscripts	129
Mawlawi manuscripts	137
Places and people	151
Conclusion	177

Chapter Three

Illuminated manuscript production in western Rūm, 1349-1351

Introduction	180
The manuscripts of İstanos	183
Frontier patrons, paper and plague	188
Conclusion	211

Chapter Four

The manuscripts of Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan (d. 1386): A Mawlawi *amīr* of eastern Rūm, 1365-72

Introduction	214
The manuscripts of Sātī: physical properties	219
The manuscripts of Sātī: inscriptions	243
The world of Sātī ibn Ḥasan: The Aratnids, the Mawlawis and Erzincan	246
Possible centres of production	266
Conclusion	271

Epilogue

The arts of the book within and beyond the Lands of Rūm	274
--	------------

<i>Bibliography</i>	284
----------------------------	------------

<i>Appendix One: Summary Table of Key Manuscripts</i>	333
--	-----

Appendix Two: Translations of Colophons and Other Inscriptions

<i>Manuscripts from Chapter One</i>	340
<i>Manuscripts from Chapter Two</i>	349
<i>Manuscripts from Chapter Three</i>	358
<i>Manuscripts from Chapter Four</i>	361

VOLUME TWO

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>List of Illustrations</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Abbreviations used in Volume Two</i>	<i>xxxix</i>

Illustrations

Illustrations from Chapter One	1
Illustrations from Chapter Two	42
Illustrations from Chapter Three	104
Illustrations from Chapter Four	109

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although many people have contributed to the research and writing of this thesis, none have been more helpful, enthusiastic or insightful than my supervisor, Zeynep Yürekli-Görkay. She has been an exceptional role model and her support has often gone above and beyond the call of duty. I am particularly grateful for her extensive assistance in making my fieldwork in Turkey a success and for opening her home to me. From the early days of my topic taking shape to the polishing of final drafts, I cannot thank Zeynep enough for her time, generosity, kindness and unfailing good humour.

I sincerely thank İlker Evrim Binbaş, Luke Treadwell and Oliver Watson, who served as assessors for my Transfer and Confirmation of Status. Their comments and criticisms have pushed me to clarify my arguments, consider new ideas and sources and think more carefully of my reader.

I am also very grateful to Scott Redford and Oya Pancaroğlu for agreeing to serve as my examiners. I am especially thankful for their careful and considered reading of the thesis, for all of their useful suggestions for its improvement and for making the viva voce an engaging and productive experience.

Many people in Oxford have provided support in academic and practical ways. Jeremy Johns has been a source of wisdom, inspiration and gentle encouragement and I am grateful to him for acting as my co-supervisor for a year. I am also

thankful to Tricia Davies and Daniel Burt for all of their help and patience over the years with my administrative needs and inane questions about technological matters. Emine akır’s Turkish tuition was hugely beneficial for my time in Turkey and her warmth, cheerfulness and expertise made the lessons a joy to attend.

Several people beyond Oxford have contributed to this thesis and my development as a scholar by graciously providing me with their work, time, advice and unique insights including Nourane Ben Azzouna, Jake Benson, Moya Carey, Linda Darling, Finbarr Barry Flood, Lucy-Anne Hunt, Charles Melville, A.C.S. Peacock, Judith Pfeiffer, Nuri ŐimŐekler, Hidemi Takahashi, Zeren Tanındı, David G.K. Taylor, Ethel Sara Wolper, Sara Nur Yıldız and Ayšın Yoltar-Yıldırım. I am particularly grateful to Fahmida Suleman who, several years ago, took time out of her busy schedule to speak to me about her positive experience as a University of Oxford student.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the curators and librarians at the institutions where I conducted research, including Saqib Baburi at the British Library, Naci Bakırcı at the Mevlana Müzesi, Nahla Nassar at the Khalili Collection, Ferruh Özpilavcı and his team at the Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Osman Nuri Solak at the İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Salih Őahin at the Beyazıt Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, and the ever-obliging Elaine Wright at the Chester Beatty Library, as well as the staff of the Ankara Vakıf Eserleri Müzesi, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Bursa Vakıflar Bölge Müdürlüğü, the John Rylands Library, the Konya Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, the Milli Kütüphane, the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, the Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Bursa and the Yusuf Ağa

Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi. I am also grateful to the following people who took the time to send me much-needed images and information: Mounia Chekhab-Abudaya at the Museum of Islamic Art in Doha, Massumeh Farhad and Simon Rettig at the Freer and Sackler Galleries and Christoph Rauch at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

The research for this thesis and the writing process were supported by several institutions: The University of Oxford who granted me a generous scholarship, the Barakat Trust who funded my travel and fieldwork expenses, the Khalili Research Fund who supported my codicological and language training, Wolfson College who helped me to attend conferences at which I presented papers related to this thesis and, finally, the Gibb Memorial Trust who supported my final write-up year. I am grateful to all for their funding.

To those friends whom I have known since before the horrors of proper adulthood – Manal Shaikh, Zayd Raof, Sami Abu Wardeh, and Sarah O’Halloran – I thank them for cheering me up and reminding me that there is a real world beyond the university bubble. Although we unfortunately are not able to meet face-to-face very often, their friendship has been, and will doubtless always be, invaluable. I am especially thankful to Manal for our time together in Istanbul, where we mastered the art of marbling.

Thanks also to friends I have made in Oxford including Yui Kanda, Umberto Bongianino, Emily Hannam, Yeliz Teber and Günseli Gürel. I thank them for their help with writing and translations and for their support and empathy through this

peculiar journey. I hope that we remain colleagues for many years to come. Yui in particular has become a great source of encouragement through our email exchanges and shared love of Pompompurin.

Thank you to my family for their love and support, especially my younger brother, Rory, who remains convinced that I am secretly a character from The Da Vinci Code. I am hugely grateful to my mother- and father-in-law, Maureen and Ismail Jalili, for providing a home away from home, a constant flow of tea and evenings filled with Hitchcock and graphic discussions about medical matters. Extra thanks must also go to Ismail and Muzahim Al-Jalili for their help with some complex Arabic translations.

Last but by no means least, I am indebted to my husband, Duraid Jalili, without whom I could not have finished this thesis as a sane person. His selflessness, patience and dedication are second to none and I thank him for all the years of unwavering encouragement, (quasi-)intellectual discussions and unsolicited corrections to my grammar. Most importantly, I am forever grateful to him for always reminding me not to take myself too seriously.

Finally, I must take full responsibility for all of the errors and deficiencies that remain in this thesis, much as I would like to shift the blame onto one of the many people mentioned above.

NOTES ON TRANSLATION, TRANSLITERATION AND DATING

I have followed the transliteration system for Arabic, Persian and Ottoman Turkish used in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. In the main body of the thesis, words that have entered common English usage, like ‘Qur’an’ and ‘madrasa’, have not been transliterated. Words that are not in common English usage, like ‘*khānqāh*’ or ‘*nisba*’ are italicised throughout and translated in the first instance. They are pluralised using the English suffix ‘-s’ unless the plural form is used widely in scholarship (e.g. ‘*ālim*’ is pluralised as ‘*ulamā*’ not ‘*ālims*’).

In the case of personal names and titles, I have tried to be consistent in the methods used for transliterating names of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish origin but have employed some discretion. For the same reason, Mongol names and terms are transliterated according to Persian or Arabic spellings (e.g. *Ūljaytū*, not *Öljeitü*). *Nisbas* (relating to place of birth, residence or origin, or to social affiliation) and *laqabs* are transliterated according to their original language (e.g. ‘al-Arzinjānī’ not ‘al-Erzincani’). While the *nisba* ‘al-Mawlawī’ is transliterated fully as part of personal names, ‘Mawlawi’ refers to the relevant dervish community and is not transliterated.

For names of dynasties, I have tried to reflect usage in recent Western scholarship, which often combines English and modern Turkish conventions (e.g. Seljuk, not Saljūq or Selçuk; Ashrafid, not Eşrefoğlu). In the case of place names, I have mostly retained the present-day English usage (e.g. Cairo, Damascus), but have used

modern Turkish names of Anatolian cities and monuments (e.g. Çifte Minareli Medrese, not Madrasa al-Shamsiyya; Kayseri, not Caesarea or Qayşariyya). For the most part, I have kept the names of libraries, museums, and other collections in their original languages to avoid confusion.

In some of the translations contained in Appendix Two, I have used both Arabic and Persian transliteration systems within the same text, to reflect the simultaneous use of both languages. This will be clearly indicated as '[Arabic]' or '[Persian]'. Translations throughout the thesis are mine unless otherwise noted.

In dating historical events, artistic production and years of birth, death and activity, I generally use Common Era dates and centuries for the sake of clarity. The main exception to this is when I discuss key manuscripts, in which cases Islamic dates will be fully noted.

INTRODUCTION

Historiography, sources and methodology

Introduction

The study of medieval Anatolian history has in the past been described as “a graveyard of scholars”.¹ Thanks to inquiries into Anatolia’s political and socio-cultural landscapes over recent decades, this bleak outlook is now largely unjustified. Alongside an increased emphasis on the contexts in which the academic field emerged, scholars have challenged the boundaries, frameworks and terms that previously dominated the literature. In these investigations, new understandings of material culture have been formulated. These acknowledge the ethnic and religious diversity of the region, the sometimes-fleeting nature of political and geographical boundaries, and the benefits of interdisciplinary approaches. However, much of this revisionist body of research has focused on Anatolia’s architectural heritage. This thesis focuses on a lesser-known aspect of medieval Anatolian visual culture: namely that of the arts of the book.

More specifically, I discuss Islamic illuminated manuscript material produced in the Lands of Rūm between the 1270s and 1370s, and examine their production and patronage contexts. While most of the manuscripts are religious texts, like

¹ Redford 2007a: 7.

Qu'rans and Sufi poetry, there are also a few local, historical chronicles and scholarly works. All are written in either Persian or Arabic. Although most of the surviving manuscripts were produced in Konya, it is important to appreciate that other production centres, such as Sivas and İstanos (Korkuteli) also existed.

Manuscript material needs to be examined in more depth for a number of reasons. A focus on manuscripts as objects will, firstly, partially redress the emphasis placed on architecture and provide insights into the production and consumption of this more 'intimate' medium. Secondly, looking at the physical and decorative aspects of manuscripts provides insights into how manuscript production developed in this understudied context, and into the visual connections with manuscript production in neighbouring regions. One of the primary contributions of this dissertation is tracing the visual development of the arts of the book of Rūm in the context of concurrent developments in the Mamluk and Ilkhanid realms and discussing the interrelationships between them. By focusing on the local along with the transregional, it is hoped that the present study fills in a remaining gap in the history of the Islamic arts of the book of this period.

Thirdly, most of the manuscripts that I discuss in this thesis also contain details concerning their production. Alongside a consideration of which specific texts were produced, these details can include information about patrons and later owners, authors, artists, locations of production and anything else someone felt that it was necessary to record. This wealth of detail, which is unique to manuscript material, can enhance our understanding of artistic production and

patronage and reinforce (or contradict) what we already know from studying buildings and other objects. Manuscripts in general were closely connected to the activities of scholarly and literary circles, which could encompass a diverse cross-section of society. Naturally, illuminated manuscripts can only tell us a limited amount about such circles but they can also reveal a certain amount about patronage, craftsmanship and affluence in a way that non-illuminated manuscripts cannot, since they can be more complex and expensive to produce.

A focus on production and patronage can provide an effective way of linking sources, material and events together with broader knowledge about the individuals who created and read manuscripts.² Making these connections can help to situate patrons and artists within their environments, rather than leaving them as disembodied names on a page. By addressing individuals' patronage, one can also avoid the sometimes assumed connection between dynasty and visual style. To patronage, I would also add production, circulation, function and consumption as important facets for understanding manuscript culture. While it is not always possible to uncover the details of these (particularly in the context that I discuss), it is important to acknowledge manuscripts as whole, physical objects that exist in time and space.³

Although I focus on illuminated manuscripts, which originate from a limited number of production centres, even a brief look at non-illuminated material

² Yalman 2010: 4.

³ See, for example, Roxburgh 2005, Liechti 2008 and Hirschler 2012.

reveals copying locations all over Rūm. While looking at this material would undoubtedly provide a great degree of insight into scribal and scholarly practices in this period, a study of such size is beyond the scope of this work. Analysing illumination, in addition to calligraphy and bookbinding, is important because it provides extra layers of visual analysis and presents a corrective to the attention given to painting in the field of the arts of the book. As I discuss below, the scholarly field emerged in the nineteenth century out of inquiries into manuscript illustration. This bias – due initially to a European preoccupation with painting – remains in the study of Islamic manuscripts. The attention given to miniatures in part accounts for the relative neglect of this period, from which only one securely identified illustrated manuscript is known.⁴

There are several complexities intrinsic to the study of medieval Anatolia on the one hand, and to the field of Islamic manuscripts on the other, that need to be addressed. These issues are partially to blame for deficiencies that endure in our understanding of Anatolian society and manuscript culture. Other problematic aspects of the literature are due to scholarly biases and flawed methodologies.

⁴ This is a copy of *Daqā'iq al-Ḥaqā'iq*, a Persian work on astrology and magic by Nāṣir al-Rummālī al-Sīwāsī that was completed in Aksaray and Kayseri in 1272-3 (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 174). See Barrucand 1991. I briefly discuss this manuscript in Chapter One but have chosen not to focus on it further since it is not illuminated. Furthermore, the manuscript would require a significant amount of further study since its folios are out of order and some parts of the manuscript are seemingly of a later date. Another illustrated and non-illuminated manuscript – a thirteenth-century copy of *Varqa va Gulshāh* in the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi (Istanbul, H.481) – has been attributed to Anatolia (Melikian 1970, Rogers et al. 1986). This is the earliest known illustrated manuscript in Persian. The dating and provenance are due to the illustrator, 'Abd al-Mu'min ibn Muḥammad al-Naqqāsh al-Khūyī, appearing in the 1253 *waqfiyya* of the Büyük Karatay Medrese in Konya (Özergin 1970).

These will be discussed more fully in the sections concerning historiography and codicology below.

A perpetual problem is the gaps that remain in the historical record of the medieval period. Although there are a number of sources that pertain to events in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, these largely focus on the political context.⁵ Additionally, not all textual sources have been published or fully edited, and access to these is limited by knowledge of relevant languages.⁶ Unless new material comes to light, some aspects of the period are likely to remain obscured.

Interpretations of manuscript production are similarly shaped by the vagaries of survival, and the issue of geographical dispersal. Credible comparative analyses of paper, handwriting, and decoration require access to primary materials, which one can usually only discover through catalogues, databases or secondary literature. Beyond the limits of catalogues and scholarship, first-hand access to collections can occasionally uncover material that was previously unknown or misidentified, as has been the case in the present study. It is entirely possible that other

⁵ These are discussed in more detail in 'Primary sources' below.

⁶ Unpublished chronicles include *al-Walad al-Shafiq* and *Anis al-Qulub*. The former was copied in 1340 by Aḥmad of Niğde and exists in a single manuscript (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 4518). *Anis al-Qulub* was composed by Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Abū Naṣr ibn Maṣṣūr al-Anawī (of Ani, in present-day Turkey) who died some time after 1222. It also exists in a single manuscript (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2984). Only the final part has been published (Köprülü 1943). Excerpts have been translated into English by A.C.S. Peacock (2015a). See also Peacock 2004a and 2004b, Danielyan 2016 and Jackson 2017. One of the most important sources on medieval Anatolia, Ibn Bībī's *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-Umūr al-'Alā'iyya*, written around 1282, has been published in facsimile based on the original manuscript (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985). See Ibn Bībī 1956. This original copy remains largely unedited. I discuss Ibn Bībī's chronicle in Chapter One.

manuscripts will be discovered in the future that will re-shape some of the arguments put forth in this dissertation.

In addition to problems with sources, there are complexities inherent to the setting of medieval Anatolia itself. Firstly, a large degree of political fragmentation occurred between the Mongols' defeat of the Rūm Seljuks at the Battle of Kösedağ (1243) and the broad consolidation of territory under Ottoman ruler Bāyazīd I (r. 1389-1402). Cemal Kafadar has argued that a long period of political instability encompasses the years between 1071 and 1526, from the Battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt) to the suppression of the last of a series of anti-Ottoman revolts in Anatolia.⁷ Either way, this volatile environment is not suitably reflected in the tripartite periodisation of 'Seljuk', 'Beylik' (or 'pre-Ottoman') and 'Ottoman' Anatolia. This dynastic framework, for better or worse, has been remarkably persistent in both historical and art historical scholarship until recently.⁸

Another difficulty in studying medieval Anatolian society is the large degree of ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity present at the time. In addition to travellers, traders, and military forces from Central Asia, Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, inhabitants of Anatolia communicated in a number of languages including Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Persian, Syriac and Turkish. The use of languages did not always fall along ethnic lines. Added to this were various and often overlapping Muslim, Christian and (to a lesser extent) Jewish communities.

⁷ Kafadar 2007: 8.

⁸ For a critical analysis, see Pancaroğlu 2007 and Necipoğlu 2007: 174.

This continues to present linguistic and methodological problems for scholars since understandings of these contexts have also been affected by the separation of scholarly fields into, for example, 'Byzantine', 'Islamic art' or 'Turkish' studies, though progress has been made through the adoption of interdisciplinary approaches.⁹

In large part, it is such complexities that necessitate the next section, where I discuss the chronological and geographical scope and some of the terminology used in this dissertation, and present reasons for their adoption.

Chronological and geographical scope of the thesis

Gülru Necipoğlu has suggested that the period from circa 1050 to circa 1450, which she terms the 'medieval' and 'late medieval' eras in the Islamic world, is characterised by the incorporation of greater territories into the Islamic sphere and the increasing fragmentation of political authority.¹⁰ In this scheme, the 'late medieval' period commences with the Mongol sack of Baghdad (1258) and ends with the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople (1453) and the consequent rise of court cultures and workshops. Necipoğlu deliberately uses "Western" chronological categories so as not to relegate Islamic lands to "different time zones".¹¹

⁹ Such as Goshgarian 2007.

¹⁰ Necipoğlu 2012: 13.

¹¹ Ibid: 12.

The point that the history of the 'Muslim' world should not be isolated from that of the 'European' world is a valid one. To suggest otherwise recalls Orientalist dichotomies of East and West. However, the use of 'medieval' in the study of both European and Islamic history remains controversial.¹² The concept of a 'medieval' era was introduced in the Renaissance period, to denote a time of darkness and ignorance that began after the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476.¹³ Daniel Varisco has compared its negative connotations to how the *jāhiliyya* ('state/days of ignorance') is viewed in Islamic tradition.¹⁴

However, the problem of Islamic periodisation and what to use instead of 'medieval' persists with no satisfactory solution.¹⁵ In the context of Persianate societies, the term 'post-Mongol' has been used in scholarship to refer to the period after the first incursions of Chingīz Khān.¹⁶ This certainly acknowledges the significance of the events, and roughly corresponds to the beginning of Necipoğlu's 'late medieval' period. Although the use of 'post-Mongol' is applicable to Anatolian history, however, it is problematic for Islamic regions that were not subjected to their authority, like Muslim Spain, and has yet to be adopted by the wider field.

¹² Hodgson 1974: II, 48.

¹³ Derived from the Latin for 'middle period' (*medium aevum*), the era was theoretically bookended by the classical and Renaissance periods.

¹⁴ Varisco 2007: 389. Even today, 'medieval' has been applied as a derogatory attribute of modern-day Islam (Mutman 1992: 165; Varisco 2007: 398).

¹⁵ Other scholars who have attempted to demarcate Islamic history include Marshall Hodgson in *The Venture of Islam* (1974), Jonathan Berkey (2003) and Chase Robinson (2003: xv). Periodisation does not seem to have concerned Islamic scholars.

¹⁶ Pfeiffer and Quinn 2006.

The Mongol victory over the Rūm Seljuks in 1243 brought about a period of profound political and cultural change by shattering the relative territorial integrity of central Anatolia. The period around 1277, however, is the starting point for the present study. This is because in 1276-77, Ilkhanid interests in Rūm were seriously threatened by two rebellions and a defeat at the hands of the Mamluks in the Battle of Elbistan (Abulustayn). These events prompted the fiscal and bureaucratic incorporation of the region into the Ilkhanid realm, which entailed the removal of any remaining Seljuk power and the appointment of a series of Mongol governors directly from the Ilkhanid *ordu*. The crises of 1276-77 also encapsulated the shifting power dynamics and military skirmishes that characterised much of the period's political landscape, and thus provide an appropriate starting point for further discussions.

The material at hand also supports my choice of starting date. At the time of writing, I am aware of only one illuminated manuscript dated to the period between 1243-77 which is securely attributable to the region.¹⁷ My chronological scope ends with the temporary unification of much of the Anatolian peninsula under the control of Ottoman ruler Bāyazīd I from 1389. Though it is certainly possible to extend this scope in future studies, the period under discussion remains understudied in terms of its artistic production. Furthermore, an

¹⁷ This is a 1272-6 copy of *Kitāb al-Shifā'* produced in Maragha and Harput (Elazığ) (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2442). There is also an illuminated copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna* produced in 1262 which has been attributed to Konya (Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cologne, 527). I discuss both manuscripts in Chapter One.

appreciation of this period, which was characterised by frequent conflict and socio-political fragmentation, is crucial for understanding what comes after.

The survival of material is an issue that unmistakably shapes the nature of any discussion on visual and artistic culture. The content of this thesis gives a significant amount of attention to Konya as a production centre. Despite searching several libraries, I have been unable to find convincing evidence of another contemporary centre of comparable importance for the production of illuminated material. It is probably the case that other cities like Sivas or Kayseri may have had smaller enterprises for the production of such material. Some of the materials' survival is connected to the continual integrity of the Mawlawi shrine's library (today part of the Mevlana Müzesi), despite the political volatility of the period.

The manuscripts that have survived do not readily form a straightforward, linear narrative, nor do I wish to force them into one. While the structure of the thesis is broadly chronological, each chapter focuses on cohesive groups of material that are, by and large, anchored to specific production centres or contexts. The emphasis on particular places and points in time has two, interrelated aims. Firstly, grounding my analyses in specific milieux puts the local context at the forefront of analysis and highlights how this context interacts with regional and transregional developments. Although the primary nature of the interactions discussed in this dissertation are artistic and visual, I do also discuss literary, political, economic and religious connections as well. This emphasis allows for a more nuanced, accurate and inclusive account of cultural and artistic phenomena.

Secondly, this focus will redress scholarly frameworks that employ modern political borders and prioritise the Ottoman narrative by producing an alternative narrative that is determined by material rather than governing structures.

The question of geographical scope is often a complex issue in the premodern period but particularly so in the context of late medieval Anatolia where political boundaries were relatively fluid. Even before the arrival of the Mongols in the mid-thirteenth century, Anatolia was already fragmented internally. Following the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, in which the Great Seljuks had defeated the Byzantine Empire, Turkic settlers slowly trickled into the region. From the eleventh century onwards, power was divided between various Byzantine polities (ca 330-1453), the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1198-1375), and a number of Islamic principalities, or beyliks. These beyliks included the Danishmandids (1071-1178), three branches of the Artuqids (1102-1409), the Saltuqids (1072-1202) and the Mangujakids (1072-1277), who variously were hostile to or allied with the Rūm Seljuks. By the turn of the twelfth century, the Seljuks had absorbed a large proportion of the Anatolian peninsula into their realm. Throughout the medieval period, the region was subjected to continued hostilities and shifting borders that encompassed occasional pockets of stability. Within this, trade networks enabled the movement of people, as well as their beliefs, ideas, skills and possessions, in and out of Anatolian cities.

Unlike those of modern-day Turkey, the boundaries of Rūm in the later medieval period certainly did not correspond to today's borders. Although I run the risk of

reifying the region's boundaries, it is practical and useful to consider what these were, particularly since the geographical scope I have adopted does not correspond precisely to the whole of the Anatolian peninsula or Ilkhanid or Seljuk territories. The 'Lands of Rūm' is a more inclusive alternative to the geographical descriptors of 'Turkey' or (Seljuk/Ilkhanid) 'Anatolia' that evokes a sense of the region at the crossroads of cultures, religions and languages.¹⁸ It is also more reflective of usage of 'Rūm' and 'Rūmī' in contemporary sources.¹⁹

'Bilād al-Rūm' appears to have had the meaning of 'Byzantine Empire', 'Europe' or both, according to Arabic geographies of the 9th-11th centuries. As Koray Durak argues, the idea of Bilād al-Rūm was a flexible one, perhaps formed as a Christian "mirror-image" of 'Bilād al-Islām'.²⁰ In the centuries following Muslim penetration into these regions, however, polities like the Seljuks and Danishmandids adopted 'Rūm' as part of their state identities. This was perhaps intended to suggest their status as heirs to the Byzantines, and also to remain familiar to the substantial local Christian Greek population.²¹ The coinage of the Danishmandid ruler, Malik Muḥammad Ghāzī (r. 1134-42), for example, featured Greek text reading, "The king of all Rome and Anatolia".²²

¹⁸ Blessing 2014a: 3.

¹⁹ Kafadar 2007, Necipoğlu and Bozdoğan 2007.

²⁰ Durak 2010: 295.

²¹ Bosworth 2017a.

²² David Collection, Copenhagen, C.531.

The Ilkhanid historian and geographer Ḥamdullāh al-Mustawfī al-Qazwīnī (d. after 1340) lists the towns that constituted ‘Rūm’ in *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* (1340).²³ In al-Qazwīnī’s description, the Lands of Rūm stretched from Erzincan in the east to Afyonkarahisar in the west.²⁴ Northern towns included Kastamonu and Samsun, while towns in the south included Elbistan and Eğirdir. In the south and east lay the regions of Greater Armenia and Diyār Bakr, which remained culturally and politically separate from Rūm. In the north and south-east of central Anatolia, respectively, Rūm neighboured the Byzantine Kingdom of Trebizond (1204-1461) and the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia.

However, al-Qazwīnī’s is not the only account and in light of others’ writings, I consider ‘Rūm’ to be a relatively flexible descriptor without fixed borders. Contemporaries like al-‘Umarī (d. 1349) and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (d. 1377) also distinguished between Bilād al-Rūm and other regions, though had slightly differing views concerning specific boundaries.²⁵ Unlike al-Qazwīnī, both writers include western Anatolia as part of Rūm, a region which, following the dissolution of the Rum Seljuk state, was largely populated by Turkmen principalities. Both writers also highlight the ‘Turkish’ (or possibly Muslim) aspect of the region: al-‘Umarī refers to ‘the Kingdom of the Turks in Rūm’ (*mamlakat al-Atrāk bi-al-Rūm*) while Ibn Baṭṭūṭa terms the region, ‘the land of Turks known as the lands of Rūm’ (*barr al-Turkiyya al-ma’rūf bi-bilād al-Rūm*).²⁶

²³ Al-Qazwīnī 1919: 95-100.

²⁴ Ibid: 95, 98.

²⁵ Al-‘Umarī 1929, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1854 and 1962.

²⁶ Al-‘Umarī 1929: 1, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 255.

Although this might seem to suggest that Rūm was a Turkish land, as was certainly proposed by many Turkish scholars in the twentieth century,²⁷ the reality is perhaps more complicated. As with the use of ‘Rūm’ in sources, the *nisba* ‘al-Rūmī’, which derives from the Arabic word for ‘Rome’, or ‘Byzantium’, is used in primary sources from at least the early thirteenth century.²⁸ It seems to have been used to describe Greek Christians, such as the painter ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Rūmī,²⁹ as well as other non-Christian and non-Greek inhabitants of Rūm such as the Sufi author and patron saint of the Mawlawi order, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273). Although the Mawlawi leader may not have been known by this *nisba* in his time, fourteenth-century sources do use it.³⁰ In addition to its Byzantine overtones, the designation ‘al-Rūmī’ seems to have absorbed positive, perhaps cosmopolitan or urban, social connotations. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī is reported to have said that the “cultivation of the world belongs to Rūmīs, and the devastation of the universe is confined to Turks”.³¹

²⁷ I discuss the emergence of Seljuk studies in the context of Turkish nationalism and the later Turko-Islamic synthesis in more detail in ‘Studying Turkish art and history’ below.

²⁸ Kafadar 2007: 11.

²⁹ Aflākī 1961: I, 425, 552-3; 2002: 292-3, 382-3.

³⁰ An illuminated copy of Rūmī’s *Dīvān-i Kabīr* from 774/1372 probably produced in Shiraz names the author as ‘Jalāl al-Milla wa al-Dīn al-Rūmī’ (British Library, London, Or.2866). Franklin D. Lewis also asserts that two early fourteenth-century sources use ‘Rūmī’ to refer to Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī but he does not mention the names of these sources. He also suggests that part of the text of *Dīvān-i Kabīr* alludes to the use of ‘Rūmī’ as part of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī’s name (2008: 10).

³¹ “*Imarāt-i ‘ālam makḥṣūs-ast bi Rūmīyān va kharābī-i jahān maqṣūr-ast bi-Turkān*” (Aflākī 1961: II, 721). Although O’Kane translates ‘Rūmī’ as ‘Greek’, I have already suggested that the term could be used for non-Greek people as well (Aflākī 2002: 502). In this context, ‘Turks’ probably refers to Turkmen nomads.

The Mawlawi leader's comment would seem to indicate that sophisticated Rūmīs and uncouth Turks existed in opposition to each other. Indeed, such an assessment could correlate with early modern scholarship on the western 'frontier'. With the partial incorporation of central and eastern Anatolia into the Ilkhanid realm from the mid-thirteenth century, the region became the western fringe of Mongol territories. Even before that, the western part of Seljuk lands had bordered the Byzantine Empire of Nicaea (1204-1261). These borderlands, variously called the 'frontier', the 'marches' or the 'ūj', were characterised by rich pastures, valleys and mountains, which enabled the pursuit of a nomadic lifestyle. The proximity to unguarded Byzantine territories also provided easy targets for Turkmen raiders.

In his study of the rise of the Ottomans, Paul Wittek's discussion of the 'frontier', or 'ūj' as he termed it, has strongly shaped later conceptions of the region as a lawless borderland where folk and warrior culture flourished.³² This opposition between the unruly, nomadic marches of the western frontier and the cultured cities of the Seljuk heartland has permeated throughout scholarly understandings of the political and cultural landscape of medieval Anatolia.³³ More recently, Cemal Kafadar has critiqued this binary conception, stating that, "if anything characterised medieval Anatolian frontiers, and possibly all frontiers, it was mobility and fluidity".³⁴ Kafadar has suggested that the frontier was not in opposition to the centre, but rather shaped by multiple layers of authority (e.g.

³² Wittek 1934: 3-4, Zachariadou 2015.

³³ This was almost certainly helped by similar ideas put forward by Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, one of the most (if not the most) significant early historians of the Seljuk and Ottoman period. Köprülü is discussed in more detail below.

³⁴ Kafadar 1995: 140.

Mongols, Seljuks and Turkmen princes) and religion. In Kafadar's words, religious belief and practice in this period could be viewed as a "metadoxy", a "state of being beyond [ortho- or hetero-]doxies".³⁵ In light of this, the differences between Turk and Rūmī perhaps reflected tensions over class and learning, rather than ethnicity or religion. This distinction is all the more important when considering manuscript material, which was often linked to literary and scholarly circles.

A.C.S. Peacock has taken Kafadar's argument one step further, arguing that the Turkmen 'frontier' was in some cases culturally, economically and politically integrated with Konya, a centre of urban, Persianate culture.³⁶ Peacock also suggests that scholars should refrain from even equating 'frontier' and 'ūj', as it is not always clear what the latter meant in medieval sources.³⁷ Although it is undeniable that a geographical 'buffer zone' existed, what the 'frontier' actually consisted of and how the 'ūj' might have been understood in the medieval period was complex and variable.³⁸ It is the case that the illuminated manuscripts that I discuss were largely produced in towns. However, a fuller discussion of their production contexts will entail a more nuanced understanding of Turkmen culture, the 'frontier' and its connection to the 'centre'.

Underlying the somewhat nebulous nature of identity and geography in medieval Anatolia is the issue of mobility that Kafadar has highlighted. As I have mentioned,

³⁵ Kafadar 1995: 76, 124-5.

³⁶ Both Seljuk and Mongol elites funded buildings in the region, while manuscript evidence shows that scholars and Sufis shared in the intellectual culture of Anatolia's towns (Peacock 2014).

³⁷ Peacock 2014: 274.

³⁸ Korobeinikov 2014: 218-82.

the chapters of the present study focus on specific production centres. By closely examining the visual and material properties of the manuscripts, I suggest links with the arts of the book of neighbouring regions. In the context of manuscript production, such connections generally occurred through the movement of either craftsmen or manuscripts or both. For example, motifs that first appear in manuscripts from twelfth and thirteenth-century Jazira and Persia later appear in Ilkhanid, then Mamluk, Injuid and Anatolian illumination. There are several reasons that artists might have been mobile, including economic migration, escaping natural or man-made disasters, or being taken prisoner. Manuscripts, for their part, could travel with their owners, or be given away or appropriated. However, there is no clear evidence of manuscripts being brought into Rūm from outside the region having had a direct impact on the visual properties of locally-produced manuscripts. Appreciating the mobility of craftsmen (as well as Sufis, scholars (*‘ulamā’*), bureaucrats and merchants) into and out of the region is therefore crucial for understanding how the artistic landscapes of Rūm’s towns were embedded into the world around them, and how material was produced as a result of these local and transregional connections.

The Lands of Rūm, circa 1250-1400

The political scene in late thirteenth and fourteenth-century Anatolia was complex, fragmented and turbulent. This environment, characterised by frequent conflict between competing Mongol, Turkish and Christian forces, was the result of troubles within the Byzantine Empire, and the decisive Mongol victory at Köseadağ

in 1243. Political authority in Anatolia had been split between the Byzantines, Armenians and Muslim polities since the late eleventh century. In addition to the beyliks mentioned above, this patchwork of power was further disrupted by numerous Crusader incursions into various parts of the region over the course of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries.

In 1204, Constantinople was sacked by Crusader armies, leading to a weakening of Byzantine territorial integrity. Out of this emerged three Byzantine successor states: the Empire of Nicaea (1204-61), the Empire of Trebizond (1204-1461), and the Despotate of Epirus (1205-1479). The Byzantine Empire was finally restored in 1261 when the Empire of Nicaea recaptured Constantinople, only to experience numerous civil wars over the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Following their loss at Köseadağ, the Seljuks were forced to pay tribute to the Mongols, and their power as rulers was substantially diminished. Even in the former Seljuk capital of Konya, political authority became divided between ambitious bureaucrats, Mongol governors and Turkish *beys* (prince or governor, Ar. *amīr*). By 1308, the Seljuks disappeared entirely from the historical record. The Mongol victory also began a process by which de facto political power in Rūm, formerly unified under the Seljuks for the most part, was divided between the Ilkhanate, local viziers and governors, and various beyliks. This diffusion of power

persisted until the short-lived unification of the region under the command of the Ottoman ruler Bāyazīd I (r. 1389-1402).³⁹

Following the death of the Ilkhanid ruler Abū Saʿīd (r. 1316-35), the Mongol regime disintegrated into a handful of rival successor states, such as the Aratnids (1335-81) and the Jalayirids (1335-1432). With the Ilkhanate gone, several groups vied for control in Rūm in a complex network of alliances and competition.⁴⁰ These groups included some of the Ilkhanid successor states, numerous Turkish beyliks who occupied most of the Anatolian peninsula, the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria, and, latterly, forces headed by Tīmūr (r. 1370-1405). In addition to these were the Byzantine Empire's Palaeologian dynasty, and their rivals, the House of Kantakouzenos, the Empire of Trebizond (1204-1461), the Lusignan Kingdom of Cyprus (1192-1489), the Knights Hospitallers,⁴¹ and Cilician Armenia (1198-1375).

Although the present study focuses on Islamic manuscripts, it is certainly the case that patrons from Christian communities also commissioned illuminated manuscripts in the region. Of these, Armenian and Byzantine patrons were probably the most prolific. Several illuminated Armenian manuscripts are known from eastern Anatolia and their visual relations to Islamic book arts remain

³⁹ 'Short-lived' because Tīmūr gave many of the *amīrs* their lands back after imprisoning Bāyazīd after the Battle of Ankara in 1402.

⁴⁰ Such networks were made up of both political and marital alliances. The latter were comprised of marriages between the beyliks and between beylik princes and Greek and Serbian princesses (Vyronis 1971: 466). See also Shukurov 2012.

⁴¹ Founded circa 1099, the group is now better known as the Order of Saint John.

understudied.⁴² Additionally, Byzantine Greek manuscripts were produced throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Constantinople, Nicaea (İznik), and Trebizond (Trabzon).⁴³ The above mentioned single illuminated manuscript dated to the period between 1243 and 1277 and attributable to Rūm was in fact produced for a Syriac-speaking physician who was travelling from Maragha to Harput (Elazığ).⁴⁴

In this environment of political fragmentation and cultural cosmopolitanism, the importance Konya had held as a centre of political and economic activity under the Rūm Seljuks was, to a certain extent, displaced to other urban areas like Sivas, Antalya and Tokat. According to surviving manuscript evidence, however, Konya clearly remained a significant hub of artistic and intellectual activity. Despite a near-constant instability in the political sphere, cultural life in many other cities of Bilād al-Rūm flourished as well. In addition to Sivas, Antalya and Tokat, places like Erzincan, Bursa, Kayseri and Amasya rose in importance to become prominent centres of political, economic, cultural and artistic activity.

Notable scholars and Sufis had emigrated to Rūm from the late eleventh century onwards. This movement occurred alongside the initial territorial expansion of the Great Seljuks from Persia into Rūm. Since the consolidation of Rūm Seljuk rule in

⁴² Merian 1993, Soucek 1998 and Dadoyan 2013-14.

⁴³ Buchthal 1978 and 1983 and Carr 1982 and 1987. See also Nelson 1988, Hunt 1998 and Uyar 2015.

⁴⁴ See n. 17 above. I am not aware of any other thirteenth-century Syriac manuscripts produced in Harput or Maragha that have survived. Thirteenth-century Syriac manuscripts that employ Hijri dating (as the above-mentioned manuscript does) seem mainly to have been produced in Iraq and the Jazira (Brock 2005: 285-6).

the late twelfth century, notable individuals like ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Kāsānī (d. 1189), Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Rāwandī (d. after 1204) and Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 1240) had all resided in Rūm either temporarily or permanently. The movement of dervishes, craftsmen, traders, bureaucrats and scholars from all over the Islamic world into the region continued throughout the thirteenth century.

Part of this influx was undoubtedly motivated by the devastation wrought by the Mongol armies in Persia and the Jazira, and facilitated by the ease of travel along trade routes that had been established across the region by the Rūm Seljuks in the early thirteenth century. Even before this movement, Rūm’s cities were already populated by people of various religious backgrounds and ethnic origins, including Persian and Turkish-speaking Muslims, Mongols, Christian Greeks and Armenians, and European merchants. This relative ease of travel and the possibilities of employment attracted craftsmen to the region, and helped to foster an atmosphere of artistic exchange between such communities.

This diversity also engendered a large degree of intellectual openness and religious latitudinarianism on the local level. This favourable climate likely encouraged the migration of scholars and dervishes who were seeking more accommodating religious communities, and patronage opportunities. Indeed, in earlier periods, Rūm had become an appealing intellectual milieu for scholars and dervishes whose works and activities fell outside the orthodox Ḥanafī school

(*madhhab*) previously endorsed by the Great Seljuks of Persia (1037-1194).⁴⁵ In the later medieval period, there are several examples of non-Ḥanafī scholars making a living and authoring works in Rūm.⁴⁶

Such conditions were encouraged by the construction of madrasas, Sufi lodges (*khānqāh* or *zāwiya*), and shrines (*turba*) in the region.⁴⁷ The foundation of madrasas and lodges - sometimes within the same complex - facilitated the process of Islamisation in Anatolia through the instruction of scholars and Sufis.⁴⁸ As in other parts of the Islamic world, madrasas and dervish lodges were funded by the revenue of designated landed properties, such as mills and shops, as a *waqf* (endowment). In addition to fulfilling a religious duty, endowments allowed *wāqifs* (endowers) to protect and control land, and create sources of revenue. Moreover, in their support of such institutions, *wāqifs* provided necessary communal spaces and public services, like soup kitchens, libraries, and bath houses, and consolidated relations with local scholars and dervishes. Particularly prestigious institutions had the potential to attract notables from further afield and enhance the *wāqif*'s own regard.

⁴⁵ Madelung 1971: 141 and Safi 2006. The historian and Ḥanafī scholar Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Rāwandī praised the Great Seljuks as ‘champions’ of Sunni orthodoxy (Rāwandī 1921: 17-18, 29-30, Hillenbrand 2005: 160).

⁴⁶ Such scholars included Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283) and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Aqsarāyī (d. 1388) who were both Shāfi‘īs. Shāfi‘ī students were for the most part welcomed at institutions of learning in Rūm (Atcil 2010: 44). As Aflākī reports, Rūmī admonished the patron of a recently-constructed madrasa for barring Shāfi‘ī students (1961: I, 444-5; 2002: 306-7)

⁴⁷ Patricia Blessing has shown that in the forty years after the Mongol occupation of Anatolia, twelve madrasas were constructed, compared to eleven in the sixty-three years between 1180-1243. According to Blessing, Sufi lodges and tomb complexes were only constructed in the region after 1243 (Blessing 2012: Maps 4-6).

⁴⁸ Leiser 2004.

The relative intellectual and religious openness of society in this period was encouraged by the total breakdown in Seljuk rule, which itself had faced a series of difficulties even before the Mongol invasion. In a time of relative political instability and socio-religious fluidity, Sufis became important representatives of the Islamic faith and made crucial contributions to socio-religious, political and economic life.⁴⁹ These included in particular the Mawlawi dervishes who, as we will see, played a very significant part in the production of high-quality manuscripts. Dervishes held a degree of authority over the local population, and could become legitimising intermediaries between political elites and the devoted public, or, indeed, sources of rebellion.⁵⁰

The Mawlawis' patron saint was the Sufi author Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), who lived in Konya for most of his life. Rūmī moved to Rūm in around 1212 at the age of five with his father, Bahā' al-Dīn Walad (d. 1231), a Ḥanafī scholar from Central Asia. Bahā' al-Dīn and his young son first lived in Malatya, and then Sivas, Akşehir (now known as Akşar Köyü) and Larende (Karaman), before settling in Konya in the 1220s.⁵¹ Rūmī first became a *murīd* (disciple) of Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn who was a former pupil of Rūmī's father. Upon the death of Burhān al-Dīn around 1239-40, Rūmī continued his education in Aleppo and Damascus. Although both Rūmī and his father appear to have shared an interest in *taṣawwuf* and asceticism, it was not until Rūmī met the Qalandarī shaykh Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī in 1244 that his faith

⁴⁹ Wolper 2003.

⁵⁰ Omid Safi has discussed how prominent Sufis were used to legitimise Seljuk authority in Iran, while religious figures who opposed the regime were suppressed (2000).

⁵¹ It is unclear precisely why Bahā' al-Dīn decided to leave Central Asia (Lewis 2008: 46-63).

took on more ecstatic forms.⁵² By the time that he died, Rūmī had amassed a sizeable group of devotees who extended across all strata of society in Konya.⁵³ According to surviving evidence, some of the wealthier of these disciples were active in the patronage of illuminated manuscripts. Moreover, the craftsmen who produced these manuscripts were, for the most part, also disciples of Rūmī and his son Sulṭān Walad (d. 1312), who became leader of the Mawlawi shrine following the death of Rūmī's immediate successor, Ḥusām al-Dīn Chalabī in 1283.

As an urban Sufi group, Rūmī and the early Mawlawis had regular interactions with other socio-religious groups inhabiting Konya, like the *'ulamā'* and the *akhīs*. This is not to say, however, that such groups occupied separate spheres. Indeed, the activities of the Mawlawi community took place in a variety of settings that included madrasas, *zawīyas* and *khānqāhs*. For example, an illuminated manuscript produced by a Mawlawi scribe, which is examined in Chapter Two, has various parts that were copied in Rūmī's shrine (*turba*) and madrasa (*madrasa-yi khudāvandigār*).⁵⁴ Both Rūmī and his father taught at madrasas in Konya and had positive relations with local scholars.⁵⁵ However, although the worlds of Sufis and scholars overlapped, such relationships were not always without tension.

According to the Mawlawi hagiographer, Aflākī (d. 1360), soon after Rūmī's death

⁵² Lewis 2008: 274.

⁵³ Notable supporters included 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II (r. 1246-57) and the *parvāna* (personal assistant to the sultan), Mu'īn al-Dīn Sulaymān (d. 1277). For more on Rūmī's followers and contemporaries, see Aflākī 1961 and 2002, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 1992, Peacock 2012 and Küçüküseyin 2013.

⁵⁴ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177, fols 192b and 317b.

⁵⁵ Aflākī mentions several scholars and their dealings with Rūmī, such as Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī, the chief *qāḍī* of Konya, who is mentioned several times in the Mawlawi hagiography (Aflākī 1961 and 2002).

in 1273, “partisan jurists and ascetics given to outward formalities” complained to the *parvāna* Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān (d. 1277) that the Mawlawi performance of the *samā‘* was a “reprehensible innovation”.⁵⁶ The uneasiness between exterior (*zāhiri*) and interior (*bāṭini*) forms of religion presented in this anecdote correlates to a certain extent with the friction that existed between the nonconformist *bābās* (dervishes) of the countryside and the more urbane form of Islam and Sufism in Rūm’s cities.⁵⁷

This apparent duality between ‘popular’ Turkish folk culture and ‘high’ Persianate court culture was first explored in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü’s (1890-1966) 1918 work, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (Early Sufis in Turkish Literature), which focused on the poetry of the Central Asian Sufi Aḥmad Yasavī (d. 1166) and the Anatolian Sufi Yūnus Emre (d. ca 1320). This important work not only heralded new understandings of the place of Turkish and Islamic culture held in Anatolian history, but also highlighted the importance and complexities of the period and opened the study of Turkish literature and history to a large degree, through its extensive use of historical texts and sources.

Köprülü contended that the widespread Islamisation of Turkish people in Anatolia largely occurred through the activities of *bābās*, whose ‘heterodox’ version of Islam

⁵⁶ Aflākī 2002: 396. The Persian reads, “*jamā‘atī az fuqahā’-ya muta‘aṣṣib va zāhidān-i mutarassim pīsh-i parvāna ghulū kardand ki samā‘ al-battah ḥarām-ast*” (Aflākī 1961: II, 578). The *samā‘* is a form of *dhikr* (devotional act often involving repeated prayers).

⁵⁷ This friction manifested itself most emphatically in the Bābā’ī rebellion of the 1240s in Amasya (Ocak 1989). Aflākī’s contempt for the *bābās* is made clear in his chronicle (1961: I, 146-7, 381-3; 2002: 102-3, 263).

was ultimately derived from a context of Central Asian shamanism.⁵⁸ In Köprülü's view, the *bābās* and their "veneer" of Sufism were in opposition to the sophisticated Arab and Persian Sufis of Rūm's urban centres, like Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. This dichotomy of "orthodox" (*müteşerri'*) urban Islam and "heterodox" (*aykırı*) rural Islam has had a profound impact on understandings of the Islamic histories of Central Asia, Persia and Anatolia in both Turkish and Western academia.⁵⁹

While there were evidently differing strains in the practice of Islam and Sufism (as suggested by Aflākī's anecdote mentioned above), this 'great and little traditions' framework has to an extent obscured the nature of being a 'Sufi' in medieval Anatolia and anchored its origins to Central Asia, whether or not this was well founded.⁶⁰ Textual evidence suggests that despite generally being composed in two languages (Turkish or Persian) for different audiences, the two traditions did not exist in isolation from each other.⁶¹ It is perhaps more appropriate to think of the myriad practices and beliefs of *taşawwuf* as overlapping points along a spectrum rather than opposing camps. Indeed, adherents of so-called 'folk' Sufism were – as

⁵⁸ Köprülü 2006: 7-8. See also Köprülü 1929. Defining 'shamanism' as it was understood in medieval Central Asia is problematic due to a lack of source material. A recent study describes shamanism as "an animist world-view ... involving distinctive practices that focus on the ability of certain individuals to induce and control various states of consciousness for the purpose of mediating between culturally accepted dimensions of the world" (Sumegi 2013: 72). See Amitai-Preiss 1999 and DeWeese 2006: xvi. Köprülü's understanding of the cultural connection to Central Asia and shamanism was particularly guided by the work of Mehmed Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924). See Gökalp 1923 and 1926 and Köprülü 1929.

⁵⁹ Köprülü 2006. Devin DeWeese has noted that Köprülü can hardly be blamed for the uncritical repetition of his views (2006: xi). See also Dressler 2010 and Kafadar's helpful discussion of 'metadoxy' (1995: 76).

⁶⁰ Karamustafa 1993, Karakaya-Stump 2013. Some scholars, like Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, continue to advance this problematic conception of Sufi culture (Ocak 2009). See also Dressler 2013: 260-8.

⁶¹ Karamustafa has discussed how so-called 'folk' Sufis wrote in languages other than Turkish, such as Ḥājji Baktāsh-i Walī's (d. ca 1271) Arabic *Maqālāt*, or had non-Turkish commentaries written about their work, such as Quṭb al-'Alawī's fourteenth-century Persian commentary on Baraq Bābā's (d. 1307-8) *shaḥīyyāt* (ecstatic expressions) (Karamustafa 1993: 197).

Köprülü himself recognised – well-versed in the literary genres of poetry and hagiography. Like Yūnus Emre, the poet ‘Āshiq Pāshā (d. 1333) wrote poetry in Turkish, composing the *Gharībnāma* in 1330. ‘Āshiq Pāshā’s son Alvān Chalabī (fl. 14th c.) wrote a versified Turkish hagiography of his great-grandfather, Bābā Ilyās, who was one of the instigators of the Bābā’ī rebellion.⁶²

While it is clear that Rūmī’s devotees were not the only Sufis producing and reading literary works, they are the only group whose illuminated manuscripts remain. While it is impossible to know precisely why this is the case, further investigation into the cultural and political networks within which the Mawlawis operated may uncover some reasons as to why they were so involved in the production of the arts of the book. Until now, these more ‘earthly’ aspects of the early Mawlawis have not been fully explored even though their connection to the arts has been noted in scholarship.⁶³

This neglect may in part be due to ethnocentric conceptions of Sufi thought and practice. Omid Safi, for example, has criticised some European scholars’ applications of Christian principles concerning ‘mysticism’ to understandings of medieval Islamic Sufism.⁶⁴ In this body of literature, Sufism is portrayed as an ineffable quest for personal contact with God, which is diametrically opposed to Islamic orthodoxy. Hence, once a Sufi order became increasingly institutionalised,

⁶² Tulum 2000.

⁶³ Uzluk 1957, Lifchez 1992.

⁶⁴ Safi 2000.

“spiritual insight atrophied”.⁶⁵ Such views extracted Sufis from their social history reducing their activities to vaguely mystical pursuits, which in reality took on forms that could be specific to time, place and group.⁶⁶ In fact, Sufis certainly participated in worldly networks of power and patronage and wrote widely on ‘madrasa’ subjects like *tafsīr* (exegesis), *ḥadīth* (Prophetic sayings) and *fiqh* (jurisprudence).⁶⁷ The focus on mysticism has not only obscured deeper considerations of political and social activities but also the multiple other affiliations that dervishes could have. Rather than merely falling into two groups of rural Turkish-speakers and urban Persian-speakers, Sufis in this context were actually quite diverse. As I shall discuss throughout the dissertation, Mawlawi disciples were from all levels of society, had a variety of professions, were familiar with multiple languages and, in some cases, were not even Muslim but Christian.⁶⁸ Their contribution to material culture should be viewed in this framework of worldly associations.

⁶⁵ Trimingham 1971: 70. William James ethnicised the dichotomy between Sufism and Islamic orthodoxy by ascribing the emergence of Sufism to the “pantheism” of the Persian mind, in opposition to the “hot and rigid monotheism” of the Arab mind (James 1902: 402).

⁶⁶ Lloyd Ridgeon has defined Islamic mysticism as the belief that “some form of intimacy with God was possible ... which went beyond the piety of many Muslims who engaged in “normative” Islamic ritual activity and who accepted “orthodox” forms of belief” (Ridgeon 2014: 126). See also Shahzad Bashir’s discussion of ‘Sufism’, which is technically a Western term that is not the equivalent of the Arabic word *taṣawwuf* (Bashir 2011: 9-11).

⁶⁷ Safi 2000, Ridgeon 2014.

⁶⁸ Küçükhüseyin 2013.

Understanding Islamic visual culture in medieval Rūm: A historiographical analysis

In recent decades, Islamic art scholars have increasingly engaged with the emergence of their academic field in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and have explored how this has affected the shape of academic study today.⁶⁹ These developments have questioned received wisdom concerning historical narratives, geographical boundaries and the nature of ethnic and religious affiliation in the multilayered histories of Islamic lands.

In this section and those that follow, I discuss some of the scholarly contexts that are relevant to understanding how medieval Anatolian material culture, and manuscripts in particular, have been approached. This examination involves a diverse range of viewpoints, subject matters and methods. These include the impact of Orientalism on the study of Islamic manuscripts, and the effects of a marriage between Turkish ethno-nationalism and the Viennese ‘formalist’ school of art history on the study of Anatolian history and material culture. While these themes are probably each deserving of full-length studies, I can only briefly outline them here. The inherently complex nature of discussing historiographical contexts is a consequence of the constantly splintering and intertwining nature of the academic discourse. As no unified or official ‘voice’ ever existed, I do not attempt to trace a single historiographical narrative.

⁶⁹ See, for example, Vernot 2000, Blair and Bloom 2003, Hillenbrand 2003 and 2010, Flood 2007, Junod et al. 2012, and all papers in vol. 30 of *Ars Orientalis* (2000) and vol. 6 of the *Journal of Art Historiography* (2012).

Numerous scholars have discussed how inquiries into the Near and Middle East emerged in a nineteenth-century environment of romantic fascination with the 'Orient', and European political and economic dominance over the peoples and places of Asia and Africa.⁷⁰ Such ventures were in part motivated by negative perceptions of European industrialisation, and yearnings for simpler and more rustic ways of life. The appeal exhibited by the East was expressed through the responses of artists, architects, writers, historians, curators, dealers and enthusiastic amateurs to the landscapes, buildings, artefacts and peoples of Oriental cultures. Idealised notions of an exotic Middle East, the movement of collectors and dealers into the region, quasi-Darwinian perspectives on race and material culture, and a lack of historical knowledge all shaped conceptions of 'Saracenic' and 'Persianate' visual culture that are still in the process of being unravelled.⁷¹

Motivated by developments in the biological sciences and linguistics, theorists on race like Arthur de Gobineau (1816-82) traced the origins of European civilisation back to its supposed Aryan roots. In this simplistic hierarchy, Persians emerged as superior to their Semitic and Turkic counterparts. This attitude which was consistently seen in nineteenth and early twentieth-century writings on Islamic art and architecture resulted in the designation of certain Mamluk and Ottoman

⁷⁰ The postmodern study of cultural representations of the 'Orient' was pioneered by Edward Said (1978). From this, a large body of scholarship has emerged. See, for example, Nochlin 1991, MacKenzie 1995, Beaulieu and Roberts 2002, and Tromans 2008.

⁷¹ For the discussion concerning the term 'Islamic art' see Blair and Bloom 2003, Necipoğlu 2012, and Shalem 2012.

objects as ‘Persian’.⁷² Arthur Upham Pope (1881-1969), one of the most well-known early scholars of Islamic art, called the Rūm Seljuks, for example, a “barbaric race” and claimed that ‘Turkish’ art was in reality mostly Persian in origin.⁷³

The evolutionary understanding of visual culture resulted in a historicising of Islamic art from the outset. In Banister Fletcher’s ‘Tree of Architecture’ (1896), Islamic (or ‘Saracenic’) buildings are presented as an offshoot of ‘Roman’ architecture. Like other ‘non-Western’ building styles, such as those of east Asia, India and South America, the Islamic branch is relegated to static history, in opposition to the evolving and dynamic architectural heritage of Europe. This European perception of the apparent ‘decline’ of Oriental cultures has resulted in a ‘rise-and-fall’ paradigm in which Middle Eastern historical development is viewed as a downward trajectory from an early medieval ‘Golden Age’.⁷⁴

In addition to the racial overtones of discussions concerning Islamic art, Western hierarchies of visual culture placed the ‘fine’ arts of painting, sculpture and architecture above the ‘minor’ or ‘decorative’ arts, such as pottery, metalwork or wood carving. Although the Islamic tradition had no art form comparable to that of European painting, manuscript illustration bore the closest resemblance to it, and thus became one of the primary targets of European collectors and dealers.⁷⁵

⁷² See Wearden 2000 and Necipoğlu 2012.

⁷³ Rizvi 2007: 47.

⁷⁴ Hodgson 1974: III, 203-5.

⁷⁵ Hillenbrand 2010.

Gülru Necipoğlu has discussed how ‘dilettantism’ was an important aspect of the early study of Islamic art.⁷⁶ This was especially true for the study of Islamic manuscripts. The early historiography of the Islamic arts of the book owes more to amateur collectors and morally questionable dealers than it does to scholars.⁷⁷ Although some European inquiries into Islamic history and epigraphy had been based on looking at other aspects of material culture, such as coins and inscriptions,⁷⁸ this empiricist vein soon gave way to activities that were more motivated by commercial trends and the interests of amateur collectors.

Early forays into Islamic manuscript history were often characterised by a lack of scholarly method and shaped by Eurocentric value judgments, which resulted in interpretations and frameworks not shaped by historical evidence. The British historian Thomas Walker Arnold (1864-1930), for example, compared the chronology of Persian painting (which, according to him, started in the fifteenth century) to that of Renaissance art, and compared the patronage of Timurids to that of the Medicis.⁷⁹ Moreover, the Swedish diplomat F.R. Martin (1868-1933) compared the illustrations of one of his recently-acquired manuscripts to the work of Dürer, Hellenistic painting and Japanese temple art, amongst other things.⁸⁰

The enthusiastic collecting of Persian painting resulted in a demotion of Islamic calligraphy, towards which collectors were relatively indifferent (due perhaps to

⁷⁶ Necipoğlu 2012.

⁷⁷ Roxburgh 1998.

⁷⁸ Kehr 1724 and Niebuhr 1772.

⁷⁹ Soucek 2001: 119.

⁸⁰ Hillenbrand 2010: 210. See also Roxburgh 1998.

the language barrier).⁸¹ The emphasis on painting endures in scholarship today, several important publications on calligraphy notwithstanding.⁸² Furthermore, as scholarship was shaped by the market, dealers carved up albums and manuscripts (sometimes while they were still in museum collections) and split folios in order to produce two leaves out of one and thus maximise profits.⁸³ The removal of illustrations from their physical contexts helped to normalise the analysis of such material in isolation. This separation of the constituent arts of the book (painting, calligraphy, bookbinding and illumination) also persists in scholarship and has, in some cases, hindered a better understanding of Islamic manuscript production.

The study of Islamic visual culture in medieval Rūm is further complicated by misleading frameworks adopted from twentieth-century narratives of the region's political and cultural history. A significant proportion of the manuscript material at the centre of the present study does not comfortably fit into the dynastic or ethno-national categories that are prevalent in some twentieth-century scholarship on medieval Anatolia. If patrons and endowers can be identified, their political affiliations do not necessarily mean their manuscripts are 'dynastic' products, which were, generally speaking, produced for patrons of the highest levels in dedicated ateliers. Additionally, artists were often of a mixed cultural background,

⁸¹ This contrasts with the high status of calligraphy in Islamic texts. The Ottoman historian Muṣṭafā 'Alī (d. 1600), for example, writes that "[the Pen's] precedence and preferableness is made manifest" in the Qur'an and that "penmen are the most virtuous of people" (Muṣṭafā 'Alī 2011: 152-3).

⁸² See Huart 1908 for a unique early study, and Schimmel 1990, Safwat 1996, Blair 2006a, and George 2010, for example.

⁸³ The most famous instance of this occurring is the Paris art dealer George Demotte's (1877-1923) dismantling of the so-called Great Mongol *Shāhnāma*, a monumental illustrated manuscript which was probably produced for the Ilkhanids in the 1330s. It was also formerly referred to as the 'Demotte' *Shāhnāma* (Grabar and Blair 1980, Carboni and Komaroff 2002 and Hillenbrand 2004).

with a variety of vocational experiences, as reflected in the diversity of visual motifs.

The political and cultural landscape in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was evidently more complex than ethno-nationalist grand narratives would claim. Though such grand narratives can have their uses in other contexts, the near-overwhelming focus on the Rūm Seljuks as a frame of reference for the study of history and material culture has obscured the nuances of the material culture of the later medieval period and, as a result, many gaps remain in historical and art historical study. For example, English-language contributions to the study of Seljuk history and art, compared to those of Turkish-speaking academics, remain relatively limited.⁸⁴ Many Turkish contributions to the field are extremely valuable, often covering neglected subjects and materials. However, it is crucial to be aware of their limitations, as a number of these works are shaped by ideological biases that continue to affect the field today. In particular, historiographical attempts to distinguish ‘Seljuk Anatolia’ from the Persianate sphere or Ottoman rule have helped to reinforce and essentialise the geographical and dynastic frameworks that dominated the literature, and are in the process of being unravelled by scholars in the field. The predominance of the Seljuks (and the Ottomans) in the Turkish historical narrative has contributed to the scholarly neglect of the material discussed in the present study, as it does not easily fit into the dynastic frameworks presented. In some cases, the material has been forced into such

⁸⁴ Yalman 2010: 26. Scholars who have written about medieval Anatolian material culture in English include Scott Redford, Oya Pancaroğlu, Antony Eastmond, Robert Ousterhout, Ethel Sara Wolper, Patricia Blessing and Gary Leiser. Publications are listed in the bibliography.

categories without a proper consideration of what these labels mean in the specific historical setting.⁸⁵

Initial scholarly inquiries into the Rūm Seljuks occurred in the spheres of architecture and epigraphy, mainly by Europeans operating in the context of a broader Orientalist interest in the East. These early researchers included Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941), Max van Berchem (1863-1921), Friedrich Sarre (1865-1945), Guillaume de Jerphanion (1877-1948) and Albert Gabriel (1883-1972).⁸⁶

While the scholarly contributions of van Berchem, Sarre, de Jerphanion and Gabriel have been comparatively less studied,⁸⁷ there have been several recent examinations of the legacy of Strzygowski and the Vienna School of Art History.⁸⁸ The emphasis on Strzygowski is due to the fact that his legacy, more than that of other early scholars, continues to endure in the academic study of Turkish art in Turkey.

Strzygowski's interpretation of 'Oriental' visual culture was initially motivated by a desire to undermine the Hellenocentrism of Western art historical scholarship, and to promote the artistic and cultural achievements of 'Aryan' peoples.⁸⁹ In *Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung* (Altai-Iran and the Migration of Nations, 1917), Strzygowski demonstrated how artistic motifs had travelled from the 'North' Aryan sphere to

⁸⁵ For example of these see Ersoy 1988 and Algaç 2000.

⁸⁶ Van Berchem and Edhem 1917, Gabriel 1931, de Jerphanion 1928, Sarre 1921 and 1936.

⁸⁷ The work of Max van Berchem has not been studied in a historiographical context. On Gabriel, see Pinon 2006, Redford 2006 and Blessing 2012; on de Jerphanion, see Luisier 1998 and Ruggieri 1997 and 2010; and on Sarre, see Pancaroğlu 2011 and Blessing 2014b.

⁸⁸ Marchand 1994, Kite 2004, Pancaroğlu 2007, Redford 2007b, Grigor 2007, Vasold 2011, Makuljević 2013 and Rampley 2013.

⁸⁹ Strzygowski 1917, cited in Pancaroğlu 2007: 70.

the ‘South’ regions of China, India and the Near East via Turkic and Scythian “carriers” (*Träger*)⁹⁰. Its evidently dubious framework aside, this publication employed a formalistic methodology that was adopted by modern Turkish scholarship. This methodology focuses on physical form and style, separating aspects of an art work into its constituent elements and decontextualising them from their socio-cultural environment. In Strzygowski’s work, visual elements of structure and ornament were isolated in order to provide evidence of an intrinsic Aryan and Turkic “artistic spirit”.⁹¹

Strzygowski’s advocacy of a distinct Turkish art was later embraced by Turkish academics in the newly-established Republic.⁹² Having been invited by Mehmed Fuad Köprülü to contribute to *Türkiyât Mecmuası*, the journal of Istanbul University’s Turcology Institute, Strzygowski maintained in his article that the origin of Turkish art extended back to Central Asia.⁹³ Such a claim correlated with the nationalist ‘Turkish History Thesis’ (*Türk Tarih Tezi*) endorsed by the state, as described in *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları* (Outline of Turkish History, 1930).⁹⁴ Strzygowski also revised his previous claim that the Rüm Seljuks and Ottomans

⁹⁰ Cited in Pancaroğlu 2007: 70.

⁹¹ Ibid: 74.

⁹² The Turkish Republic was established on 29 October 1923. The positive reception of the work of Strzygowski and Glück contrasts to the dismissiveness shown by Turkish academia towards Sarre (Blessing 2014b). Although Sarre was motivated by a questionable desire to promote the primacy of Persian art, he argued that Seljuk art should be seen in a Persianate context and recognised the impact of Byzantine and Armenian art on Seljuk material culture.

⁹³ Strzygowski 1935. Redford 2007b: 244.

⁹⁴ Türk Ocağı 2014. This publication was produced by a sub-committee of the Türk Ocağı (Turkish Hearth), an assembly of academics selected by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (Yıldız 2006: 31, n. 55). See also Berktaş 1983, Strohmeier 1984, Kafadar 1995 and Başan 2010.

represented a later (i.e. non-Turkic) stage of art and acknowledged that ‘Turkish’ art had also been transmitted by these later dynasties.⁹⁵

In the same volume of *Türkiyât Mecmuası*, Strzygowski’s student, Heinrich Glück (1889-1930), took this idea one stage further, by suggesting that Seljuk and Ottoman art was predominantly Turkic in character and displayed fundamental connections to earlier inhabitants of Anatolia, like the Hittites (again echoing the *Türk Tarih Tezi*).⁹⁶ Glück’s claim that the Turkish aspect of Seljuk and Ottoman culture was handed down from their pre-Islamic Anatolian ancestors also corresponded to the contemporary scholarly framework of ‘Anatolianism’ (*Anadoluculuk*).⁹⁷

Anatolianism maintained that Anatolia was a discrete geo-political unit that had endured from prehistoric times to the present day, and that Turkic peoples had always resided there.⁹⁸ This regional focus emerged out of contemporary discussions over identity, culture and history in the Turkish Republic. Although these early Republican ideologies were hardly unified, there were some common strains in how geography and history were re-interpreted. The Republic was now geographically concentrated on the Anatolian peninsula following the loss of the Ottoman Balkans, North Africa and parts of the Middle East, while political power

⁹⁵ Pancaroğlu 2007: 73. Pancaroğlu suggests that this change in stance may have arisen as a concession to the audience of the *Türkiyât Mecmuası* article.

⁹⁶ Glück 1935. Pancaroğlu 2007: 74.

⁹⁷ In the field of art, Anatolianism manifested itself in the establishment of the Hittite Museum in 1938 (now the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara), See Pancaroğlu 2007: 73-4.

⁹⁸ See, for example, Şevket Aziz Kansu’s work on ‘Hittite’ and ‘Seljuk’ skulls (Kansu 1943 and Gürpınar 2012: 12).

was oriented away from the former Ottoman capital of Istanbul, and around the new centrally-located Republican capital of Ankara.

Like Anatolianism, Kemalism, generally speaking, positioned Turkey as a modern, secular nation-state, dismissed Islam as backward and reinvented the Ottomans as decadent 'Orientals'.⁹⁹ Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (1900-61), a historian and prominent proponent of Anatolianism, proposed a timeline that privileged the Rûm Seljuks' contribution to Turkish history in particular. In this scheme, the Seljuks were instrumental in making Anatolia the Turks' own "land" (*yurt*) following their victory over Byzantine forces at Manzikert in 1071, while the six centuries of Ottoman rule were comparatively marginalised.¹⁰⁰ During this early period, Turkish academics like Yinanç played important roles in helping to communicate the vision of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's (1881-1938) new government which entailed a re-shaping of Turkey's historical identity and, consequently, a far stronger emphasis on the contributions of the Seljuks.¹⁰¹ In the state's understanding of history, the Rûm Seljuks emerged as an ideal medieval expression of Anatolian Turkishness, and the Great Seljuks of Iran were portrayed as instrumental in spreading Turkish culture through Rûm, and in defending the Islamic world from Christian invasion.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Eldem 2010: 28.

¹⁰⁰ Yinanç 1944: 1, Gürpınar 2012: 15.

¹⁰¹ Aziz Başan has discussed how writings on the Rûm Seljuks were also produced in the later Ottoman period, criticising the neglect of the Ottoman period in discussions of Seljuk historiography (Başan 2010: 1). From the fifteenth century onwards, Ottoman historians had regarded their dynasty as the legitimate successor to the Rûm Seljuks in Anatolia. In the post-Tanzimat period (after 1876), however, the Seljuks were recast in histories of the Ottomans as a critical link in Turkic history that culminated in the Ottoman Empire (Gürpınar 2012: 3).

¹⁰² As outlined in the *Türk Tarihi Ana Hatları* (Türk Ocağı 2014).

One of the most important figures in this intersection between political ideology and historical study was the historian and politician, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, mentioned several times above.¹⁰³ Alongside the work of the Vienna School in art history, Köprülü's immense impact on the academic discipline of history in Turkey helped to change this negative view of the Seljuks, and to initiate a much broader interest in Seljuk history.¹⁰⁴

Dissatisfied at European Ottomanists' dismissive attitudes towards Turkish culture and the Rüm Seljuks,¹⁰⁵ Köprülü sought to emphasise the continuity between Central Asian and Anatolian cultures in his work and to present the cultural milieu of the period as largely Turkish in character.¹⁰⁶ In publications like *Anadolu'da İslamiyet* (Islam in Anatolia, 1922) and *Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları* (Local Sources in Anatolian Seljuk History, 1943), Köprülü outlined the important cultural roles played by immigrant Oghuz Turkmen, "Christian Turks" (Rumelian Turks in Byzantine service), and other Turkic peoples alongside Mongols and Khwarazmians.¹⁰⁷ Reiterating a point that he had made in *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, Köprülü also highlighted the importance of Turkmen *bābās* in Islamising Anatolia, and downplayed other elements of

¹⁰³ While Köprülü's contribution to the study of Turkish history is by now well-known, some of his contemporaries, such as İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı (1896-1984), İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı (1898-1977) and Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, and their academic contributions remain understudied (Blessing 2012: 59-60).

¹⁰⁴ Copeaux 1997: 48.

¹⁰⁵ H.A. Gibbons (1880-1934), for example, claimed that the Ottomans were barely 'Turks', emphasising their superiority above the uncivilised Turkish inhabitants of Anatolia (Gibbons 1916: 29). See also Wittek 2012. Köprülü was possibly also inspired by Turanist writers like Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935) (Başan 2010: 1-21).

¹⁰⁶ Köprülü 1992, 1993 and 2006: 359.

¹⁰⁷ Köprülü 1993: 4.

Anatolian political and cultural life.¹⁰⁸ For Köprülü, the Seljuks (and to a certain extent, the beyliks) embodied the idea of a strong Turkish state that, while absorbing non-Turkish elements, advanced a simple and righteous version of Turkish Sunni Islamic culture¹⁰⁹. This soberer (albeit still ideologically motivated) view of the Turkish-Islamic heritage of Anatolia set the tone for future shifts in academia that sought to reconcile Turkish history with a renewed interest in the nation's Muslim heritage.

Although a proponent for the recognition of pan-Turkic culture, Köprülü was critical of romantic and essentialist conceptions of Turkish history and identity that were not based on primary sources.¹¹⁰ By contrast, some Turkish art historians uncritically applied the Vienna School's formalist principles in order to dispel the notion that Turkish art was derivative. Celal Esad Arseven (1876-1971) advanced this view in *Türk Sanatı* (Turkish Art, 1928). In this publication, Arseven provided a corrective to European Orientalist studies that had elevated the status of Persian and Byzantine art, and questioned the a priori notion of a distinct 'Islamic art'.¹¹¹ However, by employing formalist methodology and ethno-national classifications in his discussion of the 'national character' of Turkish art, Arseven fell into the same trap of essentialism as those whom he criticised.

¹⁰⁸ Köprülü 1993: 11 and 67, n. 31.

¹⁰⁹ Köprülü 1992.

¹¹⁰ Yıldız 2006: 32, n. 55. Indeed, in his usage of historical source material, Köprülü was one of the first Turkish scholars to conduct empirical and critical studies of Turkish history and literature, alongside Halil Edhem (1861-1938), Ahmed Tevhid (1868-1940) and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı (Tevhid 1910, van Berchem and Edhem 1917, Edhem 1926 and Uzunçarşılı 1937). Köprülü was also not overly critical of the Ottomans in this early nationalist period, portraying them as a Turkish polity who nevertheless absorbed multi-ethnic influences (Köprülü 1992).

¹¹¹ Arseven 1928. Kuban 1969, Necipoğlu 2007: 161-3, 167-73 and 2012: 7, and Kickingereeder 2009.

Some of Strzygowski's students, like Ernst Diez (1878-1961) and Katharina Otto-Dorn (1908-99), both of whom taught in Turkish universities in Istanbul and Ankara,¹¹² maintained the focus on a Central Asian origin for Turkish art but largely disregarded the more racialist foundations of Strzygowski and Glück's work. Recalling Köprülü's similar binary conception of Anatolian Islam, Diez proposed in his book, *Türk Sanatı* (Turkish Art, 1946), that Turkish art existed in two mutually-exclusive forms: that of the nomads, and that of the urban, sedentary 'Turkish-Islamic' state.¹¹³ Diez also emphasised a Central Asian origin for Turkish folk art and claimed, like Strzygowski, that this art was best represented by textiles and metalwork.¹¹⁴

As Oya Pancaroğlu has demonstrated, Diez's work was instrumental in implementing formalist methodology more widely throughout Turkish academia. However, *Türk Sanatı's* usage as a coursebook in Turkey only occurred after substantial revisions were made to parts of the text that discussed connections between Turkish, Byzantine and Armenian art.¹¹⁵ Diez's student, Oktay Aslanapa (1914-2013), who had translated Diez's work into Turkish, published a revised edition of this book in 1955 with these controversial sections removed. Aslanapa continued to disseminate formalist methodology and the Central Asian thesis to the next generation of Turkish art historians. As a result, the notion of a Central

¹¹² Diez was Chair of the Department of Art History at Istanbul University from 1943. Otto-Dorn held the same post at Ankara University from 1954.

¹¹³ Diez 1946: 5.

¹¹⁴ Diez 1946: 7-25. Pancaroğlu 2007: 73-5. Strzygowski 1935: 13.

¹¹⁵ Due to intense criticism levelled at the book, Diez left Turkey soon after its release (Blessing 2012: 72).

Asian or shamanic origin in Seljuk culture and art continues to persist in some scholarly circles.¹¹⁶

Although Köprülü's writings had laid the groundwork for an intellectual reconciliation of Turkish nationalism and Islam, such a movement only took hold in Turkish academia in the late 1960s. Critical of the secularisation and Westernisation of Turkey, and of negative attitudes towards Islam, the so-called 'Turco-Islamic synthesis' (*Türk-İslam sentezi*) sought to highlight the Turkish contribution to Islamic culture. These developments were led by the prominent historians (and students of Köprülü) Osman Turan (1914-78), İbrahim Kafesoğlu (1914-84) and Mehmet Altay Köymen (1916-93). These scholars also wrote extensively on the Rüm Seljuks, following the precedent set by Köprülü and others concerning the status of the Seljuks in Anatolian Turkish history. Both Kafesoğlu and Turan also echoed the dichotomy of medieval Anatolian socio-cultural spheres first advanced by Köprülü, namely a quasi-shamanistic (or heterodox) Turkish folk culture opposed to elite, orthodox 'Persianate' court culture.¹¹⁷

Kafesoğlu presented the Rüm Seljuk dynasty as powerful unifiers of Anatolia and as staunch defenders of Sunni Islam,¹¹⁸ while Köymen argued that the Seljuk period was the natural starting point for discussing Turkish history, as Seljuk

¹¹⁶ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak has claimed that the socio-cultural links between Anatolia and Central Asia continued throughout the Seljuk and Ottoman periods (2009: 376). In the field of art, see for example Ölçer 2005: 108-9.

¹¹⁷ Kafesoğlu 1988: 113-24, Turan 1977: 251.

¹¹⁸ Kafesoğlu 1988. This edition of Kafesoğlu's entry on the Seljuks in the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, edited by Gary Leiser, also includes the full account of the controversy over the publishing of this article, in which Turan accused Kafesoğlu of plagiarism.

territory, unlike Ottoman lands, had roughly corresponded to the Anatolian landmass. The Rūm Seljuks, he claimed, also instituted a paternal democratic system (*baba devlet*) into Anatolia that eventually led to the modern Turkish homeland (*vatan*).¹¹⁹ Like Kafesoğlu, Turan portrayed the Seljuks as “defenders of Islam and champions of a universal Turkish domination” who overcame a weakened Byzantine Empire in order to create a “wholly Turkish territory”.¹²⁰

In Turan’s view, the Seljuks’ achievements reached a crescendo in the reign of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37) before suffering devastation at the hands of foreign invaders, just as the Ottomans began to emerge as a serious political force. This ‘rise-and-fall’ narrative has been replicated in historical and art historical scholarship. Although the ethno-nationalist and socio-religious frameworks that both scholars advocated have created a number of problems in the literature, Turan (like Köprülü) cannot be blamed for the unquestioning repetition of his arguments or for their simplified applications to material culture.

Such issues, which I have briefly mentioned above, are effectively highlighted through an assessment of how the beyliks and Mongols have been treated in Turkish scholarship. Until recently, there has been limited scholarly engagement with beylik history (other than that of the Ottomans) and the role of the Mongols in

¹¹⁹ Köymen 1976: 355.

¹²⁰ Turan 1977: 231, 233. The celebration of the Battle of Manzikert (1071) was central to this narrative (Gürpınar 2012). See Vryonis (1971) for another perspective on the paradigm of Byzantine decline and Turkish influx.

Anatolia.¹²¹ While this can perhaps be partially blamed on gaps in source material, the study of the role of the beyliks and Mongols in medieval Anatolian culture and politics has also been hindered by an adherence to ethno-nationalist and dynastic frameworks.

The perception of Anatolia as a bounded geo-political unit in some nationalist histories advanced the notion that the mantle of authority passed directly from the ‘Seljuk Turks’ to the ‘Beylik Turks’.¹²² Turan, for example, praises the beyliks as a dynamic force for “turkification” that emerged as the Seljuk state deteriorated under the increasing tyranny of their “pagan” Mongol overlords.¹²³ In this scheme, the beyliks, supposedly untainted by Persian culture, are presented as a Turkish force of resistance to the Mongol interlopers,¹²⁴ despite the claims of scholars in the 1940s, like Zeki Velidi Togan (1890-1970) and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, who demonstrated that the Ottoman beylik was in fact connected to the Mongols, both economically and culturally.¹²⁵

¹²¹ Survey works that discuss the beyliks include Tevhid 1910, Edhem 1926, Uzunçarşılı 1937, Cahen 1968: 3-13, Turan 1977, Hopwood 1993 and Koca 2002. Works that discuss individual beyliks in detail include Wittek 1934, Dilçimen 1940, Lemerle 1957, Akın 1966, Varlık 1974, Yücel 1980 and 1989, Yinanç 1989, Göde 1994, Öden 1999, Kofoglu 2006, Yıldız 2006 and 2016, and Paul 2011 and 2013. See also individual entries in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam 2* and *3* and the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*.

¹²² This narrative was reflected in the study of art history. Beylik architecture was used by Oktay Aslanapa to demonstrate a link between Rüm Seljuk and Ottoman buildings (Aslanapa 1971). See Yürekli 2017.

¹²³ Turan 1977: 250-1.

¹²⁴ Kaymaz 1970: 9. Cited in Yıldız 2006: 37. Yıldız has, for example, questioned the idealisation of the Qaramanid beylik (1250-1487), as champions of the Turkish language (ibid: 42-7 and 2012a).

¹²⁵ Such theories were ignored as Köprülü sought to establish a Turkish basis for the official state view of national historiography (Togan 1941, 1991 and Uzunçarşılı 1947). See also Tezcan 2013, which discusses the Ottomans’ self-image as inheritors of the Mongol legacy, and Lindner 1999 which builds upon Togan’s thesis.

In geographically and ethnically-bound narratives, complex socio-religious groups are divided into apparently self-evident ‘imagined communities’ that correspond to areas defined by modern geographical borders, like ‘Ottoman Turkey’.¹²⁶ Such frameworks obscure more nuanced understandings of cultural milieux and networks of socio-religious and political power by simplifying the notion of ‘identity’. The emphasis on dynastic progression has, additionally, resulted in a privileging of the Ottoman context at the expense of smaller regional polities. The beyliks have, more often than not, been evaluated as “small interchangeable dynasties” isolated from broader developments in the region and oriented around eventual Ottoman ascendancy.¹²⁷ More recently, Cemal Kafadar has suggested that the entire period from 1071 to 1526 should be viewed as an era of “waxing and waning” *ṭavā’if* (parties or groups), instead of using sometimes unhelpful ‘Seljuk’, ‘Beylik’ and ‘Ottoman’ labels.¹²⁸

Scholars have also recently questioned how the Mongols have been treated in histories of the region, and reassessed Rūm’s position in relation to the broader Ilkhanid empire and its successors.¹²⁹ Viewing events in Rūm between the mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries as taking place within a larger sphere of Mongol power dissolves imaginary historical boundaries between what is now the modern Turkish nation-state, Iran and the Arab world, in order to allow historians to assess both local and transregional phenomena. Moreover, a focus on such local

¹²⁶ The term is adopted from Anderson 1983.

¹²⁷ Cahen 1968: 361. Uzunçarşılı discusses each beylik in separate chapters, starting with the ‘*ṭavā’if-i mulūk*’ (‘party kings’) before moving onto smaller beyliks (1937: 2).

¹²⁸ Kafadar 2007: 8.

¹²⁹ Melville 2006 and 2009, Yıldız 2006 and 2012b, and Blessing 2014a.

and transregional phenomena has the potential to include areas that are relatively neglected in the Islamic history of the region.¹³⁰

Labelling material culture from the medieval period as 'Seljuk', 'Beylik' or 'Ottoman' stems in part from the impact of the formalist method and the ensuing removal of art and architecture from their contexts. In this approach, visual material is not reconciled with its complex political, socio-religious and cultural milieux. Morphology and typology are emphasised, and often placed into a hierarchical scheme while political history is often dealt with in an early isolated section. Pancaroğlu notes that in architectural studies, public structures like mosques are almost always discussed first, with domestic architecture covered last.¹³¹ In addition, visual material is often analysed from the isolated perspective of a single city or dynasty.

As far as the study of visual culture is concerned, the focus on political frameworks has resulted in an emphasis on architecture. While publications concerning other art forms of the period exist,¹³² it is notable that my discussion of historiography has had to largely draw on literature concerning the study of medieval Anatolian

¹³⁰ Such areas include, for example, Armenia and Georgia. See Peacock 2006, Goshgarian 2007 and 2013 and Dadoyan 2013-14.

¹³¹ Pancaroğlu 2007: 67-8.

¹³² For example, Riefstahl 1933, Ağa-Oğlu 1938, Rice 1955, Ünver 1967, Allan 1978, Remler 1980, Çağman et al. 1983, Melikian 1985, Bayburtluoğlu 1988, Öney 1989, Süslü 1989, Barrucand 1991, Tanındı 1990a, 1991, 2000, 2001 and 2012, Aydın 1994, Şentürk and Johnson 1994, Tanman and Rifat 2001, Pancaroğlu 2004, Ölçer 2005, Algaç 2000 and 2006, Bozer 2007, Arık 2008, Crane 2009, Broome 2011 and Demircan Aksoy 2010 and 2014.

(mostly Seljuk) architecture,¹³³ since comparative historiographical discussions pertaining to other art forms are yet to be produced.

This aspect of scholarship is a result of both practical and theoretical reasons.

Practically, the range of primary material is broader. There are far fewer surviving manuscripts than extant buildings, and buildings often have explanatory inscriptions and sometimes endowment deeds. On a theoretical level, architecture has had a high status in European art history since the Renaissance period. This hierarchy is also to blame for the significant attention given to miniature painting to the disadvantage of calligraphy, bookbinding and illumination. As a result of this bias, and the emphasis in early Turkish scholarship on the political history of the Seljuks, public architecture was construed as the most representative art form of Seljuk society.¹³⁴ As a visual form that often expressed political prestige, public architecture can indeed provide insights into networks of power and the socio-cultural environment. It is the case, however, that the focus on architecture has perhaps resulted in other more intimate media, like manuscripts, being overlooked in surveys of material culture.¹³⁵

The implementation of the formalist method in art history has affected how Islamic manuscripts have been understood as artistic and cultural objects. In a

¹³³ Necipoğlu and Bozdoğan 2007, Pancaroğlu 2007 and 2011, Redford 2007b, Yalman 2010: 1-34 and Blessing 2012: 21-82.

¹³⁴ Köprülü 2006: 196. See, for example, the focus on architecture in Crane 2009.

¹³⁵ Manuscripts are a more private medium which naturally cannot make as public a statement as architecture. Medieval Islamic treatises on calligraphy emphasise the intimate nature of experiencing manuscripts. See, for example, the tenth-century treatise of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī (Rosenthal 1948).

formalist structure, the component book arts are often considered independently of each other and detached from their production and ownership contexts. This methodology was adopted for the only book-length study of illuminated medieval Anatolian manuscripts.¹³⁶ This study, the unpublished PhD thesis of Zeynep Demircan Aksoy, has nonetheless brought many previously overlooked manuscripts to light. The present study has benefited greatly from the accumulated material and seeks to situate it more fully in its socio-religious, cultural, political and economic contexts.

In addition to the application of formalist methods, the study of the arts of the book has also been constrained by the prevalence of connoisseurship, which as discussed above was rooted in the early foundations of the field. The work of Mehmet Uğur Derman – one of the most prominent writers on Ottoman calligraphy – contains extensive practical information on materials and techniques, and biographies of celebrated calligraphers like Shaykh Ḥamdullāh (d. 1520).¹³⁷ However, cultural contexts and production processes are yet to be explored. This would require a historical source-based approach which, as a practitioner and connoisseur rather than historian, Derman should not be expected to adopt.

Although many early studies concerning the arts of the book were not methodological in their approach, they produced an important body of literature that opened up the field for further enquiry.¹³⁸ However, many of these initial

¹³⁶ Demircan Aksoy 2010.

¹³⁷ Derman 1998a and 1998b.

¹³⁸ For example, Martin 1912, Arnold and Grohmann 1929, and Blochet 1929.

forays into Islamic manuscripts have yet to receive full historiographical treatment.¹³⁹ A reason why the material at the centre of the present study has not been examined in depth until now is the lingering legacy of connoisseurship, which focuses on painting and dynastic production. Paradoxically, while very few illustrated manuscripts securely attributed to medieval Anatolia exist, survey texts prioritise them over non-illustrated, illuminated manuscripts, which gives the impression that the arts of the book in this period were lacklustre in comparison to the contemporary arts of the book from neighbouring regions.¹⁴⁰

Approaches to the arts of the book outside of dynastic and national frameworks remain problematic. One exception is Annemarie Schimmel's exploration of the connection between Sufism and calligraphy in *Calligraphy and Islamic Culture* (1990). This work, through its detailed and thorough exploration of the significance of calligraphy and calligraphers in Islamic history provides a corrective to the scholarly bias towards painting. However, its general outlook means that specific contexts are not discussed in detail. At present, a body of scholarship concerning the role of particular Sufi networks in the production and patronage of calligraphy, and the arts of the book in general, has yet to emerge.¹⁴¹ Moreover, there have been relatively few art historical studies of Sufi material culture and the area remains understudied. The more successful studies situate the

¹³⁹ For some explorations into the early study of Islamic manuscript material, see Vernoit 1989 and 2000, Roxburgh 2000a, 2000b and 2014, Ben Azzouna 2009, George 2010: 13-20 and Hillenbrand 2010.

¹⁴⁰ Ettinghausen et al. 2001: 257-63, Blair and Bloom 1994: 146-8. See n. 4 for illustrated manuscripts attributed to medieval Rūm.

¹⁴¹ Some works that acknowledge the connection between Sufis and calligraphy include DeJong 1989, Schimmel 1990 and 1992, Derman 2005, Schick 2008, Ernst 2009 and Shani 2012.

material evidence of ‘Sufi’ art and architecture in their historical contexts rather than referencing nebulous concepts of ‘mysticism’ and ‘love’.¹⁴²

Primary sources

The most important primary source materials for this study are the manuscripts themselves. Beyond the manuscripts, I also rely on relevant contemporary textual sources, including endowment deeds (*waqfiyyas*), inscriptions, historical chronicles, hagiographies, chronologies (*taqwīm*), geographical and travel accounts, encyclopaedic studies and writings on trade and fiscal matters. In searching for visual connections, I have looked at contemporary Islamic and Christian illuminated manuscripts produced in Egypt, the Levant, the Jazira, Persia, Central Asia, Armenia and Byzantine Nicaea, in addition to other media, architectural decoration and wood carving in particular.

The well-known gaps in the historical record provide both advantages and disadvantages in art historical studies.¹⁴³ In a similar way to Patricia Blessing’s privileging of monuments, I place manuscript material at the forefront of my analyses. The rich historical and visual details of the manuscripts enable the reconstruction of aspects of contemporary artistic practice where deficiencies in the textual sources remain. In this period, there are no surviving treatises or records concerning recipes, techniques or workshops, so information from

¹⁴² See, for example, Blair 1990, Wolper 2003 and Yürekli 2003 and 2012.

¹⁴³ Blessing 2012: 8.

manuscripts must therefore fill this gap in the record. Essentially, the manuscripts form the core substance of my thesis around which everything else is constructed. Since the chronicles of this period are by and large political in their focus, they can only supplement, and not shape, the narrative of manuscript production. As I have mentioned above, framing a history of manuscripts in terms of political activity is problematic due to the intimate nature of the medium.

The manuscripts provide historical information in the form of colophons, ownership marks, *waqf* notes, dedications, seal impressions and other inscriptions. These provide information on dates and places of production, authors, artists, initial and later owners, *wāqifs* and anything else an individual deemed important to record. Aside from *waqf* notes in manuscripts, I also reference *waqfiyyas* of buildings in relation to the creation of libraries. As legal documents, *waqfiyyas* provide useful information concerning the functions of buildings and the names of witnesses to the endowment.

Historical chronicles written in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Rūm are relatively few in number though there are other sources written in neighbouring regions that are relevant to the period. The following paragraphs outline sources that I will use extensively in the present work. The most well-known is the Persian work, *al-Awāmir al-‘Alā’iyya fī al-Umūr al-‘Alā’iyya*, written some time around 1282 by Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Ja‘farī al-Rughadī al-Munshī, better known as Ibn al-Bībī al-Munajjima (d. after 1285, hereafter Ibn Bībī). The work, which exists fully in a single remaining manuscript, was commissioned by the Ilkhanid

governor of Baghdad, ‘Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī (d. 1283), and dedicated to the Seljuk sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (r. 1265-84).¹⁴⁴ *Al-Awāmir* concerns the history of the Rūm Seljuks from 1188 to circa 1281, with a particular focus on the rule of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37).

Another important Persian chronicle is *Musāmarat al-Akḥbār wa Musāyarat al-Akhyār* by Karīm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad al-Aqṣarāyī (d. before 1333), written in Rūm in 1323.¹⁴⁵ Al-Aqṣarāyī was an official in the service of the Ilkhanid ruler Ghāzān Khān (r. 1295-1304), and held a number of positions in the fiscal administration of Rūm.¹⁴⁶ *Musāmarat al-Akḥbār*, written for Tīmūrtāsh ibn Chūbān (d. 1328), the Mongol governor of Rūm, covers the period between the middle of the thirteenth century until 1323, and as such is a crucial source on Ilkhanid rule in the region. The work exists in two fourteenth-century manuscripts.¹⁴⁷

A further major local chronicle is the anonymous, Persian-language *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlī*, completed some time after 1363. Possibly written by more than one person, the *Tārīkh* covers Seljuk rule and events in Konya between 1277 and 1299, and includes some supplements concerning events until 1341.¹⁴⁸ One of the authors may have been a guildsman of Konya.¹⁴⁹ The work exists in a unique

¹⁴⁴ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985 (for the facsimile edition of this manuscript, see Ibn Bībī 1956). For a useful discussion on later, abridged manuscripts and other published versions of the text, see Yıldız 2006: 433, n. 41.

¹⁴⁵ Al-Aqṣarāyī 1944.

¹⁴⁶ Bacqué-Grammont 2015.

¹⁴⁷ Ayasofya 3143 (copied 1334) and Yenicami 827 (copied 1345), both in the Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul.

¹⁴⁸ Peacock 2004a: 98, Melville 2006: 150-1.

¹⁴⁹ Darling 2004: 127.

manuscript and has been published in facsimile.¹⁵⁰ Finally, an important source pertaining to the later part of the period under discussion is *Bazm u Razm* by ‘Azīz ibn Ardashīr al-Astarābādī (d. after 1397).¹⁵¹ The Persian text, which focuses on the life of the usurper of the Aratnid throne, Burhān al-Dīn Aḥmad (d. 1398), who ruled Sivas from 1381, spans a timeframe of circa 1380 to 1398 and discusses many key political figures of eastern Rūm.

In addition to these historical sources, there are several important works concerning the early history of the Mawlawi dervishes, who feature prominently throughout the thesis. The earliest sources are letters written in Persian by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, from the mid-thirteenth century until his death in 1273.¹⁵² The letters are mostly addressed to prominent political figures of the day including the Seljuk sultans and the *parvāna*, Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, as well as scholarly figures such as the *qāḍī* of Konya, Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283).¹⁵³ The letters mainly comprise requests made by Rūmī, and provide insight into his and his followers’ concerns.

The earliest biographical source on the Mawlawis is Sulṭān Walad’s *Ibtidānāma*, written around 1291, most likely in Konya.¹⁵⁴ This work of Persian verse contains details concerning Rūmī, the author’s father. Two other important sources were written in Persian by members of the Mawlawi inner circle, Farīdūn ibn Aḥmad

¹⁵⁰ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Schefer 1553. The facsimile along with a Turkish translation is published in Anonymous 1952 and an edited Persian version is published in Anonymous 1999.

¹⁵¹ Al-Astarābādī 1928.

¹⁵² Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 1992.

¹⁵³ Peacock 2012.

¹⁵⁴ Sulṭān Walad 1936.

Sipahsālār (d. late 13th c.) and Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī (d. 1360). Sipahsālār's account, *Risāla-yi Sipahsālār*, concerns first-hand observations of Rūmī, his family and his followers.¹⁵⁵ Its contents suggest that the text was probably completed in the first half of the fourteenth century, perhaps in 1338, possibly by another individual.¹⁵⁶ *Manāqib al-ʿĀrifīn*, Aflākī's account of Rūmī and several early Mawlawi leaders is the better-known of the two chronicles.¹⁵⁷ The work was written in Konya between 1318 and 1353-4. Though Aflākī's text is far broader in its historical detail, it is perhaps less reliable than Sipahsālār's treatise as it mostly relies on oral accounts.¹⁵⁸ It is also more hagiographical in its focus, attributing numerous miracles to Rūmī. The two treatises, and their sources and historical details, are yet to be critically compared.¹⁵⁹

Two Arabic sources that are particularly useful for the period are the *Riḥla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, the Maghribī traveller who visited Rūm (amongst many other places) in the early 1330s,¹⁶⁰ and *Masālik al-Abṣār fī Mamālik al-Amṣār* by Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī, a Mamluk bureaucrat. The *Riḥla* – one of the most well-known sources on the medieval Islamic world – provides a great deal of information on various political and cultural figures of Rūm such as *beys*, dervishes

¹⁵⁵ Sipahsālār 2007.

¹⁵⁶ Lewis 2008: 244-5. Lewis deems it likely that Sipahsālār died some time between 1284 and 1312, during the leadership of Sulṭān Walad.

¹⁵⁷ Aflākī 1961 and 2002.

¹⁵⁸ Lewis 2008: 249.

¹⁵⁹ There are two sources written in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries which discuss Mawlawi personalities after the 1350s but since they were written several decades after the fourteenth century, they are not reliable sources for the period. The first is the unpublished Persian verse biography, *Gulshan-i Asrār*, which was written in 1544 by Shāhidi Ibrāhīm Dede (d. 1550), and the second is *Safīna-yi Nafīsa-yi Mawlawiyyān* by Sāqib Muṣṭafā Dede, who died in 1735 (Sāqib Muṣṭafā Dede 1866). *Gulshan-i Asrār* is discussed in Şimşekler 1998.

¹⁶⁰ Hrbek 1962.

and *akhīs*, in addition to descriptions of cities, landscapes and customs.¹⁶¹

Completed in 1357 by Ibn Juzayy from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's dictation, the work copied sections of Ibn Jubayr's late twelfth-century *Riḥla*, in order to compensate for the loss of notes or memory. Although the account suffers from some inconsistencies, having been written over twenty years after the author's travels, its details often correlate with information from other sources.

Masālik al-Abṣār was written by al-ʿUmarī, probably after his dismissal as head of the Mamluk chancery in Damascus in 1342. The encyclopaedic work covers many subjects including history, geography, literature, religion, politics and law. It also contains a description of the political situation in Rūm in the first half of the fourteenth century, based on the testimony of a Genoese slave who converted to Islam and an itinerant Rūmī shaykh.¹⁶² This section is a valuable source on the relative strength of the beyliks and the extent of their territories.

There is a long list of other sources relevant to the period, some of which I use intermittently in this dissertation. These include the *Qarāmānnāma*, written by Aḥmad Beg Shikārī (fl. 16th c.),¹⁶³ *Ṣubḥ al-Aʿshā* by Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418),¹⁶⁴ *Taqwīm al-Buldān* by Abū al-Fiḍāʾ (d. 1331),¹⁶⁵ *Risāla-yi*

¹⁶¹ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1854 and 1962.

¹⁶² Al-ʿUmarī 1929.

¹⁶³ Shikārī's sixteenth-century work is apparently based on a lost fourteenth-century Persian *shāhnāma* composed by Yarjānī at the command of the Qaramanids (Shikārī 2005). Written in Anatolian Turkish in the form of a folk epic, questions remain over the chronicle's reliability partially because the author and the conditions under which the text was written have not been properly identified (Yıldız 2010). The text mainly concerns the reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ibn Khalīl (d. 1397-98).

¹⁶⁴ Al-Qalqashandī 1913.

¹⁶⁵ Abū al-Fiḍāʾ 1840.

Falakiyya by ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Kiyā al-Māzandarānī (d. after 1363),¹⁶⁶ *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* by Ḥamdullāh al-Mustawfī al-Qazwīnī (d. after 1340),¹⁶⁷ Armenian colophons,¹⁶⁸ Italian trade manuals¹⁶⁹ and European travelogues.¹⁷⁰ There are numerous other sources written in Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Latin, Persian and Syriac which are certainly useful for the wider period, but are not necessarily relevant for the limited scope of the present study.¹⁷¹

A codicological approach to manuscripts

As discussed above, selected manuscripts form the evidence around which this thesis is shaped. In conjunction with this theoretical perspective, I have chosen to employ codicological principles in my practical approach to the material. Research into Islamic manuscripts has increasingly acknowledged the complexity of the book as an object, and the importance of codicology for understanding and interpreting such complexity. In this section, I will discuss what codicology entails and the benefits that it can bring to the kind of contextual analysis attempted in this thesis and to the field of the Islamic arts of the book in general. I will also examine some recent approaches to the arts of the book and highlight some gaps that remain in the general study of Islamic codicology.

¹⁶⁶ Al-Māzandarānī 1952, Togan 1991.

¹⁶⁷ Al-Qazwīnī 1919, Togan 1991.

¹⁶⁸ Sanjian 1969.

¹⁶⁹ Pegolotti 1936 and Piloti 1950.

¹⁷⁰ William of Rubruck 1900.

¹⁷¹ A useful list of these sources is provided in Cahen 1968: 430-40 and is too extensive to reproduce here. A notable omission from Cahen’s list is *Anīs al-Qulūb*. See n. 6.

Put simply, codicology is the study of the material aspects of books. At the heart of codicological analysis is the detailed physical examination of the manuscript. An ideal codicological study should consider material in groups, in order to compare findings and to reduce the risk of mistakes or misinterpretation.¹⁷² What should be observed in practical terms includes (but is certainly not limited to) the writing support, the textblock, scripts and ink, decoration, binding, and inscriptions such as ownership records, colophons and marginalia.¹⁷³ An analysis that integrates as many of these elements as possible can therefore help to redress or supplement studies that examine paper, illumination, paintings, calligraphy and binding as separate art forms. What is uncovered in a physical examination of a group of manuscripts should ideally shape the rest of the analysis, which can then discuss the manuscripts' production and reception contexts (and the wider artistic context), the cultural significance of the text and the comparative style of decorative elements.

By pursuing a codicological approach, I aim to highlight the importance of manuscripts as complex, three-dimensional objects, and counter the impact of formalism on the study of the arts of the book. Consequently, I have closely examined all of the 'core' manuscripts in this thesis and put their physical properties and inscriptions at the heart of my analyses.¹⁷⁴ However, the limited scope of my study and the relatively small number of illuminated manuscripts has

¹⁷² Déroche 2005: 17.

¹⁷³ Loveday 2001: Chapters 3-5 and Gacek 2009: Appendix V. If circumstances allow, the chemical analysis of writing supports, ink and pigments can also be highly beneficial.

¹⁷⁴ See Appendix One: Summary table of key manuscripts.

allowed the present study to expand well beyond an exercise in codicological investigation into an attempt to integrate traditional art historical inquiries that focus on motifs and techniques, a cultural-historical focus on artists, patrons and production contexts and an appreciation of inscriptions and the physical properties of book production.

Elaine Wright's recent publication, *The Look of the Book: Manuscript Production in Shiraz, 1303-1452*, is a successful example of combining codicological and art historical approaches. By examining illumination, calligraphy, illustrations, bindings and paper closely, Wright is able to establish a convincing chronology for the development of the arts of the book and manuscript production in fourteenth and early fifteenth-century Shiraz. This chronology furthermore is contextualised within a wider appreciation of the regional arts of the book and the cultural and political milieu of Shiraz. It thus becomes a valuable resource for better understanding manuscript production and artistic practices in this period, and for applying this understanding to related contexts.

Even when analysing one aspect of the Islamic arts of the book in isolation, a sensitivity to codicological techniques can provide benefits to the reader and open the field to further study. In the field of bookbinding, for example, Karin Scheper's recent publication, *The Technique of Islamic Bookbinding: Methods, Materials and Regional Varieties* is a welcome addition. Scheper clearly outlines the benefits of studying such material and the methods of linking this information to primary and secondary literature. Her analysis, which is based on the examination of 599

bindings (of which 588 were dateable), contends, for example, that Islamic bindings, which were thought to be physically inferior to Western bindings, are more durable than previously thought.¹⁷⁵

Although codicological methods can be used to identify the chronological and geographical origins of a manuscript, the core material of a contextual study, such as the one attempted here, should be securely dated with an identified production centre where possible. Although not all of the key manuscripts in this thesis are dated or have identified production centres, other elements such as ownership records, particular motifs or names of craftsmen provide credible grounds by which to identify and discuss their production contexts.

Accordingly, I have excluded many illuminated manuscripts from this study due to unverified provenances. Zeynep Demircan Aksoy includes a number of such manuscripts in her article, 'İlhanlı ve Memlûk Etkileşiminde XIV. Anadolu Türk Tezhip Sanatı'.¹⁷⁶ These manuscripts do not contain inscriptions identifying their production locations, and seem to have been attributed to Anatolia either because they were formerly part of older Turkish collections or endowed to local religious institutions.¹⁷⁷ While some of these manuscripts may well be of Rûmî origin,

¹⁷⁵ Scheper 2015: 352-4.

¹⁷⁶ Demircan Aksoy 2014.

¹⁷⁷ For example, Demircan Aksoy briefly discusses an illuminated Qur'an produced on 14 Şafar 727 (9 January 1327) that was copied by Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Maydūmī, i.e. from Maydum in Egypt. On the basis that it was formerly in the library of the Birgi Ulucamii, Demircan Aksoy asserts that the manuscript was copied in Birgi, possibly for Muḥammad Bey (d. 1334) of the Aydinids (2010: 143-9, 2014: 269). It is in fact much more likely that this is a Mamluk manuscript produced probably in Cairo. A very similar-looking manuscript that was completed in the last ten days of Sha'bān 729 (June 1329) by Muḥammad ibn [...] ibn Ibrāhīm al-Maydūmī, who was presumably the same scribe, was endowed to a mosque in Cairo (Khalili Collection, London,

manuscripts are highly mobile objects and a long-term presence in Turkey is not sufficient evidence for their production there.

Indeed, some scholars have found success by using codicological methods to dispute the attributed origins of material. For example, Abolala Soudavar has demonstrated that a letter thought to have been written by Tīmūr to Charles VI of France was actually forged by the Archbishop of Sultaniye.¹⁷⁸ Based on her examination of around one hundred pieces attributed to Yāqūt al-Muṣṭa‘simī (d. 1298), Nourane Ben Azzouna has established that a copy of the *Gulistān* of Sa‘dī which was previously identified as a work of Yāqūt was produced in the fourteenth century, or in a historicising fourteenth-century style.¹⁷⁹ Based on the *Gulistān*’s “much rounder” script, decorative and textual discrepancies in the colophon and the construction of the manuscript itself, Ben Azzouna has shown that the manuscript’s physical and visual characteristics do not conform to the corpus of manuscripts written by Yāqūt.

The application of palaeographical analysis is essential to both of the above-cited works by Soudavar and Ben Azzouna. Palaeography – the study of deciphering, identifying and dating writing systems – is a crucial aspect of codicology and the study of inscriptions. The analysis of scripts from securely identified manuscripts can help to establish some of the basic letter forms and overall character of a script

QUR317). This mosque was built in 1329-30 by Sayf al-Dīn Qūsūn al-Nāṣirī, an *amīr* of the Mamluk ruler al-Nāṣir Muḥammad (r. 1293-1341, with interruptions). See James 1992a: Cat. 41.

¹⁷⁸ Soudavar 1999: 256-60.

¹⁷⁹ Ben Azzouna 2012.

in a given context.¹⁸⁰ At this stage, an important distinction should be made between a ‘script’, i.e. the ideal form of the letters and ultimate goal of the master calligrapher, and the ‘hand’, i.e. how those ideal forms are executed by an individual.¹⁸¹ Once a basic classification has been convincingly established, this can in theory be used to situate works that do not possess reliable evidence concerning date, place of production or copyists.¹⁸²

Within these classifications, it can be useful to contextualise the form of the script in terms of production or reception. Francis Richard has shown, for example, how the concern over forgery and confidentiality in the fifteenth-century Ottoman chancery impacted upon the visual development of the *dīvānī* script form.¹⁸³ However, relating changes in a script or scripts directly to the wider context is potentially problematic.¹⁸⁴ For example, Yasser Tabbaa has suggested that the ‘Sunni revival’ under the Abbasids in the tenth and eleventh centuries was responsible for the adoption of rounded, rather than angular, book scripts.¹⁸⁵ The direct connection that Tabbaa has drawn between the form of the script and the

¹⁸⁰ François Déroche has, for example, criticised the findings of Nabia Abbott’s work *The Rise of the North Arabic Script* (Abbott 1939). Déroche notes that although the article refines previous arguments concerning the material, Abbott’s methodology presents some problems by assuming the reliability of textual evidence written two to four hundred years after the dating of the visual material (Déroche 2005: 212).

¹⁸¹ Gacek 2009: 241.

¹⁸² Due to the nature of the key material in this thesis and its relative variety of scripts, I do not attempt to construct a typology of late medieval scripts from Rūm. However, the secure identification of scribes’ hands in this context has the potential to identify material that is currently unattributed. For example, the script of a non-illuminated copy of Sulṭān Walad’s *Ibtidānāma* which contains no colophon is extremely similar to the scripts of early fourteenth-century manuscripts copied by ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abdullāh (I discuss these manuscripts in detail in Chapter Two). The non-illuminated *Ibtidānāma* is British Library, London, IO Islamic 3870. I am very grateful to Saqib Baburi for letting me know about this manuscript.

¹⁸³ Richard 1989a.

¹⁸⁴ See, for example, Irene Bierman’s analysis of numismatic epigraphy (Bierman 1998).

¹⁸⁵ Tabbaa 1991 and 1994.

political context is, in this instance, questionable since he considers only Qur'anic manuscripts, and does not discuss the patronage or audiences of these works.

Sheila Blair has highlighted these problems in Tabbaa's work and has also criticised him for basing his argument on 'negative' evidence, which can be particularly controversial in manuscript studies because there are many remaining gaps in the material record.¹⁸⁶

A problem that remains in the employment of palaeographical methods is the lack of consensus over categories and terms, which can render the field difficult to understand to non-specialists.¹⁸⁷ The difficulty in classifying and identifying scripts is perhaps another reason that the study of Islamic painting has historically been privileged over Islamic calligraphy – the former being a more accessible medium to scholars who lack the requisite training in languages and palaeography.

François Déroche has noted that the widespread usage of calligraphic terms like *naskh*, *thuluth* or *muḥaqqaq* give the impression that a “basic typology” of scripts has been established.¹⁸⁸ While some of these scripts are easier to identify than others, terms are often used inconsistently or without being clearly defined.

'*Naskh*', for example, has been used to classify a wide range of writing styles, from high-quality rounded Qur'an scripts to informal hands that do not quite fit into categories of established script types.¹⁸⁹ It is beyond the scope of this study to extensively critique and develop the terminology currently used to define Arabic

¹⁸⁶ Blair 2006a: 174-8.

¹⁸⁷ Adam Gacek's *Vademecum for Readers* will certainly help to determine the usage and definition of certain concepts (2009).

¹⁸⁸ Déroche 2005: 218.

¹⁸⁹ Gacek 2015a.

scripts. I therefore use terms like ‘*naskh*’ and ‘*tawqīʿ*’ throughout the following chapters as they are currently understood in the wider field with the acknowledgement that such terms are imperfect but must be sufficient until further work is carried out on this topic.

Historical treatises on writing, such as Ibn al-Nadīm’s tenth-century chronicle, *al-Fihrist*, can provide useful terminology for scripts and elements of letter forms but more study needs to be done to compare and contextualise these important primary sources. *Al-Fihrist* includes many names for calligraphic scripts, like ‘Meccan’ and ‘*mudawwar*’ (rounded) but without illustrations, it is difficult to know what these scripts looked like so the usefulness of this type of material can be limited.¹⁹⁰ Adam Gacek, who has considered several of these sources, has adopted certain Arabic terms like *tarwīs* (head-serif) and *musbalah* (downward-pointing letters). It remains to be seen whether this vocabulary will be adopted by the wider scholarly community.¹⁹¹

A credible palaeographical and codicological analysis requires the collection of a large range of, often geographically dispersed, primary material, and the expertise to interpret this material convincingly. The practicalities of palaeographical and codicological methods demand much of scholars, who are required to develop their linguistic capabilities, their visual memory and level of aesthetic judgment, a knowledge of historical and literary contexts, experience in deciphering and

¹⁹⁰ Blair 2006a: xxxi.

¹⁹¹ Gacek 2003 and 2009: 242-3.

interpreting a range of data, and the patience, organisational skills, and academic support network to sustain their research. The difficulty in accessing resources and support is perhaps one reason why scholarship in Islamic codicology is less advanced than Hebrew or Greek codicology, relatively speaking. However, with an increasing number of journals and events encouraging the study of codicology, the field has made considerable progress over recent years, and the overall picture is quite optimistic.¹⁹²

Outline of chapters

The focal points of the four chapters are dictated by groupings of surviving, securely identified illuminated manuscript material. Although a strictly linear narrative is not possible in the structure of the thesis, I have employed a chronological framework in order to build my arguments clearly and logically against a backdrop of historical developments, and highlight the use of certain visual features over time. Having conducted codicological examinations of the manuscripts and translated their key inscriptions, I will begin each chapter with a detailed description of their physical features and a consideration of the circumstances of their production and patronage. I will then analyse certain aspects of the manuscripts with reference to the wider cultural landscape, and

¹⁹² Journals discussing codicology include the *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* and the Persian-language *Nāma-yi Bahāristān*. Yearly short Islamic codicology courses are run by The Islamic Manuscript Association, who also organise conferences on manuscript studies as well as occasional symposia on codicological and palaeographical topics.

discuss how the material can enhance our understanding of the period's art history.

Chapter One focuses on the earliest illuminated manuscripts produced in Rūm after the region became the de facto western frontier of the Ilkhanid empire in the second half of the thirteenth century. In terms of themes and structure, this chapter sets the scene for subsequent discussions. To begin with, I focus on two important manuscripts, neither of which have been published in depth or discussed in their socio-cultural contexts. These are a monumental *Maṣnavī-i Maʿnavī* (hereafter *Maṣnavī*) of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and a very small Qurʾan, both produced in Konya in 1278.¹⁹³ After a thorough examination of the visual properties of these manuscripts, and their relationship to contemporary manuscripts from other milieux, I take a contextualised look at production and patronage. In particular, I look at madrasas as locations for manuscript production and the role of Christians, Muslim converts and Sufis in artistic life. Through two more illuminated manuscripts from the 1280s (*al-Awāmir al-ʿAlāʾiyya fī al-ʿUmūr al-ʿAlāʾiyya* by Ibn Bībī and *Laṭāʾif al-Ḥikma* by Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī), I also consider the part that Ilkhanid officials played in manuscript patronage, and discuss the prevalence of illuminated 'mirrors for princes' manuscripts in Rūm.¹⁹⁴

The second chapter concerns manuscripts produced in Konya and Sivas between 1311 and 1332. This period roughly coincides with the rise of the Turkmen

¹⁹³ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51 and Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466.

¹⁹⁴ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121.

principalities on Rūm's political scene and the final decades of Ilkhanid rule which ended in 1335 with the death of the ruler Abū Sa'īd (r. 1316-35). The seven core manuscripts that comprise the focus of this chapter were produced for Turkmen princes and Mawlawi dervishes. The manuscripts produced for beylik patrons include a small 1311 copy of a relatively obscure work concerning Sufism, entitled *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya*, produced in Konya for an Ashrafid *bey*,¹⁹⁵ and a large two-volume Qur'an produced in 1314-15 for a Qaramanid *bey* in Konya.¹⁹⁶ Works closely connected to the Mawlawi group of dervishes include a 1314 *Intihānāma* by Sulṭān Walad, a 1323 *Maṣnavī* of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and a *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad produced before 1332.¹⁹⁷ A partial illuminated *Maṣnavī* of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī that was copied in Sivas in 1318 and was previously unknown to scholarship is also examined.¹⁹⁸ This chapter expands the analysis concerning the involvement of the Mawlawis in illuminated manuscript production that was introduced in the previous chapter and further explores the contexts of production in Konya. It also discusses the historiography of the beyliks, a thread that will be taken up in Chapters Three and Four.

Chapter Three discusses two modest manuscripts that were produced for Hamidid *beys* in the mid-fourteenth century. These manuscripts, both copies of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya's *Mirṣād al-'Ibād min al-Mabdā' ilā al-Ma'ād*, were produced in İstanos

¹⁹⁵ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Ayasofya 2445.

¹⁹⁶ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12.

¹⁹⁷ Respectively, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794 and Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177 and 74.

¹⁹⁸ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Nafiz Paşa 650.

(Korkuteli) in 1349 and 1351.¹⁹⁹ This chapter, which shifts focus from Konya to western, coastal Rūm, explores the ‘mirrors for princes’ genre in more depth, the cosmopolitan nature of the immediate area and the possible impact of bubonic plague on artistic production.

The fourth and final chapter focuses on the patronage of one individual, who emerges from surviving material as the most prolific manuscript patron of late medieval Rūm. The three manuscripts discussed in this chapter are connected to one Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥasan, an *amīr* and a Mawlawi devotee. The key manuscripts examined in this chapter are a copy of the *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad from 1366, a two-volume *Dīvān-i Kabīr* from 1367-8 and a 1372 copy of the *Maṣnavī*, both by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.²⁰⁰ The distinctiveness of the manuscripts’ illumination generates a discussion concerning the relationship between the arts of the books of Rūm, Armenia and the Mongol successor states. Even though a production centre is not named in the manuscripts, the patron had a strong connection to Erzincan and Konya. In this chapter, I outline and contextualise the political and cultural activities of Sātī and his son Mustanjid (also a bibliophile), and question where the manuscripts may have been produced.

Finally, in the Epilogue, I summarise the main findings and arguments of each chapter, and review what has been learned about visual and cultural history from the thesis’ core material. This review highlights the types of people who

¹⁹⁹ Respectively, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 2841 and Ayasofya 2067.

²⁰⁰ Respectively, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.Mixt 1594 and Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 68, 69 and 1113.

commissioned illuminated manuscript material, the identity of craftsmen and where and why such material was produced, emphasising the prominence of Konya as a production centre in particular. I also summarise the main historiographical arguments that have been discussed and developed throughout the thesis. After considering the limitations of the present study, I discuss how this research can be taken forward, and what gaps remain in the wider medieval Islamic arts of the book.

CHAPTER ONE

Patrons and artists in Konya under Ilkhanid administration, 1278-86

Introduction

In this chapter, I attempt to formulate a picture of illuminated manuscript production and patronage in Konya, which evidently continued despite intense disruption in the political sphere throughout the 1270s and 1280s. At the centre of this chapter are two key manuscripts: a small Qur'an and a monumental *Maṣnavī*, both produced in 677/1278 in Konya. Thematically and methodologically, this chapter sets the scene for the rest of the present study. I begin with a detailed codicological examination of the material, discuss the manuscripts' artists and patrons and their backgrounds, make connections to other contemporary visual material and construct an impression of the cultural scene based on this and further historical evidence. This analysis will hopefully provide an insight into the people and places of Konya that played a role in the commissioning, creation, and ownership of illuminated manuscripts.

By building an analysis of the cultural context around core manuscript material, I intend to challenge frameworks that are based on assumptions concerning geographical, religious or ethnic boundaries and to demonstrate how such evidence can create a rich picture of cultural life in late medieval Rūm. Since the thesis follows a broadly chronological structure, this chapter also lays the

groundwork for the following chapters, by establishing the contours of the political, economic, socio-religious and artistic contexts.

To begin with, I discuss the material aspects of the 677/1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī*, and highlight possible Islamic and Byzantine visual precedents for some of the manuscripts' motifs. Within this analysis, I also briefly consider two manuscripts, one of which (a 661/1262 Persian copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna*) has been attributed to late medieval Konya while the other (an undated Qur'an *juz'*) was previously unknown to scholarship. I then consider the 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī*'s artists and patrons in more depth, in light of the historiographical frameworks that were discussed in the previous introductory chapter.

In order to more fully explore the contexts of the 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī*'s production and patronage, I will then outline the political context from the 1240s until the 1280s, focusing in particular on the events of 1276-77, at which time Mongol authority in Rūm was seriously challenged. As part of this discussion, I also briefly consider an illuminated manuscript of profound political importance and examine what it can further reveal about the nature of manuscript patronage under Ilkhanid authority. This manuscript is the earliest copy of *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-'Umūr al-'Alā'iyya* by Ibn Bībī, which was almost certainly produced around 680-1/1282 in Konya.

Finally, I will examine the cultural and intellectual scene in Konya around the time of these manuscripts' production. This involves examining the commercial context,

the presence of religious scholars and dervishes in the region (the Mawlawis in particular), the built environment that provided spaces for the production and consumption of manuscript material and the participation of Konya's Christian population in artistic and religious life. In this section, I will also examine the only surviving illuminated scholarly manuscript from late thirteenth-century Rūm – a 684/1286 copy of *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma* – and discuss the life of its author, Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283), in the context of Konya's heterogeneous and latitudinarian religious landscape.

The illuminated manuscripts of 677/1278

The two manuscripts produced in 677/1278 were both illuminated by one Mukhlis ibn 'Abdullāh al-Hindī.²⁰¹ The first manuscript, a Qur'an, was completed on the final day of Rabī' al-Ākhir 677/19 September 1278, in the madrasa of Sa'd al-Dīn Köpek, who was Master of the Hunt and Public Works (*amīr-i shikār va mi'mār*) under the Seljuk ruler, 'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37).²⁰² The second manuscript, a copy of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*, was finished on 2 Rajab 677/19 November 1278.²⁰³ There is a *waqf* record dated 678/1279-80 on the last page of the manuscript (fol. 325b). Produced five years after the death of Rūmī, this

²⁰¹ The *nisba* 'al-Hindī' is omitted from the colophon of the Qur'an (Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466, fols 329b-330a) but not the *Maṣnavī* (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51, fol. 325b).

²⁰² Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466, fols 329b-330a. The madrasa is no longer extant. Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 353.

²⁰³ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51, fol. 325b. Gölpınarlı 2003: 45-55. The manuscript has been published in facsimile without its full-page illuminations (Mevlana Müzesi 1992). The manuscript has been previously discussed by Tanındı 1990a and 2001, Ettinghausen et al. 2001 (where unfortunately the date, scribe's name, number of folios and corresponding image are incorrect) and Demircan Aksoy 2010: 72-87. Blair (2006a: 366-9) and Gacek (2015a) briefly discuss its calligraphy.

manuscript is the earliest complete edition of this revered text. Compiled from drafts left behind by Rūmī, and corrections executed by his follower, Ḥusām al-Dīn Chalabī (d. 1284), this copy, which according to the endowment record was made specifically for Rūmī's shrine in Konya, establishes the canonical version of his work.

Although both manuscripts are extensively illuminated, the *Maṣnavī* is much larger than the Qur'an and thus contains larger panels of illumination. It consists of 325 folios and measures 495mm (length) x 335mm (width) x 80mm (depth), though it has been slightly cropped on all three edges. The measurements of the *Maṣnavī*'s pages corresponds to one-quarter 'Baghdādī' size, as outlined by the Mamluk historian al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418).²⁰⁴ A bifolio would have measured around 500mm x 700mm, i.e. half-Baghdādī size. According to Sheila Blair, this manuscript is currently the earliest-known example of this standardised paper size.²⁰⁵ Blair notes that the paper was probably made in Tabriz, and was very unlikely to have been made in Anatolia. While her claim is plausible, it is very difficult to identify where the paper originated based on the size alone, as many gaps remain in the codicological study of medieval Islamic paper, particularly that of Anatolia.²⁰⁶

The textblock measures 368mm x 257mm, and the main text is arranged into four columns of twenty-nine lines. The earliest known example of a textblock arranged

²⁰⁴ Bloom 2001: 53.

²⁰⁵ Blair 2006a: 367.

²⁰⁶ The only publication on the history of paper in Turkey is Kağıtçı 1976. Von Karabacek 2001 and Loveday 2001 both discuss the physical features of Islamic paper more generally, while Bloom 2001 is the only comprehensive study of paper production in the Islamic world.

into four columns is found in a copy of Firdawsī's *Shāhnāma* produced in 614/1217, which is also the earliest dated copy of this important text.²⁰⁷ Due to the presence of Turkish glosses in the manuscript, Sheila Blair has suggested that this copy of the *Shāhnāma* was produced in Konya.²⁰⁸ Elaine Wright has noted that this textblock type did not become widespread in Islamic manuscripts until at least the mid-fourteenth century, a development that coincided with a proliferation in the production of romantic epics like the *Khamsa* of Niẓāmī (d. 1209).²⁰⁹ However, besides the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, at least two illuminated Mawlawi manuscripts that were produced in early fourteenth-century Konya feature this type of textblock.²¹⁰ Although it is unclear whether the four-column format was indeed more widespread than surviving evidence shows, these three manuscripts indicate that this textblock format was commonly used in Mawlawi manuscripts from Konya.

The main paper of the *Maṣnavī* is cream-coloured with a slight pinkish hue, and is smooth and moderately burnished. Twenty horizontal laid lines measure a total of 28mm, and ten gathered sheets measure approximately 2mm in thickness.²¹¹ From folio 159 to folio 229, a similar (but much pinker) paper is intermixed with the main paper. The manuscript has lost its original binding and is currently covered with a tan-coloured Ottoman leather binding. Although the original gatherings

²⁰⁷ Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze, Florence, Magl.Cl.III.24.

²⁰⁸ Blair 2006a: 366, 400, n. 4.

²⁰⁹ Under the Ilkhanids, works of literature were more often copied in a six-column format (Wright 2012: 126).

²¹⁰ These manuscripts are a 1323 copy of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī* and a *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad produced before 1332. Both manuscripts will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

²¹¹ In all cases, measurements of paper thickness were taken by gathering random groups of ten folios throughout the manuscript and taking an average value to the nearest 0.5mm.

have been subjected to later repairs, the manuscript appears to have been bound in alternating ternions and quinions.

The Qur'an measures 105mm (length) x 80mm (width) x 55mm (depth) in its present cropped state. The manuscript consists of 335 folios and is covered in a reused binding that preserves the front and back panels of what seems to have been a fourteenth or fifteenth-century Mamluk leather binding. The main text of the Qur'an is arranged into one column of fifteen lines in a textblock that measures 70mm x 50mm. The Qur'an's small size suggests that it was for personal use and not intended as an institutional endowment like the *Maṣnavī*. The cropping was so extensive that some of the marginal medallions (on fols 330b-331a for example) have been truncated by about a third, to match the size of the reused binding. The main paper is a yellow-cream colour and, although smooth, does not appear to be burnished and contains several visible inclusions. No chain or laid lines are visible and the paper is gathered mainly into quaternions. Ten sheets measure about 2mm in thickness.

Both manuscripts were illuminated by the same artist, Mukhlīṣ ibn 'Abdullāh. Although the two manuscripts are very different in terms of size and the paper used, they share some motifs and feature similar colours (figs 1-4). Gold and blue are used extensively in both manuscripts, and in both cases, the gold has been applied first, with black used to mark out details and blue used to fill in the ground

afterwards.²¹² White, red, and green are used for decorative detailing in both manuscripts though the latter two colours are employed more extensively in the *Maṣnavī*. Although the illumination in both manuscripts is extensive and elaborate, the execution is a little messy and imprecise in places.

The Qur'an features seventeen pages with extensive illumination (figs 5-12).²¹³ Additionally, 'Allāh' is written in gold throughout the manuscript, every tenth verse (*āya*) is marked by a marginal medallion inscribed with 'ashr (ten) in white Kufic, every fifth verse is marked *khams* (five) in a circular medallion with small lozenges above and below, every single verse is marked by a small gold rosette, each *juz'* is marked by a gold hexagonal medallion with blue petals, and each half-*juz'* is marked by a blue-bordered gold rectangle. The large head and tailpieces of the Qur'an's framed illuminated pages bear a strong resemblance to the page layout of small Qur'ans copied in *naskh* attributed to eleventh-century greater Persia (fig. 13).²¹⁴

²¹² This process of applying pigment appears to be the case in all the key manuscripts I discuss throughout the thesis.

²¹³ These are: a single frontispiece (fol. 1a), opening folios (fols 1b-2a), *Sūrat al-Fātiḥa* (fol. 2b), *Sūrat al-Baqara* (fol. 3a), *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* (fols 327b-328a), *Sūrat al-Falaq* (fol. 328b), *Sūrat al-Nās* (fol. 329a), a double-folio colophon (fols 329b-330a), double-folio finispieces (fols 330b-331a), two framed circular medallions (fols 331b-332a) and dedication pages (fols 332b-333a).

²¹⁴ The manuscript illustrated in fig. 13 (see Vol. 2) is dated circa 1000-1050 on the basis of its strong visual similarity to the Ibn al-Bawwāb Qur'an which is securely dated to 1000-1 (Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1431). The reasons for this connection are unclear. It may be that the page layout was far more common than the manuscript record suggests, or that it was transmitted to Anatolia from Persia via itinerant artists that arrived into the region over the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The number of fully illuminated pages in the *Maṣnavī* totals thirty-four. This includes six pointed oval medallions (figs 14-19),²¹⁵ sixteen full-page illuminations (also called carpet pages, or *sar-lawḥ*)²¹⁶ (figs 20-27) and twelve framed text pages (figs 28-33).²¹⁷ In addition, the main text of each of the six volumes of the manuscript begins with an illuminated headpiece (figs 34-39).²¹⁸ The *waqf* note is also written in gold (fig. 40). Zeren Tanındı has suggested that the arrangement and style of the *Maṣnavī*'s decoration is reminiscent of illuminated Qur'an's broadly, particularly in the use of small marginal roundels.²¹⁹ This seems reasonable, considering the cultural and religious importance of both the text and the manuscript itself. Although the two manuscripts share some motifs, the overall impression of the 1278 Qur'an's decoration does not compare to the intricacy and sophistication of the *Maṣnavī*'s illumination. The complexity of the *Maṣnavī*'s illumination is likely partially due to its larger size, which would have given the illuminator more creative freedom. It is also probably due to its status as a precious object produced for Rūmī's shrine.

In addition to the page layout of both manuscripts, which has been discussed above, some individual elements of the Qur'an's and *Maṣnavī*'s illumination can broadly be linked to illuminated manuscripts produced in the eastern Islamic world from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. One example of this has been mentioned above already (see fig. 13). Marginal roundels and half-palmette circles

²¹⁵ The lengths of these measure 277-285mm (fols 1b, 53a, 98a, 159a, 208a and 266a).

²¹⁶ Fols 1a, 3a, 3b, 6a, 53b, 55a, 98b, 100a, 159b, 161a, 208b, 210a, 210b, 212a, 266b and 268a.

²¹⁷ Fols 6b-7a, 7b, 9a, 55b, 57a, 100b, 102a, 161b, 163a, 268b and 270a.

²¹⁸ Fols 9b, 57b, 102b, 163b, 212b and 270b.

²¹⁹ Tanındı 1990a: 20.

in both the Qur'an and the *Maṣnavī* find similar motifs in eleventh and twelfth-century Qur'ans written in what François Déroche has termed 'New Style' Kufic (figs 41-45).²²⁰ Additionally, the geometrically-irregular designs that are present in some of the full-page illuminations of the *Maṣnavī* bear some resemblance to eleventh-century Qur'an illuminations (figs 46-47).

The variety of motifs present in both manuscripts demonstrates the rich visual vocabulary that was being employed by the Konya-based artist. Many of these motifs have no known direct precedents in the Islamic manuscript tradition. Convincing links to contemporary architectural motifs and the surface decoration of metalwork and woodwork have also not been discovered.²²¹ Whilst I acknowledge the ever-present issue of survival, it is also possible that this particular illuminator developed some patterns and motifs that were relatively peculiar to him. Without additional dated and securely attributed material to put these two manuscripts into their visual contexts, it is difficult to know how innovative or typical the illumination is on a wider level. Even where reliably identified manuscripts exist, forming broader arguments on the basis of visual similarities alone can be problematic. When the means of transmission are far from clear, such similarities must necessarily be fairly convincing.

²²⁰ Déroche 1992: 132-7. Aside from the one example that is dated to 1177-8 (Vol. 2, fig. 44), the other two examples are not dated and are possibly later. However, all three examples feature 'New Style' Kufic (as Déroche terms it) which is not seen in Qur'an manuscripts after the late twelfth century (Blair 2017).

²²¹ I have looked at Islamic architectural decoration, metalwork and woodwork from Anatolia, Persia, the Jazira and the Levant, as well as material from Byzantine and Armenian contexts.

Both manuscripts feature full-page medallions, or *shamsas*. In the *Maṣnavī*, a pointed oval medallion marks the beginning of each of the six volumes, and in the Qur'an, two identical circular medallions decorate the end of the manuscript. In both cases, I have been unable to find dated visual precedents.²²² Pointed oval shapes do appear in the illumination of earlier Qur'ans but they are generally quite small in scale and integrated into larger designs (see fig. 42, for example).

Repeated pointed oval shapes also appear in textiles produced in the late medieval period.²²³

The pointed oval motif does, however, occur in three manuscripts that will be discussed in the next chapter which were produced in Konya from the 1310s-1330s.²²⁴ A pointed oval frontispiece also appears in the unique copy of *Anīs al-Qulūb*, by Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Abū Naṣr ibn Maṣṣūr al-Anawī (d. after 1222).²²⁵ The manuscript, which contains five illuminated pages and six headpieces, was most likely produced in Konya in the first quarter of the fourteenth century (figs 48-49). Due to this broad dating and the lack of any other production information, I will not discuss the manuscript in more detail.²²⁶

²²² I discuss the possible Byzantine origins of the pointed oval motif at the end of this chapter.

²²³ See, for example, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 46.156.17.

²²⁴ These manuscripts are a 1311 copy of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya* by Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Tustarī, a 1323 *Maṣnavī* of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and a *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad produced before 1332. All three manuscripts are discussed in detail and illustrated in Chapter Two.

²²⁵ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2984. There are two more examples of pointed oval-shaped illuminations in undated and unattributed material. The first is a copy of a detached folio that formed the frontispiece of a Qur'an (Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, M.73.5.558). Pointed oval-shaped text frames also appear in a copy of the fifth volume of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī* that contains no information concerning its production (Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Gotha, Orient P54). See Nebes et al. 1997: 131.

²²⁶ I discuss the material properties of this manuscript in detail in Jackson 2017. The manuscript has also been discussed briefly in a number of Turkish PhD and MA theses: Aksu 1992: 128-9, Algaç 2000: 162-4 and Demircan Aksoy 2010: 62-4. Images of the manuscript's illuminations also appear

It is likely that these appearances in later manuscripts from Konya were the result of their prominence in the *Maṣnavī*, a visually stunning and culturally important manuscript that, as a probable display object in the shrine, may have provided a significant source of artistic inspiration and popularised certain decorative modes. The pointed oval frontispiece does not appear to have become particularly widespread in other parts of the Islamic world. Pointed ovals are present in illuminated manuscripts from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries but are noticeably different in form and scale.²²⁷

Other than the 1278 Qur'an, I have only found one example in which double circular medallions appear at the end of a text. These come at the end of the first volume of a copy of the *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad that will be discussed in Chapter Four, which was produced in 1366. In this case, the medallions also include lines of poetry. A single eight-lobed medallion also appears in the finispiece of an illuminated Mamluk Qur'an dated by David James to 1304-15.²²⁸ The only dated instance I have found of double full-page medallions appearing in a manuscript's frontispiece (rather than finispiece) occur in a 1314 copy of Sulṭān Walad's *Intihānāma* which as we shall see in the next chapter was almost certainly produced in Konya.

on the dust jacket and p. 21 (fig. 4) of Ersoy 1988. Ersoy briefly describes the manuscript's illumination on p. 46. See also n. 6 above.

²²⁷ See, for example, *Supplément arabe* 1567 and *Supplément persan* 1963, both from the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris (Richard 1997: Cats 28 and 37).

²²⁸ Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1457. James 1999: Cat. 1.

Blair suggests that, in contrast to contemporary Qur'ans produced in the Ilkhanid centre of Baghdad, where "the reader expected fine calligraphy", the extensive illuminations of the 1278 *Maṣnavī* and Qur'an indicate that "Sufi patrons in Anatolia expected lavish illumination".²²⁹ This suggestion is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, Blair's conjecture is based on only two manuscripts from the region (the 1278 *Maṣnavī* and 1278 Qur'an). While this is understandable given the broad scope of her publication, discussing what patrons might have expected is difficult when there is no evidence characterising patrons' and artists' interactions and participation in the production process.

Secondly, Blair's suggestion assumes a fundamental difference between Ilkhanid and Anatolian patrons' expectations. As I argue throughout the present study, the boundaries between artistic production in Rūm and the eastern Islamic world are perhaps more permeable than previously thought. Indeed, as Rūm became a de facto province of Ilkhanid territories, craftsmen, scholars and dervishes travelled across the region in search of opportunities. Additionally, as I discuss in relation to Ibn Bībī's chronicle below, Ilkhanid officials could commission manuscripts made in Konya. Although I am not suggesting they be treated as one and the same, the arts of the book of Konya, Tabriz, Mosul and Baghdad were perhaps instead elements of a wider geographical and artistic network that emerged as artists traversed areas of the Islamic world, adopting and adapting ideas and skills as they went.

²²⁹ Blair 2006a: 370.

Both the *Maṣnavī* and the Qur'an are mainly executed in *naskh*, a rounded script that was used to copy a wide range of texts.²³⁰ The *Maṣnavī*'s prose prefaces are written in gold, in a script that is in between *tawqīʿ* and *naskh*.²³¹ Often used as a display script in Qur'anic and non-Qur'anic manuscripts, *tawqīʿ* is generally characterised by descenders curling upward, and several ligatures between letters.²³² In the case of the *Maṣnavī*, all the descenders curl upwards apart from some of the final *mīms*, which point downwards. However, the overall impression of the script is quite steady, albeit a little inconsistent when considering individual letter forms (fig. 50). The main *naskh* script of the *Maṣnavī* appears to anticipate *nastaʿlīq* however, which would not be used in its proper form in Anatolia until the mid-fifteenth century.²³³ As in *nastaʿlīq*, the *alifs* are small in comparison to other letters, the bowls of the *nūns*, *yā's*, *qāfs*, and *sīns* are quite deep and round, and the ends of lines of text are often written in superscription (fig. 51).²³⁴ Although the hand is not particularly exceptional, it is clear, legible and reasonably consistent.

The main script of the Qur'an is similarly legible, though the overall appearance is more cramped and rigid than that of the *Maṣnavī*. This is likely in part due to the manuscript's smaller size. In any case, individual letter forms are also not as consistent as seen in the *Maṣnavī*, with final *mīms* pointing both down and sideways, and *kāfs* varying greatly in shape and size (see fig. 8). However, like the

²³⁰ See Déroche 2005: 207-19 and Gacek 2009: 162-5 for discussions concerning various types of *naskh* and problems in understanding it as a classification of scripts.

²³¹ See p. 63 above for an explanation regarding the use of script designations.

²³² Gacek 2015a.

²³³ Gacek 2015b.

²³⁴ Blair 2006a: 369, Gacek 2009: 166.

Maṣnavī, the manuscript features small, straight *alifs*, and *nūns*, *yā's*, *qāfs*, and *sīns* with deep, round bowls.

An undated Qur'an *juz'* and a 1262 *Kalīla wa Dimna*: two more early manuscripts from Konya?

While it has been challenging identifying convincing visual forerunners of these manuscripts, they provide enough production information to be able to locate them in a particular time and place. Otherwise, identifying the provenance of manuscripts when production information is lacking can be problematic due to the wide variety of styles and motifs used in manuscript illuminations which cannot necessarily be linked to a specific context. This issue is compounded by scholarly arguments that are based on undated and unattributable material. However, since the 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī* are grounded in a specific context, they can be used to discuss the origins of other manuscript material. In this section, I briefly discuss two manuscripts, one of which is relatively unknown to scholarship. This is an undated Qur'an *juz'* in Washington DC that has been, at the time of writing, attributed to Mamluk Egypt or Syria.²³⁵ The other manuscript, a 1262 Persian copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna*, has previously been thoroughly studied and identified as a possible product of Konya.²³⁶ Discussing such material can help to construct a

²³⁵ The manuscript contains part of *Sūrat al-A'rāf* up to part of *Sūrat al-Kahf*, and is, rather unusually, one part of a four-part Qur'an (Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Washington DC, S1986.25). The Mamluk attribution is present on the museum's webpage <www.asia.si.edu/collections/edan/object.php?q=fsg_S1986.25> (accessed 14 November 2016).

²³⁶ Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cologne, 527. The manuscript has been examined and analysed by Leïla Benouniche (1995).

broader picture of manuscript production, and additionally highlight the potential drawbacks of identifying manuscripts on the basis of visual similarities alone.

Visual elements of the 1278 Qur'an display a great degree of similarity to the decoration of the Qur'an *juz'* in Washington DC. Although this *juz'* is much larger than the 1278 Qur'an, measuring 311mm (length) x 235mm (width), the motifs, colour palette and page layout of both manuscripts are extremely similar to each other (figs 52-53). The *juz'* contains no inscriptions concerning its production or ownership. However, due to its striking resemblance to the 1278 Qur'an, it is almost certain that it was illuminated in Konya by Mukhlis ibn 'Abdullah al-Hindi, or at the very least by one of his students.

Unlike the 1278 Qur'an, however, the *juz'* is copied in a large *muḥaqqaq* script, rather than in *naskh*. It is one of only two manuscripts produced in late medieval Konya to have been copied in *muḥaqqaq*.²³⁷ Although *muḥaqqaq* was the predominant script for the copying of large Ilkhanid Qur'ans from the early fourteenth century, it was not used for copying Mamluk Qur'ans until the second

²³⁷ The other manuscript written in *muḥaqqaq* script that was produced in Konya is a Qur'an copied for a Qaramanid patron. This manuscript will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two. Other manuscripts that have been tentatively attributed to Rūm and are copied in *muḥaqqaq* include Khalili Collection, London, QUR283 (undated) and New York Public Library, New York, Spencer Arab Ms 3 (dated 1333). See James 1992a: 50 and Schmitz 1992: 282-4. For the latter manuscript, see also n. 570 below. I have also come across two undated (but probably fourteenth-century) Qur'an *juz'*, perhaps originally from the same manuscript, copied in *muḥaqqaq* which visually resemble aspects of the 1278 Qur'an and *Masnavi's* illuminations: Freer Gallery, Washington DC, F1940.16 and Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1458. The former is available at < www.asia.si.edu/collections/edan/object.php?q=fsg_F1940.16 > (accessed: 18/3/2017). For the latter, see Arberry 1967: Cat. 83. It is entirely possible that these manuscripts are also products of Rūm but without more production information, it is difficult to be sure.

quarter of the fourteenth century.²³⁸ This early instance of *muḥaqqaq*, therefore, can be broadly linked to contemporary Ilkhanid manuscript production. Compared to the *muḥaqqaq* found in monumental Ilkhanid manuscripts, such as the anonymous Baghdad Qur'an (copied 1302-8), the script of the Konya *juz'* is somewhat flatter and more uneven.²³⁹ This is particularly evident when comparing the proportional size of the *alifs* and *lāms*. In the word *unzila* ('it was revealed'), for example, the *alif* and *lām* of the Baghdad Qur'an extend noticeably beyond those of the Konya *juz'* (figs 54-55). This is also seen in the form of the *lām-alif* in both manuscripts. These stylistic differences aside, the use of *muḥaqqaq* in this context demonstrates a credible relationship with the contemporary Ilkhanid arts of the book.

The 1262 Persian copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna* was written by Abū al-Ma'ālī Naṣr Allāh Munshī (d. after 1160). This manuscript, which measures 316mm (length) x 229mm (width) with a textblock of 211mm x 146mm, was completed on 15 Ṣafar 661/29 December 1262 by Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar nicknamed (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) al-Jalāl, known as (*al-ma'rūf bi-*) Ibn al-Kamāl al-Khaṭṭāṭ (son of the calligrapher Kamāl).²⁴⁰ Benouniche has identified Konya as the likeliest production centre on textual and visual bases. Firstly, she notes that parts of the text are very similar to a non-illuminated commentary on *Kalīla wa Dimna*, which was

²³⁸ James 1999: 21.

²³⁹ This Qur'an, illustrated in fig. 54, is dispersed over four collections: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Istanbul (EH 247, EH 249), Chester Beatty Library, Dublin (Is.1614a, Is.1614b), Iran Bastan Museum, Tehran (3548, 3350, 3532, 3522) and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Rogers 50.12, Rogers 55.44). See James 1999: Cat. 39 for the full bibliography of this manuscript.

²⁴⁰ Benouniche 1995.

composed by Faḍl Allāh Isfarāyīnī (of Esfarayen in northern Iran) and copied in Konya in 676/1278 by Abū al-Maḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn al-Ḥājī nicknamed (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) Ḥamīd al-Mukhlīṣī al-Bukhārī (of Bukhara).²⁴¹ However, while this strongly suggests that the 1262 copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna* was in Konya by 1278, it does not necessitate that it was produced in the same place.

Secondly, in discussing the frontispiece (which is the only illumination that remains), Benouniche highlights the presence of a prominent four-pointed star in the headpiece, and the four-pointed cross strapwork that forms the sides of the frame (fig. 56). Similar four-pointed stars appear twice in the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, and in other manuscripts that were produced in Konya in the first half of the fourteenth century (fig. 57).²⁴² Benouniche also notes that this motif appears in several architectural contexts, such as the panels above the door frames of the Şifaiye Medrese in Sivas (built 1217) and the *miḥrāb* (prayer niche) of the mosque of Şadr al-Dīn Qūnawī in Konya (built 1274). In terms of the star strapwork, Benouniche points out the similarities between the illuminated pattern and a carved stone column from the mosque portal of Şāḥib Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī’s complex in Konya (built 1258-83) (fig. 58).²⁴³ However, both the four-pointed star and the four-pointed cross strapwork are found in earlier manuscripts that were produced from the

²⁴¹ Benouniche 1995: 65-6. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1442. The title of this manuscript is *Sharḥ al-Abyāt wa al-Amthāl al-Mansūba ilā Kalīla*. This scribe also copied the 1286 *Laṭā’if al-Ḥikma* that is discussed below.

²⁴² Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51, fols 6b-7a; Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12-1, fol. 411b, Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 74, fol. 116a. The second and third manuscripts are discussed in Chapter Two. An undated Qur’an *juz*’ has also been attributed to late medieval Konya on the basis of this motif (Khalili Collection, London, QUR283). See James 1992a: Cat. 50. James cites an ‘MS.84’ from the Mevlana Müzesi which cannot be correct. He presumably means 74.

²⁴³ Benouniche 1995: 76.

eleventh to thirteenth centuries in greater Persia and Central Asia so both motifs may well have had a wider circulation and cannot be linked to Konya specifically. Given the analysis of Benouniche's evidence above, it is certainly possible that the copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna* was indeed produced in Konya but this claim is by no means irrefutable (figs 59-62).

The 1278 manuscripts' artists and patrons

As I have discussed in the previous introductory chapter, frameworks for understanding the history and material culture of late medieval Rūm have been reevaluated over the past two decades. In assessing how the Rūm Seljuks and Islamic art have been studied over the course of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scholars have produced new ways of thinking about cultural geography, identity and art in this complex milieu. I will now briefly discuss what the 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī* can tell us about artists, patrons and manuscript production in late thirteenth-century Konya. In the following sections, I will then discuss the contemporary political, economic and cultural conditions in Konya in a broader sense in order to construct a picture of the environment in which these manuscripts were commissioned, produced and consumed.

While both manuscripts were illuminated by Mukhlīṣ ibn 'Abdullāh al-Hindī, they were copied by two different scribes who were both from Konya: the Qur'an by Ḥasan ibn Chūbān ibn 'Abdullāh al-Qūnawī, and the *Maṣnavī* by Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh al-Qūnawī al-Waladī. Although both scribes were clearly competent in

Arabic, it was perhaps not their native tongue since there are spelling mistakes in the Qur'an's dedication and illuminator's inscription, and in the *Maṣnavī's waqf* note (all of which are in Arabic).²⁴⁴ While it is not mentioned where the *Maṣnavī* was produced, it was almost certainly produced in Konya. This is not only because it was illuminated by the same person who illuminated the Qur'an in the same year, but also because, as we will see, its donor was closely associated with the Seljuk elite in Konya, as was the donor of the Qur'an.

The *waqf* record on folio 325b of the *Maṣnavī* states that it was endowed to Rūmī's shrine in Konya by Jamāl al-Dīn Mubārak ibn 'Abdullāh. The inscription notes that Jamāl al-Dīn was a freed slave ('*atīq*) of Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn (d. 1288), a powerful Seljuk vizier and prolific patron of architecture, as indicated by his epithets, Ṣāḥib 'Aṭā ("friend of giving") and Abū al-Khayrāt ("master of charitable deeds").²⁴⁵ Jamāl al-Dīn is also mentioned as the '*khādim*'²⁴⁶ of Fakhr al-Dīn on a book stand (*raḥla*) that the former donated to the Mawlawi shrine.²⁴⁷ This is probably the same Mubārak ibn 'Abdullāh mentioned among one of the witnesses of Nūr al-Dīn ibn Jājā's 1272 *waqfiyya* who is named as 'Mubārak ibn 'Abdullāh al-

²⁴⁴ See Appendix Two. It is likely that their first language was Persian. This also seems to be the case with the Mawlawi *amīr* Sātī ibn Ḥasan, whom I discuss in Chapter Four.

²⁴⁵ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51, fol. 325b. There is some confusion with regards to the spelling of 'Aṭā/Atā, where the latter spelling means 'father' in Persian (Steingass 1892: 12). Both 'Ṣāḥib 'Aṭā' and 'Ṣāḥib Atā' are found in numerous secondary sources but so far, I have been unable to locate a primary source where the epithet is written in its full form. The epithet 'Abū al-Khayrāt' is mentioned in several places. See, for example, Rogers 1976: 70, n. 6.

²⁴⁶ Although literally meaning 'servant' or 'attendant', this word also acquired the meaning of 'eunuch' (Wensinck 2017). Considering that Jamāl al-Dīn was a freed slave of Ṣāḥib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, it is entirely possible that the patron was indeed also a eunuch. It was not unknown for eunuchs to be involved in illuminated manuscript production, as in the case of the eunuch Abū Bakr, also known as Ṣandal (sandalwood), who illuminated the 1304-6 Qur'an of the Mamluk ruler Rukn al-Dīn Baybars al-Jāshnigīr (r. 1309-10). British Library, London, Add.MS.22406.

²⁴⁷ This object is discussed below in terms of its possible connection to the 1278 *Maṣnavī*.

Khādim'.²⁴⁸ The section in which he is mentioned contains the names of several other converts to Islam (distinguished by the 'ibn 'Abdullāh' patronymic) who held positions such as *silāhī* (sword-bearer), *dhawwāq* (taster) and *ṭabbākh* (cook). No-one with this name or position is mentioned in the Mawlawi hagiographies by Sipahsālār and Aflākī, or in Rūmī's collected letters.²⁴⁹ However, Aflākī notes that Nūr al-Dīn ibn Jājā was the governor of Kırşehir and a Mawlawi disciple.²⁵⁰

The Qur'an was commissioned by one Sayf al-Dīn Sunqur ibn 'Abdullāh al-Şāhibī (i.e. another associate of Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī). He is identified on the Qur'an's dedication pages (see fig. 12) as '*malik al-khawāşş wa al-ḥujjāb*' (Head of the Courtly Elites and the Chamberlains)²⁵¹ and a '*kadkhudā*' (senior courtier).²⁵² There is a mention of one Sayf al-Dīn Sunqur in a 1281 *waqfiyya* pertaining to an '*imāra*' (foundation) which was built by Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī in Konya.²⁵³ A Sayf [al-Dīn] Sunqur is also mentioned as the imperial *chāshnīgīr* (official taster) around the year 1295 in the anonymous chronicle *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlī*, completed some time after 1363.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁸ Temir 1959: 80. See Pfeiffer 2015 for more on the cultural context of this document.

²⁴⁹ Sipahsālār 2007, Aflākī 1961 and 2002, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 1992.

²⁵⁰ Aflākī 1961: 497-8; 2002: 343-4, al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 74-5.

²⁵¹ Cahen notes that the head of the chamberlains was primarily an "army general" (1968: 223).

²⁵² According to Osman Turan, the title *kadkhuda* (or *katkhudā*) was used in Rūm from the thirteenth century (1958: 13) and Orhonlu et al. note that the term was also used in Ilkhanid lands to designate a village's representative concerning governmental affairs (2016). Another '*kadkhudā*' of Konya is mentioned in Aflākī (1961: II, 839; 2002: 586).

²⁵³ Bayram and Karabacak 1981: 39.

²⁵⁴ Anonymous 1952: 92. According to Ibn Bībī, the *chāshnīgīr* or *jāshnīgīr* was of the same rank as the *amīr majlis* (master of ceremonies), one of the highest dignitaries in the Rūm Seljuk court (Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 164). Cahen notes that this "honorific" role was usually held in conjunction with another high office (1968: 223). If this is the Qur'an's patron, perhaps he was promoted over the years.

The previously mentioned walnut book stand, donated to the shrine by the patron of the *Maṣnavī* who is described in the book stand's inscription as "*khādim al-Ṣāhibī*", is dated 678/1279-80.²⁵⁵ It measures 945mm in height and 425mm in width. The outsides of the two leaves are ornately carved while the inside panels are covered in lacquered and gilded decoration (figs 63-66). This decoration consists of a central double-headed eagle surrounded by seven mirrored pairs of lions on a ground of curvilinear floral motifs. The concomitance in date and patron, and similarity in measurements, strongly suggests that the stand was intended specifically for use with the 1278 *Maṣnavī*. The canonical nature of the manuscript meant that it would very likely have been used during recitals in the shrine. This, along with its considerable size, necessitated an equally impressive book stand.

Although several carved book stands were produced in this period, this is the only extant example with figural decoration.²⁵⁶ Lions and double-headed eagles were relatively common motifs that were found on a range of contemporary media, such as architecture, textiles and coinage across Europe and the Islamic world as emblems of political or regal authority.²⁵⁷ One pair of the lions, on the outer most sides of the panel, raise one paw in the direction of the eagle unlike the other six seated pairs. Scott Redford has suggested that this could signify a show of

²⁵⁵ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 332. Riefstahl 1933, Ölçer 2005.

²⁵⁶ Riefstahl 1933. There are surviving partial wood carvings with figural decoration that may have been attached to book stands. See Museum of Islamic Art, Cairo, no. 3391, available at: <http://www.discoverislamicart.org/database_item.php?id=object;isl;eg;mus01;28;en> (accessed: 18/3/2017) but, as far as I know, this example is the only surviving Islamic book stand featuring figural motifs.

²⁵⁷ Öney 1969: 208, Peker 1999, Yalman 2012.

deference to the central eagle.²⁵⁸ The specific combination of the double-headed eagle with lions understandably appears less frequently than the motifs on their own. However, both animals do appear in the decoration of an undated gilded bronze openwork lamp that was produced by one Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-Mawlawī, presumably for use in the Mawlawi shrine where it is currently housed (fig. 67).²⁵⁹ In this context, it is possible that the nature of such figural decorations was intended to express the veneration of Rūmī and other Mawlawi leaders, like the regally-named Sulṭān Walad.²⁶⁰

It is significant that the names of all three artists and both patrons involved in the production of the manuscripts include the designation ‘ibn ‘Abdullāh’, a generic paternal name used for converts.²⁶¹ Nearly all of them were probably first-generation Muslims.²⁶² In the case of Jamāl al-Dīn Mubārak, he, like many serving the Seljuks, was possibly a Greek convert from Christianity. Though Sayf al-Dīn Sunqur’s name suggest that he may have been a Mongol, it should be remembered that the brother of the Seljuk vizier Jalāl al-Dīn Qarāṭāy (d. 1254) who was of Anatolian Christian origin was named Qarā Sunqur.²⁶³ The *nisba* of the illuminator – ‘al-Hindī’ – is rather unusual, though not unknown for the time.²⁶⁴ Both scribes’

²⁵⁸ Redford 2013a. I am grateful to Scott Redford for sharing the text of his conference paper with me.

²⁵⁹ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 400. Ölçer 2005: Cat. 70. Double-headed eagles and lions also appear together on medieval woven silks. See Kuehn 2011: fig. 156, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2012.338 and Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, 1990.2.

²⁶⁰ I am grateful to Scott Redford for this suggestion.

²⁶¹ Schimmel 1989: 8. Many slaves of Greek origin were to be found in Seljuk service.

²⁶² Ḥasan ibn Chūbān ibn ‘Abdullāh may have been a second-generation Muslim.

²⁶³ Eyice 1989: 236.

²⁶⁴ The Shāfi‘ī jurist, Abū ‘Abdullāh Šāfi al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Hindī al-Urmavī (d. 1315), who was born near Delhi, lived at various times in Yemen, Mecca, Egypt, Antakya, Konya, Sivas, and Kayseri, spending a total of seventeen years in Rūm (Çelebi 1998: 66-7). It appears that the *nisba* of ‘al-

nisbas (al-Qūnawī) connect them to Konya, and they may also have been of Greek or Mongol origin.²⁶⁵ Significantly, the addition of ‘al-Waladī’ to Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh’s name suggests that he was a disciple or attendant of Rumi’s son Sulṭān Walad, who was at the shrine when the *Maṣnavī* was produced, and would be its leader from 1284 until his death in 1312. These manuscripts show that production in Konya was executed by a cosmopolitan and mobile group of artists and patrons such as Greek or Mongol converts to Islam and, possibly, a craftsman of South Asia. Consequently, ethnically-inspired categories such as ‘Turkish’, ‘Turco-Mongol’, ‘Persian’ or ‘Persianate’ are rendered fairly meaningless in this context.²⁶⁶

Politics and history writing in late thirteenth-century Konya

The two manuscripts that are the focus of this chapter anchor discussions around 1278. The entire period from the mid-thirteenth century until the late fourteenth century was politically unstable and fragmented, and the point at which the manuscripts were produced was soon after a particularly turbulent time in Konya’s history.

Urmavī’ derives from his teacher, Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283), another migrant Shāfi‘ī scholar living in Konya, whom I discuss below. There was also one Sharaf al-Dīn-i Hindī, a *khwāja* who was a contemporary of Rūmī’s who was known for bringing back “strange and wondrous merchandise” (*matā’hā-yi gharīb va ‘ajīb*) from India to Konya (Aflākī 1961: I, 91; 2002: 67). Saqib Baburi has suggested that the *nisba* of ‘al-Hindī’ might signify that the illuminator was of Hindustani heritage rather than a migrant from the region (personal communication).

²⁶⁵ It is unclear from where precisely the name ‘Chūbān’ originates but the most well-known contemporary owners of the name were the Mongol Chubanid dynasty who established a successor state to the Ilkhanids from 1335 to 1358.

²⁶⁶ As Cemal Kafadar has discussed, the notion of ‘identity’ in this setting is far from straightforward. Kafadar has suggested that the somewhat nebulous ‘Rūmī’ *nisba* may have provided a common ‘identity’ for some members of this profoundly mixed society (2007). The *nisba*, however, does not appear to have been adopted by individuals connected to the production and patronage of illuminated manuscripts in late medieval Rūm.

Since the Seljuks' defeat by the Mongols at the Battle of Köseadağ in 1243, central and eastern Rūm had been subject to a variety of skirmishes and rebellions. Even before this turning point, Seljuk power in Rūm had been weakened by the Bābā'ī revolt (circa 1240). This rebellion – led by the Turkmen preacher, Bābā Ishāq (d. 1240) – encompassed a large portion of central and eastern Rūm. Following the Seljuks' defeat in 1243, their power was vastly reduced and they were made to pay tribute to the Mongols.²⁶⁷ Upon the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II (r. 1237-46), a tripartite rule was established between the sultan's three underage sons. From this point onwards, de facto power was wielded by local bureaucrats who were ostensibly affiliated to the Seljuks, Turkmen *beys*, Mongol commanders and popular dervishes. Tripartite rule swiftly descended into scheming and infighting, and the weakened state of the Seljuks eventually resulted in another Mongol victory in 1256 at the Battle of Aksaray (also called the Battle of Sultanhanı). Finally, in 1261, the middle son, Rukn al-Dīn Qilich Arslān IV (d. 1265), was installed in Konya by the Mongols as the sole, puppet ruler.²⁶⁸ In the meantime, local *amīrs* were busy amassing wealth, lands and power. For example, in 1261, the sultan added Ladik (now known as Denizli),²⁶⁹ Honaz and Afyonkarahisar to the territories of the sons of Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī as well as the frontier towns (*vilāyāt-i ūj*) of Kütahya, Akşehir, Sandıklı and Gorgorum (near Beyşehir).²⁷⁰ Meanwhile, the day-to-day administration of Konya was largely controlled by local bureaucrats, like Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, and others like the *parvāna* Mu'īn al-Dīn

²⁶⁷ This tribute was reportedly around 400,000 dinars annually (Melville 2009: 54).

²⁶⁸ Ibn Bībī 1956: fols 628-9.

²⁶⁹ Not to be confused with Ladik on the Black Sea.

²⁷⁰ Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 657; al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 74.

Sulaymān (d. 1277) and the *nāʾib al-salṭana* (vice-sultan) Amīn al-Dīn Mikāʾil (d. 1277). In 1276-77, however, the region witnessed three major, interrelated events which changed the structure of power in Konya. These events were a consequence of both a resentment towards Mongol authority, and the imperial ambitions of the Mamluk sultan Rukn al-Dīn Baybars (r. 1260-77).

The first major event was the rebellion of the governor (*beylerbeyi*) of Niğde, Sharaf al-Dīn Masʿūd ibn al-Khaṭīr, who (possibly encouraged by the *parvāna*) wrote to Baybars urging him to send forces to Rūm.²⁷¹ Sharaf al-Dīn was eventually caught and executed in mid-1276. Despite outward loyalty to Abaqa Khān (r. 1265-82), Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān had entered into correspondence with Baybars several years before this rebellion, as a result of threats to his own privileged political position. This complicated plotting eventually resulted in not only Sharaf al-Dīn's rebellion but also the second major event of 1276-77: the Battle of Elbistan (Abulustayn).²⁷² Following this battle in April 1277, which resulted in heavy losses for the Mongols, Baybars triumphantly (albeit temporarily) occupied Kayseri. Having had coins struck and his name read during the *khuṭba* (Friday service), Baybars headed back towards Damascus several days later only to unexpectedly die in July.²⁷³

Having been encouraged to revolt by Sharaf al-Dīn, the Qaramanid beylik took advantage of the Mongols' weakened position following the Battle of Elbistan to

²⁷¹ Amitai-Preiss 1995: 165.

²⁷² Ibid: 159-68.

²⁷³ Ibid: 174-5.

seize Konya, which had been left relatively undefended.²⁷⁴ This occupation, the third of a series of major events that transpired over 1276 and 1277, took place in May 1277. Qaramanid forces killed Amīn al-Dīn Mīkāʿīl, designated Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarāmān as vizier, and installed a pretender to the Seljuk throne, Jimrī, as the puppet ruler. After the Mongols executed the *parvāna* in mid-1277,²⁷⁵ Abaqa sent his brother Qunghurṭāy (d. 1284) to restore order in Rūm. After Qunghurṭāy's troops killed Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarāmān in October, Jimrī was captured and brutally executed in June 1278.

Although the Qaramanids had been temporarily subdued, they remained hostile to Mongol rule. Upon their 1277 occupation of Konya, the Qaramanids had also declared that Turkish would become the language of government.²⁷⁶ This unprecedented change, however temporary, marked the emergence of regional Turkish principalities as a considerable force on Rūm's political scene, although Sara Nur Yıldız has convincingly suggested that its importance has been overstated in modern Turkish scholarship due to nationalist sentiment.²⁷⁷ The Qaramanids attempted to occupy Konya several times over the next few decades, and were successful on a number of occasions.²⁷⁸ In response to these threats to their sovereignty in Rūm, the Ilkhanids sent Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī (d. 1284), the *ṣāhib-dīvān* (finance minister), to Rūm to formalise its fiscal integration

²⁷⁴ Melville 2009: 70-1.

²⁷⁵ Both June and September 1277 are mentioned in contemporary sources (Amitai-Preiss 1995: 177).

²⁷⁶ Melville 2009: 70.

²⁷⁷ Yıldız 2006: 42-7 and 2012a.

²⁷⁸ A more detailed account of beylik uprisings in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries will be outlined in Chapter Two.

into their realm and further quell unrest in the region.²⁷⁹ Following this move, major political and economic decisions concerning Rūm lay with the Ilkhanid central authority.

Despite Rūm's administrative incorporation into Ilkhanid territories, the region remained volatile as a result of continued beylik hostilities and internal weaknesses in the Mongol state. Following a Mamluk victory over the Ilkhanids at the Battle of Ḥomṣ (October 1281), Qaramanid and Ashrafid raids in and around Konya and Beyşehir recommenced, and the Qaramanids invested a minor Seljuk prince, 'Alā' al-Dīn ibn Farāmurz (nephew of Mas'ūd II), as ruler in Larende (now known as Karaman).²⁸⁰ After his reign was cut short by forces loyal to the Seljuks, Qaramanid and Ashrafid raiding continued unabated until they were brutally subdued by the Mongol commander Qunghurtāy. Qunghurtāy, originally sent to Rūm by his brother Abaqa Khān (r. 1265-82) to suppress the Qaramanids after they entered Konya in 1277, laid waste to Qaramanid territories in mid-1282 and massacred their inhabitants.²⁸¹

The death of Abaqa Khān in March or April 1282 instigated a Mongol succession crisis and a period of infighting and rebellion by Mongol commanders.²⁸² The new ruler, Aḥmad Tagūdar (r. 1282-4), decided to divide the territory of Rūm between

²⁷⁹ Melville 2009: 71.

²⁸⁰ Ibid: 72.

²⁸¹ Anonymous 1952: 42, 64.

²⁸² Rūm, as a periphery of the Ilkhanid state was seen by senior Mongol rebels as "an excellent base from which to bid for independence" (Melville 2009: 73). Throughout the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, several Mongol *amīrs*, such as Baltu, Sulaymish and Tīmūrtāsh, rebelled against central authority.

the current Seljuk sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III (r. 1265-84) and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mas‘ūd II (r. ca 1282-ca 1306, with interruption), who was currently residing in Ilkhanid Tabriz.²⁸³ At some point from 1282, Mas‘ūd II was installed as Seljuk ruler by the Ilkhanids, with Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī remaining as vizier.²⁸⁴ In the meantime, Qunghurtāy, supporting Arghūn as Ilkhanid successor, became embroiled in a rebellion against Aḥmad Tagūdar. Kaykhusraw III, who had originally asked for Qunghurtāy’s assistance against beylik raiding in 1281-2, joined him in this bid for power. On his way back to Tabriz, seemingly as a result of his violent activities in Rūm, Qunghurtāy was killed in January 1284; Kaykhusraw III was found dead in Erzincan a month later.²⁸⁵

Under the reign of the new ruler of the Ilkhanate, Arghūn (r. 1284-91), beylik insurgencies and Mongol rebellions continued to emerge. In November 1284, the mother of Kaykhusraw III invested the dead sultan’s two young sons as joint rulers in Rūm.²⁸⁶ In May 1285, they were crowned in Konya again with the backing of the Qaramanid Gūnārī Bey (d. 1300) and the Ashrafid Sulaymān Bey (d. 1302), who were made a *beylerbeyi* (governor) and a *nā’ib* (deputy governor) respectively.²⁸⁷ With the assistance of Arghūn, the two young rulers were killed and Mas‘ūd II, residing in Kayseri, was re-enthroned some time in 1286.²⁸⁸ The installation of Mas‘ūd did nothing to stifle unrest in Rūm, however. The later part of the decade

²⁸³ Al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 137-8, Melville 2009: 73-4.

²⁸⁴ Yıldız 2006: 481, Melville 2009: 75.

²⁸⁵ Melville 2009: 74.

²⁸⁶ Anonymous 1952: 45, 67.

²⁸⁷ Ibid: 44-5, 66. Sulaymān Bey is one of the manuscript patrons that I discuss in the next chapter.

²⁸⁸ Ibid: 47, 69.

saw further hostilities from the Garmiyanid, Qaramanid and Ashrafid beyliks, until a tentative peace was brokered in July 1288.²⁸⁹

Generally speaking, the material properties of manuscripts in this period do not necessarily directly reflect the contemporary political context. However, the dynamics that the political environment created likely contributed to the patronage of illuminated manuscript material. In the two examples of the 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī* discussed above, both patrons were connected to Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, and probably enjoyed a certain level of wealth and status as a result, which may have facilitated the production of illuminated manuscripts.²⁹⁰

Although the patrons of both manuscripts were perhaps prominent bureaucrats or courtiers, they seem to have been relatively unknown on the Seljuk political scene.

By contrast, we also have an illuminated manuscript from late medieval Konya that is far more modest in appearance with a patron that was very well-known in Ilkhanid political circles. This manuscript is a copy of Ibn Bībī's history of the Rūm Seljuks, *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-'Umūr al-'Alā'iyya* which was commissioned by the powerful Ilkhanid governor of Baghdad, 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī (d. 1283), the brother of the Ilkhanid finance minister, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī (d. 1284).²⁹¹ The manuscript is almost certainly the original copy

²⁸⁹ Melville 2009: 76.

²⁹⁰ It is possible that the illuminator, Mukhlis ibn 'Abdullāh al-Hindī, who worked on both manuscripts, was also part of the retinue of Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī. Fakhr al-Dīn certainly appears to have had scribes in his entourage (see n. 451 below) which was also the case for Seljuk *amīrs* in earlier periods (Redford 2010). I am grateful to Scott Redford for this suggestion and reference.

²⁹¹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Ayasofya 2985.

commissioned by ‘Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī. While the illumination does not necessarily confine the manuscript to a specific period, the text speaks highly of both Juwaynīs while a later copy, dated 1284-5, omits mention of the brothers following their fall from favour.²⁹² The patron’s death in March 1283 gives the *terminus ante quem* for the manuscript’s production. Based on the content of the original text, which concludes with the arrival of Mas‘ūd II to Rūm in 679/1280-1,²⁹³ Sara Nur Yıldız has argued that the text was likely finished in the summer of 1282, while Mas‘ūd was still in Tabriz following the death of Abaqa earlier that year.²⁹⁴ Although Yıldız has thoroughly discussed the contents of this important manuscript, its physical characteristics have not been examined until now.²⁹⁵

The manuscript was copied by Ibrāhīm ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Bakr al-Qayṣarī (i.e. of Kayseri) (fig. 68). It contains 372 folios and measures 325mm (length) x 240mm (width) x 65mm (depth). The textblock is 221mm x 166mm with twenty-one lines in one column (though this varies somewhat throughout the text with no discernible pattern). The paper is light brownish cream, and is very smooth and a little shiny. It features horizontal laid lines, twenty of which measure 30mm, and ten gathered sheets measure 2mm in thickness. These characteristics are similar to the 1278 *Maṣnavī*’s paper.²⁹⁶ The manuscript is bound in quinions though has lost its original covering and has been cropped. The manuscript has been copied in a

²⁹² This later Persian abridgement, the *Mukhtaṣar-i Saljūqnāma*, was copied in 683-4/1284-5 (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1536). Yıldız 2006: 474.

²⁹³ Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 735.

²⁹⁴ Yıldız 2006: 476.

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ See Appendix One.

dark brown *naskh* script. Although the script is fairly legible, its letterforms are not hugely consistent and in some places, rather messy. The overall impression is that the manuscript was written in somewhat of a hurry though the script does broadly resemble the handwriting of other manuscripts that were produced in Konya. The frontispiece features an illuminated roundel that contains a dedication to Kaykhusraw III (r. 1265-84) (fig. 69).²⁹⁷ Above and below this roundel are rectangular head and tailpieces. The beginning of the text also features a rectangular headpiece (fig. 70).²⁹⁸

The small amount of illumination bears clear similarities to that of the 1278 *Maṣnavī* (fig. 71). Given this resemblance, in addition to the circumstances of the text's composition, it is very likely to have been produced in Konya where Ibn Bībī lived. The format of a circular medallion with head and tailpieces is strongly associated with manuscripts of the Injuids, a Mongol successor state which ruled over Shiraz and Isfahan from 1335 to 1357.²⁹⁹ However, Elaine Wright has suggested that this format may ultimately derive from manuscripts like the 1198-9 *Kitāb al-Diryāq*, which was probably produced in the Jazira.³⁰⁰ The *Kitāb al-Diryāq* manuscript features circular medallions set into or surrounded by rectangular frames. This design in fact appears even earlier as shown by a Qur'an

²⁹⁷ Yıldız 2006: 478-81. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985, fol. 1a.

²⁹⁸ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985, fol. 1b.

²⁹⁹ Wright 2012.

³⁰⁰ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Arabe 2964. This manuscript is available online at <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8422960m>> (accessed: 6/12/2016). See also Wright 2012: 10.

dated 505 (1111-12) that was produced in Bost (known today as Lashkargah in present-day Afghanistan) (fig. 72).

The Juwaynī brothers were among the two most powerful political figures during the rule of Abaqa.³⁰¹ ‘Aṭā-Malik was also the author of *Tārīkh-i Jahān-gushāy* (ca 1260), and was, like his brother, a prolific patron of architecture.³⁰² Ibn Bībī’s text mentions the Mongols very little and strives to emphasise the glories of Seljuk rule while blaming recent troubles on corrupt and greedy bureaucrats and *amīrs*.³⁰³ Yıldız has suggested that the contents of Ibn Bībī’s work (and other chronicles commissioned by the brothers), and the Juwaynīs’ architectural works served to “emphasise the importance of Islamic institutions” during the Mongol reign, whilst also promoting their own positions as Islamic bureaucrat-scholars *par excellence*.³⁰⁴

The manuscript itself contains meagre production information. Its physical features broadly link it to Konya but are otherwise unremarkable. However, the circumstances of the manuscript’s patronage give some insight into the changing power dynamics of late medieval Rūm. No other manuscripts from Konya commissioned by ‘Aṭā-Malik are known. His brother Shams al-Dīn, however, had a clear connection to Rūm. Prior to arriving in Rūm in 1277 to formally incorporate

³⁰¹ In addition to appointing relatives to several important administrative positions, members of the family made marriage alliances with Abbasid and Ayyubid princesses (Yıldız 2006: 510, 556).

³⁰² ‘Aṭā-Malik, for example, funded the two largest madrasas in Baghdad, the Mustanşiriyya (1269) and the Nizāmiyya (1277), while his brother built the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas (1271-2).

³⁰³ Yıldız 2006: 442.

³⁰⁴ Ibid: 520. See also Melville 2001.

the region into the Ilkhanid taxation system, Shams al-Dīn had also constructed a madrasa in Sivas in 1271-2, which is today known as the Çifte Minareli Medrese. These activities, alongside ‘Aṭā-Malik’s patronage of a manuscript produced in Konya, highlight how in some ways the region became absorbed into the Ilkhanid political sphere. The manuscript, at the intersection of Seljuk and Ilkhanid cultural spheres, reflects how the nature of illuminated manuscript patronage in this milieu had the potential to be shaped by complex and transregional changes in the political environment.

The cultural and intellectual landscapes of Konya: scholars, Sufis and Christians

Richard Bulliet has discussed how the establishment of medieval Islamic governments tended to result in the growth of capital cities which then became attractive focal points for trade routes, and for the endowment of religious and educational sites. In the context of the medieval Islamic world, cosmopolitan urban populations, respected educational institutions and sufficient economic prosperity combined to support a non-productive class which in turn produced a “cultural climate conducive to intellectual endeavour”.³⁰⁵ Bulliet’s claim presupposes a stable and centralised government which, as is evident from the previous section, is not how Konya can be described in the late thirteenth century (and, arguably, even earlier).

³⁰⁵ Bulliet 1979: 14.

However, despite these disturbances and the lack of a strong, local governing structure in the late thirteenth century, Konya remained a centre for artistic patronage and intellectual activity. The city also retained a level of political and economical importance, which is clear from the extensive building work that occurred there from the 1240s to the 1270s. Patricia Blessing has discussed how, in the absence of imperial patronage, powerful bureaucrats like Jalāl al-Dīn Qarāṭāy, Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān and Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī endowed charitable, multipurpose complexes in Konya in this period.³⁰⁶ The buildings financed by Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī in particular are noteworthy for the richness and inventiveness of their surface decoration.³⁰⁷

Although fewer buildings were constructed in Konya after the 1270s compared to earlier periods, the city appears to have been an active centre for the production of illuminated manuscripts into at least the 1330s.³⁰⁸ While the quality of the 1278 Qurʿan and *Maṣnavī*'s calligraphy and illumination may not quite reach the polished heights of some contemporary monumental Ilkhanid manuscripts, they do demonstrate that production and tastes were relatively sophisticated. Numerous other illuminated manuscripts were likely produced in similar circumstances, and the surviving examples may be the remains of what was a thriving industry. Indeed, there may be further manuscripts, like the

³⁰⁶ Blessing 2014a: 21-67.

³⁰⁷ Some of Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī's foundations are mentioned throughout this thesis. His endowments include the Sahipata Han in Sultandağı (1249-50), the Taş Medrese in Akşehir (1250), the Sahip Ata Külliyesi in Konya (1258-83), the İnce Minareli Medrese in Konya (1260s), the Sahibiye Medrese in Kayseri (1267) and the Gök Medrese in Sivas (1271).

³⁰⁸ It is important to note that building activity continued in other places like Beyşehir, Larende, Sivas, Tokat, Ankara, Amasya and Erzurum.

aforementioned undated Qur'an *juz*', that are currently misidentified, and in fact belong to this context.

The 1278 Qur'an and *Maṣnavī* reinforce the point that artistic patronage and production continued in Konya despite contemporary political upheaval. By this point in time, the Seljuk rulers were no longer active as patrons of art, and these manuscripts cannot be termed 'Seljuk' as it obscures their true significance as artistic and cultural objects. Both patrons of the 1278 manuscripts were, instead, directly connected to Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, who was vizier at the time. Though no books commissioned by the vizier himself appear to have survived, those in his retinue clearly had the means and desire to finance lavishly illuminated manuscripts. This material must therefore be interpreted in an alternative framework to one that is prominent in the field of Islamic art in which objects are categorised under dynastic patronage.³⁰⁹ To that end, the contexts that I discuss in the following sections, and throughout the thesis, emphasise the importance of mobility as a feature of Islamic learning and culture, the ensuing interplay between the local and the transregional, and the patronage patterns that existed below the imperial level.

The 1278 *Maṣnavī* demonstrates that Rūmī's early devotees had an integral role in illuminated manuscript production in Konya.³¹⁰ This important connection,

³⁰⁹ Blair and Bloom 2003: 160-1.

³¹⁰ The strong connection between the Mawlawis and manuscript production in this period is partially due to the fact that the shrine's library in Konya has largely remained intact, unlike many other collections in Turkey. As a result, the shrine currently holds one of the richest illuminated manuscript collections in the country and is an invaluable resource for scholars. This has

discussed by Zeren Tanındı, is yet to be contextualised in a wider cultural history of the period.³¹¹ The Mawlawis' place and status in Konya in the last decades of the thirteenth century needs further investigation. Rūmī's disciples, however, were but one socio-religious group in the cultural landscapes of Konya in particular and Rūm more broadly. At this stage, the Muslim population in the region remained in the minority (though perhaps less so in Konya). These circumstances, coupled with the lack of a strong centralised government, resulted in multiple "layers of authority", one of which was occupied by prestigious dervishes and scholars.³¹²

During the height of their powers, the Rūm Seljuks had established a strong and enduring trade network that was furnished with caravanserais (*khāns*).³¹³ Caravanserais were not only economically valuable, providing shelter for merchants and their goods, but provided rooms, food and other supplies to travellers, thereby contributing to the safe passage of travellers and the economic prosperity of nearby towns. These networks connected Rūm's towns to Egypt, Syria, greater Persia, the Black Sea and Crimea, Cilician Armenia and Constantinople. Since Anatolia was very rich in natural resources, with copious grazing lands, cereal crops, fruits, pulses, vegetables, minerals, metals and other goods like cloth, brassware and wine, the region was familiar to Christian and Muslim traders from across the Mediterranean. Before and after the Mongol conquest, Konya was visited by Persian, Greek, Armenian, Frankish, Genoese and

undoubtedly and fundamentally shaped the focus of the present study (Gölpınarlı 1967 and 2003, Bağcı 2003).

³¹¹ Tanındı 2000, 2001 and 2012.

³¹² Kafadar 1995: 125.

³¹³ Önge 2007.

Venetian traders.³¹⁴ With the political fragmentation of the former Seljuk territories that ensued after the region became part of the Mongol empire, towns other than Konya became emerging centres of power and culture. Commercial activity in Sivas, Sinop, Alanya and Antalya in particular were vital for the regional economy, while other towns like Tokat, Kayseri, Erzurum, Amasya and Niğde also grew in importance.

These trade networks also, crucially, facilitated the movement of Muslims and non-Muslims alike, with scholars, artists, and bureaucrats travelling over great distances into Rūm in order to escape persecution, seek patronage or study with certain teachers. This mobility in turn allowed for the cultivation of cultural, intellectual, and artistic exchange in the respected urban centres of the Muslim world. Throughout the thirteenth century, Konya increasingly became part of the scholarly itinerary, joining such places as Córdoba, Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus and Samarqand. Before (and after) the Mongol takeover, Konya had a relatively open and diverse intellectual scene that was populated by groups of various ethnic origins and religious beliefs.

In her analysis of late medieval Anatolian architecture, Patricia Blessing has discussed how the Sunni Revival, which took place in the Muslim East from the eleventh century, did not occur in Rūm due to the fact that Islam was not securely established as the dominant religion there.³¹⁵ The religiously-mixed nature of

³¹⁴ William of Rubruck 1900: 277, Vryonis 1971: 235, Fleet 2009.

³¹⁵ Blessing 2012: 35. The 'Sunni Revival' is a term used in modern scholarship to describe a movement that culminated with the Great Seljuks of Iran who supported a resurgence in moderate

society in medieval Rūm and its position as a 'frontier' between Christian and Islamic realms inhibited the formation of a common, mainstream religious faith as was the case in older Islamic urban centres. Indeed, while Rūm's towns did not have the same venerable reputation as the more traditional centres of Islamic learning mentioned above, the region did see the arrival of intellectuals with less-than-orthodox views, like Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 1240), Bābā Ilyās (d. 1240) and Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī (d. 1247), who had come to Rūm and found receptive audiences for their ideas.³¹⁶ In many cases, they stayed for extensive periods, enjoying the religious tolerance and patronage they found there. It is not surprising then, that the Sufi scholar Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya (d. 1256) praised the Rūm Seljuk rulers for their endowments of educational foundations and sponsorship of both scholars and dervishes.³¹⁷

After the incorporation of central and eastern Anatolia into the Ilkhanid realm in the mid-thirteenth century, the ensuing absence of an effective centralised governing structure prompted a rise in the status of Sufis and scholars as embodiments of ideal Islamic practice. In the period following the Seljuks' defeat, Konya remained an attractive city for scholars and dervishes who may have found life in older, more orthodox centres of scholarship difficult.³¹⁸ Thus in the late thirteenth century, Rūm possessed a vibrant cultural and intellectual scene that

Sunni jurisprudence while challenging Shīʿī polities like the Buyids and the Fatimids, and actively persecuting radical Shīʿī figures in governing and scholarly circles. On the Sunni Revival (and criticisms of the concept), see Makdisi 1973, Tabbaa 2001 and Peacock 2010: 99-127.

³¹⁶ Kafadar 2007: 10

³¹⁷ Rāzī 1982: 43-4.

³¹⁸ Anatolian-based scholars were still compelled to travel outside of the region in order to access higher education. Rūmī, for example, went to Aleppo and Damascus to receive teaching as a young man before returning to Konya (Lewis 2008: 109-12).

was populated by peripatetic intellectuals from across the Islamic world like Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273, born in Balkh), Sirāj al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Abī Bakr Urmavī (d. 1283, born in Urmia, north-western Iran), Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Irāqī (d. 1289, born in Kumjan, north-western Iran), and Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 1311, born in Shiraz).

The movement of ‘*ulamā*’ across the Islamic world and into Rūm resulted in the composition of several important works spanning various genres over the thirteenth century. However, a significant proportion of illuminated manuscripts from late medieval Rūm are works that are connected to the Mawlawi dervishes.³¹⁹

The second largest ‘category’ of illuminated manuscripts comprises works of advice literature (*naṣīḥatnāmas*, or, mirrors for princes) that were produced in Konya and other cities. The earliest of these, and the only one that I shall discuss in the present chapter, is a copy of *Laṭā’if al-Ḥikma* by Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī.³²⁰ The manuscript was completed a few years after the death of its author on 4 Dhū al-Ḥijja 684 (31 January 1286). It was copied in Konya by Abū al-Maḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn al-Ḥājī nicknamed (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) Ḥamid al-Mukhlīṣ al-Bukhārī (fig. 73).³²¹

³¹⁹ Of the sixteen key manuscripts that I examine in the present study, eight are connected to the Mawlawi dervishes. This group of sixteen, however, does not include manuscripts that I have attributed to Rūm, such as the Sackler Qur’an *juz*’ discussed above, or the copy of *Anīs al-Qulūb* that I describe in Jackson 2017.

³²⁰ I describe other examples in Chapters Two and Three, and examine the advice literature category in more depth in both.

³²¹ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121, fol. 182b (Richard 1989b: 138-9, Richard 1997: Cat. 5). Urmavī 1972. See also n. 241 above for another manuscript copied by the same scribe.

The manuscript measures 240mm (length) x 172mm (width) x 34mm (depth). The first page of text has an illuminated headpiece (fol. 1b) and is written in a clear and consistent *naskh* that is neater than other hands discussed in this chapter (fig. 74). The headpiece is mainly painted in red and blue with some gold. The illuminated area is split into three equally-sized squares, with a repeating motif of the title written in floriated and interlaced Kufic surrounded by half-palmettes. The style of illumination is quite different to that seen in any of the manuscripts previously discussed in this chapter and the presence of the interlaced Kufic perhaps has a parallel in contemporary architectural decoration (fig. 75).

The fact that the scribe came from Bukhara suggests the appeal of Konya to artists travelling from the east. However, the manuscript contains evidence of movement in the opposite direction as well. It ended up in the library of Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī (d. 1318), who was the Ilkhanid vizier from 1298, as shown by his ex libris seal impression on folio 178b which reads “*waqf-i kitābkhāna-yi Rashīd*”.³²² The manuscript was later owned by one Ḥāfiẓ Muṣṭafā ‘Iffatī, and purchased in Istanbul in 1729-30 by François Sevin.³²³

A non-illuminated manuscript produced in Konya in this period also contains several seal impressions of Rashīd al-Dīn’s library and therefore perhaps also

³²² Richard 1997: 39. This seal impression appears in several other manuscripts securely connected to the patronage of Rashīd al-Dīn (Blair 2006b: 173, n. 27).

³²³ Richard 1989b: 139. Ḥāfiẓ Muṣṭafā ‘Iffatī owned several other manuscripts that are now in the collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris (Persan 133, Persan 276, Supplément Persan 204, Supplément Persan 1370 and Arabe 5951). His ex libris is written in *ta’līq* script that is very typical of later Ottoman inscriptions.

made its way to the *Rabʿ-i Rashīdī* in Tabriz.³²⁴ The small number of marginal inscriptions in the book suggests that it was not a madrasa copy (which were often annotated with students' and teachers' comments) but was instead in a private collection, perhaps in the possession of a scholar.

The text was composed by Sirāj al-Dīn in 1257, the year in which he moved to Konya from Cairo, and dedicated to ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II (r. 1246-57). The text is the only Persian work in Sirāj al-Dīn's oeuvre, and Louise Marlow has suggested that he chose to compose *Latāʾif al-Ḥikma* in this language rather than Arabic in order to demonstrate his bilingualism in this new environment where Persian was the language of court.³²⁵ However, it is also possible that the author was following in the long-established tradition of Persian advice manuals that had been composed for the Rūm Seljuks since the early thirteenth century. Notable Persian works include *Rawḍat al-ʿUqūl* written by Muḥammad ibn Ghāzī al-Malaṭyawī around 1201 for Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymānshāh (r. 1196-1204),³²⁶ *Rāḥat al-Ṣudūr wa Āyat al-Surūr* by Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Rāwandī which was written soon after 1202 and dedicated to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusraw I (r. 1192-1211, with interruption),³²⁷

³²⁴ Milli Kütüphane, Ankara, A.571/1. This is a 1269 copy of Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Ḥilya al-Abdāl wa mā Yaẓharu ʿAnhā min al-Maʿārif wa al-Aḥwāl*. Rashīd al-Dīn's seal impression appears on several folios. The copying date (4 Muḥarram 668/3 September 1269) and location are mentioned on folio 1a. It is not clear how the manuscript ended up in Ankara and it is possible that it never made its way to Tabriz. Aside from several Milli Kütüphane seal impressions, the only other sign of ownership is a stamp in modern Turkish on folio 1a reading "Nurettin Kayhan Hirdavat Kantariye Tokat".

³²⁵ Marlow 2010: 305. Marlow also points out that Sirāj al-Dīn spends a great deal of time in the text emphasising the importance of Arabic as a scholarly language. Other works by the author, which mainly concern jurisprudence, logic and philosophy, include *Maṭāliʿ al-Anwār fī al-Manṭiq*, *Bayān al-Ḥaqq* and *Kitāb al-Taḥsīl*, an abridgement of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's *al-Maḥṣūl fī ʿIlm Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (Çağrıçı 2009).

³²⁶ Peacock 2015b: 278-80. This text survives in a unique manuscript dated to 21 Şafar 697 (22 June 1280) (Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, Leiden, Or. 539).

³²⁷ Hillenbrand 2005, Rāwandī 1921.

Barīd al-Saʿāda by Muḥammad ibn Ghāzī al-Malaṭyawī which was completed in 1212-13 for ʿIzz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs I (r. 1210-19),³²⁸ and three works dedicated to ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37): Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya’s *Mirṣād al-ʿIbād min al-Mabdāʾ ilā al-Maʿād*, written in Sivas in 1223,³²⁹ *al-Laṭāʾif al-ʿAlāʾiyya* (the only Arabic-language advice manual dedicated to the Rūm Seljuks) written in 1228 by Aḥmad ibn Saʿd ibn Maḥdī ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī al-ʿUthmānī (d. after 1228),³³⁰ and *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siyar fī Adab al-Mulūk* by Niẓām al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Ṣāʿid ibn Aḥmad, which does not mention its date of composition.³³¹

Before moving to Konya at the age of sixty, Sirāj al-Dīn was already a highly-regarded Shāfiʿī jurist and diplomat, and had served as the Ayyubid ambassador of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ (r. 1240-9) at the Sicilian court of Frederick II, the Hohenstaufen Holy Roman Emperor (r. 1220-50).³³² At the time of his arrival in Rūm in 1257, the Seljuks had recently suffered another defeat at the Battle of Aksaray in 1256 and their authority had all but withered away. While it is not clear what ultimately compelled Sirāj al-Dīn to leave Cairo,³³³ choosing Konya as his new home suggests that the town did indeed have an appealing intellectual scene that could attract scholars of high repute despite ongoing political instability. He was made *qāḍī al-*

³²⁸ Marlow 2016, al-Malaṭyawī 1972.

³²⁹ Rāzī 1982. This work (and illuminated copies of it) are discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

³³⁰ Zanjānī 2005.

³³¹ Yaḥyā ibn Ṣāʿid ibn Aḥmad 1982.

³³² Sirāj al-Dīn’s work, *Maṭālīʿ al-Anwār*, was possibly composed for the Emperor, according to Ibn Wāṣil, a Shāfiʿī contemporary of the scholar (cited in Marlow 2010: 294).

³³³ Sirāj al-Dīn may have left Cairo due to a combination of two reasons: conflict between the Ayyubids and the Baḥriyya Mamluks, and the death of both his patron, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ (r. 1240-9), and his colleague, Afḍal al-Dīn al-Khūnajī (ibid: 297).

quḍāt (chief judge) of Konya soon after his arrival and held the post until he died.³³⁴

Al-Aqsarāyī suggests that Sirāj al-Dīn was well-liked,³³⁵ and the scholar is described by Shams al-Dīn Aflākī as the “second al-Shāfi‘ī” (*Shāfi‘ī-yi ṣānī*).³³⁶ In certain instances throughout Aflākī’s hagiography of the Mawlawis, Sirāj al-Dīn’s eminent position is highlighted but his questioning of Rūmī’s authority always results in his intellectual and spiritual submission to the Mawlawi leader.³³⁷ This tension hints at the contemporary competition among Sufis and scholars for audiences, resources and influence in this culturally and religiously heterogeneous context. Such tensions should not, however, give the impression that clear lines were drawn between ‘orthodox’ and ‘heterodox’ forms of Islam, or between how religion was practised in the madrasa or the *khānqāh*.³³⁸ Although practical and intellectual differences existed between various socio-religious groups, competition between certain members did not necessarily mean that these groups were “fundamentally opposed”³³⁹. In fact, the lines between them could be quite blurred. As Ahmet Karamustafa has discussed, supposedly ‘folk’ Sufis, like Geyikli Bābā or Yūnus Emre, were hardly “shamans in disguise” but were instead highly literate and integrated into the contemporary network of so-called ‘mainstream’

³³⁴ Marlow 2010: 288, 290.

³³⁵ Al-Aqsarāyī notes that several people attended his *majlises* (al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 90, 121).

³³⁶ Aflākī 1961: I, 410; 2002: 283.

³³⁷ In one anecdote, for example, Sirāj al-Dīn’s grave begins to spew black smoke, which is interpreted by Ḥusām al-Dīn Chalabī as the scholar’s “denial” (*inkār*) of Rūmī and the friends of God. Sirāj al-Dīn then appears in Ḥusām al-Dīn’s dream declaring that his spirit only entered Paradise “through the favour of Mawlānā” (*ba-ināyat-i Mawlānā*) (Aflākī 1961: II, 763-5; 2002: 533).

³³⁸ As I have mentioned in the previous chapter, it is perhaps more helpful to think of religious belief in this period as a ‘metadoxy’ (Kafadar 1995: 76).

³³⁹ Cahen 2015.

Sufis.³⁴⁰ As I shall discuss below, even the disciples of Rūmī themselves were quite a diverse group.

While it is not clear where the 1278 *Maṣnavī* was produced, the production location of the 1278 Qur'an is clearly stated as the madrasa of Sa'd al-Dīn Kōpek. In this period, there is no evidence of what could be termed an atelier or workshop, either imperial or commercial. However, madrasas in addition to dervish lodges provided environments for the copying and reading of books by scholars, dervishes and their students. It is indeed the case that Rūmī and his disciples frequented madrasas, shrines and lodges.³⁴¹ The use of both spaces is another facet of the blurred lines between the supposed realms of scholars and Sufis. The construction of multipurpose, charitable complexes by powerful figures, like Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, helped to support local dervish groups and scholars, and possibly gain their loyalty, while also providing necessary services to the public, fulfilling the patron's religious duties, and securing revenue for descendants or other beneficiaries.³⁴² Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī's complex in Konya (built 1258-79), for example,

³⁴⁰ Karamustafa 1993.

³⁴¹ The discussion concerning workspaces will be expanded upon in the next chapter. The earliest known production of an illuminated manuscript in an explicitly 'Mawlawi' location is in 1323 (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177). This manuscript was partially produced in Rūmī's shrine (*turba*) and will be discussed in Chapter Two. There is also a non-illuminated copy of Sulṭān Walad's *Ibtidānāma* which was copied in Muḥarram 694 (November-December 1294) in the '*madrasa-yi khudāvandīgār*' (madrasa of the creator of the world) by Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Lārandī (of Larendē) al-Waladī (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2206). Although '*khudāvandīgār*' was not used for Rūmī exclusively, the early date for the copying of this Mawlawi text (composed circa 1291) and the Mawlawi affiliation of the scribe suggests that the madrasa was probably Rūmī's or his father's. Aflākī mentions the construction of a '*madrasa-yi khudāvandīgār*' that appears to have been built for Rūmī's father, Bahā' al-Dīn Walad (Aflākī 1961: I, 44; 2002: 34).

³⁴² Wolper 1995: 40. See also Leiser 2017.

consisted of a mosque and a madrasa, with a smaller mosque, a *khānqāh*, a mausoleum and a bath house (*ḥammām*) added later.

The small size of the 1278 Qur'an suggests that it was a private commission unlike the 1278 *Maṣnavī*. The *Maṣnavī*'s monumental size, elaborate illumination and production only five years after Rūmī's death is a testimony to his shrine's cultural importance, and suggests that such display objects were probably recited in the same location. Rūmī's oeuvre will certainly have played an important role in Mawlawi communal ritual and teaching, and having a keen knowledge of the work and skill in recitation would have been necessary prerequisites for reading the text aloud.³⁴³ One Sirāj al-Dīn Maṣnavī-Khvān (literally, 'one who reads/recites the *Maṣnavī*') is mentioned several times in Aflākī's hagiography, for instance.³⁴⁴ The number of anecdotes he provides to the author of the hagiography suggests that he was an important member of Rūmī's inner circle, thereby highlighting the cultural importance of the Mawlawi text and of its recitation in the communal experience of worship. Two other *Maṣnavī* reciters, Sa'd al-Dīn and Tāj al-Dīn, are also mentioned by Aflākī, who states that the latter was appointed a vicegerent (*khalīfa*) by Ulu 'Ārif Chalabī (d. 1320).³⁴⁵

³⁴³ Lewis 2008: 432. I do not discuss the specificities of Mawlawi ritual in this period in more depth as it is outside the scope of my study. Furthermore, my comments concerning the relationship between manuscripts and ritual are necessarily speculative due to a general lack of discussion surrounding the early development of Mawlawi ritual. İlker Evrim Binbaş, who has discussed Mawlawi ritual in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, notes that fourteenth-century Mawlawi sources do not give a clear picture of the *samā'* while Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı states that the ritual was only formalised under Pīr 'Ādil Chalabī (d. 1460). See Binbaş 2005: 58-61, Gölpınarlı 1963: 78-94.

³⁴⁴ Aflākī 1961: I, 162-3, 222, 272; II, 583, 597, 738-9, 745, 752, 761, 773, 790, 829, 832, 880; 2002: 113-4, 154, 189, 400, 409, 514, 516, 520, 525, 530-1, 539, 551, 579, 581, 615.

³⁴⁵ Aflākī 1961: II, 797, 935; 2002: 556, 654.

Konrad Hirschler's research on practices of readership has discussed a similar context in medieval Cairo and Damascus and provides a useful framework for considering the communal use of manuscripts. Hirschler has documented the growth in the popularity of communal reading sessions and the importance of both oral and textual transmission in learning as well as the interplay between orality and textuality.³⁴⁶ Such sessions were also pivotal for the participants' initiation into the world of scholarship and a consequent blurring of the boundaries between so-called 'popular' and literary culture. Hirschler has demonstrated that it was merchants and artisans, rather than scholars, who advanced the popularity of such forums.³⁴⁷ Indeed, as I shall discuss below, Mawlawi adherents were from all walks of life, and not only recruited from scholarly or political circles.

With the permeation of those involved in trade and crafts into the sphere of learning, medieval Cairo and Damascus also saw the development of local, endowed libraries which, in contrast with courtly libraries, were more accessible to the public and founded by a wider variety of individuals.³⁴⁸ Although the evidence for similar developments in Konya is less rich by comparison, some sources give insight into the emergence of endowed public libraries in Rūm. The *waqfiyya* for the İplikçi Medrese, which was built in Konya in 1201-2 by the Seljuk official Shams al-Dīn Altun Aba (d. after 1201-2), stipulates a fund of 100 silver

³⁴⁶ Hirschler 2012: 12-15.

³⁴⁷ Ibid: 70.

³⁴⁸ Ibid: 138-9. For example, Hirschler names bureaucrats, military officers and scholars as founders of libraries.

dinars per year for the purchase of books,³⁴⁹ which suggests that the madrasa functioned like a public library. Books were to be lent to readers in exchange for a deposit to be repaid when the book was returned to the treasurer (*khāzin al-kutub*).³⁵⁰ In another case, a prominent Konya-based scholar's will states that part of his book collection should be turned into an endowment while his own writings should be made available to the scholarly public for study.³⁵¹

In addition to its patron, the calligrapher of the *Maṣnavī*, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh al-Qūnawī al-Waladī, was clearly a Mawlawī disciple of Sulṭān Walad. In this environment of cultural diversity and religious latitudinarianism, dervishes wielded a large degree of influence over the local population, including Christians and newly-arrived Turkmen immigrants.³⁵² Sufis living in urban centres also interacted with contemporary political elites, and could play important roles in social, religious, and economic life. Rūmī himself formed close relationships with most of the Seljuk elite, including the sultan Kaykāvūs II (r. 1246-57) and Qilich Arslān IV (r. 1248-65/66), the statesmen Jalāl al-Dīn Qarāṭāy and Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaymān, and Gurjī Khātūn (d. 1286), the wife of, first, Kaykhusraw II (r. 1237-

³⁴⁹ Vryonis 1971: 353, Turan 1947. For comparison, the *mutawallī* (caretaker) earned 400 dinars per year, the *mudarris* (teacher) 800 dinars, and the *muʿadhdhin* (leader of the call to prayer) 100 dinars.

³⁵⁰ Turan 1947: 202.

³⁵¹ This scholar was Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 1274), the well-known disciple of Ibn al-ʿArabī. The relevant part of his will reads: "My books on philosophy (*ḥikamī*) should be sold and the proceeds given as alms. The rest of the books – the medical works, works on jurisprudence, Qurʾanic commentaries, collections of prophetic traditions, etc. – should be made into an endowment. My own writings (*taṣānīf*) should be taken to ʿAfīf al-Dīn [al-Tilimsānī (d. 1291)] ... and he should be enjoined not to be niggardly in giving them to those in whom he sees the qualifications to profit from them" (Yusuf Ağa Kütüphanesi, Konya, 4883). Translation by William Chittick (Chittick 1978). It is not clear where precisely Ṣadr al-Dīn's books and writings were kept but many are housed today in the Yusuf Ağa Kütüphanesi in Konya (ibid).

³⁵² This was made clear in the earlier part of the century, with the Bābāʾī revolt (ca 1240), in which dervishes, Christians and Turkmen had risen up against the Seljuk state and its ʿulamāʾ.

46), and, then, Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān.³⁵³ Beyond the Seljuk elite, however, Rūmī’s devotees were to be found amongst Mongol officials, such as ‘Arab Nūyan (d. 1319), governor of Sivas, and Turkmen beyliks like the Garmiyānids and the Aydinids.³⁵⁴

Although some of the disciples of Rūmī were urban and elite, this was not the case for all of them. Fourteenth-century sources show that Mawlawi devotees could be found across the socio-economic spectrum, and in ‘frontier’ cities, such as Ladik.³⁵⁵ Various anecdotes from Aflākī’s hagiography, for example, mention that Rūmī’s followers included carpenters, perfumers, butchers, cooks, tanners, hat-makers, merchants, musicians, at least one executioner and a former prostitute.³⁵⁶ Scribes can certainly now be added to that list. In letters written to elites of the city like Şāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī, Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān and Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī, Rūmī sometimes asks for funds, employment or for clemency on behalf of some of his less fortunate disciples.³⁵⁷

There have been several mentions above of artists who were converts to Islam and were perhaps previously Christian slaves. It is certainly the case that Konya and other towns were inhabited by large Christian populations that mainly consisted of Greeks but also included Armenians and Tuscan, Genoese, Venetian

³⁵³ Lewis 2008: 277-83.

³⁵⁴ Aflākī 1961: II, 855, 945-7; 2002: 597, 661-4. See also Trepanier 2001 and Peacock 2012.

³⁵⁵ The presence of Mawlawi devotees in the ‘frontier’ will be discussed in Chapter Three.

³⁵⁶ Aflākī 1961: I, 150, 231, 333, 373, 375, 384, 426, 437, 476; II, 605, 894-5, 933; 2002: 105, 161, 231, 258, 259-60, 265, 294, 301, 329, 415, 431, 625-6, 653. See also Küçükhüseyin 2013.

³⁵⁷ Numerous examples are listed throughout Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 1992. See, for example, pp. 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 37, 40, 51, 113, 114, 115.

and Frankish traders.³⁵⁸ Prominent Seljuk statesmen like Jalāl al-Dīn Qarāṭāy and Amīn al-Dīn Mikāʿil were of Christian slave origin,³⁵⁹ and the wives of some Seljuk and Turkmen princes were of Byzantine Greek origin.³⁶⁰ While many of these wives converted, it seems that this was not a strict requirement. Gurjī Khātūn, who was the daughter of Queen Rusudān of Georgia (r. 1223-45) appears to have either remained Christian or converted to Islam some time after her first marriage.³⁶¹ In one anecdote, Gurjī Khātūn commissions a devotional portrait (*ṣūrat-gārī*) of Rūmī from the painter (*naqqāsh*) ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Rūmī.³⁶² This act is not presented by Aflākī as controversial. However, elsewhere in the same source, Rūmī criticises the painter ‘Ayn al-Dawla for his admiration of icons of Mary and Jesus – or, “images without a soul” (*naqsh-i bī-jān*) – after which the painter immediately repents and converts to Islam.³⁶³ Although Muslims (including converts) and Christians mixed frequently, this anecdote evokes the tensions that remained in this diverse religious landscape.

In addition to Gurjī Khātūn, Aflākī suggests that it was fairly normal for Christians, or Christian converts to Islam, to also identify as Mawlawi devotees, in keeping

³⁵⁸ Cahen 1968: 164-7 and 204-215, Vryonis 1971: 143-244, Fleet 2009, Pfeiffer 2015: 313. Although the Jewish population would have been much smaller, they do appear to have had their own quarter in Konya (Aflākī 1961: II, 621; 2002: 427).

³⁵⁹ Vryonis 1971: 243.

³⁶⁰ Ibid: 466. On Turkish and Greek intermarriage, see Bryer 1981, Tekinalp 2009, Yıldız 2011 and Shukurov 2012. On women beyond their roles as wives, see Dalkesen 2007, De Nicola 2014 and Redford 2015, the latter of which contains a useful analysis of the relevant literature.

³⁶¹ De Nicola 2014.

³⁶² Aflākī 1961: I, 425; 2002: 292-3. Aflākī writes that “in that age was a painter who was the second Mani (the founder of Manichaeism) in portrait painting and the drawing of images” (*dar ān ‘ahd naqqāshī būd ka dar ṣūrat-garī va taṣvīr-i muṣawwarāt Mānī-ya ṣānī būd*).

³⁶³ Aflākī 1961: I, 552-3; 2002: 382-3.

with the diverse and relatively tolerant religious climate during this period.³⁶⁴ For example, there are several instances of Rūmī associating with monks (both Greek and Armenian), and Aflākī notes that Christian and Jewish leaders recited verses from the Psalms, the Gospels and the Torah during Rūmī’s funeral.³⁶⁵ It was probably for Christian disciples (or recent converts) that both Rūmī and Sulṭān Walad included some Greek couplets in their work.³⁶⁶ ‘Ayn al-Dawla, the painter mentioned above, was a Mawlawi devotee both before and after his conversion to Islam from Christianity. Based on reports from Byzantine chroniclers, Rustam Shukurov has even recently suggested that Mawlawis were present and performed religious rituals at the imperial palace of the Byzantine emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (r. 1347-54).³⁶⁷

It seems that, more widely speaking, the presence of Christians in artistic life was hardly unusual. The signature of an architect, Kalūk ibn ‘Abdullāh, possibly an Armenian convert to Islam, is inscribed on the west side of the mosque portal (built 1258) of Ṣāhib Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī’s complex, and the portal arch of the İnce Minareli Medrese (built 1274, also by Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī), both of which are in Konya.³⁶⁸ The signature of another craftsman, who was named Kālūyān,³⁶⁹ appears

³⁶⁴ Küçükhüseyin 2013.

³⁶⁵ Aflākī 1961: I, 80-1, 360-2, 592; 2002: 60, 249-50, 405-6. It is worth noting that the latter anecdote may have been exaggerated in order to underline Rūmī’s popularity and eminence.

³⁶⁶ Even beyond the dervish context, Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī cited both the Torah and the Gospels in *Laṭā’if al-Ḥikma* (Urmavī 1972: 13, 16-17).

³⁶⁷ Shukurov 2016: 375-6.

³⁶⁸ Durukan 1999: 279. For the possible Armenian roots of the name ‘Kalūk’ see Redford 2013b: 329, n. 31. I am grateful to Scott Redford for highlighting this possible connection.

³⁶⁹ The name ‘Kālūyān’, with the same spelling, appears in fourteenth-century Persian sources in association with John II Komnenos (r. 1118-43) who was known as ‘Kaloioannes’ or ‘Good John’ (Yürekli 2012: 105-6). See, for example, the anonymous *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlī*, completed some time after 1363 (Anonymous 1952: 42).

in an inscription on the Gök Medrese in Sivas which was built in 1271 by Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī. This is possibly the same ‘Kālūyān-i Naqqāsh’ who is a Greek painter mentioned by Aflākī as a Mawlawi disciple during Rūmī’s lifetime.³⁷⁰ The name ‘Kālūyān’ also appears on several buildings that were constructed in the early fourteenth century and it is possible that there were two artists or architects with this name. These buildings are the Köşk Medrese in Kayseri (built 1339), the mausoleum of Amīr Shahāb in Kayseri (built 1327-8) and the Ulu Camii of Bünyan (built 1333).³⁷¹ Finally, Ibn al-‘Arabī writes of meeting a master Byzantine painter in 1203 in Konya.³⁷²

There is also some evidence to indicate that Christians were indeed involved in the production of Arabic and Persian manuscripts as both patrons and artists and I will briefly discuss two examples of this. There is one surviving example of an illuminated Arabic manuscript that was produced for a Christian physician and copied by a Christian scribe. This manuscript is a copy of Ibn Sīnā’s (d. 1037) *Kitāb al-Shifā’*, which was begun in Maragha in 671/1272-3 and completed in Harput (now known as Elazığ) in 674/1275-6.³⁷³ According to the manuscript’s Arabic colophon, it was copied by Amīn al-Dīn Māniyūl (Manuel, perhaps)³⁷⁴ for Bukhtanaşar ibn Sham‘ūn al-Muṭabbib (Nebuchadnezzar son of Simeon, the

³⁷⁰ Aflākī 1961: II, 552; 2002: 382.

³⁷¹ Yürekli 2012: 106-7. Yürekli speculates that the same artist may also have been responsible for the early fourteenth-century portals of the shrine of Ḥājjī Baktāsh in Hacıbektaş, central Turkey (ibid: 107).

³⁷² Uyar 2015: 217.

³⁷³ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2442, fol. 1a.

³⁷⁴ In another inscription on fol. 1a that is in a different hand, Amīn al-Dīn is described as a commentator (*shāriḥ*) of Ibn Sīnā’s *al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbihāt* and Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī’s *Bayān al-Ḥaqq*. ‘Manuel’ is not a name that was known in the Syriac-speaking context and it is possible that he was a member of the Melkite or Greek Orthodox churches (Takahashi 2017).

physician) of Rumkale.³⁷⁵ The manuscript contains an illuminated headpiece and a partially-obscured illuminated panel which may be a title or a dedication (fig. 76). These look considerably different from each other and it is possible that one part was completed in Maragha while the other was executed in Harput.

Nebuchadnezzar was in fact the son of Simeon of Rumkale (d. 1289) of the Syriac Orthodox Church, who was a respected physician-priest that served Hūlagū in Maragha.³⁷⁶ Simeon and Nebuchadnezzar were members of a prominent ecclesiastical family that included the Patriarch Philoxenus Nemrod (d. 1292).³⁷⁷ Notably, Simeon was also a close contemporary of Barhebraeus (d. 1286), Maphrian of the East of the Syriac Orthodox Church.³⁷⁸ The identity of the patron connects the production of the book to the Syriac ecclesiastical-medical communities of Rumkale and Maragha, where the works of many Islamic scholars, like Ibn Sīnā, were popular. Maragha, notable in particular for being the location of

³⁷⁵ Known as ‘Qal‘at al-Rūm’ in Arabic and ‘Hromkla’ in Armenian, this fortress is 48km north-east of Gaziantep and was home to the Armenian *catholicos* (bishop) and other Christian communities until 1292 (Honigmann and Bosworth 2015). Some of Rumkale’s physician-priests were very highly regarded at the Ilkhanid court. I am very grateful to David G.K. Taylor for translating the Syriac portion of the colophon, which reads, “He wrote, [namely] Nebuchadnezzar son of Simeon, and to God be pr[aise]” (Taylor 2015). See also Ünver 1948: 644.

³⁷⁶ Takahashi 2001: 49. The family connection is confirmed in a Syriac inscription on folio 24b of a miscellany of Sinaitic fragments (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, Syr. 647). The inscription reads, “This book belongs to me, the wretched Nebuchadnezzar, son of the priest Simeon, son of the priest Joshua, of Rumkale” (*Ce livre m’appartient à moi le misérable Nabuchodonosor, fils du prêtre Šem‘ōn, fils du prêtre Išō, de Qāl‘ah Rōmaytā.*) (Géhin 2015: 56). Translated into French from Syriac by Paul Géhin. I am very grateful to Hidemi Takahashi for sending me this reference and the reference in the following note.

³⁷⁷ Nebuchadnezzar and his cousin Philoxenus Nemrod had unusual names for the period, which may have been a conscious attempt to link the family to ancient Mesopotamian kings (Fathi 2016: 151, n. 108).

³⁷⁸ Two of Barhebraeus’ Syriac works were dedicated to Simeon (Takahashi 2001: 68-70). These works are *Suloqo hawnonoyo* (Ascension of the Spirit), a work on astronomy and mathematical geography written in 1279, and *K. d-remze wa-m‘ironwoto*, a translation of Ibn Sīnā’s *al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbihāt* completed some time before 1278.

a prestigious observatory built by Hūlagū in 1259,³⁷⁹ was an active intellectual centre where exchange between Muslim and Christian authors was not unusual.³⁸⁰

An illustrated, non-illuminated manuscript produced around the same time as the copy of *Kitāb al-Shifā'* reinforces the ethnic diversity of actors involved in the production of Arabic and Persian material. This manuscript is a copy of *Daqā'iq al-Ḥaqā'iq*, a Persian work on astrology and magic which has been studied by Marianne Barrucand.³⁸¹ This work was written by the geomancer and court astrologer Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abdullāh al-Rummāl al-Mu'azzam al-Sā'atī al-Haykalī, also known as Nāṣir al-Rummālī al-Sīwāsī, and was dedicated to Kaykhusraw III.³⁸² Although the manuscript does not include a colophon per se, two inscriptions note that the manuscript was copied in Aksaray on 10 Ramaḍān 670/10 April 1272 (fol. 51a) and Kayseri in mid-Shawwāl 671/early May 1273 (fol. 133a). Some of the manuscript's illustrations (completed at the same time) contain iconographical features that suggest the involvement of Christian painters, such as the affinity between the depiction of Byzantine "equestrian dragon-slaying saints" and an image of the angel Shamhūrash on folio

³⁷⁹ Saliba 1987.

³⁸⁰ A well-known case of this is the work of Barhebraeus, mentioned above. Originally from Malatya, Barhebraeus wrote in both Syriac and Arabic and visited Maragha several times. The cultural scene there was crucial in guiding his considerable corpus of work. Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-Shifā'* in particular was important for Barhebraeus' work, *Ḥewat ḥekmto* (Cream of Wisdom), written in 1285-6 (Takahashi 2016).

³⁸¹ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 174. See Barrucand 1991.

³⁸² Ibid: 114.

83a (fig. 77).³⁸³ Elements of dress in some illustrations also display connections to Mongol and Crusader contexts.³⁸⁴

In terms of illuminated manuscripts from late thirteenth-century Konya, there is no clear evidence for the direct involvement of Christian artists though, as I have mentioned, there were a number of artists and patrons who were converts to Islam. Given the preceding discussion, however, it is reasonable to assume that Christian conventions in the arts of the book may have had some impact upon the shape of Islamic manuscript production in Rūm. In the absence of any precedents in the Islamic tradition, it is possible that the pointed oval frontispiece that is so prominent in manuscripts from late medieval Konya was adopted from the Byzantine context.³⁸⁵ The pointed oval, which is known as a ‘mandorla’ (almond) or ‘vesica piscis’ (fish bladder) in the Christian context, is an iconographical feature of Byzantine and Gothic art, often featuring Christ or other holy figures at its centre. Rostislava Todorova has discussed how the mandorla depicted the glory of God and signified a ‘sacred space’ in medieval Christian iconography, with the pointed oval shape becoming particularly prominent in Byzantine art and architectural decoration from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.³⁸⁶ In terms of manuscripts, the shape appears in the frontispieces of Byzantine Nicaean Gospels which have been dated by Annemarie Carr to circa 1150-1250 (fig. 78).³⁸⁷

³⁸³ Pancaroğlu 2004: 161. Tolga Uyar has recently highlighted the similarities between this image and thirteenth-century Byzantine wall paintings in Cappadocia (2015: 222).

³⁸⁴ Barrucand 1991: 118. See, for example, fols 17a and 18a.

³⁸⁵ See notes 224-5.

³⁸⁶ Todorova 2013: 292.

³⁸⁷ Carr 1982.

As I have described, both Christians and Muslim converts from Christianity were living in Konya at the time of the *Maṣnavī*'s production and participating in artistic life. Indeed, some of these craftsmen were also devotees of Rūmī. It remains unclear what the exact means of transmission of this shape were, or what cultural significance it had when it was included so prominently in the decoration of the *Maṣnavī*. Perhaps due its sacred associations, the mandorla was adapted from Byzantine visual contexts by Muslim artists in order to provide a suitable decoration for a venerated Islamic text. Or, perhaps the mandorla was part of a common visual vocabulary created in the context of a heterogeneous and mobile society.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed manuscript production in Konya in the 1270s and 1280s, mainly through an analysis of two key manuscripts: the 1278 Qur'an and 1278 *Maṣnavī*. In addition, I have identified an undated Qur'an *juz'* as a product of the same context, and presented two further manuscripts, a circa 1282 copy of *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya* and a 1286 copy of *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma*.

As far as material qualities are concerned, manuscript production in this period was very varied in terms of sizes and decoration although scripts in several instances seem to have had a reasonable degree of similarity to each other (apart from the *muḥaqqaq* script of the undated Qur'an *juz'*, which is an important example of a script that was strongly associated with the Ilkhanid sphere).

Additionally, paper quality seems to have been reasonably high in this period, and we have one example of tinted paper which appears in the 1278 *Maṣnavī*.

Illumination was also quite sophisticated, though perhaps not as technically proficient as seen in contemporary imperial Ilkhanid and Mamluk manuscripts.

However, certain elements of illumination in these manuscripts, such as the pointed oval frontispiece, suggest that Konya had its own local style (perhaps introduced by Mukhlīṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Hindī), while also adopting components from the arts of the book of other Islamic centres.

Together, these manuscripts give various insights into aspects of the artistic, political and intellectual landscapes of Konya through the richness of their material properties and what is revealed from their production contexts. Based on these manuscripts, patrons and artists appear to have been a varied group, which included Seljuk courtiers, an Ilkhanid vizier, Muslim converts, Mawlawi disciples and a migrant possibly from the Indian subcontinent. Generally speaking, however, illuminated manuscripts commissioned by those outside of Konya’s elite political circles are rare and it may be that production costs were prohibitive for most people. We do have one manuscript from the fringes of eastern Rūm that was copied by a Christian scribe for a Syriac Orthodox physician from a prominent ecclesiastical family that was based in Rumkale and Maragha. Additionally, evidence shows that in the absence of a formal dynastic atelier, illuminated manuscripts were copied in madrasas and shrines in this period. Such material sometimes formed endowments (*waqfs*) and could play a central part in important religious rituals while other examples were made for personal use.

Against a backdrop of diminishing Seljuk rule and relatively distant Ilkhanid rule, these manuscripts suggest that Konya remained an important centre of artistic production and patronage. The endurance of regional trade routes and the rise of ambitious bureaucrats and religious personalities to fill the power vacuum ensured that Konya was indeed a regional hub of economic, political, and cultural activity in the late medieval period. This situation was only encouraged by Konya's existing ethnic and religious diversity, and the migration of itinerant artists and intellectuals. The cultural and visual exchange that occurred as a result of such cosmopolitanism also demonstrates how modern geographical, dynastic and ethnic categories, like "Turkish", "Seljuk" or "Persianate", are not applicable in a context in which visual material cannot be so easily categorised. Additionally, the religious landscape in Rūm's cities was relatively fluid and diverse, particularly in comparison to more traditional centres of learning like Cairo, Aleppo and Damascus. Close attention therefore needs to be paid towards the variations that were present in the religious spectrum. As the prevalence of cosmopolitanism and mobility as features of cultural life continued throughout the fourteenth century, the following chapters will in various ways build upon the themes and contexts that have been introduced here.

CHAPTER TWO

Illuminated manuscript production and patronage in early fourteenth-century Rūm

Introduction

This chapter focuses on six illuminated manuscripts, all of which were copied between 1311 and 1332, and one other which was copied in 1228 but contains additional illumination from the early fourteenth century. I will discuss this last manuscript, which is a copy of an Arabic work titled *al-Laṭāʾif al-ʿAlāʾiyya*, in the first section, along with two others, one produced in 1311 (an autograph unicum of the Arabic work, *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawāʾid al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya*) and the other produced in 1314-15 (a two-volume Qurʾan). These were all dedicated to Qaramanid and Ashrafid *beys*. The other four manuscripts, ranging in date from 1314 to before 1332, are illuminated copies of texts by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and his son Sulṭān Walad. Three of these were produced in Konya and one was produced in Sivas. In many ways, this chapter complements Chapter One, which introduced several threads that I continue and develop here. These include the nature and extent of Mawlawi involvement in the production of illuminated manuscripts, Konya as a centre for manuscript illumination, and the character of manuscript patronage and consumption against a backdrop of continued political instability. This chapter also endeavours to show changes and continuities in visual aspects of illuminated manuscripts produced in the late medieval period.

The turbulence of the political scene in the late thirteenth century (discussed in the previous chapter) continued well into the first few decades of the fourteenth century. After attempts at monetary reform and a move towards Islamic norms, particularly after the conversion of Ghāzān Khān (r. 1295-1304) to Islam in 1295, the Ilkhanid regime faced repeated opposition from Mongol rebels and certain beyliks, most notably the Qaramanids. In 1314, the Qaramanids annexed Konya, killing the city's leader, Akhī Muṣṭafā.³⁸⁸ Later that year, the Qaramanids were not amongst the *beys* who pledged allegiance to the new Mongol governor of Rūm, Chūbān Suldus (d. 1327), who proceeded to retake Konya in 1315.³⁸⁹ At some point after 1316, Konya was again annexed by the Qaramanids, and then recaptured in 1323 by the new governor of Rūm, Tīmūrtāsh,³⁹⁰ who then imprisoned Mūsā ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. 1345) and Falak al-Dīn Dūndar (d. 1324) of the Hamidids.³⁹¹ Continuing in the same vein, Tīmūrtāsh effectively extinguished the Ashrafid beylik in 1326 by killing its ruler, Sulaymān ibn Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad (r. after 1320-6), and dividing Ashrafid territories between the Qaramanids and the Hamidids.³⁹² Following Tīmūrtāsh's execution some time around 1328, a quick succession of governors ensued until the eventual demise of the Ilkhanid state in 1335 with the death of Abū Sa'īd Bahādur Khān (r. 1316-35).

³⁸⁸ There is no date for the event but, as both Melville and Sümer suggest, the reason for Chūbān's arrival in Rūm in the summer of 1314 was to deal with both Īranjīn (the corrupt and inept Mongol governor of Rūm) and the Qaramanids (Melville 2009: 89, Sümer 2001).

³⁸⁹ Al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 311. Al-Aqsarāyī notes that, amongst others, members of the Hamidids, the Ashrafids and the Garmiyānids came to pay tribute: "*Falak al-Dīn Dūndār Ḥamīd az Būrghlū (Uluborlu) va awlād-i Ashraf az Ghurghurūm (Gorgorum) va asbāṭi Šāhib Fakhr al-Dīn az Qarāhišār (Afyonkarahisar) dawla va umarā' Garmiyān va abnā' 'Alīshīr az Kūtāhya va qilā' ān ḥudūd va Sulaymān Pāshā az Qaştamūniya (Kastamonu)*".

³⁹⁰ The son of Chūbān Suldus.

³⁹¹ Anonymous 1952: 67-8, 93.

³⁹² Al-'Umarī 1929: 31-2.

From this period onwards, Konya, Larende (today known as Karaman) and Ermenek were under Qaramanid control, apart from a brief period of dominance under the Ilkhanid Uyghur general, Aratnā (r. 1327-52).³⁹³

Initially, I will describe the physical properties of the seven key manuscripts and outline their salient inscriptions in roughly chronological order. The chronological structure of this part of the chapter also highlights two patronage contexts: that of the beyliks and that of the Mawlawi community. Although these contexts are introduced in two consecutive sections ('Qaramanid and Ashrafid manuscripts' and 'Mawlawi manuscripts'), they will be considered together in the final parts of the chapter.

Following this descriptive overview, I will analyse both material aspects and inscriptions in more depth in order to reconstruct production and patronage contexts as far as possible. To this end, I focus on production locations, artists, patrons and possible users of the manuscripts. Finally, these analyses in turn generate a discussion concerning the historiography of the period, and the nature of cultural patronage in early fourteenth-century Rūm.

³⁹³ Sümer 2001. Aratnā's reign, and those of his descendants, in central and eastern Rūm will be discussed in Chapter Four.

Qaramanid and Ashrafid manuscripts

The two manuscripts that I will initially discuss in this chapter were both produced in Konya within a few years of each other. The first is a copy of an Arabic text concerning philosophy and metaphysics entitled *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya* (hereafter, '*al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*').³⁹⁴ This manuscript was produced in mid-Dhū al-Qa'da 710 (April 1311) and copied by its author, Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Tustarī (of Shushtar, in south-western Iran, d. 1329-30) (fig. 79).³⁹⁵ As far as I could ascertain, this is a unicum copy of this text. As stated on folio 4a, the text is dedicated to the Ashrafid *bey* Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Sayf al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn Ashraf (r. 1302-after 1320), which is substantiated by the use of the adjective '*Ashrafiyya*' in the text's title. The illuminated title page on folio 2a states that this manuscript was also made specifically for him. The pointed oval seal impressions of Bāyazīd II (r. 1481-1512) on folios 1a and 56b show that the manuscript was in the Ottoman palace collection in the early sixteenth century though it is not clear how it ended up there. The other manuscript that I will discuss is a two-volume monumental Qur'an produced in 714 (1314-15) for the Qaramanid *bey* Khalīl ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. 1340s).³⁹⁶ The manuscript was copied by one Ismā'īl ibn Yūsuf and illuminated by Ya'qūb ibn Ghāzī al-Qūnawī. It is unclear how it entered the

³⁹⁴ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2445. This manuscript is unpublished.

³⁹⁵ Not much is known about this author's life but he appears to have written several other works concerning *fiqh*, philosophy and *taṣawwuf* in the early fourteenth century including *Sharḥ Manāzil al-Sā'irīn*, *Sharḥ al-Taḥṣīl*, *Mukhtaṣar al-Jāmi' al-Hikāyāt*, *Sharḥ Minhāj al-Wuṣūl ilā 'Ilm al-Uṣūl*, *Ta'līqāt 'alā Sharḥ al-Ishārāt li-al-Ṭūsī* and *al-Muḥākamāt bayn Shurrāḥ al-Ishārāt*. I am very grateful to A.C.S. Peacock for providing me with information about this author.

³⁹⁶ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12 (vol. 1 = 12-1, vol. 2 = 12-2).

collection of the Mevlana Müzesi in Konya. Finally, I will also briefly discuss a 1228 copy of *al-Laṭāʾif al-ʿAlāʾiyya*, an Arabic work by Aḥmad ibn Saʿd ibn Mahdī ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī al-ʿUthmānī (fl. 13th c.), which was written for ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37), and for whom the manuscript was also made as we learn from its original frontispiece.³⁹⁷ An illuminated finispiece added in the early fourteenth century re-dedicates it to Badr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. after 1341).

Al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya is quite a small manuscript that measures 162mm (length) x 120mm (width) x 12mm (depth) and consists of 64 folios. The textblock measures 102mm x 73mm, and is arranged into one column of thirteen lines. The watery, brown text is written in a standard, neat *naskh* that resembles earlier examples of *naskh* produced in Konya. Notable differences include letter forms that are elongated along the baseline and slightly shallower bowls in places (figs 80-81). The manuscript's paper is light brownish cream, smooth and slightly shiny. Ten sheets measure 2mm in thickness. The text is gathered into quaternions but was rebound at a later date and is currently covered in a fifteenth or sixteenth-century Ottoman brown leather binding that features dark red and yellow plaid fabric panels and a brown leather flap.³⁹⁸ In addition to the seal impression of Bāyazīd II, folio 1a also contains the seal impression of Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54, partial circle), and another partial, unidentified seal impression.

³⁹⁷ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Aşir Efendi 316. The original Arabic text has not been published but it has been translated into Turkish in al-Zanjānī 2005. The work has been examined in detail in Fazlıoğlu 1997 and is also discussed by Peacock 2015b: 283-6.

³⁹⁸ Demircan Aksoy 2010: fig. 369.

The manuscript contains only two pages of illumination: a pointed oval frontispiece (fol. 1b), and a dedication panel (fol. 2a) (figs 82-83). Like the 1278 Qur'an examined in the previous chapter, the colour palette of the illumination is dominated by gold and blue. The pointed oval, however, also contains small areas of green, red, light blue and light brown. It is surrounded by distinctive petals containing graduated colour (often described as *mūnhani* by modern Turkish practitioners of the traditional art of illumination). The earliest example of the use of *mūnhani* appears to be from early thirteenth-century Persia in an undated copy of *Tarjuma-yi Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* by Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī which was produced for Ḥājji Rabīb al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim Hārūn ibn 'Alī ibn Ḍafar Dindān, the vizier of the Ildiguzid ruler Muḏaffar al-Dīn Uzbek (r. 1210-25) (fig. 84).³⁹⁹ It is used in Ilkhanid illumination as well (see, for example, the marginal roundels in fig. 313). The central motif of the pointed oval in *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya* will be discussed in more detail below. Apart from these two pages of illumination, and chapter headings written in gold, the manuscript contains no other decoration.

Unlike *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*, the Qaramanid Qur'an is very large. It measures 475-485mm (length) x 335mm (width) x 90mm (depth), and the first volume consists of 415 folios while the second consists of 401 folios. The second volume begins with the nineteenth *sūra* (al-Maryam). The textblocks in both volumes are identical, measuring 360mm x 200mm, with the *muḥaqqaq* text arranged into one column of seven lines. The manuscript's paper is gathered into quaternions and

³⁹⁹ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1610. The manuscript does not say where or when it was produced but the patron connects it to north-western Persia and Azerbaijan between 1210 and 1225.

has been cropped on all sides. It is light cream, smooth, shiny and thin, with ten sheets measuring 1.5mm in thickness. Horizontal laid lines are visible, with twenty measuring 25mm across.

This two-volume manuscript is the earliest known dated, illuminated manuscript produced in Rūm that retains its original binding, albeit partially⁴⁰⁰ (figs 85-88). The original flaps of both volumes, however, are missing. The brown leather doublures of each volume are decorated with circular, vegetal scrollwork (figs 89-90). The binding itself, which is dark brown leather (though very faded in some places), has been subjected to later repairs and only the front and back panels remain. The front panel of each volume is decorated with a central rectangular section containing a pointed-circle medallion that is filled with a geometric pattern and surrounded by stylized floral motifs. This rectangle is framed by thick bands of strapwork. The back panel of each volume is decorated with a large central rectangle containing a geometric pattern and framed by geometric head and tailpieces and thin geometric bands. The original edges and spines of the binding no longer remain and it is possible that they were damaged and then cropped off, perhaps at the same time as the paper.

The decoration on this binding is also very similar to that of an illuminated single volume copy of the Qur'an that was completed on 3 Muḥarram 727 (29 November

⁴⁰⁰ There is one binding that was produced in Rūm that is dated earlier than the Qaramanid Qur'an, though it is visually very simple by comparison. The manuscript is a non-illuminated copy of Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī's (d. 1274) *Tafsīr al-Fātiḥa* that was copied in Ankara in Rabī' al-Awwal 703 (October-November 1303) by Ibrāhīm ibn Sha'bān (Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, A.110). See Tanındı 1990b: fig. 15.

1326) by a scribe named ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Khaṭṭāṭ al-Sāvajī (of Saveh, in north-western Iran)⁴⁰¹ (figs 91-95). It is not clear where this manuscript, now in Konya, was produced, though Zeren Tanındı and Zeynep Demircan Aksoy have identified Konya as a likely place of production due to the binding’s similarities with the Qaramanid Qur’an.⁴⁰² The doublures, illumination, and textblock arrangement of the manuscripts, however, are very different so this attribution remains uncertain (figs 93 and 96-97). There is of course the possibility that the manuscript was made elsewhere and bound (or re-bound) in Konya. It is possible to connect these bindings to the Mamluk sphere but I have not found any examples which predate these two Qur’ans.⁴⁰³

The Qaramanid Qur’an was copied in large, black *muḥaqqaq*, apart from the first two text pages (fols iib and iiiia), which contain the first *sūra* (al-Fātiḥa) written in gold *muḥaqqaq*. The black script is watery, rough and uneven in some places (figs 98-99). The two text pages on folios iiib and 1a contain the beginning of the second *sūra* (al-Baqara) in black *muḥaqqaq*, with Persian interlinear translations that are written in gold *naskh*. Gold interlinear translations also appear in the second volume on folios 372b-373a, 374b-375a and 391b-392a. These account for the 78th (al-Nabā’), 79th (al-Nāzi‘āt), 80th (‘Abasa), 93rd (al-Ḍuḥā), 94th (al-Inshirāḥ, or al-Sharḥ), 95th (al-Tīn) and 96th (al-Iqrā’, or al-‘Alaq) *sūras*. It is unclear precisely why these sections were chosen to be translated but the gold interlinear

⁴⁰¹ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 13.

⁴⁰² Tanındı 1991, Demircan Aksoy 2010: 134-42.

⁴⁰³ The bindings of both the Qaramanid Qur’an and the Qur’an copied by ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Khaṭṭāṭ al-Sāvajī bear a significant degree of resemblance to a Mamluk binding that was probably produced in the late fourteenth century (John Rylands Library, Manchester, 42). See Ohta 2012: fig. 4.7.

inscriptions are probably contemporary with the creation of the manuscript, since the text interrupts the gold frame on certain pages (fig. 100).

As in the case of the undated Qur'an *juz*' discussed in the previous chapter, the use of *muḥaqqaq* in this manuscript can be connected to contemporary Ilkhanid (rather than Mamluk) scribal practices. However, the script of the Qaramanid Qur'an is quite perpendicular in its orientation, rather than displaying the left slant often seen in imperial Ilkhanid Qur'ans (fig. 101, see also fig. 54). It also lacks the dramatic height and visual rhythm of Ilkhanid *muḥaqqaq*, appearing more inconsistent in terms of height and letter forms.

The illumination of the Qaramanid Qur'an is probably the most eclectic out of any of the manuscripts produced in late medieval Rūm. Only one illuminator, Ya'qūb ibn Ghāzī al-Qūnawī, is named but he perhaps headed a team of artists. The first volume contains two full-page illuminations and three framed text pages (figs 102-107). The second volume contains one full-page illumination, in addition to framed panels that include the illuminator's name and the dedication/colophon (figs 108-109). One pattern of full-page illumination seems to have been relatively common in this period, appearing in several diverse contexts (figs 107 and 110-114). The other pattern (see fig. 102) seems to have been less common, but has some similarities with a wooden window panel formerly in the Ashrafid mosque in Beyşehir (Eşrefoğlu Camii) constructed in 1296 by Sayf al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn Ashraf (d. 1302), the father of the Ashrafid patron for whom the manuscript of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya* was made (fig. 115).

Two double-page sections near the end of the second volume (fols 372b-373a and 374b-375a) are also framed with a simple gold band. These are some of the same folios that contain the Persian interlinear translations mentioned above.

Throughout the manuscript, each *sūra* is marked with a colourful, decorative headpiece and accompanying marginal vignette; every tenth verse is marked with an elaborate marginal roundel containing the word *‘ashr* (ten); and each verse is marked with a small, gold roundel. The styles of the headpieces and tenth-verse markers that appear throughout the manuscript vary significantly (figs 116-122).

The possible sources for the motifs and patterns of the Qur’an’s illumination are similarly diverse. Firstly, some elements can be clearly linked to older manuscripts produced in Konya, such as the 1278 Qur’an and *Maṣnavī* examined in the previous chapter (figs 123-126, see also fig. 57). Additionally, *mūnhani* and interlacing petal motifs feature prominently both in the Qaramanid Qur’an (figs 121 and 127) and in the centre of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*’s pointed oval frontispiece (see fig. 82).

Whilst this is hardly surprising given the chronological proximity of the two manuscripts dated to the early 1310s, similar motifs again also appear in the 1278 Qur’an and the 1278 *Maṣnavī* (figs 11 and 128).

Both motifs are also present in illuminations added to an earlier Arabic manuscript that is dated to Dhū al-Qa‘da 625 (October 1228), which was copied in Alanya by its author, Aḥmad ibn Sa‘d ibn Mahdī ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī, for ‘Alā’ al-Dīn

Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37).⁴⁰⁴ This manuscript, titled *al-Laṭāʿif al-ʿAlāʾiyya*, is the only surviving copy of this mirror for princes (*naṣīḥatnāma*) and contains a rare example of Seljuk illumination before the Mongol invasion in 1243 (fig. 129).⁴⁰⁵ The later illumination of the manuscript consists of two medallions on the first and last pages, probably added some time in the early fourteenth century (figs 130-131). The medallion on folio 106b states that the manuscript is 'for the reading' (*bi-rasm muṭālaʿa*) of Badr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. after 1341), who was based at various times in Larende and Ermenek. The medallions' *mūnhani* borders are similar to those in manuscripts produced in Konya in the early fourteenth century (see, for example, figs 82 and 121).

Certain elements of the Qaramanid Qur'an's decoration can be connected to early fourteenth-century Ilkhanid and Mamluk Qur'an illumination. Particularly noteworthy in the Qaramanid Qur'an is the use of red cross-hatched ground with blue half-palmettes, and the eight-lobed shape of the colophon (figs 106 and 109). The former decorative element appears in both Mamluk and Ilkhanid Qur'ans of the early fourteenth century (figs 132-133). The distinctive eight-lobed colophon of the Qur'an finds a visual parallel in the ten-lobed commissioning certificate of the 1315 Qur'an of the Ilkhanid vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī (d. 1318), which was probably produced in Tabriz (fig. 134).

⁴⁰⁴ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Aşir Efendi 316.

⁴⁰⁵ Peacock 2015b.

Although these three manuscripts are related by dating, visual properties and patronage contexts, it is important not to simply label them as ‘beylik’ manuscripts. They vary greatly in terms of their appearance (despite sharing some common motifs), so do not amount to a coherent ‘beylik’ visual identity. Unlike later manuscripts that were produced in identifiable workshops, such as the *kitābkhāna* of the Timurid prince Bāysunghur (d. 1433) in fifteenth-century Herat or the sixteenth-century Ottoman *naqqāshkhāna*, these manuscripts cannot be viewed in the same way as products of a specific court milieu as there is no evidence to support this.

Mawlawi manuscripts

The next group of dated manuscripts that I will discuss are four illuminated copies of works written by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and Sulṭān Walad, which were produced by Mawlawi scribes in Konya and Sivas. The earliest is a copy of Sulṭān Walad’s *Intihānāma*, which was originally composed in Konya some time after 1301, the year in which his *Rabābnāma* was completed.⁴⁰⁶ This earliest-known copy of the *Intihānāma* was finished on 21 Sha‘bān 714 (30 November 1314) (fig. 135). The location of its production is not mentioned but, as I shall demonstrate, it was almost certainly produced in Konya. The second manuscript that I will describe is a copy of Rūmī’s *Maṣnavī*.⁴⁰⁷ This copy was completed on 25 Ramaḍān 723 (28 September 1323) in Konya. The manuscript contains extensive information about

⁴⁰⁶ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794. Blochet 1928: no. 1507.

⁴⁰⁷ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177.

where precisely it was copied and how long the process took. Inscriptions that appear after five of the six chapters of the text describe when and where each was completed (figs 136-140).⁴⁰⁸ These inscriptions show that the copying of each chapter took between a few weeks to two months to finish. Chapters four and five were copied in Rūmī's tomb (*dar turba-yi muṭahhar-i ḥāzret-i khudāvandigār*) while the colophon, and presumably chapter six, were completed in Rūmī's madrasa (*fī madrasat Mawlānā*). The manuscript's illumination was completed after its copying, as shown by instances where the opaque watercolour partially covers the ink (fig. 141). The third manuscript that I will outline in this section is titled *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, and comprises three *maṣnavīs* (rhyming couplets) by Sulṭān Walad, namely the *Ibtidānāma* (composed in 1291 in Konya), and the aforementioned two works titled *Rabābnāma* and *Intihānāma*.⁴⁰⁹ This manuscript was endowed to Rūmī's shrine in the last ten days of Shawwāl 732 (15-24 July 1332) (fig. 142). Although, theoretically, it may have been produced well before this date, the script mentioning the date, and its ink, are very similar to the writing in the rest of the manuscript. This single volume is the earliest known compilation of these three texts, illuminated or otherwise. For the sake of clarity and brevity, I will hereafter refer to the three manuscripts as the '1314 *Intihānāma*', the '1323 *Maṣnavī*', and the 'circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*'. The final manuscript that I will discuss in relation to these three is a copy of the third volume of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*, which was completed on 24 Rabī' al-Awwal 718 (26 May 1318) in Sivas (hereafter the '1318 *Maṣnavī*').⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁸ See Appendix Two for translations of all of the manuscript's relevant inscriptions.

⁴⁰⁹ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 74.

⁴¹⁰ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Paşa 650.

The 1314 *Intihānāma* is a rather modest manuscript and the smallest of the three produced in Konya. It measures 235mm (length) x 160mm (width) x 50mm (depth) and contains 222 folios. The textblock measures 170mm x 110mm, and the text is arranged into two unframed columns of nineteen lines (fig. 143). The main paper of the manuscript is dark cream and quite smooth and somewhat matte. Ten sheets measure 2mm in thickness. The paper has laid lines but they are too faint to measure. The manuscript is in relatively good condition though it has been cropped on all edges and repaired with later paper. It is gathered into quaternions. Like most of the manuscripts that I discuss in this chapter, the 1314 *Intihānāma* has lost its original binding. It has been rebound in an eighteenth-century leather Ottoman binding.

The 1323 *Maṣnavī* measures 310mm (length) x 240mm (width) x 70mm (depth), and contains 320 folios. The textblock measures 252mm x 184mm, and the text is divided into four columns of twenty-five lines each (fig. 144). The manuscript's paper is light brownish cream, smooth and a little shiny. Its paper is somewhat thinner than the 1314 *Intihānāma*'s, with ten sheets measuring 1.5mm in thickness. The paper is laid, with twenty vertical laid lines measuring about 33mm across. The manuscript is in relatively good condition, and was rebound in the twentieth century with a black leather Ottoman-style binding. Like the 1314 *Intihānāma*, it is gathered into quaternions.

The circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is larger than both of these manuscripts, though it is still slightly smaller than the monumental 1278 *Maṣnavī* (discussed in Chapter

One). It measures 460mm (length) x 314mm (width) x 85mm (depth), and contains 315 folios. The manuscript's textblock measures 336mm x 236mm and, like the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, is arranged into four columns of twenty-five lines (fig. 145). The manuscript consists of two kinds of paper that share a virtually identical physical appearance. Both are light cream, somewhat smooth and matte, and have a thickness of 3mm per ten sheets. The first group, which consists of folios 1-297, has no visible laid or chain lines. The second group, which consists of folios 298-315, has horizontal laid lines, twenty of which measure 20mm, and groups of three chain lines, which are spaced 20-25mm apart. The manuscript is gathered into quinions and rebound in a dark red leather seventeenth-century Ottoman binding. The first few folios of the manuscript have been repaired with later European watermarked paper and, like the other two manuscripts, it has been cropped on all three outside edges.⁴¹¹

Both the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* were copied by the same scribe, 'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh, who describes himself in the colophons of both manuscripts as the 'atīq (freed slave) of Sulṭān Walad.⁴¹² A patron is not

⁴¹¹ The watermark consists of seriffed text reading 'CALCAGNO'.

⁴¹² Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794, fol. 221a; Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177, fol. 317b. 'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh was possibly the father of two other Mawlawi scribes, named Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. One Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Waladī copied a non-illuminated manuscript of Sulṭān Walad's *Divān* on 11 Rajab 722 (26 July 1322) (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Halet Efendi EK 139) but no location is mentioned. Some forty to fifty years later, one Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī copied three illuminated manuscripts dated 1368-72 for the Mawlawi *amīr* Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan, whose manuscript patronage forms the focus of Chapter Four. An individual named Ḥusayn ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī al-Qūnawī completed two non-illuminated copies of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī* on 13 Şafar 738 (11 September 1337) and 25 Shawwāl 744 (11 March 1344) (respectively, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Berlin, Minutoli 21, fol. 143b and İnebey Kütüphanesi, Bursa, Orhan 620, fol. 121a). The earlier manuscript from Berlin, which measures 305mm x 205mm, appears to have been intended for illumination as it features several pages of framed text and large, empty medallions outlined in red or black ink. Some of the

mentioned in either manuscript, and it is possible that the scribe copied the manuscripts for himself or for the shrine or madrasa of Rūmī, where the 1323 *Maṣnavī* was copied. The copyist of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is identified in a *waqf* note at the end of the manuscript as Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ‘the Scribe’ (*al-Kātib*). The same note names the endower as ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Waladī (i.e. a follower of Sulṭān Walad). Unfortunately, nothing else is yet known about this individual.⁴¹³

All three manuscripts were copied in *naskh*, with introductory sections copied in *tawqī‘*. The density of the ink and the quality of the script varies between the three manuscripts. The calligraphy of the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, which were copied by the same scribe, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abdullāh, is fairly consistent across both manuscripts. The ink of the earlier manuscript, however, is different, being brown and quite watery, in comparison to the rough and uneven black ink of the later manuscript (figs 146-147). The *tawqī‘* script of the introductory texts in both examples is somewhat chaotic, with large swooping bowls and inconsistent deviations from the text’s baseline (figs 148-149). The *naskh* script of both manuscripts has similarly deep bowls and appears a little messier, although more fluid, than the *naskh* of the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, for example (see fig. 51). In both the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, a noticeably thicker nib was used by the

frames, and one medallion, are filled in with inked floral motifs but these do not appear to be contemporary with the manuscript. There is no information on the patron in either manuscript.
⁴¹³ He is not mentioned in any contemporary Mawlawi sources, historical chronicles or other sources that have been used in this thesis.

scribe, giving a heavier visual effect than seen in the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, or indeed the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*.

By comparison, the calligraphy (both *naskh* and *tawqīʿ*) of the manuscript of circa 1332 is more spaced out, and generally has a neater and more consistent appearance than the other two Mawlawi manuscripts from Konya in this period (figs 150-151). Otherwise, it shares similar letter forms to the other manuscripts discussed here and in the previous chapter: deep bowls, small *alifs* and large initial *kāfs*. The ink also appears to be of a higher quality: it is consistently solid black throughout the manuscript and shows no signs of variation in texture. The higher calligraphic quality of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* in comparison to the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* is perhaps unsurprising given that the copyist identified himself as a 'scribe' (*kātib*). If he was a professional scribe or chancery employee, then certainly he would have been expected to have excellent handwriting. These subtle variations in the quality of scripts notwithstanding, the approach to calligraphy in illuminated Mawlawi manuscripts seems to have been quite conservative. There does not appear to have been a significant difference in the type of scripts used, with both smaller, more modest illuminated manuscripts and large, lavish endowments employing similar styles of *naskh* and *tawqīʿ*.

All three manuscripts are illuminated, although the quality and overall appearance of the illumination varies significantly. However, as I will show below, they all display certain motifs, which strongly suggests that they were produced in the same location, although only the 1323 *Maṣnavī* mentions Konya (and specifically

the shrine and ‘madrasa’ of Rūmī) as its place of production. In accordance with its relatively high standard of calligraphy, the illumination of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is the most accomplished of the three manuscripts. The design of the illumination in this manuscript, which contains three chapters, is more diverse and intricate than the other two, and its execution is noticeably more precise. Each of its three chapters is preceded by one large pointed oval medallion (figs 152-154),⁴¹⁴ two full-page illuminations (figs 155-157),⁴¹⁵ and two or four framed text pages,⁴¹⁶ totalling nineteen illuminated pages across the manuscript (figs 158-161). The introduction to each chapter and the *waqf* note at the back of the third chapter (fol. 315b) are also all written in gold *tawqī*.

The 1314 *Intihānāma* contains two circular medallions in its frontispiece and four framed text pages⁴¹⁷ (figs 162-163). Compared to the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, the design of its illumination is quite simple, and nearly entirely composed of thick, gold strapwork.

The 1323 *Maṣnavī*, which like all complete *Maṣnavīs* consists of six chapters, contains one pointed oval frontispiece at the beginning of the first chapter (fig. 164) and one smaller pointed oval that appears after the end of the fifth chapter (fig. 165), as well as thirteen framed text pages (figs 166-172) and six headpieces (figs 173-178). It does not feature any full-page (i.e. ‘carpet’) illuminations, apart

⁴¹⁴ Fols 1a, 114a and 220a.

⁴¹⁵ Fols 1b, 2a, 114b, 115a, 220b and 221a.

⁴¹⁶ Fols 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, 115b, 116a, 116b, 117a, 221b and 222a.

⁴¹⁷ Fols 1b-2a (medallions), 2b-3a, and 3b-4a (framed text pages).

from the oval frontispiece on folio 2a. In total, there are twenty-one pages of illumination, which, although higher in quantity than the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, are poorer in quality, appearing both rushed and less ambitious.

In both the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, the predominant pigments used in the illumination are gold and bright blue, with a slightly watery green used in a more limited fashion. The range of colours used in the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, however, is much wider. Gold is used extensively throughout the manuscript's decoration, along with bright blue, dark blue, bronze, red, green, and light purple. White is sometimes used for giving emphasis to knotted patterns, enhancing their visibility (fig. 179). The purple pigment in the manuscript is used as much as the bright blue, if not more.⁴¹⁸ This is a clear shift from the preference for the gold-and-blue dominated colour schemes that characterise the decoration of the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, as well as the earlier manuscripts discussed in Chapter One, including the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, the 1278 Qur'an, and the undated Sackler Qur'an *juz'*.⁴¹⁹

The 1314 *Intihānāma* and the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* do not contain any information concerning their production locations. The scribe of the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* (which was definitely produced in Konya) are one and the same but this in itself is not sufficient evidence to link the earlier

⁴¹⁸ Without chemical testing, it is impossible to know what this pigment consists of. It is perhaps a mix of red, blue, and white pigment.

⁴¹⁹ Respectively, Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466 and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Washington DC, S1986.25.

manuscript to Konya, considering that the copyist may well have moved in the nine years between the manuscripts' production. Although Konya was the centre of the Mawlawi network, I have identified one illuminated and several non-illuminated early fourteenth-century manuscripts either of Mawlawi texts or copied by Mawlawi scribes that were produced beyond Konya, in Sivas, Niğde, Damascus and Cairo (these will be discussed below). A comparative analysis of the illumination seen in manuscripts with identified places of production, emerges as the most conclusive method for identifying the production place of the 1314 *Intihānāma*. In this respect, the evidence points clearly towards Konya.

The 1314 *Intihānāma*'s decoration features a few motifs and patterns that can be linked to contemporary manuscripts made in Konya. Both four-petalled interlacing and colourful *mūnhani* are found in the 1311 copy of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*, the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an and the later early fourteenth-century illumination of *al-Laṭā'if al-'Alā'iyya*, which are discussed above (figs 82, 121, 127 and 130). The 1314 *Intihānāma* has striking similarities to *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya* and the Qaramanid Qur'an, both of which were produced in Konya. Moreover, the thick gold strapwork border of the 1314 *Intihānāma* bears a strong resemblance to strapwork borders found in the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* (figs 106, 167 and 171). Indeed, it is possible that the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* were perhaps also decorated by the illuminator of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an.

As for the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, the *nisba* of the patron ‘al-Waladī’ indicates his connection to Sulṭān Walad, perhaps as an attendant or former slave. This could perhaps tie the manuscript to Konya as the only other instances I have found of this *nisba* are in reference to people who appear to have been based in Konya.⁴²⁰ The patron’s *nisba*, in addition to the fact that the manuscript was endowed to Rūmī’s shrine in Konya, strongly suggests that it was produced in the same city, and perhaps in the shrine itself. This is supported, again, by a comparative analysis of the illumination, which indicates a very close relationship with the monumental 1278 *Maṣnavī*. This suggests that either it was produced by the same artist (or one of his apprentices), or that the creators had direct access to this iconic manuscript kept in the shrine. Aside from the colour palettes of the two manuscripts, which are quite different, their overall visual appearances are quite similar.

Firstly, the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* follows the same programme of illumination set out by the 1278 *Maṣnavī*. Each volume begins with a large pointed oval medallion, full-page illuminations, and illuminated text pages. The only

⁴²⁰ Aside from the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, there are two more manuscripts that I have come across which contain the *nisba* of ‘al-Waladī’ and can be connected to a specific production location, which in both cases is Konya. The first is the 1278 *Maṣnavī* (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51) discussed in Chapter One. The second is an early, non-illuminated copy of the *Ibtidānāma* by Sulṭān Walad. This manuscript was completed in Muḥarram 694 (November-December 1294) by Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Lārandī (of Larende) al-Waladī in the ‘*madrassa-yi khudāvandigār*’, which was almost certainly in Konya (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2206). See n. 341 above. This scribe also completed a 1297 copy of Sulṭān Walad’s *Ibtidānāma* (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Paşa 480) and a copy of Sulṭān Walad’s *Ma‘ārif* from the 1320s (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 2114). Neither colophon includes a production location. In addition to these three examples, the scribe of the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* described himself as a freed slave (‘*atīq*’) of Sulṭān Walad but did not use the *nisba*, ‘al-Waladī’. Finally, one Ḥasan ibn ‘Uthmān al-Waladī produced a non-illuminated copy of the *Dīvān* of Sulṭān Walad in 1322 but this manuscript does not mention a production location (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Halet Efendi EK 139). In other sources, Aflākī’s hagiography mentions, for example, Shaykh Sa‘d al-Dīn-i Maṣnavī-Khvān-i (the *Maṣnavī*-reciter) Valadī, who presumably resided in Konya (Aflākī 1961: II, 797; 2002: 556).

structural difference is that the later manuscript does not contain headpieces like the earlier manuscript. Seeing as this distinctive programme of illumination was not common for the period, the similarity of the two manuscripts may not be a coincidence. In fact, several elements of illumination in the 1278 manuscript seem to have been consciously replicated in the circa 1332 manuscript. The first pointed oval frontispieces in both manuscripts are strikingly similar though not exactly the same size, indicating that the latter example was inspired by the 1278 manuscript but not traced or reproduced from the same preparatory drawing (figs 14 and 152). Further parallels in the composition of the illumination and individual motifs abound. For example, another pointed oval frontispiece in the later manuscript closely resembles part of a full-page illumination in the earlier manuscript (figs 26 and 153), while half-palmette circles, four-pointed stars, alternating circle and oval borders, and various types of gold strapwork are found in both (figs 2, 4, 57 and 180-182).

It is unlikely that the illuminator of the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, Mukhliṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Hindī, was directly involved in the decoration of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, given the long gap between their production. The *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* was probably illuminated by another individual, possibly a student of Mukhliṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh. This assertion is supported by visual differences between the two manuscripts. The later manuscript is more conservative in its forms and motifs, notwithstanding some unique elements, such as a roundel found on folio 220b that is composed of two stylized, intertwined birds (fig. 183). Compared to the broad range of patterns and compositions found in the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, the range of motifs used in the circa

1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is narrower, consisting mainly of half-palmette circles, floral borders and various types of gold strapwork. The differences in complexity and execution are most evident through a comparison of the manuscripts' marginal motifs. In the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, these are intricate, detailed and colourful, whereas in the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, they are comparatively plain (fig. 184). The overall visual impression is also softer in the later manuscript, with light purple and bronze being favoured over the bold blues and reds of the 1278 *Maṣnavī*.

The final manuscript that I will discuss in detail here is a copy of the third volume of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*. It was completed on 24 Rabī' al-Awwal 718 (26 May 1318) in Sivas in *al-madrasa al-Shamsiyya*, which almost certainly refers to the Çifte Minareli Medrese, which was founded in Sivas in 1271-2 by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī (d. 1284), the Ilkhanid *ṣāhib-dīvān* (finance minister) and brother of 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī mentioned in the previous chapter (fig. 185).⁴²¹ The manuscript was copied by Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīb (i.e. leader or chief) al-Mawlawī nicknamed (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) Tāj. An individual named 'Mawlānā Tāj al-Dīn ibn Naqīb' is mentioned three times in Aflākī's hagiography, in the chapter concerning Ulu 'Ārif Chalabī's leadership of the Mawlawis between 1312

⁴²¹ At least one other manuscript may have been copied in this madrasa. This manuscript is a non-illuminated copy of *Nihāyat al-Idrāk fī Dirāyat al-Aflāk* by Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 1311), which was completed in the middle of Sha'bān 680 (November-December 1281) in *al-madrasa al-Ṣāhibiyya al-Shamsiyya* in Sivas and corrected in the presence of its author on 10 Shawwāl 683 (20 December 1284) (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Köprülü 956, fol. 148b). The colophon has been transcribed by Kaveh Farzad Niazi who states that '*al-madrasa al-Ṣāhibiyya al-Shamsiyya*' probably refers to the Çifte Minareli Medrese (Niazi 2011: 115, n. 1). This is possible since Shams al-Dīn was the Ilkhanid *ṣāhib-dīvān*, hence '*al-Ṣāhibiyya*'. However, '*al-Ṣāhibiyya*' could refer to Ṣāhib 'Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī's Gök Medrese in Sivas. I am grateful to Ethel Sara Wolper for this reference.

(the death of his father, Sulṭān Walad) and his own death in 1320.⁴²² Tāj al-Dīn is referred to as the ‘king of teachers’ (*malik al-mudarrisīn*), one of the ‘great men among the companions’ (*akābir-i yārān*), and a tutor or lecturer (*muʿīd*) in the Madrasa Atābakiyya in Konya.⁴²³ The correspondence in dates and names strongly suggests that this individual may be the scribe of the 1318 manuscript from Sivas.⁴²⁴

The manuscript consists of 301 folios, and measures 235mm (length) x 160mm (width) x 60mm (depth). The textblock measures 178mm x 112mm, and is divided into two columns of seventeen lines each. The size and format of the textblock is very similar to that of the 1314 *Intihānāma*, which measures 170mm (length) x 110mm (width), and is formatted into two columns of nineteen lines (fig. 186).

The original binding has been lost and the manuscript is now covered with green fabric, although the envelope flap remains. The manuscript’s paper is cream with lots of visible inclusions (i.e. there are numerous fibres present), smooth but quite matte and a little thick, with ten sheets measuring 2.5mm. The paper has been gathered into quinions. The script is a rather cramped and slightly chaotic *naskh*, copied in watery brown ink. The letter forms – deep bowls, small, serifless *alifs*,

⁴²² Aflākī 1961: II, 831, 844 and 867; 2002: 580, 589 and 606, Konyalı 1968: 99. Tāj al-Dīn is not mentioned in Sipahsālār’s chronicle (Sipahsālār 2007).

⁴²³ A no longer extant institution founded in the 1250s by Fakhr al-Dīn Arslān Ṭughmush ibn Sawinch.

⁴²⁴ There is no indication in the manuscript as to why the scribe was in Sivas but Aflākī’s hagiography makes it clear that the city did have a Mawlawi presence. Aflākī mentions that the Mawlawi *samāʿ* took place there from at least the time of Ulu ʿĀrif Chalabī’s leadership (1312-20) and that the Mongol governor of Sivas, ʿArab Nūyan (d. 1319), was a Mawlawi disciple (Aflākī 1961: II, 852-6, 863-4; 2002: 595-7, 603).

and large *kāfs* – are quite inconsistent across the manuscript but broadly similar to examples of *naskh* discussed here and in Chapter One. The manuscript’s decoration is, overall, quite simple. The first five pages (fols 1a-3a), which comprise the introduction to the third volume of the *Maṣnavī*, are copied in alternating rows of gold and blue *tawqīʿ*, with the diacritical marks written in the opposing colour. These lines of text are outlined in black and embellished with floral motifs (fig. 187). The ground has been filled with light brown cross-hatching. The manuscript’s only headpiece on folio 3b is decorated in the same way but is copied in gold *muḥaqqaq* (fig. 188). Headings throughout the manuscript are written in gold *naskh*.

The use of alternating blue and gold ink in the 1318 *Maṣnavī*’s introduction is very unusual for this period. I have, thus far, not found securely identified examples in any thirteenth or fourteenth-century manuscripts from Rūm, Egypt, the Levant, the Jazira or Persia. There is one undated (apparently fourteenth-century) Qur’an that features *sūra* headings in blue *thuluth* and text in gold *muḥaqqaq* but it is unclear from where it originated (fig. 189).⁴²⁵ Alternating rows of black and gold ink are found in some Ilkhanid Qur’ans, however (fig. 190), while rows of blue, gold, red and black calligraphy are found in Tughluq Qur’ans produced in Delhi at the turn of the fifteenth century (fig. 191). The earliest example from Rūm that I have identified is a thirty-part Ottoman Qur’an produced in the second half of the

⁴²⁵ Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Cod. Arab. 2676 (Lings 2005: fig. 102). Lings attributes the manuscript to fourteenth-century Iraq, Persia or the Near East.

fifteenth century that is copied exclusively in blue and gold *muḥaqqaq* script (fig. 192).⁴²⁶

Places and people

The material described above, consisting of six illuminated manuscripts produced between 1311 and 1332, and one produced in 1228 with early fourteenth-century illumination, provides a unique insight into the cultural history of Rūm. In the final part of this chapter, I will explore what this material can reveal about the locations of manuscript production, the identities of scribes and illuminators, and the nature of illuminated manuscript patronage and consumption, supported with evidence from non-illuminated manuscripts. These analyses will then be expanded into a broader critique of how the artistic output of the so-called 'beylik' period has been approached in historiography.

Up to this point, discussions in the present study have been dominated by Konya as a centre for the production of manuscripts. The production of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya* in Konya, for an Ashrafid *bey* based in Beyşehir, shows that the town remained an important centre for copying and illuminating manuscripts in this period. On the one hand, it is possible to see Konya as a local centre that

⁴²⁶ I believe that there are several parts of this Qur'an dispersed across various collections. *Juz*' 5 is in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, with the accession number AC1995.124.2. Two sections are in the Khalili Collection, London (QUR229 (*juz*' 13) and QUR289 (*juz*' 6)). See James 1992b: Cat. 20. *Juz*' 12 is in a private collection (S. Tanman Koleksiyonu, Istanbul, ST2). See Tanman and Rifat 2001, where it is incorrectly labelled as a thirteenth-century manuscript. Finally, there is also a detached folio from the end of *juz*' 8 in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, EA1993.394.

specialised in the production of such material, in a similar way to how other towns in Rūm were known for manufacturing particular goods. For example, Bursa was known for its silk, Antalya was the centre of shipbuilding, and Aksaray produced the best woollen rugs, as claimed by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.⁴²⁷ On the other hand, however, the production of manuscripts discussed in this chapter cannot be viewed solely in the context of commerce. The specific intellectual nature of manuscript patronage and the wider framework of intellectual activities in Konya and Sivas would also have determined where and by whom the manuscripts were produced, and thus would have shaped aspects of their physical appearances.⁴²⁸ The illumination of a manuscript could serve various practical purposes (such as personalising them for owners or institutions, structuring them for easy reading or increasing their market value), but none of these purposes were independent from the significance attributed by owners/patrons to the content of the copied texts themselves.

As I have mentioned, it is highly likely that illuminated manuscripts were produced in this period outside of the former Seljuk capital due to the movement of artists and the proliferation of local notables following the dissolution of effective centralised governing structures. The 1318 *Maṣnavī* produced in Sivas is incontrovertible proof of that. Although it is visually modest, it does demonstrate that the process of decorating manuscripts and thus enhancing their value did not

⁴²⁷ Schiltberger 1879: 34, Piloti 1950: 61, 73, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 432-3.

⁴²⁸ Elaine Wright has discussed how, in fourteenth-century Shiraz, the aesthetics of illuminated manuscripts were heavily shaped by the nature of patronage, which veered towards the commercial sphere in the early part of the century and the courtly sphere in the later part (Wright 2012).

exclusively take place in Konya.⁴²⁹ Furthermore, the manuscript shows that Mawlawi devotees were producing manuscripts outside of Konya, the site of their primary shrine, in sites that did not have an explicit association with the Sufi group (in this case, the Çifte Minareli Medrese).

It is perhaps unsurprising that, beyond Konya, an illuminated manuscript from Sivas has survived, as the city was of significant economic, political and cultural importance throughout the late medieval period. Frequented by Russian, Qipchak, Persian, Egyptian and Syrian merchants, Sivas was a notable trading post at the crossroads of north-south and east-west routes.⁴³⁰ Ḥamdullāh al-Mustawfī al-Qazwīnī's (d. after 1340) *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* contains Ilkhanid fiscal accounts from 1336, which show that out of the 3.3 million dinar budget of *mamālik-i Rūm*, over 1.3 million (1,384,866 according to Togan) was allocated to Konya and Sivas.⁴³¹ This was similar to the annual budget of Tabriz, which was 1.39 million.⁴³² Furthermore, Patricia Blessing has discussed how from the 1270s, Sivas became an important centre of scholarship with the construction of three large madrasas around 1271, one of which was the madrasa built by the Ilkhanid *ṣāhib-dīvān* Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī where the 1318 *Maṣnavī* was copied.⁴³³ In the

⁴²⁹ This was seemingly also the case in the late thirteenth century, as I discussed at the end of Chapter One, in connection to the illuminated copy of *Kitāb al-Shifā'* (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2442) and the non-illuminated copy of *Daqā'iq al-Ḥaqā'iq* (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 174).

⁴³⁰ Fleet 2009: 248.

⁴³¹ Togan 1991: 223-6.

⁴³² Ibid: 228.

⁴³³ Blessing 2014a: 69. These are the Gök Medrese, founded by Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, the Çifte Minareli Medrese, built by Ilkhanid *ṣāhib-dīvān* (finance minister) Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juwaynī, and the Buruciye Medresesi, named for its otherwise unknown patron, Muẓaffar ibn Hibatullāh al-Mufaḍḍal al-Burūjjirdī.

context of Mongol rule, Sivas – geographically closer to the Ilkhanid capital of Tabriz – became an important base for the regime. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited Sivas in 1331, described it as the biggest city of the ‘ruler (*malik*) of Iraq’ (i.e. the Ilkhanid ruler, Abū Sa‘īd) in Bilād al-Rūm.⁴³⁴

Looking at specific copying locations within the urban context, it is clear that manuscripts were copied in madrasas and Sufi institutions. Several inscriptions in the six-chapter 1323 *Maṣnavī* show that copying locations could vary even within one manuscript. An inscription at the end of the manuscript’s third chapter on folio 192b states that this section was finished in the tomb (*turba*) of Rūmī, while the colophon on folio 317b notes that the copying of the manuscript was completed in the madrasa of Rūmī (*madrasat Mawlānā*).⁴³⁵ This is the first confirmed instance of an illuminated manuscript being produced in a specifically Mawlawi location, namely the sepulchral shrine in Konya.⁴³⁶ It is, however, unclear where exactly the *madrasat Mawlānā* mentioned in the colophon was situated with respect to the tomb of Rūmī. Aflākī describes an incident in which Sulṭān Walad and several disciples performed the *samā‘* barefoot in a downpour between the shrine and this madrasa, suggesting that the distance between the two buildings was worth remarking upon.⁴³⁷ Either way, the changes in copying location across the six chapters of a single work show that there was not necessarily a formal workspace

⁴³⁴ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1854: 289, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 434.

⁴³⁵ See Appendix Two for the full translations of these inscriptions.

⁴³⁶ See n. 341 above.

⁴³⁷ Aflākī 1961: II, 795-96; 2002: 555-56.

for copying manuscripts.⁴³⁸ In fact, scribes could be itinerant during a project, as is also evident from an illuminated manuscript dated 1272-6 that I discussed in the previous chapter, which was begun in Maragha and finished in Harput for a patron based in Rumkale.⁴³⁹

The use of both madrasas and shrines for copying manuscripts highlights the porous boundaries between scholarly and Sufi spaces. Indeed, it was not unusual for individuals to conduct intellectual activities in both madrasas and dervish lodges. Rūmī himself evidently had his own madrasa, while Tāj al-Dīn ibn Naqīb, who may well have been the scribe of the 1318 *Maṣnavī*, was both a Mawlawi disciple and a tutor in the Madrasa Atābakiyya in Konya. The material in this chapter, therefore, reinforces the sense that the boundaries between dervishes/lodges and scholars/madrasas was, for practical purposes, quite permeable. It is possible as well that Mawlawi institutions were open to individuals who did not identify themselves as disciples of the Sufi group, as shown by a 1338 copy of the *Tafsīr* of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī, which was produced in a Mawlawi *zāwiya* in Ladik by ‘Abd al-Salām ibn Turkmān ibn Ṭūghānshāh al-Qūnawī.⁴⁴⁰

Although the 1318 *Maṣnavī* is the only illuminated manuscript produced by Mawlawi individuals that has an identified production location outside of Konya,⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁸ The illumination, which was completed after the calligraphy, would probably have been executed in a single place for practical reasons.

⁴³⁹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2442.

⁴⁴⁰ Yusuf Ağa Kütüphanesi, Konya, 6877. This scribe copied another manuscript (a copy of Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s *al-Ta’wīlāt al-Najmiyya*) in the same year in a madrasa in Ladik and identified himself in the same way (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Hudai 71). See Peacock 2014: 281.

⁴⁴¹ The only fourteenth-century copy of an illuminated Mawlawi text produced outside of Konya and Sivas that I have come across is a copy of Rūmī’s *Dīvān-i Kabīr*. Due to the distinctive style of its

a brief look at non-illuminated manuscripts demonstrates that Mawlawi devotees were copying manuscripts outside of Konya from an early date. A copy of the second volume of the *Maṣnavī*, which was produced in Damascus, was completed on 4 Sha‘bān 706 (9 February 1307) by Mūsā ibn Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamza al-Mawlawī for his own usage (*‘alā yad ṣāhibihi*).⁴⁴² This manuscript is the first dated instance of the *nisba* ‘al-Mawlawī’ being used to refer to a member of the Sufi group.⁴⁴³ Another copy of the third volume of Rūmī’s *Maṣnavī* from 1317 was copied in *al-madrasa al-Zāhiriyya* in Cairo (no longer extant) by a scribe named Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Ilīsh ibn [...]mad ibn al-Jum‘a al-Musta‘ṣim al-Baghdādī designated (*al-mad‘ūww bi-*) Ibn [...]āb Diyā’ al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Shukrī al-Musta‘ṣimī al-‘Abbāsī.⁴⁴⁴ A Persian inscription on folio 2a written by Niẓām al-Dīn al-Arzinjānī al-Mawlawī outlines how he checked the manuscript against the ‘true copy’ (*nuskha-yi ṣaḥīḥ*, which is almost certainly the 1278 *Maṣnavī*) in the ‘*madrasa-i khudāvandigār Mawlānā*’ in

illuminated headpiece, which features minute gold, floral sprays on a blue ground, I believe that it was most likely copied in Muzaffarid Shiraz. This unpublished manuscript was completed on 1 Jumādā al-Ākhira 774 (27 November 1372) by its scribe Aḥmad ibn Walī al-Shīrāzī according to its colophon (British Library, London, Or.2866, fol. 328b). No patron is named. On this same folio, Rūmī is actually referred to as ‘al-Rūmī’ which does not occur in any of the Mawlawi manuscripts from Konya.

⁴⁴² Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Cod.pers.45.

⁴⁴³ ‘Al-Mawlawī’ was also used more generally in the late Ayyubid and Mamluk periods to refer to viziers or high-ranking members of the military or *‘ulamā’* so the epithet does not always necessarily refer to the Mawlawis specifically. See, for example, a copy of the Gospels that was completed in 1340 for a Coptic scholar in Cairo (Hunt 2009: 119 and fig. 2). The dedication reads, ‘For the sublime library of the lord and master’ (*Li-al-khizāna al-‘āliyya al-mawlawiyya al-mālikiyya*). Due to this confusion, I believe that an illuminated manuscript in the Walters Art Museum which is currently identified as a Mawlawi product of Konya is probably from the Mamluk sphere (Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, W.581). This manuscript is a copy of *Qaṣīdat al-Burdah* by al-Būṣīrī (d. 1294) with a *takhmīs* (amplification) by Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Fayyūmī. It was copied by Riḍwān ibn Muḥammad al-Tabrīzī in Jumādā al-Ākhira 767 (February-March 1366) for an unnamed *Shaykh al-Islām* (a title given to eminent scholars). The dedication on folio 1a opens with the words, ‘For the noble and sublime library of the lord’ (*Li-al-khizāna al-karīmiyya al-‘āliyya al-mawlawiyya*).

⁴⁴⁴ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Pasa 658.

Konya during Şafar 723 (February-March 1323).⁴⁴⁵ This demonstrates that the richly illuminated 1278 manuscript could be consulted upon request for the purposes of comparison (which is especially interesting if, as I mentioned above, the shrine and madrasa were separate buildings, as this would have required the transport of the manuscript for consultation from the shrine to the madrasa). Although the production circumstances of the 1317 Cairo manuscript are unknown, the later inscription suggests that Mawlawi disciples took care to ensure an accurate dissemination of their texts, and that the 1278 *Maşnavî* fulfilled one of its intended functions as the authoritative canonical version of Rûmî's work.

The four illuminated manuscripts of texts by Rûmî and Sulţān Walad clearly show that Mawlawi devotees continued to play an important role in the preservation of highly valued texts in decorated codices. Two of the manuscripts (the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maşnavî*) were copied by the same calligrapher, 'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh, a freed slave of Sulţān Walad. Like many of the artists in late thirteenth-century Konya, 'Uthmān appears to have been a first-generation convert to Islam, as indicated by the generic patronym 'ibn 'Abdullāh'. As already related, the person who copied the 1318 *Maşnavî* in a madrasa in Sivas, Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīb al-Mawlawī, can also be identified as a *mu'īd* in the Madrasa Atābakiyya in Konya who frequented Rûmî's shrine. The scribe of the circa 1332 *Maşnavî-i Valadī*, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib, did not mention any Mawlawi affiliation in this manuscript but I have identified another manuscript – a

⁴⁴⁵ This individual is mentioned in Aflākī's hagiography where the author refers to him as his own master or teacher (*ustāz-am*). Aflākī 1961: II, 898; 2002: 628.

non-illuminated copy of Rūmī's *Dīvān-i Kabīr* – copied by this individual, in which he confirms his identify as a Mawlawi disciple. In this manuscript, which was completed in Ramaḍān 727/July-August 1327, the scribe states his full name as Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib known as (*al-ma'rūf bi-*) Ibn al-Nassāj al-Mawlawī (son of the Mawlawi weaver) al-Aḥadī (?).⁴⁴⁶ This non-illuminated manuscript has two red-framed panels containing large circles that appear after the colophon (fig. 193). These panels, which were presumably designed to be illuminated, contain traces of erased inscriptions that likely gave the name of the intended patron/owner. It is possible that this manuscript was intended for the Mawlawi shrine in Konya, like the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, but was for some reason left unfinished. The scripts of both manuscripts that were copied by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib are very similar (figs 194-195), which reinforces the point made above that calligraphy in the context of Mawlawi illuminated manuscript production was relatively uniform, with the same scripts being used for smaller, modestly decorated manuscripts as well as large, monumental tomes.⁴⁴⁷

In addition to the community of Mawlawi artists that resided in Konya, there were of course other craftsmen working for other patrons. Neither the scribe (Ismā'īl ibn Yūsuf) nor the illuminator (Ya'qūb ibn Ghāzī al-Qūnawī) of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an identify themselves as Mawlawi disciples. As seen in the previous chapter, artists who were native to or settled in Konya (using the 'al-

⁴⁴⁶ Milli Kütüphane, Ankara, Afyon Gedik Ahmet Paşa İl Halk Kütüphanesi 18233, fol. 202a.

⁴⁴⁷ See p. 143 above where I discuss the calligraphy of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*. It should be noted that the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is much larger than this 1327 *Dīvān-i Kabīr*. The 1332 manuscript measures 460mm x 314mm while the *Dīvān* measures 220mm x 150mm.

Qūnawī' *nisba*) continued to play a key role in illuminated manuscript production. In the case of the Qaramanid Qur'an's illuminator, he seems to also have been of Muslim origin, as indicated by his father's name, Ghāzī.

In *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*, the introductory text shows that the author, an itinerant scholar named Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Tustarī, copied the manuscript and had it decorated (or perhaps decorated it himself), in order to gain patronage, rather than being commissioned by the patron to produce the work. After several expressions of praise for the *bey*, the author asserts on folios 3a-3b that he is at the service of the treasury of 'he who has achieved great success in the acquisition of feats and glorious deeds'.⁴⁴⁸ This rather general statement, in addition to the fact that the illuminated dedication panel does not mention a treasury, could suggest that the author was not yet attached to the patron's court. The author later states on folio 4b that he hopes the patron will be satisfied with the book, assuring him that its contents are authoritative.⁴⁴⁹ Bearing this context in mind, a scenario in which the author had the manuscript illuminated in Konya, in order to impress or honour the patron, before travelling to Beyşehir to present it at court seems possible. Not much is known about the author but he seems to have been active in Rūm, Persia and Egypt in the early fourteenth century, having also composed texts for a vizier named Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Lunbān[ī] (Lunban being a

⁴⁴⁸ *Akhḍumu* [sic: *akhḍimu*] *bi-hā khizānata man ḥāza* [sic: *aḥraza?*] *qaṣaba al-sabq fī jalba* [sic: *jalb*] *al-ma'āthir wa al-mafākhir*. The phrase '*aḥraza qaṣaba al-sabq*' means 'to come through with flying colours, carry the day [or] score a great success' (Wehr 1994: 897).

⁴⁴⁹ *Wa arjū min in'āmīhi an yanẓura ilayha ba'in al-riḍā wa al-'ināya wa yatafakkara fī-ha tafakkura man taḥaqqāqa bi-kamāli al-dirāyati wa sammaytuha al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*.

district of Isfahan) and the Mamluk sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (r. 1293-1341, with interruptions).⁴⁵⁰

Of course, ‘Mawlawi’ and ‘non-Mawlawi’ scribes and illuminators (according to how they identified themselves in colophons) did not simply form two separate groups. Looking in more detail at the colophons and inscriptions of both illuminated and non-illuminated texts demonstrates that early Mawlawi manuscripts were sometimes copied or decorated by scribes and illuminators who did not identify themselves as devotees. For example, the 1278 *Maṣnavī* was illuminated by Mukhlīṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Hindī, while a non-illuminated *Maṣnavī* from 1281 was copied (probably in Konya) by one Ismā‘īl ibn Sulaymān ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Qayṣarī (from Kayseri) for a patron named Nāṣir al-Dīn.⁴⁵¹ The aforementioned scribe of the third volume of the *Maṣnavī* completed in Cairo in 1317 (Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Ilīsh) did not mention any Mawlawi affiliation amongst his long list of *nisbas*, though that is not a guarantee that he was not a Mawlawi.⁴⁵²

⁴⁵⁰ The text that was composed for the vizier is *Sharḥ al-Taḥṣīl* (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Carullah 515). It was completed on Jumādā al-Ūlā 716 (July-August 1316) in ‘Rashīdābād’ (i.e. Tabriz). It is currently unclear at which court Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Lunbān[ī] served and whether the manuscript was also produced for him, as opposed to being a later copy. The early date would suggest that it was perhaps the vizier’s own copy. If he was based in Tabriz in 1316, it is possible that he served the Ilkhanid court. There was apparently a prominent Isfahani family named ‘Lunbānī’ around this time (Morton 1994: 50). The text produced for Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn is *Sharḥ Manāzil al-Sā‘irīn* (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 2707). It survives in a later copy that was produced in the 760s (1359-68) in Esfarayen (north-eastern Iran).

⁴⁵¹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Paşa 670, fol. 1a. This patron remains unidentified but is titled ‘*khudāvandigār*’ (an honorific title meaning ‘creator of the world’ or ‘lord’ that is usually used for Rūmī, and, later the Ottoman ruler Murād I), ‘*malik al-umarā*’ (master of the commanders), ‘*nizām al-mulk*’ (order of the realm), and ‘*walī-Allāh*’ (friend of God) in the frontispiece dedication, which suggests he was probably a Mawlawi and a local commander and/or bureaucrat of some importance. The manuscript’s scribe is mentioned in a 1281 *waqfiyya* pertaining to an ‘*imāra*’ built by the vizier Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī in Konya and was possibly in his retinue (Bayram and Karabacak 1981: 41).

⁴⁵² Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Pasa 658, fol. 157b.

Additionally, according to evidence from non-illuminated manuscripts, Mawlawi scribes were also interested in Arabic and Persian texts outside of Rūmī's and Sulṭān Walad's oeuvres. Such texts covered a range of scientific, spiritual and literary topics. For instance, scribes with the 'al-Mawlawī' epithet produced copies of *Kitāb al-Dharī'a ilā Makārim al-Sharī'a* by al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī (1317), which is a work on ethics that retains its original brown, leather binding (figs 196-197),⁴⁵³ 'Awārif al-Ma'ārif by Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar al-Suhrawardī (a Sufi work copied in 1320, possibly in Konya),⁴⁵⁴ the *Dīvān* of al-Mutanabbī (ca 1332, Larende),⁴⁵⁵ *Kitāb al-Uṣṭurlāb* by Abū al-Ḥasan Kaykhusraw ibn 'Alī al-Shīrāzī (1344, Damascus),⁴⁵⁶ and an illustrated copy of Badī' al-Zaman ibn al-Razzāz al-Jazarī's (d. 1206) *Kitāb fī Ma'rifat al-Ḥiyal al-Handasiyya* (1315, perhaps the Jazira).⁴⁵⁷

The continued use of certain forms and motifs in the manuscripts of Konya suggest that by the 1330s, and possibly earlier, a 'school' of illumination had developed in the town. Such motifs included the use of colourful *mūnhani*, the pointed oval frontispiece (which appears in several manuscripts produced in Konya from 1278

⁴⁵³ Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Berlin, Or.Quart.1583, fol. 115b. The scribe's name is 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Aqsarāyī al-Mawlawī. Max von Weisweiler notes that the manuscript was produced in Niğde but I cannot find evidence of this (von Weisweiler 1962: Pl.18).

⁴⁵⁴ Konya Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Konya, Burdur İl Halk Kütüphanesi 1839. The scribe's name is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Mawlawī. It is unclear whether this is the same individual mentioned above who copied the circa 1332 copy of the *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1327 copy of *Dīvān-i Kabīr*.

⁴⁵⁵ İnebey Kütüphanesi, Bursa, Haraccioğlu 937. The scribe's name is Yūnus ibn S[...] ibn Yūnus al-Larandī al-Mawlawī.

⁴⁵⁶ Millet Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Feyzullah Efendi Koleksiyonu 1362, fol. 60b. The scribe's name is Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn al-Mawlawī.

⁴⁵⁷ Metropolitan Museum, New York, 55.125.11-15; Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait, MSLNS 17 (Canby et al. 2016: 189-90). The scribe's name is Farrūkh ibn 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Kātīb al-Yāqūtī al-Mawlawī. His epithets, 'al-Kātīb al-Yāqūtī', indicates that he was a professional scribe and a student of the celebrated calligrapher Yāqūt al-Musta'ṣimī (d. 1298).

to circa 1332), the half-palmette circle, the four-pointed star, and the four interlaced petals. By a 'school' of illumination, I mean a loose community of local artists who, in the absence of an official court atelier, were perhaps linked by broad networks of production, possibly by sharing teachers, patrons or workspaces, or by frequenting civic or religious forums. Evidence from illuminated manuscripts also highlights the potential transregional links between production in Konya and elsewhere. The *nisbas* of some artists, like 'al-Bukhārī',⁴⁵⁸ 'al-Hindī' and 'al-Tustarī', could suggest a general westward movement of craftsmen towards Rūm. Although *nisbas* are not always entirely accurate indicators of an individual's origin,⁴⁵⁹ clear visual links to Ilkhanid and, to a lesser extent, Mamluk arts of the book indicate that some artists indeed had vocational experience beyond Rūm. It is possible that artists were following models from manuscripts brought to Konya from other lands but I have not been able to identify any conclusive examples of this. Either way, it is indisputable that the arts of the book in Konya did not exist in isolation from manuscript production in Tabriz, Mosul, Baghdad, Damascus and Cairo.

A substantial community of artists seems to have been working in Konya at the time. Although, broadly speaking, late thirteenth and early fourteenth-century manuscripts from Konya show a certain degree of variety in scripts, sizes, colour palettes, page formats, programmes of illumination, and motifs, there are enough

⁴⁵⁸ The scribe of *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma* (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121), which was discussed in detail in Chapter One, was nicknamed (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) Ḥamīd al-Mukhlisī al-Bukhārī.

⁴⁵⁹ The material evidence for the movement of manuscript artists from east to west is rare but a manuscript that was begun in Maragha and completed in Harput has been noted above and in the previous chapter (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2442).

similarities between them to demonstrate that artists were drawing on a common vocabulary of visual culture. It is possible that a different vocabulary was available to the scribe (Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīb nicknamed Tāj) and the unnamed illuminator of the 1318 manuscript from Sivas, which may account for the distinctive and unusual blue-and-gold script and floral patterns. With no other illuminated manuscripts surviving from contemporary Sivas, we have nothing with which to compare it.

As I have mentioned above, the patron of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Waladī, was clearly a disciple of Sulṭān Walad. As far as I can ascertain, the *nisba* of ‘al-Waladī’ is rarely used outside of its appearance in a handful of manuscripts, all of which are texts by Rūmī and Sulṭān Walad.⁴⁶⁰ It appears once in Aflākī’s hagiography, with reference to one Sa’d al-Dīn-i Maṣnavī-Khvān-i Valadī.⁴⁶¹ In comparison to ‘al-Mawlawī’, a *nisba* that first appears in the aforementioned 1307 Damascus manuscript, ‘al-Waladī’ seems to have been employed less by Mawlawi disciples. Its appearance in the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, up to twenty years after the death of Sulṭān Walad himself, is the *nisba*’s last-known usage. Perhaps the patron, who is otherwise not mentioned in any other historical source that I know of, was an intimate or even another freed slave (‘*atīq*’) of Sulṭān Walad, like the scribe of the 1314 *Intihānāma* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*. These possible reasons could explain why he retained the ‘al-Waladī’ *nisba* some years later, when ‘al-Mawlawī’ seems to have been more common, and

⁴⁶⁰ See n. 420 above.

⁴⁶¹ Aflākī 1961: II, 797; 2002: 556.

why he decided to commission and endow a monumental copy of the collected *maṣnavīs* of Sulṭān Walad to Rūmī's shrine.

As the earliest surviving compilation of these collected works in a single volume, the elaborate 1332 manuscript was perhaps produced in order to fill a gap in the Mawlawi shrine's holdings. It also possibly functioned as an authoritative copy (as was the case with the 1278 *Maṣnavī* according to its *waqf* note, discussed in the previous chapter), and its production may also have been prompted by others' inaccurate renderings of the text. Given the visual references to the monumental 1278 *Maṣnavī*, both in its motifs and in its programme of illumination, it seems highly likely that this was also a presentation copy intended to be displayed in the sepulchral shrine, and handled only for purposes of ritual and instances of checking the accuracy of other manuscripts. The similar size to the earlier manuscript, which was endowed with its own lacquered book stand (see Chapter One), suggests that the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* may also have been exhibited in a similar fashion⁴⁶² and perhaps used as an aid during communal recitation led by *maṣnavī-khvāns*⁴⁶³ in the same way as Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*. The similarly large size and embellishment of the text probably served to venerate the teachings within, while also displaying the endower's devotion to the text, its author, the sepulchral shrine and, by extension, the wider Mawlawi community. The potential display of authoritative, illuminated copies of Rūmī's and Sulṭān Walad's *Maṣnavīs* together would have highlighted the spiritual lineage from father to son and, by extension,

⁴⁶² I have not identified a book stand that can be securely connected to the endowment of this later manuscript.

⁴⁶³ See pp. 113-4.

to later descendants who assumed leadership of the Mawlawis, such as ‘Ābid Chalabī (d. 1338) who was in charge of the shrine during the time that the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* was produced, quite possibly at the shrine itself.

The illumination of the 1314 *Intihānāma*, the 1318 *Maṣnavī* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, along with their lack of marginal annotations, suggests that these manuscripts were probably not teaching copies. Given their smaller sizes and modest illumination, they were perhaps produced for disciples (possibly even the scribes themselves) of more limited means who still desired ornamented versions of important Mawlawi texts. Whoever the owners were, the clear difference in the quality of the illumination between the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and these three earlier manuscripts shows that there were indeed different levels of patronage, which may have corresponded to the different audiences/readerships and functions of the manuscripts. While the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* (like the 1278 *Maṣnavī*) was an object perhaps used in communal ritual, the 1314 *Intihānāma*, the 1318 *Maṣnavī* and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* were probably perused by only a few people in private contexts.

This may also be the case with the unicum of *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya*, copied in 1311 in Konya for the Ashrafid *bey*, Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad. There is not much information about this ruler in historical sources, nor are there any other manuscripts securely attributed to his patronage.⁴⁶⁴ According to İsmail Hakkı

⁴⁶⁴ Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı suggests that a non-illuminated copy of al-Zamakhsharī’s (d. 1144) *al-Kashshāf* that was copied on 1 Rajab 712 (1 November 1312) by Ibrāhīm ibn Nazkarī could have been produced for Mubārīz al-Dīn and endowed to a mosque in Beyşehir (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya,

Uzunçarşılı, Ashrafid territory under Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad extended from Beyşehir to Akşehir and Bolvadin.⁴⁶⁵ Although, as discussed in Chapter One, they were previously allies of the Qaramanids, the Ashrafids appear to have pledged loyalty to the Ilkhanids during the reign of Mubāriz al-Dīn, as al-Aqsarāyī mentions them in his list of beyliks that came to pay their respects to the new Mongol governor of Rūm, Chūbān, in 1314 in Karanbük (Qarānbük).⁴⁶⁶ Mubāriz al-Dīn's main seat was probably Beyşehir, the site of his father's mosque and mausoleum, known today as the Eşrefoğlu Camii. The connection between Mubāriz al-Dīn and Beyşehir is substantiated by an anecdote in Aflākī's hagiography, in which the Mawlawi leader, Ulu 'Ārif Chalabī, is invited to a banquet in Beyşehir by 'the king of the commanders' (*malik al-umarā'*), 'Mubāriz al-Dīn Chalabī Muḥammad *bey*, son of Ashraf'.⁴⁶⁷ At another point in the *bey*'s reign, the Mawlawi leader also held a 'great gathering' (*jam'īyat-i 'aẓīm*) attended by 'prominent men' (*akābir*) in the city's (presumably Mawlawi) *zāwiya*.⁴⁶⁸

Although the manuscript was probably presented to the *bey* by its author (rather than being commissioned by the former), there are no other known manuscripts, illuminated or otherwise, that belonged to the same patron so it is difficult to view *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya* in the wider context of Mubāriz al-Dīn Muḥammad's patronage. However, the fact that there are no other surviving copies of this text

5806) (Gölpınarlı 1967: II, 379). A *waqf* note on folio 68a states that the manuscript was donated to a mosque in 'Sulaymānshahr', which is another name for Beyşehir (Cahen 1968: 305). Gölpınarlı also mentions that the book was in Beyşehir before entering the Mevlana Müzesi's collection (Gölpınarlı 1967: II, 379).

⁴⁶⁵ Uzunçarşılı 2016.

⁴⁶⁶ Al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 311.

⁴⁶⁷ Aflākī 1961: II, 924; 2002: 647.

⁴⁶⁸ Aflākī 1961: II, 945; 2002: 661.

suggests that it probably had very limited circulation, perhaps confined to the Ashrafid court, if indeed the author was successful in gaining the *bey's* support. The fact that he copied a text for a patron based in Tabriz a few years later suggests that, for whatever reason, he was not content to stay in Beyşehir.⁴⁶⁹

The production of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an coincides with a brief period in which Konya was temporarily under Qaramanid control. Yakhshī ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān – the brother of the Qur'an's patron – killed the governor of Konya Akhī Muṣṭafā, in 1314, only to be driven out by the Ilkhanid governor Chūbān early in 1315. Given the timing of its production, the commissioning of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an may well have been facilitated by increased access to the artistic networks of the city.

As with Mubārīz al-Dīn, not a great deal is known about the life of this manuscript's patron, Khalīl ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. 1340s). He may have been the Turkmen individual named 'Khalīl Bahādur' that the Anonymous *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭūlī* mentions as sacking Konya in the summer of 1291.⁴⁷⁰ According to Faruk Sümer, Khalīl may have killed his brother, Yakhshī, at a later date (around 1341-43) in Konya, which indicates that the beylik was hardly a unified body and was affected by internal tensions and fractures.⁴⁷¹ At some point, Khalīl also built a mosque (Sipas Camii) and a Mawlawi *zāwiya* (no longer extant) in Ermenek, and

⁴⁶⁹ See n. 450.

⁴⁷⁰ Anonymous 1952: 60, 63, 85 and 89.

⁴⁷¹ Sümer 2001.

endowed a field and mill to a Mawlawi *zāwiya* in Larende, where he was based from 1333 to 1340.⁴⁷²

There is also little known about Badr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. after 1341), who appropriated the 1228 manuscript of *al-Laṭā'if al-‘Alā’iyya*, originally produced for ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād I, by adding an illuminated dedication to it in the early fourteenth century. He seems to have been in control of Konya and Larende from some point after 1323 when the Mongol governor of Rūm, Tīmūrtāsh, entered Konya and imprisoned Khalīl and Ibrāhīm’s brother Mūsā. In 1333, however, Ibrāhīm voluntarily transferred rule to Khalīl. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited Konya and Larende around 1331, mentions that both cities were under the control of ‘Badr al-Dīn ibn Qarāmān’, and that he had captured the towns from an unnamed Mamluk *amīr* with whom Mūsā was allied.⁴⁷³

Like his brother Khalīl, Ibrāhīm appears to have had a positive relationship with the Mawlawis. Ibrāhīm is mentioned by name in Aflākī’s hagiography and was almost certainly in Konya around 1317 when it was again under Qaramanid control.⁴⁷⁴ In Aflākī’s account, a Qaramanid officer by the name of Jalāl-i Kūchak steals a white marble basin (a gift from the Garmiyānids of Kūtahya) from Rūmī’s sepulchral shrine, in order to install it in his house in Larende. Jalāl is eventually

⁴⁷² The *zāwiya* in Larende was built by one Akhī Muḥammad Bey ibn Qalamī. This individual and his *zāwiya* are mentioned in Aflākī’s hagiography (Aflākī 1961: II, 962; 2002: 673-4). See also Eser and Küçükdağ 2013, Özönder 1994: 145 and Tanrıkorur 2001.

⁴⁷³ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 430, 432 and 432, n. 73.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibrāhīm’s presence in Konya can be dated because Ulu ‘Ārif Chalabī is mentioned by Aflākī as being in Sultaniye at the same time, just after the death of the Ilkhanid ruler, Ūljaytū, on 16 December 1316 (Aflākī 1961: II, 906; 2002: 633).

punished and dismissed by Ibrāhīm, who sends apologies and gifts to the shrine as recompense.⁴⁷⁵

Although no other illuminated or non-illuminated manuscripts attributed to these patrons are known, the above discussions indicate that some Turkish *beys* were interested in owning illuminated manuscripts, the appearances of which could vary substantially. This material also suggests that these patrons were expected to be literate in Arabic. In the case of Khalīl, the interlinear translations of the two-volume 1314-15 Qur'an suggest that he prioritised Persian over Turkish, perhaps in part due to his and Ibrāhīm's relationship with the predominantly Persian-speaking Mawlawis.⁴⁷⁶ However, it remains impossible to make any general comments about what kinds of scholarly subjects such individuals may have been reading. Although ownership of a Qur'an must have been fairly common, the appropriation of the copy of *al-Laṭā'if al-ʿAlā'iyya* suggests a personal interest in the advice literature genre, and possibly also in the eminent ʿAlā' al-Dīn Kayqubādī as a historical figure for whom the work had been originally produced. Advice literature appears to have been relatively popular as a subject, broadly speaking, as was briefly discussed in Chapter One in relation to the 1286 copy of *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma*.⁴⁷⁷ It follows logically that these *beys* may have cultivated scholarly and

⁴⁷⁵ Aflākī 1961: II, 906-8; 2002: 633-35.

⁴⁷⁶ It is noteworthy that the main Qaramanid chronicle, the sixteenth-century Turkish prose work, the *Qarāmānnāma*, which was written by Aḥmad Beg Shikārī, was apparently based on a lost fourteenth-century Persian *shāhnāma* composed by Yarjānī at the command of the Qaramanids (Shikārī 2005). Furthermore, the first Anatolian Turkish translations of parts of the Qur'an, and Qur'anic commentaries, are dated to the 1350s and 1360s which was well after the production of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an. These occurred under Inanchid and Ottoman patronage (Özkan 2008).

⁴⁷⁷ The next chapter will discuss advice literature further.

literary circles in the towns in which they were based. Aflākī, for example, mentions that the Ashrafid ruler Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad had an attendant and travelling companion in his service who was a ‘poet and a well-known, accomplished person’ (*shā‘ir va fāzil-i mashhūr*) by the name of Ṭirāzī.⁴⁷⁸

As in the late thirteenth century, the continued absence of an imperial framework of patronage is evident. All of these manuscripts’ patrons appear to have been individuals of relatively minor political importance. Although some are named in historical sources, they were neither prominent political figures nor particularly prolific artistic patrons. The fact that patronage appears to have been relatively confined to the political class is noteworthy however.⁴⁷⁹ Patricia Blessing has discussed how the nature of architectural patronage in Rūm in this period shifted away from Seljuk strongmen like Ṣāḥib Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī and the *parvāna* Mu‘īn al-Dīn Sulaymān, towards Mongol governors and local figures who usually do not appear in chronicles detailing political developments.⁴⁸⁰ In the early fourteenth-century context of a weakening Ilkhanid state, imperial patronage was centred on Tabriz and Sultaniye, ‘free[ing] up resources for use by local communities’.⁴⁸¹ In the more intimate, less politically-charged setting of illuminated manuscript production, there is even more evidence of localisation in production and patronage. While all seven manuscripts share some common motifs, there is a large degree of visual diversity between them in terms of their size, calligraphy

⁴⁷⁸ Aflākī 1961: II, 951; 2002: 665.

⁴⁷⁹ The patron of the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Waladī, remains unidentified and it is possible that he was not a political figure.

⁴⁸⁰ Blessing 2014a: 165-6.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid: 167.

and modes of decoration. While a loose ‘school’ may certainly have existed, this was an entirely different thing from the structured manuscript ateliers that produced imperial Mamluk Qur’ans or the monumental works of the Ilkhanid vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī.⁴⁸² Apart from ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī’s commissioning of Ibn Bībī’s *al-Awāmir al-‘Alā’iyya fī al-Umūr al-‘Alā’iyya* in Konya in the 1280s (discussed in Chapter One), there are no other manuscripts produced in Rūm that had identifiable Mongol patrons in this period, even though the region was arguably more integrated with the Ilkhanid realm. Patronage of illuminated manuscripts by the Ilkhanids, and that of their successors, the Injuids (1304-53), Jalayirids (1335-1432) and Muzaffarids (1314-93), remained squarely in the urban centres of Iran and Iraq.⁴⁸³

The seven illuminated manuscripts that I have described in this chapter connect their patrons (and artists) to Konya and its environs and, along with evidence from other historical sources such as Aflākī’s hagiography, highlight how such individuals and their activities may have intersected within the broader cultural landscape. Although I have introduced ‘Qaramanid and Ashrafid’ and ‘Mawlawi’ manuscripts in separate subsections in this chapter for the sake of clarity and convenience, it is important to adopt a more inclusive analytical framework that focuses on individuals and acknowledges the overlap between, and fractures within, the two groups.

⁴⁸² Blair 2006a and Ben Azzouna 2013.

⁴⁸³ Wright 2012.

As I have mentioned above in several instances, all three ‘beylik’ patrons were on friendly terms with the Mawlawi disciples, hosting them or showing them deference. In the case of Khalīl ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān, he directly contributed to the expansion of the Mawlawi network by supporting two Mawlawi institutions in Larende and Ermenek. The relationship between the Mawlawis and some of the Qaramanids evidently continued throughout the fourteenth century. Not only did they restore and expand Rūmī’s shrine in the late fourteenth century, but Khalīl’s son, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn (d. 1397-8), built the Aktekke Mosque (also known as Mader-i Mevlana Camii) in Larende in 1367-8, which houses some of Rūmī’s family and members of the Qaramanids.⁴⁸⁴

The positive relationship between the Mawlawis and individual Qaramanid and Ashrafid *beys*, however, should not lead us to assume cordiality between the Sufi community and *all* members of these Turkmen principalities. Aflākī relates that during the aforementioned banquet in Beyşehir that was hosted by Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad, the guest Ulu ‘Ārif Chalabī declared the *bey*’s heir, Sulaymān (d. 1326), to be ‘headstrong’ (*khīra-sar*) and ‘unworthy of any kind of leadership and sovereignty’ (*hīch naw‘-i sarī va sarvarī-rā lā’iq nīst*), much to the dismay of the host.⁴⁸⁵ Additionally, during the 1314-15 Qaramanid occupation of Konya, Ulu ‘Ārif Chalabī declared to the occupiers that he favoured the Mongols as he believed that the Chingizids (*Chingīz-Khāniyān*) were God’s chosen successors of the Seljuks.⁴⁸⁶ Moreover, the claims that the patron of the Qaramanid Qur’an, Khalīl, was

⁴⁸⁴ Konyalı 1967: 253, Blessing 2014a: 66.

⁴⁸⁵ Aflākī 1961: II, 924; 2002: 647.

⁴⁸⁶ Aflākī 1961: II, 926; 2002: 647-8.

responsible for the murder of his brother Yakhshī⁴⁸⁷ attests to a level of rivalry that was not uncommon between local princes, governors and other power-brokers in Rūm. Such rivalries not only contributed to the fragmentary nature of the contemporary political scene but also resulted in conflicting networks of loyalty and patronage, and by extension, differences in cultural outlook.

A consideration of how individuals within the Qaramanid and Ashrafid beyliks interacted with the Mawlawis and were even Mawlawi devotees themselves, highlights a problem that Claude Cahen has pointed out, namely that of viewing the beyliks as “small interchangeable dynasties” in historiographical terms.⁴⁸⁸ Osman Turan’s conception of the beyliks as “half-shamanistic” and ruled by Turkish “frontier princes” who were resistant to Mongol rule and “unaffected by Persian culture” has served to crystallise how a generic beylik should be viewed and defined.⁴⁸⁹ As Jürgen Paul notes in his analysis of *Bazm u Razm*, the ethnic (i.e. Turkish) background of the beyliks remains an important question in some Turkish scholarship of the period,⁴⁹⁰ and the use of the Turkish word ‘beylik’ is itself suggestive of their role in the Turkification of Rūm, despite their rule over ethnically-diverse populations, their marriage with non-Turkish women and their engagement with non-Turkish intellectual cultures.⁴⁹¹ An example of the connection fostered in Turkish scholarship between the beyliks and Turkification

⁴⁸⁷ Sümer 2001.

⁴⁸⁸ Cahen 1968: 361.

⁴⁸⁹ Turan 1977: 251-3.

⁴⁹⁰ Paul 2011: 109.

⁴⁹¹ Although alternatives such as ‘principality’ and ‘emirate’ are also employed, ‘beylik’ remains probably the most frequently-used term in English and Turkish-language scholarship to describe local Turkmen governing structures of late medieval Rūm.

is Muḥammad ibn Qarāmān's (d. 1278) Turkish language edict of 1277, which, in parts of modern Turkey, has been imbued with nationalist sentiment and transformed into a symbol of Turkish resistance against foreign interlopers.⁴⁹²

The analyses above concerning Persian and Arabic manuscripts (one of which, namely the Qaramanid Qur'an, contains Persian interlinear translations), and the relationship between certain *beys* and the Persian-speaking Mawlawis, indicate that there is more to beylik cultural history than their contribution to the Turkification of Rūm. Ethno-nationalist notions of the beyliks have also obscured the ways in which the principalities interacted with the Mongols, for example. Indeed, the Mongols were, in some cases, accepted suzerains or military allies, or even, as Baki Tezcan has argued, political role models.⁴⁹³ The relative lack of nuance in scholarship on the beyliks has led Jürgen Paul to question what the practical differences really are between 'principalities', 'chiefdoms', 'regional states', or 'tribal confederations' in the context of fourteenth-century Rūm. He states that such organisations, which included local Mongol groups like the Samāghār and the Bārambāy as well as the Turkmen beyliks, were all noble families that controlled a sizeable, ethnically-diverse territory, operated through a network of alliances and/or vassality, and were able to maintain a stable rule for a period before generally succumbing to "internal fission", unable to make the transition to a "conquest state" like the Ottoman empire.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹² Yıldız 2012a.

⁴⁹³ Paul 2011 and Tezcan 2013.

⁴⁹⁴ Paul 2011: 120.

In exploring some of the lesser-known political figures of fourteenth-century eastern Rūm, Paul remarks that a figure named Junayd “represented a ‘house’ just as the other beylik emirs did. We do not have a beylik called the Ömeroğulları, but we well might”.⁴⁹⁵ This touches upon the predominant systems of naming and identifying beyliks, which generally consist of ‘-id’ or ‘-oğulları’ suffixes (e.g. Qaramanid in English or Karamanoğulları in Turkish).⁴⁹⁶ Such nomenclature reinforces the beyliks’ status as ‘proper’, unified, multigenerational polities with a certain cultural policy who possessed a relatively stable territory anchored around a major town. The drawback of this terminology is that it potentially diminishes the roles and affiliations of individual family members, and the contributions of lesser-known regional and local figures who did not belong to named beyliks.

Historiography based on nationalist and dynastic frameworks has in some cases oversimplified the significant differences that could exist between beyliks and between different members of the same beylik. This is done by relegating individuals outside of the ruling roles to the background, and reifying the constantly shifting borders of beylik territories. Such territories were evidently not confined to the so-called ‘frontier’ of Turkish-speaking nomads but could include urban centres like Konya. Surveys or monographs of the beyliks are often polity-centred and rarely discuss the activities and affiliations of individuals in detail.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁵ Paul 2011: 145.

⁴⁹⁶ In English-language scholarship (as is the case in the present study), the suffix ‘-id’ is often used and carries roughly the same meaning, being derived from the Latin suffix ‘-ides’ meaning ‘descent from’. In Turkish and some English-language scholarship, the beylik name is formed by the ‘founding father’s name’ followed by the suffix ‘-oğulları’, meaning ‘the sons of’ in Turkish: for example, the Sahibataoğulları (the sons of Şahīb ‘Aṭā Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī).

⁴⁹⁷ See, for example, Uzunçarşılı 1937.

Yet, this was a time when political authority was fragmented not only between different ruling bodies, but also between individuals within these bodies.⁴⁹⁸

Some of these shortcomings in scholarship can be blamed on relatively scarce source material that makes it very difficult to construct more nuanced understandings of the various beyliks. However, an adherence to dynastic and ethno-nationalist frameworks, such as those formulated by Osman Turan, has also hindered better understandings of these contexts, and privileged the rise of the Ottoman beylik in particular. The later, unified dynastic identity of the Ottoman empire has also perhaps inaccurately shaped perceptions of their forefathers and predecessors in Rûm.

One general comment that can be made about the beyliks is that they partially filled the imperial power gap left by the Seljuks, due to their demise, and the Ilkhanids, due to their own internal weaknesses and the ineffectiveness of their rule in the region. However, it is difficult, and possibly unproductive, to attempt to define the quintessential 'beylik' beyond that. In the widest possible sense, the beyliks were nebulous collectives that differed in size, geographical territory, political and cultural affiliations, and internal dynamics. The beyliks were also nebulous because they were clearly not coherent, unified ruling structures in some cases, with brothers, cousins and vicegerents competing for power, land and resources. In the context of such rivalries, some individuals evidently sought the

⁴⁹⁸ For a further example of such internal strife, see Togan 2005.

support of certain networks such as that of the Mawlawi disciples, which in turn helped to shape their cultural activities and artistic patronage.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed six illuminated manuscripts produced in early fourteenth-century Rūm (one of which was previously unknown to scholarship), and one from 1228 with early fourteenth-century illumination. While three of these manuscripts are connected to Turkmen *beys*, four are closely linked to the Mawlawis. The detailed physical descriptions of these manuscripts underline visual similarities and differences between them, and highlight relationships with Mamluk and Ilkhanid illumination, as well as connections to manuscripts produced in late thirteenth-century Konya. Through this outline of material characteristics, as well as an examination of the manuscripts' inscriptions, and other historical sources, I have also explored their production and patronage contexts in depth, including the locations of production, artists, patrons and possible readers.

Three of the four Mawlawi manuscripts (the 1314 *Intihānāma*, the 1323 *Maṣnavī*, and the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*) clearly show a degree of continuity from the period covered in Chapter One, in terms of decoration, production locations and the identity of artists and patrons. I have therefore suggested that it is possible to speak of a 'school' of illumination in Konya that was formed from a loose network of Mawlawi artists and patrons that, as discussed in the previous chapter, were present at all levels of society. The unusual appearance of the 1318 *Maṣnavī* from

Sivas, which was perhaps produced outside of the boundaries of this 'school', supports this suggestion, yet also demonstrates that Mawlawi illuminated manuscript production was not confined to the former Seljuk capital.

The visual properties and inscriptions of the three so-called 'beylik' manuscripts, and their broader cultural contexts, show that the 'beylik' label is in fact not particularly helpful in this instance, in comparison to, for example, 'Ilkhanid' manuscripts, so designated because they were produced for Ilkhanid rulers or viziers in imperial ateliers. Instead, it is perhaps more compelling to view illuminated manuscripts produced for Ashrafid and Qaramanid patrons against the background of Konya's diverse cultural and intellectual scene that was host to a range of artists, itinerant scholars, Sufis and Turkmen *beys*. More broadly speaking, such a perspective also calls the study of the beyliks into question, by challenging their 'Turkish' and 'frontier' identity and putting more emphasis on the specific circumstances of individuals and their relationships with each other. This is an important theme that will be expanded upon in the next two chapters.

As in Chapter One, this discussion has also demonstrated that illuminated manuscripts are important sources for both cultural history and art history. Even though gaps remain, such material gives unique, and previously unknown, insights into the practicalities of manuscript production and the types of people involved. It also helps to reconstruct the more intimate aspects of artistic production and consumption, which can be easily overlooked due to the prevailing academic focus on architecture (particularly public architecture) and its political facets in this

period. As in the previous chapter, these manuscripts also show that the dynastic and ethno-national scholarly frameworks of the cultural historiography of Rūm, which privilege the tripartite 'Seljuk-Beylik-Ottoman' narrative and the apparent division between cosmopolitan Persian-speaking urbanites and nomadic Turkish-speaking frontier lords, are no longer tenable when discussing material culture. As I hope I have established, the reality was far more complex.

CHAPTER THREE

Illuminated manuscript production in western Rūm, 1349-1351

Introduction

Whereas the two previous chapters have concentrated on Konya and Sivas as locations of manuscript production and patronage, this chapter shifts focus from central and eastern Rūm to the western regions. The core material for this chapter consists of two medium-sized illuminated manuscripts which were produced for two *beys* in İstanos (now known as Korkuteli) near Antalya. The manuscripts are both copies of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād min al-Mabdā’ ilā al-Ma‘ād* (hereafter ‘*Mirṣād al-‘Ibād*’) by Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya (d. 1256).⁴⁹⁹ This Persian work was composed by Najm al-Dīn, a Kubrawi devotee originally from Rayy,⁵⁰⁰ in Sivas in 1223-4. The work, which is an advice manual or *naṣīhatnāma* (mirror for princes), provides guidance for commoners and elites on how to follow principles of *taṣawwuf*.

The previous chapters have discussed the role of Mawlawis and certain Turkmen *beys* in the production and patronage of illuminated manuscripts in the late medieval period. Such analyses, which have enabled broader examinations of the contemporary cultural context, have described the relationships that existed between scholarly, religious, artistic and political communities. By contextualising

⁴⁹⁹ Rāzī 1352 and 1982.

⁵⁰⁰ A Sufi order founded in the thirteenth century in Khwarazm by Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1221).

the two manuscripts of *Mirṣād al-ʿIbād* and the text itself, this chapter expands upon some of those discussions and explores the cultural and scholarly activities of *bey*s further west and, by extension, the nature of the so-called ‘frontier’, and the cosmopolitan character of Antalya and its surrounds.

After the fall of the Ilkhanids in 1335 following the death of Abū Saʿīd (r. 1316-35) without an heir, the resulting infighting left their territories, which included central and eastern Rūm, without an imperial authority. The power vacuum in the region was quickly filled by the Ilkhanid commander Aratnā (r. 1327-52) who had held *de facto* power in parts of Rūm even before the Ilkhanid empire had fully crumbled.⁵⁰¹ In the west of Rūm, the Turkmen principalities who had by and large consolidated their rule in the earlier parts of the century, maintained control of their lands. On the western Mediterranean coast of Rūm, these principalities included the Hamidids (ca 1290s-1391), the Teke beylik (1321-1423), the ‘Alāʿīyya beylik (1293-1471), the Qaramanids (ca 1250-1487), the Mantashids (1261-1424), the Inanchids (1262-1391) and the Aydinids (1308-1425).

It is difficult to gain a sense of the western region’s broader political and cultural landscape for the same historiographical reasons discussed in the last chapter. Additionally, much of the scholarship that discusses this context is either oriented around the development of the Ottoman beylik,⁵⁰² or focuses on individual

⁵⁰¹ Aratnā and his dynasty will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

⁵⁰² Lindner 2009: 108. Though Lindner acknowledges that his chapter in *The Cambridge History of Turkey* focuses largely on the rise of the Ottomans, he does attempt to provide an overview of the most prominent beyliks and their place in the history of Rūm. Although the chapter could benefit from more discussion of beylik historiography, it is the most useful English-language overview of

principalities rather than taking a broader view. The relative lack of primary source material that deals with the beyliks in depth has also led to difficulties in chronology and in identifying individual members.⁵⁰³ The significant differences between the beyliks and the presence of internal fissions also make it challenging to provide any easy summary of the context. As of yet, there has also been no detailed study that discusses the political histories of the beyliks in a synthesised manner, which is perhaps understandable given the scale of such an undertaking.

This chapter, which is limited to discussing one of many beyliks, will begin with a detailed description and analysis of the physical characteristics and inscriptions of the two manuscripts. After discussing the scribe and the identity of the patrons in more depth, I will then contextualise the cultural activities of the two *beys* within a historiographical analysis of the ‘frontier’ and ‘centre’ dynamic. Following this, I relate these historiographical concerns to the production of advice literature in Rūm during the late medieval period and discuss the patronage of Persian literature by Turkmen *beys* more generally. Finally, I consider the specific context of Antalya and its surrounds, detailing both its contemporary economic prosperity and the possible impact of the bubonic plague outbreak in the late 1340s.

fourteenth-century beylik history to date. In that respect, it is a helpful complement to Charles Melville’s account of Mongol rule in Rūm in the same volume (Melville 2009). In Turkish, Uzunçarşılı 1937 remains the most comprehensive account of beylik history. For selected studies on individual beyliks, see n. 121.

⁵⁰³ The main exceptions being the *Qarāmānāma* which deals with the Qaramanids (Shikārī 1946) and the *Dustūr-nāma* which is about the Aydinids (Anvarī 1929). There are two further sources that discuss several of the beyliks (Ibn Baṭṭūta 1962 and al-‘Umarī 1929). Ibn Baṭṭūta is rather anecdotal and inconsistent in his level of detail, while al-‘Umarī gives short descriptions of several beyliks, including the sizes of their territories and armies.

The manuscripts of İstanos

The two copies of *Mirşād al-‘Ibād* possess striking physical similarities to each other. They were copied by the same scribe, one Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Muqarrab,⁵⁰⁴ around two years apart. The earlier manuscript was completed at the end of Muḥarram 750 (10-19 April 1349) for ‘Īsā, son of Zakariyyā’ who is described as deceased (*marḥūm*) (figs 198-200).⁵⁰⁵ The later manuscript was produced just over two years later, on 23 Jumādā al-Ūlā 752 (18 July 1351) for Ghiyāth al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, son of Yūnus (figs 201-203).⁵⁰⁶ As I shall discuss in more detail below, both of these individuals were *amīrs* of the Hamidid/Teke beylik, which was based on the south-western coast of Rūm over the course of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.

The colophon of the 1351 manuscript notes that it was produced in İstanos, which is a small town about 60km north-west of the city of Antalya. Since the manuscripts were produced by the same scribe for members of the same dynasty, it is highly likely that the earlier manuscript, which does not mention a production location, was also completed in İstanos. As I discuss in more detail below, the

⁵⁰⁴ ‘Muqarrab’ has several similar meanings: ‘the favourite’, ‘close companion’, ‘intimate’ or ‘courtier’ but, as the definite article is omitted in both manuscripts, ‘Muqarrab’ may well just be a name.

⁵⁰⁵ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 2841, fol. 1a and 176a. Algaç 2000: 96-7, Algaç 2006, Demircan Aksoy 2010: 362-8.

⁵⁰⁶ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2067, fol. 1a and 200b. Algaç 2000: 98-9, Algaç 2006, Demircan Aksoy 2010: 369-75. Although both ‘Jumādā al-Awwal’ and ‘Jumādā al-Ūlā’ are used in the thesis’ key manuscripts, I will translate all instances as ‘al-Ūlā’ for the sake of consistency. All original forms are included in Appendix Two.

manuscripts are also physically very similar and were probably illuminated by the same artist.

The manuscripts are virtually the same size, with the 1349 copy measuring 255mm (height) x 175mm (width) x 42mm (depth) and the 1351 copy measuring 250mm (height) x 170mm (width) x 45mm (depth). The earlier manuscript does not appear to have been cropped, unlike the later manuscript which shows evidence of cropping on the outer sides. The 1349 copy contains 173 folios with a textblock measuring 197mm x 114mm. The 1351 copy consists of 200 folios and has a slightly smaller textblock that measures 170mm x 102mm. The page format of both manuscripts is similar, with the calligraphy arranged into one column that is bordered by two, thin red lines. The earlier manuscript has 19 lines per folio as opposed to the later manuscript's 21 lines per folio. The only significant difference in the manuscripts' *mise-en-page* is that the colophon of the earlier manuscript is more decorative, being written in gold and arranged into an upturned triangle (see figs 200 and 203).

The light cream paper of the 1349 manuscript is of a relatively standard thickness, with ten sheets measuring about 2mm. The paper contains groups of two horizontal chain lines measuring 45mm between groups and 10mm between lines, with twenty vertical laid lines measuring 36mm across. Page markers have been sewn onto the margins of thirty of the manuscript's folios. These were perhaps added later. This is the only manuscript in the thesis' core group that possesses thread page markers.

The 1351 manuscript contains two types of paper. The first type, which comprises the first three quarters of the manuscript, is a yellow-cream colour that is darker than the earlier manuscript but about the same thickness. The chain and laid line measurements are also similar, with groups of two horizontal chain lines measuring 35mm between groups and 10mm between lines, and twenty vertical laid lines measuring 35mm. The second type of paper in the 1351 manuscript is a pale cream colour and noticeably shinier than the two papers previously discussed. Brushstrokes, presumably from the application of size, are visible on the paper's surface. This second paper features horizontal laid lines only, twenty of which measure 50mm across. The most interesting feature of this paper is a watermark that occurs throughout the last quarter of the manuscript.⁵⁰⁷ The watermark, which consists of two conjoined, equally-sized circles bisected by a long vertical line, originated in fourteenth-century Italy according to Charles-Moïse Briquet (fig. 204).⁵⁰⁸ Similar watermarks are mainly found in fourteenth-century manuscripts produced in several places in Italy but also appear in books from France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, England, Germany, Poland and Russia.⁵⁰⁹ This could suggest that this specific paper was a widely traded commodity, rather than being made in a local workshop.

Neither manuscript retains its original binding and both are gathered into alternating ternions and quinions. The 1349 copy has been rebound in a circa fifteenth-century reddish-brown Ottoman leather binding but it appears that part

⁵⁰⁷ Neither Algaç (2006) nor Demircan Aksoy (2010) have commented on this watermark.

⁵⁰⁸ Briquet 1907: I, 214.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid: I, 214-15.

of its original brown, stamped leather doublure has survived. Within the doublure's decoration is a stamp that, unusually, features a repeated inscription. It appears to read, "enduring glory within the skies/heavens" (*al-'izz al-dā'im fī al-aflāk*) (fig. 205).⁵¹⁰ The 1351 copy was rebound in a much later period, and both the outer and inner boards are covered in marbled paper. There are two seal impressions on folio 1a of the 1349 manuscript (see fig. 198). They belong to the Ottoman sultan Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54,) and Darwīsh Muṣṭafā, the *waqf* inspector of Mecca and Medina (*al-mufattish bi-awqāf al-ḥaramayn al-sharīfayn*). The 1351 manuscript also contains the seal of Maḥmūd I (on folio ib) but it is instead accompanied by the seal impression of Aḥmad Shaykhzāda, who was another *waqf* inspector of Mecca and Medina. The later manuscript also contains the seal impression of Bāyazīd II (r. 1481-1512) on folios 1a and 203a (see fig. 201).

There are no other later ownership marks in the two manuscripts, apart from a short inscription below the colophon of the 1351 copy (see fig. 203).⁵¹¹ The inscription consists of the birth dates of three individuals from the same family but does not mention a location. The inscription was possibly written some time in the early fifteenth century since the last recorded date is 1404. The first line concerns one Vārṣākh(?) Bey al-Mawlawī al-Burhānī who was born in 1360-1.⁵¹² 'Al-

⁵¹⁰ I am very grateful to Günseli Gürel for obtaining photographs of this manuscript's doublure.

⁵¹¹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2067, fol. 200b. Neither Algaç (2006) nor Demircan Aksoy (2010) have commented on this inscription. It is fully translated in Appendix Two.

⁵¹² It is possible that this part of the inscription can be read as 'Vārṣākh' which is also spelled in a number of different ways, e.g. Warsakh, Wārṣāq, Fārsākh, etc. It is generally rendered as 'Varsak' in modern Turkish scholarship. Although I have not been able to identify this particular individual (or his sons), the name could refer to a Turkmen Oghuz tribe that first settled in the Taurus region of Anatolia in the thirteenth century (Pavet de Courteille 1859: 161). According to the Ottoman scholar Khwāja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi (d. 1599), the Varsak tribe was allied with the Qaramanids against the Ottomans from the reign of Murād I (r. 1362-89) (Khwāja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi 1974: I,

Burhānī' appears to be a relatively unusual *nisba* in medieval Rūm.⁵¹³ While *burhān* means 'proof' or 'testimony', it is unclear what *burhānī* means precisely in this context. It could refer to a personal affiliation, perhaps that of Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Aḥmad, the de facto ruler of Sivas and Kayseri from 1381 to 1398. The second and third lines mention the birth of two sons, Muḥammad and Aḥmad, in 1402-3 and 1404 respectively.

The main script of both manuscripts, copied by the same scribe, is a neat but unremarkable *naskh*, written in black ink (see figs 199 and 202). The calligraphy features many of the characteristics seen in the manuscripts that were discussed in earlier chapters. These characteristics include short serifless *alifs*, terminal *nūns*, *lāms* and *qāfs* with deep round bowls and *kāfs* with long wide heads. Additionally, the contents pages of both manuscripts are headed by titles written in large, elongated gold, black and red *thuluth* (figs 206-207).

The illumination of both manuscripts is visually very similar and is rather modest compared to examples discussed in other chapters. Both manuscripts open with a full-page illuminated dedicatory frontispiece, followed by a slim headpiece (figs

163). Indeed, Uzunçarşılı notes that the Varsak tribe continued to aid the Qaramanids throughout the fifteenth century in their conflicts with the Ottomans (Uzunçarşılı 1937: 23). Faruk Sümer states that a *daftar* (Ottoman tax register) written during the reign of Bāyazīd II (r. 1481-1512) mentions that the Varsak tribe originally came from Karaman and that one branch had settled in Antalya at some point (Sümer 1964: 83). Although most of the primary and secondary literature presents the Varsak tribe as Turkmen, the fifteenth-century chronicle of Oruç notes that 'Varsak' was the son of a Mongol though was named after an Oghuz tribe (Tezcan 2013: 33).

⁵¹³ The *nisba* only appears in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2 and 3 and the *İslam Ansiklopedisi* in reference to figures born after the medieval period or the fifteenth-century Burhāniyya Sufi order based in Sudan. Although there is a place in Turkey called Burhaniye, this town was formerly named Taylieli and Kemer and was only given the name Burhaniye after the Ottoman prince Muḥammad Burhān al-Dīn (1885-1949) renamed the town after himself.

198-199 and 201-202). The frontispieces and headpieces are of slightly different sizes which indicates that the later example was not traced or replicated from the earlier manuscript. The head and tailpieces of the dedications contain the manuscript's title, written in gold *thuluth*, on a background of white scrollwork on a dark blue ground. The presence of scrollwork in illuminated head and tailpieces is seen in late twelfth and early thirteenth-century manuscripts from the Islamic east (see fig. 41, for example). The central panel contains the dedicatory inscriptions which are written in gold *thuluth* on a red cross-hatched ground. This cross-hatching, and inscriptions on scrollwork are both seen in the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an discussed in the previous chapter (see figs 106 and 108). As I mentioned, this cross-hatching is also seen in illuminated manuscripts produced in Mamluk and Ilkhanid ateliers (see figs 132 and 133). Both frontispiece frames feature small finials. Additionally, the 1349 manuscript features a few more pages that contain some illumination. The colophon (mentioned briefly above) is written in gold on a ground of red cross-hatching, and gold titles and rosettes occur throughout the manuscript (figs 199-200). None of these elements appear in the 1351 manuscript.

Frontier patrons, paper and plague

In order to examine the production and content of the two manuscripts in the context of the milieu of western, coastal Rūm, I will first discuss the scribe and patrons and then consider the significance of the 'frontier' in both historiography and source material, and what relevance it has for understanding the production

(and consumption) of these manuscripts. By looking in more depth at the phenomenon of advice literature in Rūm, and the material nature of the manuscripts (particularly the paper), I suggest that the copies of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* challenge simplistic conceptions of the ‘frontier’ as a nomadic ‘no-man’s land’ that was distinct from a sophisticated, urban heartland.

Unfortunately, the scribe’s name – Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Muqarrab – does not give any clues as to his geographical origins or religious affiliations. Currently, no other manuscripts copied by him are known. The illuminator is unnamed but it appears that he probably had access to wider regional or transregional styles. Although the amount of illumination is modest, what is present is hardly idiosyncratic and displays similarities with elements of the decoration of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur’an, such the presence of red cross-hatched ground.

As I have mentioned above, the patron of the 1349 copy of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* was ‘Īsā, son of Zakariyyā’, and the patron of the 1351 copy was Ghiyāth al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, son of Yūnus. As far as I can tell, ‘Īsā and ‘Abd al-Raḥīm are not mentioned in any historical chronicles and were probably not rulers at any point. Both, however, are called ‘great commanders’ (*al-amīr al-kabīr*) in their dedicatory frontispieces. ‘Īsā is also termed ‘possessor of the sword and the pen’ (*ṣāhib al-sayf wa al-qalam*) which suggests that he may have been a scholar or bureaucrat of some kind, in addition to undertaking a military role. As well as being an *amīr*, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm held the title ‘*zayn al-ḥājj wa al-ḥaramayn*’, which was perhaps a

logistical post concerning the organisation and safeguarding of the annual pilgrimage to Mecca on behalf of the beylik's inhabitants.⁵¹⁴

'Abd al-Raḥīm's father, Yūnus (d. before 1324), was the brother of the Hamidid ruler Falak al-Dīn Dūndār Bey (d. 1324). The Hamidids were one of the many small principalities that emerged in the wake of the Seljuks' 1243 defeat at the hands of the Mongols at the Battle of Köseadağ, but their early history remains obscure due to a lack of contemporary sources.⁵¹⁵ At some point in the first decade of the fourteenth century (perhaps after 1308),⁵¹⁶ Falak al-Dīn Dūndār captured Antalya and handed control of the city over to Yūnus.⁵¹⁷ At the time that al-'Umarī was writing in the 1340s, he noted that '*mamlakat Anṭāliyā*' (the kingdom of Antalya) occupied twelve towns and twenty-five fortresses and possessed 8,000 cavalymen.⁵¹⁸ While the descendants of Falak al-Dīn remained in Eğirdir, Uluborlu and Gölhisar, the descendants of Yūnus were based in Antalya, İstanos and 'Karahisar' (fig. 208). This 'Karahisar' most likely refers to 'Ḳarā Ḥiṣār-i Takah', a place near Antalya.⁵¹⁹

⁵¹⁴ Oleg Grabar has stated that the '*zayn*' or '*ra'īs al-ḥajj wa al-ḥaramayn*' signified the "leader of the pilgrimage to Mecca" (Grabar 2006: 210). The title appears in a 616/1219 manuscript copied for an *isfahsalār* (military commander or officer) (ibid). Another individual from late medieval Rūm held this title. This was an Aydinid courtier by the name of Khwāja 'Alī ibn Ṣāliḥ who is titled '*zayn al-ḥajj wa al-ḥaramayn*' on the foundational stone of a bath house that he founded in Ayasuluk (today known as Selçuk). See Yıldız 2016: 200-1. In this politically decentralised context, it is possible that each beylik appointed their own leader to protect the local population during pilgrimage.

⁵¹⁵ Key works on the Hamidids and Teke beylik in the fourteenth century include Flemming 1964, de Planhol 2016, Leiser 2016, Kofoglu 1997, 2006 and 2011. See also Uzunçarşılı 1937: 62-9.

⁵¹⁶ Leiser 2016.

⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

⁵¹⁸ Al-'Umarī 1929: 48.

⁵¹⁹ Aḥmad Vafiq Pāshā 1293: II, 912. Ḳarā Ḥiṣār-i Takah may be associated with the ancient sites of Perge or Sillyon/Sylleion, both north-east of Antalya. See Mordtmann and de Planhol 2017. Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī describes this Karahisar as one day's travel from Antakya (*Qarāḥiṣār 'alā yawm min Anṭākiya*), by which he presumably means Antalya (1869: 44-5).

According to al-‘Umarī, after the death of Yūnus, a certain Zakariyyā’ fought with Yūnus’ heir (who is not named by al-‘Umarī) and seized Karahisar, becoming the ruler of ‘*mamlakat Qarāṣār*’ (the kingdom of Karahisar).⁵²⁰ This Zakariyyā’ was a former slave (*mamlūk*) of Yūnus. He is almost certainly the father of ‘Īsā, the patron of the 1349 copy of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād*. It is unclear precisely when Zakariyyā’ seized Karahisar, but it must have been before 1349 as he is mentioned as deceased in the manuscript’s frontispiece. Al-‘Umarī notes that the territory was rather poor (*dīqa*), encompassing three towns and twelve fortresses, and possessing only 1,500 cavalymen.⁵²¹ There is another Zakariyyā’ in the Hamidid family. He was the son of Ishāq ibn Falak al-Dīn Dūndār *Bey*. According to a tombstone from a *khānqāh* built by Ishāq in the Yazla neighbourhood of Eğirdir in 736 (1335-6), this Zakariyyā’ died in 755 (1354-5).⁵²² However, since the Zakariyyā’ mentioned as the patron’s father in the frontispiece was deceased by 1349, it cannot be him.

Both patrons are clearly connected to the Hamidid beylik which appears to have controlled an area on the south-western Mediterranean coast that aside from Antalya and İstanos, included Eğirdir, Isparta, Gölhisar, Uluborlu and Karahisar. There is some inconsistency in the historical chronicles (and therefore in secondary literature) as to the specific name of the governing authority of Antalya and its surrounds. In some cases, the rulers of Antalya are referred to as the ‘*beys of Teke*’ or the ‘*Teke beylik*’, whereas in others, all of the rulers in the region are

⁵²⁰ Al-‘Umarī 1929: 48.

⁵²¹ *Ibid.*

⁵²² Coşan 1981: 109.

referred to as ‘Hamidid’, with the Antalya branch marked as subsidiary.⁵²³ Gary Leiser notes that late fourteenth-century Lusignan chronicles, for example, refer to the *bey* of Antalya as the ‘*amīr* of Taka/Takka’.⁵²⁴ Al-‘Umarī refers to ‘*mamlakat Anṭāliya*’ and ‘*mamlakat Qarā[hi]ṣār*’ as parts of the ‘*mamlakat ‘Amīdlī* [sic: *Ḥāmīdlī*]’ (the kingdom of the Hamidids).⁵²⁵ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, however, does not mention the connection between the ruler of Antalya, and the rulers of Eğirdir and Gölhisar.⁵²⁶ A Mongol fiscal account from the early or mid-fourteenth century lists both ‘*Awlād-i Ḥamīd*’ (the sons of Ḥamīd) and ‘*Agrīdir*’ (Eğirdir) separately.⁵²⁷ In this case, perhaps ‘*Awlād-i Ḥamīd*’ refers to the Antalya side of the family. For the sake of clarity, I will refer to the two branches as the ‘Eğirdir Hamidids’ and the ‘Antalya Hamidids’ where necessary.

Since the familial connection between the Eğirdir and Antalya branches is acknowledged in some of the primary and secondary literature, it may be that in practical terms, the nominal labels were relatively flexible. It is also possible that the uncertainty about names was due to conflicts between and within the dynasties. As I mentioned above, Zakariyyā’ fought with the heir of Yūnus for control of Karahisar after Yūnus’ death. It is difficult to know who this heir was due to lack of evidence. Another of Yūnus’ heirs, Maḥmūd, was allied with Tīmūrtāsh ibn Chūbān (d. 1328), despite the latter having killed his uncle, Falak al-Dīn

⁵²³ For example, Uzunçarşılı (1937) discusses the two branches in two separate chapters (‘Hamidoğulları’ and ‘Hamidoğulları - Antalya subeşi’) while Lindner also acknowledges the split but calls the Antalya branch the ‘beylik of Teke’ (Lindner 2009).

⁵²⁴ Leiser 2016.

⁵²⁵ Al-‘Umarī 1929: 39, 48.

⁵²⁶ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 421-4.

⁵²⁷ Togan 1991: 233.

Dündār Bey, in 1324 and having attacked Uluborlu in 1327.⁵²⁸ This is comparable to the internal strife of the Qaramanids that was discussed in the previous chapter and serves to emphasise that the beyliks were not unified governing bodies and were subject to internecine conflict. Following the execution of most of Tīmūrtāsh’s family at the hands of Abū Sa‘īd in 1327, both he and Maḥmūd ibn Yūnus fled to the Mamluk court in Egypt, where they were promptly imprisoned. After Maḥmūd’s detainment, his brother, Sinān al-Dīn Khiḍr (d. after 1331), also known as Jālis (comrade or companion),⁵²⁹ took over as ruler of Antalya where he met Ibn Baṭṭūṭa around the year 1331.⁵³⁰ It is unclear who was in charge of Antalya (or İstanos) at the time of the manuscripts’ production in 1349-51.⁵³¹

It is noteworthy that in the Mongol fiscal account mentioned above, both branches of the Hamidids are grouped with other Turkmen principalities under the region of ‘*al-Ūjāt*’ (the frontier). This source, which is ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Kiyā al-Māzandarānī’s *Risāla-yi Falakiyya*, includes records of tax revenues from 1349-50 (or perhaps earlier).⁵³² The account makes clear distinctions between ‘*wilāyat-i Arman*’ (the state of Greater Armenia), ‘*wilāyat-i Diyār Bakr-i ‘Arabī*’ (the state of the Jazira) and ‘*mamālik-i Rūm al-maḥrūsa*’ (the protected kingdom of Rūm).⁵³³

⁵²⁸ Melville 2009: 91.

⁵²⁹ Uzunçarşılı 1937: 67, Combe et al. 1931-91: XIV, no. 5420. These definitions of ‘Jālis’ are found in Steingass 1884: 214 and 1892: 350.

⁵³⁰ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 421.

⁵³¹ Some secondary sources state that Khiḍr was in charge of İstanos as well (Emecen 1991, Leiser 2016). It is unclear on what basis this claim has been made but it appears that it is because he built a madrasa in the town in 1319 (Kofoglu 1995). It is possible that he lived in İstanos until Maḥmūd ibn Yūnus was imprisoned, after which time he ruled both İstanos and Antalya.

⁵³² Al-Māzandarānī 1952, Togan 1991, Remler 1985. Although the record is dated 750 (1349-50), it may refer to an earlier period of Ilkhanid rule when the dynasty was in a politically and economically stronger position (Tezcan 2013: 36, n. 28).

⁵³³ Togan 1991: 232-3.

Within the latter are two regions: *'al-Waṣṭānīyya'* (the centre) and *'al-Ūjāt'*.⁵³⁴ Aside from *'Awlād-i Ḥamīd'* and *'Agrīdir'*, polities of the *ūjāt* that paid taxes to the Mongols included the Qaramanids (*'Qarāmān'*), the Aydinids (*'Umūr Bīk'*), the Garmiyānids (*'Garmiyān'*), the Isfandiyarids (*'Qaṣṭamūniya'* and *'Sīnūb'*) and the Ottomans (*'Ūrkhān'*).⁵³⁵ This is perhaps surprising seeing as some of the towns in this conception of *'al-Ūjāt'* included former Seljuk territories like Antalya, Sinop and Konya which otherwise would not be considered part of the 'frontier'. While a fuller analysis of how the *'ūj'* was understood in the late medieval period is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is important to briefly consider how the 'frontier' and the *'ūj'* have been treated in secondary scholarship in order to provide a fuller context for the production of the manuscripts being presently discussed.

The notion of the 'frontier' or *'ūj'* in secondary scholarship has been strongly shaped by Paul Wittek's conception of the romantic, lawless marches inhabited by Turcophone, heterodox nomads and the urbane, 'Persianate' towns of central and eastern Rūm that were controlled by imperial powers.⁵³⁶ In this view, Wittek elaborated upon Köprülü's position that the frontier was populated by nomadic Turkmen tribes who, despite a "veneer apparently borrowed from Arabic and Persian culture", were able to maintain 'folk' customs and the "harsh and heroic spirit of the early migratory Turkish hordes".⁵³⁷ Such views were perpetuated into

⁵³⁴ Togan 1991: 233.

⁵³⁵ Ibid. As mentioned in the previous chapter, many representatives of these same polities, such as the Hamidids, the Garmiyānids and the Isfandiyarids, had already come to pay homage in 1314 to the new Mongol governor of Rūm, Chūbān, in Karanbük (al-Aqsarāyī 1944: 311).

⁵³⁶ Wittek 1934: 3-4, 55.

⁵³⁷ Köprülü 2006: 210.

the latter half of the twentieth century by scholars like Osman Turan, who claimed that the Turkmen *beys* of the frontier, “unaffected” by Persian culture, were powerful drivers of the ‘Turkification’ of the region.⁵³⁸ Through the writings of Köprülü, Wittek and Turan, the characterisation of the frontier as a region inhabited by nomadic Turkmen raiders (*ghāzīs*), heterodox *bābās* and folk poets continues in modern scholarship.⁵³⁹

Other scholars such as Dimitri Korobeinikov and A.C.S Peacock, however, have re-evaluated the historical chronicles and challenged previous historiographical thought.⁵⁴⁰ Al-Māzandarānī’s fiscal account suggests that *ūjāt* was a term employed by bureaucrats to describe the western, largely Turkish-speaking region of Rūm, which was inhabited by several small principalities. The *ūj* is also often equated with the western fringes in scholarship that follows Wittek’s formula. However, the term ‘*ūj*’ did not always correspond to the western frontierlands. Dimitri Korobeinikov has pointed out that Ibn Bībī and al-Aqsarāyī use the term ‘*ūj*’ to refer to a large territory that sometimes even includes Konya, while A.C.S Peacock avoids the use of ‘*ūj*’ altogether due to its ambiguity and suggests that it may even refer to “a people” (the Turkmen) rather than a place.⁵⁴¹

Crucially, al-Māzandarānī’s account also indicates that several Turkmen principalities paid taxes to the Mongol authority which demonstrates that the

⁵³⁸ Turan 1977: 252-3.

⁵³⁹ See, for example, Hopwood 1993 and Zachariadou 2015.

⁵⁴⁰ See the next footnote for relevant works.

⁵⁴¹ Korobeinikov 2004: 228-30, Peacock 2014: 274. Another important critique of Wittek’s frontier theories, albeit with an Ottoman-specific focus, is Heywood 2002.

western region was in fact linked to the central and eastern regions despite not ‘officially’ being part of Mongol lands.⁵⁴² If looking in more detail at the cultural and intellectual context, it is clear that the western region was not in fact disconnected from the Persian-speaking intellectual circles of Rūm’s urban centres. Aflākī makes it clear that the ‘*ūj*’, which was possibly equated with the western region in Aflākī’s mind,⁵⁴³ was not merely a land of unruly, heterodox Turkmen but was actually home to Mawlawi devotees such ‘Muḥammad Bey of the *Ūj*’ and Akhī Pūlād.⁵⁴⁴ Several Turkmen *beys* of the western regions are also mentioned as Mawlawi devotees.⁵⁴⁵ These include Mas‘ūd (d. ca 1319) and his son Shujā‘ al-Dīn Ūrkhān (d. ca 1344) of the Mantashids, who are portrayed by Aflākī as ‘Turks’,⁵⁴⁶ and Shujā‘ al-Dīn Īnānch of the Inanchids, who ruled the city of Ladik (now Denizli).⁵⁴⁷

A.C.S. Peacock has recently shown that scholars of the ‘frontier’ city of Ladik could indeed partake in the type of intellectual activities supposedly reserved for the central lands, through a manuscript copied in a madrasa of the city (*bi-madīnat al-*

⁵⁴² Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited Rūm a few years before the collapse of the Ilkhanid state in 1335, states that the Mongols’ official territory was limited to their capital at Sivas, a garrison at Kayseri, Aksaray, Niğde, Amasya, Gümüşhane, Erzincan and Erzurum (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 433-7).

⁵⁴³ Aflākī 1961: II, 990-1; 2002: 694. In one anecdote, Aflākī relates a westward journey that he and Ulu ‘Ārif Chalabī undertook to the *ūj* in which they left Konya and passed by Ladik.

⁵⁴⁴ Aflākī 1961: I, 485-6, II, 921; 2002: 334-5, 644-5. It is unclear who either of these two individuals were.

⁵⁴⁵ As mentioned in the previous chapter, members of the Qaramanid and Ashrafid beyliks were also Mawlawi devotees.

⁵⁴⁶ Another courtier is named as ‘Tarkān of the Turks’ (*tarkān-i turkān*), and their chief spiritual advisor is also identified as a Turk (Aflākī 1961: II, 851; 2002: 595). John O’Kane, the translator and editor of the English-language version of Aflākī’s hagiography notes that Tarkān is a woman and perhaps Mas‘ūd’s wife but it is not clear why he claims this (Aflākī 2002: 746, n. 34). The main reference to a similar word that I have found is ‘tarkhān/tarkhān/tarqān’, which appears to be a title derived from Central Asia that is not attached to a specific gender (Golden 2016).

⁵⁴⁷ Aflākī 1961: II, 864; 2002: 604-5.

maḥrūsa dār al-thaghr Lādhīq...fī al-madrasa al-mabnīyya).⁵⁴⁸ This manuscript is a non-illuminated copy of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī's *al-Ta'wīlāt al-Najmiyya*, which was copied in 738/1338 by 'Abd al-Salām ibn Turkmān ibn Ṭūghānshāh al-Qūnawī, who appears to have been a Muslim Turk from Konya.⁵⁴⁹ This scribe may have had a Mawlawi connection, given that he also completed a non-illuminated copy of the *Tafsīr* of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī in the same year in a Mawlawi *zāwiya* in Ladik.⁵⁵⁰

The two non-illuminated manuscripts copied by 'Abd al-Salām ibn Turkmān provide a relevant parallel to the manuscripts currently under discussion. All four manuscripts were copies of Persian texts by Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya produced in western Rūm by or for Turkmen individuals. Together these manuscripts suggest that, like Konya in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, towns that were controlled by Turkish-speaking *beys* such as Ladik and İstanos also possessed active intellectual networks that comprised scholars and Sufis, and facilitated the production of Persian works. Such manuscripts seriously call into question the notion of a frontier, or any region populated by Turkmen, that is characterised as nomadic, heterodox and unsophisticated.

The two illuminated copies of *Mirṣād al-'Ibād* also show that the patrons 'Īsā and 'Abd al-Raḥīm were likely interested in advice literature as well as Sufism. The text

⁵⁴⁸ *'Thaghr'* (pl. *thughūr*) literally means 'gap'. In the medieval period, the term was used to denote "points of entry between the Dār al-Islām and the Dār al-Ḥarb" (Bosworth 2017b). In its plural form, it also identified fortifications that protected gaps along the frontiers between Muslim and Christian territories (ibid).

⁵⁴⁹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Hudai 71 (Peacock 2014: 281).

⁵⁵⁰ Yusuf Ağa Kütüphanesi, Konya, 6877. This manuscript was mentioned briefly in Chapter Two.

provides guidance for those following the path of *taṣawwuf* and some sections on how rulers should apply these spiritual principles. It is therefore also classified as a *naṣīhatnāma* (advice manual, or ‘mirror for princes’).⁵⁵¹ *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* is Najm al-Dīn’s most celebrated work and numerous manuscripts of it survive. Copies of the *Mirṣād* were produced across the Islamic world though it was perhaps most popular in Rūm to begin with.⁵⁵² It was praised by Aflākī as the “stock-in-trade of examiners of the Qur’an”,⁵⁵³ and was one of the few contemporary works to be discussed by Ibn Bībī.⁵⁵⁴ Due to this and other works like *al-Ta’wīlāt al-Najmiyya* and his *Tafsīr* mentioned above, Najm al-Dīn was evidently an important contributor to the spiritual and intellectual life of Islamised Rūm, along with such other figures as Ibn al-‘Arabī, Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.⁵⁵⁵ Although *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* was a relatively popular work, these two manuscripts are the earliest surviving illuminated copies, and the only ones that are securely attributable to Rūm.⁵⁵⁶ There is one other illuminated copy dated 1378 which Peacock suggests was produced in Rūm but this manuscript gives no indication as to where it was produced.⁵⁵⁷ The two illuminated copies from İstanos appear to be

⁵⁵¹ Yalman 2010: 48, Peacock 2015b: 289-95.

⁵⁵² Peacock 2015b: 290.

⁵⁵³ “... *tafsīr-i Shaykh Najm al-Dīn-i Dāya-ra ki sarmāya-yi muḥaqqiqān-i Qur’ān-ast*” (Aflākī 1961: II, 933, 2002: 652). Aflākī’s assertion, on the same page, that the text spread throughout Rūm after ‘Ārif Chalabī was given a copy in Tabriz is very unlikely to be the case.

⁵⁵⁴ Peacock 2015b: 289.

⁵⁵⁵ The text of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* was not translated into Turkish until 1422 by Qāsim ibn Muḥammad al-Qarāḥīṣārī for Murād II (r. 1421-51, with interruption) under the title *Irshād al-Murīdīn* (Okuyan 2006).

⁵⁵⁶ The only other manuscript (illuminated or otherwise) of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* from medieval Rūm that I have come across was produced in Erzincan in 672/1272-3 by one Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Şehid Ali Paşa 2708-1). This scribe copied another of Najm al-Dīn’s works, *Mi’yār al-Şidq fī Mişdāq al-‘Ishq*, in Kayseri in the following year (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Şehid Ali Paşa 2708-2).

⁵⁵⁷ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2065. This manuscript was copied on 2 Rabī‘ al-Ākhir 780 (28 July 1378) for one Fakhr al-Dīn, who is described in the manuscript’s illuminated frontispiece (folio 1b) as *‘malik al-mu‘azzam shāhanshāh al-a‘zam mawlā mulūk al-‘alām nāzim*

amongst the earliest extant copies of the text in a list of twelve manuscripts in Muḥammad Amīn Riyāḥī's introduction to the edited Persian version of *Mirṣād al-'Ibād*.⁵⁵⁸

According to Ibn Bībī, Najm al-Dīn presented and dedicated his recently completed work to the Seljuk sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1219-37)⁵⁵⁹ following a meeting in Malatya with Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar Suhrawardī (d. 1234), the well-known dervish and Abbasid envoy.⁵⁶⁰ The latter gave Najm al-Dīn a letter of reference to take to the sultan, introducing both the author and his work. Ibn Bībī further reports that the text which apparently was completed before the author's arrival in Malatya, met with the sultan's approval.⁵⁶¹

The text that was composed in Sivas and presented to Kayqubād was actually the second version of the work, which was originally completed in 1221 soon after the author's arrival in Kayseri. Considering that the text was probably not originally intended specifically as a *naṣīḥatnāma*, neither version deals with matters of governance in extensive detail nor are they arranged in the "classic ten-chapter

maṣāliḥ al-mu'minīn dhū al-manāqib wa al-mafākhir' (the esteemed sovereign, the great king of kings, chief of the sovereigns of the world, governor of the affairs of the faithful, master of commendable acts and glorious deeds). The illumination is somewhat idiosyncratic but is most similar to contemporary Persian illumination, broadly speaking. A.C.S. Peacock suggests that it was produced in Rūm, due presumably to its early date (Peacock 2015b: 290).

⁵⁵⁸ Rāzī 1352: 110-20 of the introduction. The editor also mentions that the earliest dated copy of the text was completed on 22 Ramaḍān 684 (21 November 1285) and belonged to its scribe, 'Imād al-Dīn Samarqandī. A copying location is not mentioned. Riyāḥī states that this manuscript is no. 664 in the 'Bursa Library', which presumably means the İnebey Kütüphanesi but it is unclear.

⁵⁵⁹ Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 234.

⁵⁶⁰ This individual should not be confused with Shihāb al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Ḥabash Suhrawardī, a Persian philosopher who died in 1191.

⁵⁶¹ Ibn Bībī 1956: fol. 234.

format” of royal mirrors.⁵⁶² Indeed, Najm al-Dīn himself states that both “elect and commonalty” (*khāṣṣ u ‘ām*) should benefit from the book’s teachings.⁵⁶³ Najm al-Dīn seemingly did not care to stay in central Rūm, as he soon produced a third version of the work for the Erzincan-based Mangujakid ruler, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Dāwūd ibn Bahrāmshāh (r. 1162-1225). This version, which is entitled *Marmūzāt-i Asādī dar Mazmūrāt-i Dāwūdī*, does not seem to have been in wide circulation as only one copy has survived. It has much more of a focus on governance than Sufism.⁵⁶⁴ In this work, Najm al-Dīn also laments his miserable experiences in Rūm.⁵⁶⁵ In 1225, he left Rūm entirely for Baghdad.

Mirṣād al-‘Ibād is concerned with how both commoners and elites can follow the Sufi path in order to obtain divine bounty. Its appeal to all levels of society perhaps explains why several copies of the manuscript from the fourteenth century survive. Its production in İstanos in 1349 and 1351 suggests that the two Turkmen patrons were interested in the development of their spiritual lives and how this related to the practice of good governance. This is perhaps unsurprising in light of how they are described in their manuscripts’ dedications: ‘Īsā is termed the ‘possessor of the sword and the pen’ (*ṣāhib al-sayf wa al-qalam*) while ‘Abd al-Raḥīm is given the title of ‘leader of the pilgrimage to Mecca’ (*zayn al-ḥājj wa al-ḥaramayn*).⁵⁶⁶ Both

⁵⁶² Peacock 2015b: 290. Hamid Algar notes that the differences between the two versions mainly consist of matters of style with the second version being more “ornate” (Rāzī 1982: 12, n. 38).

⁵⁶³ Rāzī 1352: 34 (of main text), Rāzī 1982: 57. Steingass notes that “*khāṣṣ u ‘ām*” can mean “the public in general” (Steingass 1892: 439).

⁵⁶⁴ Peacock 2015b: 293. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Esad Efendi 1704.

⁵⁶⁵ Rāzī 1982: 12-13.

⁵⁶⁶ See n. 514 above.

their titles and their manuscripts indicate that the patrons were probably well-educated members of court.

Mirṣād al-ʿIbād, and its later version, *Marmūzāt-i Asadī*, were part of a series of Persian and Arabic advice literature produced in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Rūm.⁵⁶⁷ Persian, Arabic, Turkish and Armenian writings on *futuwwa*,⁵⁶⁸ a subset of the *naṣīḥatnāma* category, also flourished in this same period.⁵⁶⁹ Antalya appears to have been a particularly active centre of *futuwwa* and, according to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, was populated by a group of *akhīs*, young men who were organised into guilds and followed *futuwwa* principles.⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁷ See pp. 109-10 above for Persian and Arabic advice literature produced in medieval Rūm.

⁵⁶⁸ The word '*futuwwa*' is derived from the Arabic word *fatā* (young man). Originating in eleventh-century greater Persia, it is generally understood as an ideal way of behaving for young men and is imbued with notions of chivalry, generosity and altruism (Ridgeon 2016).

⁵⁶⁹ Goshgarian 2007: 70-1.

⁵⁷⁰ The *akhī* feature prominently in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's description of Antalya though the traveller does encounter them in several other of Rūm's cities (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 422, 426, 429-30, 433-4, 437-8, 444 and 450). These hierarchical fraternities, which were particular to Rūm, were often organised into guild-like structures and "provided a stable social unit whose members were engaged in armed conflict (protection), diplomatic efforts, and who participated in creating a social environment in urban centers" (Goshgarian 2007: 18). Although no manuscripts produced by or for *akhīs* have survived, it is worth noting an illuminated Qur'an *juz'* (the thirtieth volume) which was owned by an *Akhī* Yūsuf (New York Public Library, New York, Spencer Arab Ms 3, fol. 40b). This *juz'*, which was copied by Ḥusayn son of Ḥasan, known as (*al-mulaqqab bi-*) Ḥusām the poor Mawlawi (*al-Faqīr al-Mawlawī*) at the end of Rabī' al-Awwal 734 (November 1333), does not mention a production location (fol. 40a). Its somewhat unusual illumination has some similarities with roughly contemporary Ilkhanid and Injuid compositions but not enough to form a convincing theory regarding provenance (Schmitz 1992: fig. 298). The original brown, leather binding is decorated with an eight-pointed star motif. Furthermore, I have located nineteen Qur'an sections which are possibly part of this 1333 Qur'an (Milli Kütüphanesi, Ankara, Tokat Müzesi 276-294). The brown-black leather bindings of these sections are identical, featuring a central decagon combined with a ten-armed star. Some of these sections contain short inscriptions stating that they were copied by 'Ḥusām al-Mawlawī', followed by a distinctive prayer not to forget the scribe ('*lā yansā-hu'*). The manuscripts' size, textblocks, marginal roundels and calligraphy are virtually identical with the *juz'* in the New York Public Library. The twenty-ninth *juz'* is dated 732 so there is a considerable gap between the copying of the penultimate and last sections (Milli Kütüphanesi, Ankara, Tokat Müzesi 285, fol. 40a). None of the *juz'* contain full-page illuminations. Numbers 277, 279, 281 and 294 contain the scribe's name.

Although there were Turkish-language mirrors for princes also written or translated from the fourteenth century onwards,⁵⁷¹ the manuscripts being presently discussed suggest that the two Hamidid patrons were interested in accessing the tradition of Persian advice literature that was well-established in the region. In light of the fact that there are four illuminated *naṣīḥatnāmas* from the late medieval period (including the one that had illumination added in the fourteenth century, discussed in the previous chapter), perhaps this genre was particularly favoured for decoration by patrons, although it is not clear why.⁵⁷² The association between specific advice literature and distinguished rulers may have played a part in the patrons' interest. Although *Mirṣād al-'Ibād* was a relatively popular text in its own right, it may have been favoured also because it was dedicated to the celebrated Seljuk ruler, 'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād I. As discussed in the previous chapter, the early fourteenth-century illuminations added for Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān to the 1228 copy of *al-Laṭā'if al-'Alā'iyya*, which was originally dedicated to and illuminated for Kayqubād, suggest that this Qaramanid patron may have been interested in the intellectual legacy of the Seljuk ruler. It

⁵⁷¹ Some notable examples include the *Gharīb-nāma* by 'Ashiq Pāshā (d. 1333) which was completed in 1330 (İz 2016), and Şadr al-Dīn Muṣṭafā ibn Shaykh's (d. 1401-9, known as Şeyhoğlu in Turkish) Turkish translations of the *Marzubānnāma* and *Qābūsnāma*, which was completed for the Garmiyānid ruler Sulaymān Shāh (r. before 1363-87). Şeyhoğlu's translation was based on Sa'd al-Dīn Warāwīnī's Persian *Marzubānnāma* which in turn was based on a lost tenth-century work and completed in circa 1210-25 for the Ildiguzid ruler Muẓaffar al-Dīn Uzbak (r. 1210-25). *Rawḍat al-'Uqūl*, mentioned on p. 109 above, was also based on this now-lost composition. The latter translation, the *Qābūsnāma*, was originally written by the Ziyarid ruler of Tabaristan, Kaykāwūs ibn Iskandar (r. ca 1050-87) for his son, Gīlānshāh (r. ca 1087-90). See Peacock 2015b: 278.

⁵⁷² Aside from the two copies of *Mirṣād al-'Ibād*, these include a copy of *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma* by Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī discussed in Chapter One (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121) and a unicum of *al-Laṭā'if al-'Alā'iyya* by Aḥmad ibn Sa'd ibn Maḥdī ibn 'Abd al-Şamad al-Zanjānī al-'Uthmānī, which was discussed in Chapter Two (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Aşir Efendi 316).

may also have been the legacy of Kayqubād that partially inspired the Hamidid patronage of the illuminated *Mirṣād al-ʿIbād* manuscripts.

These manuscripts signify one aspect of a broader movement by the Hamidid patrons of the *Ūjāt* to access the scholarly and literary traditions of the ‘centre’. At least one member of the beylik was also interested in Qur’anic exegesis. This is demonstrated by an undated Turkish *tafsīr* of *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ* which was written for Badr al-Dīn Khiḍr ibn Ishāq ibn Falak al-Dīn Dūndār by Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā ibn Muḥammad, perhaps in Antalya or Eğirdir.⁵⁷³ Although not much else is known about Hamidid literary patronage, a recent study by Sara Nur Yıldız gives some insight into the extent of such activities in a similar context, namely that of the Aydinid court based in Birgi and Ayasuluk. Yıldız has shown that the Aydinid court on the western coast of Rūm was the site of prolific literary production in Arabic, Persian and Turkish despite also being part of the supposedly nomadic, Turcophone frontier that the Hamidids inhabited. Works concerning stories of the Prophets (*qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ*), romance poetry, medical subjects, theology and logic were composed throughout the fourteenth and early fifteenth century for the Aydinid rulers Muḥammad (r. 1308-34), Ūmūr (r. 1334-48) and Fakhr al-Dīn ʿĪsā

⁵⁷³ Coşan 1981: 104. Another undated Turkish *tafsīr* of *Sūrat al-Mulk* by the same author may also have been written for this individual. This *tafsīr* was copied for one ‘Khiḍr ibn Gölbeyi/Gül-bağī’ (the lake prince). Coşan proposes several possibilities as to who this person is and claims that he is probably the son of the Hamidid ruler Ishāq (ibid: 109). He bases this on evidence from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who met a jurist and professor named Muṣliḥ al-Dīn in Eğirdir. This scholar was part the retinue of the Hamidid ruler Ishāq Bey (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 422-3). However, the author of a Turkish *futuwwa* treatise, Yaḥyā ibn Khalīl ibn Chūbān Fatā al-Burghāzī (fl. ca 1275-1325), notes that he studied with a Muṣliḥ al-Dīn in Antalya (Goshgarian 2013: 49). Coşan suggests that this Muṣliḥ al-Dīn is the author of the two *tafsīrs*, and that Khiḍr ibn Gölbeyi/Gül-bağī was probably based in Eğirdir, and therefore a Hamidid. While Coşan’s conclusions are based on circumstantial evidence, the fourth and sixth largest lakes in Turkey (Eğirdir Gölü and Burdur Gölü, respectively) were both in Hamidid territory so it is possible that ‘Gölbeyi/Gül-bağī’ was an epithet of one of their rulers.

(r. 1360-90).⁵⁷⁴ Through the production of *adab/ādāb*⁵⁷⁵ and the patronage of travelling scholars and poets, this multilingual intellectual environment in western Rūm was in fact linked to long-established traditions of Perso-Arabic literature and to other Islamic centres of scholarship, like Cairo and Shiraz.⁵⁷⁶

The geographical distance of Aydinid territories from these historic centres of Islamic learning appears to have been acknowledged in a text composed in the name of Īsā, who is termed “protector of the Muslim frontier (*thughūr*)” and whose knowledge “resonates from Damascus and Egypt to China”.⁵⁷⁷ Under his rule, “Rūm is not the distant *ūj* – on the contrary, it is an entire world adorned with his glorious aura (*farr*)”.⁵⁷⁸ In a similar way to the production of the *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* manuscripts, the patronage of such works was perhaps a more intimate facet of the rulers’ wider desire to portray themselves as “world-dominating potentates” and their court as urbane and sophisticated, despite supposedly being on the fringes of the central Islamic world.⁵⁷⁹

The watermark that is present in some pages of the 1351 copy of *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* indicates that this paper was not produced in Rūm and was very likely Italian in origin, perhaps reinforcing the cosmopolitanism of the region in which the

⁵⁷⁴ Yıldız 2016: fig. 7.4.

⁵⁷⁵ *Adab* and its plural form, *ādāb*, literally mean ‘habit(s)’ or ‘custom(s)’ but have since the pre-Islamic period developed into a set of principles relating to the practice of civility, refinement and learning. Since *adab* literature could be produced for the edification or entertainment of the court, it encompassed a wide variety of subjects like Qur’anic exegesis, *ḥadīth*, poetry, science and governance. For more, see Gabrieli 2017.

⁵⁷⁶ Yıldız 2016: 199.

⁵⁷⁷ Ibid: 218. Translations by Yıldız. Necip Paşa Kütüphanesi, Tire, Diğer Vakıf 812, fol. 1b.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid: 222. Translations by Yıldız. Necip Paşa Kütüphanesi, Tire, Diğer Vakıf 812, fol. 17a.

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid: 199.

manuscripts were produced. It is the only paper within this thesis' core material that features a watermark and is thus far the earliest dated example of watermarked paper being used in an Islamic manuscript from Rūm. However, since no systematic study has been conducted concerning papers used in late medieval Islamic manuscripts (illuminated or otherwise) from Rūm,⁵⁸⁰ it remains unclear to what extent Italian paper was used in this context.⁵⁸¹ Jonathan Bloom claims that many Arabic, Persian and Armenian books were copied onto Italian paper by the mid-fourteenth century due to the decline of the Baghdad paper industry and the low price of Italian paper.⁵⁸² Bloom does not clarify what proportion of books used Italian (as opposed to Persian, Egyptian or Syrian) paper, nor does he specify whether Italian paper was favoured for particular types of material (e.g. manuscripts, scrolls, letters, deeds, etc.).

Even though paper was a mobile commodity, it is probably not a coincidence that it appears in an illuminated manuscript produced in İstanos, rather than, say, Konya or Sivas. Considering İstanos' location near Antalya, one of Rūm's major international centres of mercantile activity, it follows that acquiring Italian paper may have been relatively straightforward. As a port city, Antalya was where foreign traders and goods from across and beyond the Mediterranean converged. The city was essentially a commercial gateway from Europe to the rest of Rūm. It

⁵⁸⁰ No serious studies have been conducted on the history of the Anatolian papermaking industry. See Kağıtçı 1976. There is no information on paper-making in Anatolia in von Karabacek 2001 or Loveday 2001 though Bloom mentions the region a few times (Bloom 2001).

⁵⁸¹ The only other manuscript discussed in this thesis that has a secure paper provenance is that of a 1368 copy of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's *Dīvān-i Kabīr*. A note in this manuscript written by its patron, Amīr Sātī, states that the paper was bought in Damascus. Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 69, fol. 147b.

⁵⁸² Bloom 2001: 56.

probably only grew in economic importance following the fall of the Ilkhanids in 1335 and the consequent instability in the eastern regions.⁵⁸³

Antalya had been an important trading post since the tenth century, attracting the attention of Byzantine, Muslim, Jewish, Armenian and (since the eleventh century) Italian merchants.⁵⁸⁴ According to Ibn Bībī, the initial motivation for the Seljuks' conquest of Antalya in 1207 was primarily economic, following the apparent mistreatment of Muslim merchants by Frankish authorities.⁵⁸⁵ Having conquered Antalya and Sinop – an important commercial port on the Black Sea – in 1214, the Seljuks established merchant communities in the cities to encourage trade and included both towns as significant stops in their vast network of caravanserais.⁵⁸⁶ By the middle of the thirteenth century, the city formed a vital entrepôt in the movement of goods and traders in Rūm and beyond.

As well as overland links that were reinforced by the caravanserai network, Antalya was also connected to other Mediterranean ports that were administered by various powers. Such ports included Ayasuluk, which was controlled by the Aydinids, Candia (today known as Heraklion) which was part of Venetian Crete, Famagusta, which was a possession of Lusignan Cyprus, Rhodes, which was run by the Hospitallers, and Ayas (today known as Yumurtalık), which was occupied by the Mamluks.⁵⁸⁷ Although these trading relationships could be strained by

⁵⁸³ Pamuk 2000: 33.

⁵⁸⁴ Preiser-Kapeller 2015: 121-2.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibn Bībī 1956: fols 95-105.

⁵⁸⁶ Fleet 2009: 258.

⁵⁸⁷ Preiser-Kapeller 2015: 124.

religious tensions or military conflicts, it seems that by and large, “commercial interests opened a middle ground beyond religious or ethnic antagonisms”.⁵⁸⁸ It is these commercial links, constructed and maintained via the caravanserai system and the movement of goods and people, that helped to ensure that the so-called western ‘frontier’ was economically, socially and politically connected with other parts of Rūm and the rest of the Islamic world, Europe and even China.

Contemporary sources give a vivid picture of how cosmopolitan and prosperous Antalya was in the fourteenth century.⁵⁸⁹ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited around 1331, noted that Antalya was “one of the finest of cities, enormous in extent and bulk, [among] the most handsome of cities to be seen anywhere, as well as the most populous”.⁵⁹⁰ He also noted that the main city had “vast bazaars most admirably organized” in addition to separate, walled living quarters for its Christian and Jewish populations.⁵⁹¹ It is, however, possible that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa is mistakenly describing another city as Antalya does not appear to have been divided in this way.⁵⁹²

⁵⁸⁸ Fleet 1999: 141.

⁵⁸⁹ Recent research by Johannes Preiser-Kapeller has demonstrated that, in addition to Constantinople, the most active port cities in the region were Antalya, Ayas, Ayasuluk and Trebizond (2015: 127).

⁵⁹⁰ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 418.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid.

⁵⁹² Johannes Preiser-Kapeller has stated that Scott Redford has expressed doubts regarding Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s account, due to the surviving archaeological evidence (Preiser-Kapeller 2015: 125, n. 42). Indeed, a map showing Antalya’s medieval walls does not seem to suggest that the city did not consist of separate, walled areas (Redford and Leiser 2008: fig. 2). Preiser-Kapeller notes that special living arrangements for Christian merchants (*funduq*) were included in commercial treaties between the Venetians and the ports of Balat (Miletus) and Ayasuluk (Preiser-Kapeller 2015: 125, n. 42).

The Venetian merchant from Crete, Emanuele Piloti (fl. ca 1371-after 1441), writing in the early fifteenth century, noted that Antalya was known as a regional centre of shipbuilding⁵⁹³ and exported timber and pitch (a resin used for waterproofing) to Cairo.⁵⁹⁴ He also noted that Antalya (along with Alanya) was important in the slave trade: in one incident, a Mamluk ship that was docked in Antalya was seized by a corsair Petro de Laranda, and its 150 Arab sailors were sold to the Duke of Naxos Jacopo de Crispo.⁵⁹⁵ Francesco Balducci Pegolotti (fl. 1310-47), a Florentine merchant, wrote in the 1330s that Antalya exported grain, vegetables and pulses to the Aegean coastal region, and traded imported gold, silver, tin, copper and iron in its markets.⁵⁹⁶ Antalya was also central in the trade of fine textiles. Along with Balat (Miletus), it was an export centre for the kilims and pile carpets that were to become popular across much of Europe.⁵⁹⁷ It also sold Turkish and Persian silk to Constantinople and Alexandria, and imported Cypriot camlet and other cloths from Italy and France.⁵⁹⁸

In light of the area's evident prosperity, it is striking that the only surviving illuminated manuscripts from this context are two relatively modest copies of *Mirṣād al-'Ibād* and that they were produced in the small town of İstanos, rather than Antalya.⁵⁹⁹ By contrast, there are no securely identified illuminated manuscripts from Konya dated after the 1330s. Nor are there any surviving

⁵⁹³ Piloti 1950: 61 and 73.

⁵⁹⁴ Fleet 1999: 34.

⁵⁹⁵ Piloti 1950: 95-6.

⁵⁹⁶ Pegolotti 1936: 56-8.

⁵⁹⁷ Piloti 1950: 60 and 73.

⁵⁹⁸ Fleet 1999: 98-103.

⁵⁹⁹ It is possible that İstanos was a *yayla* (summer resort) of Antalya (as is the case today) which could explain why scribes and craftsmen produced the 1349 and 1351 manuscripts there.

illuminated manuscripts from any other town in Rūm until the early fifteenth century.⁶⁰⁰ As I have discussed, part of the emphasis on Konya's manuscript community can be attributed to the integrity of the Mawlawi shrine's library. While I think that this does partially explain the shape of surviving material, there is an alternative explanation as to why we see only modest examples (both in number and appearance) of illuminated manuscript production in the mid-fourteenth century, and why the output shifted from the metropolis of Konya to the smaller town of İstanos.⁶⁰¹

I propose that this can in part be explained by a major outbreak of bubonic plague (or, the 'Black Death') in the 1340s in the region. Originating in the Central Asian steppes, the plague most likely travelled westwards via Black Sea trading routes. Consignments containing foodstuffs and furs were particularly susceptible to rats that carried fleas infected with plague. The disease was first recorded in the region in Crimea in 1346 and Constantinople in 1347.⁶⁰² Ironically, the bustling Mediterranean trade that had brought prosperity into the region enabled the quick spread of plague throughout the port cities of the Middle East and Europe. Soon after appearing in Constantinople, the plague reached Alexandria, Sicily, Marseille and Trebizond in the same year.⁶⁰³ In 1348 and 1349, the epidemic spread inland,

⁶⁰⁰ The manuscripts discussed in Chapter Four do not have a securely identified place of production and may have been produced in Erzincan or possibly Damascus.

⁶⁰¹ The town is not mentioned in any contemporary chronicles and the only published work that I have been able to find that discusses the town in any detail outlines the history of the region more generally (Çaycı 2004). As far as I can ascertain, there are only two surviving buildings in İstanos from the medieval period: the Emir Sinaneddin Medresesi, built by the Hamidid *amīr* Sinān al-Dīn Khidr in 1319 (Kofoglu 1995) and the Alaaddin Camii, which Çaycı attributes to the patronage of the Qaramanid prince 'Alā' al-Dīn ibn Khalīl (d. 1397-8). See Çaycı 2004: 112.

⁶⁰² Ayalon 2015: 29.

⁶⁰³ Schamiloglu 2004: 265, Ayalon 2015: 29.

hitting Divriği and Antakya (also known as Hatay), as well as Damascus, Cyprus, Cairo, Tunis, Mecca, Mosul and Baghdad, finally subsiding in 1351.⁶⁰⁴ The plague's arrival in Divriği and Antakya probably prompted, or exacerbated, the spread of the disease into central and western Rūm. The Mamluk historian al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442) who was not yet born when the plague struck, claimed that people fleeing Antakya brought the disease into Qaramanid territories and Kayseri.⁶⁰⁵

Although there are no records of when the plague appeared in south-western Rūm, coastal cities were particularly adversely affected due to the constant movement of people, and the accompanying fleas and rats, in and out of their ports. There is no reason to assume that the coastal regions were spared the disease.⁶⁰⁶ It is impossible to know precisely what impact the plague had on cultural production in fourteenth-century Rūm, as no in-depth research has been undertaken on this subject, probably due to a lack of source material. Its potential effects do remain, however, relatively unacknowledged in much secondary scholarship concerning the period.⁶⁰⁷ A possible consequence that the plague had on city life was the movement of elites from urban to more rural and plague-free environments. In order to escape the epidemic in Antalya, the court may have relocated to İstanos where the manuscripts were then produced for the *amīrs* 'Īsā ibn Zakariyyā' and

⁶⁰⁴ Dols 1977: 60, 66, Ayalon 2015: 29. There were however several further outbreaks in the Middle East in the second half of the fourteenth century in 1362-4, 1373-5, 1395 and 1405 (Ayalon 2015: 40).

⁶⁰⁵ Cited in Dols 1977: 62.

⁶⁰⁶ Schamiloğlu 2004: 271.

⁶⁰⁷ Apart from Schamiloğlu's work (2004), there are no published works that deal with the Black Death in fourteenth-century Rūm as a general phenomenon. Yaron Ayalon, Nükhet Varlık and Heath Lowry, however, have discussed the plague in terms of its impact on the early Ottoman empire. See Lowry 2003, Ayalon 2015 and Varlık 2015.

Ghiyāth al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Yūnus. It appears that the town was, in later years, used as a refuge by the ruler from attacking Lusignan forces.⁶⁰⁸ More generally speaking, it is conceivable that a significant decrease in the population could have meant there were fewer practising scribes, artists and papermakers, and wealthy patrons in Rūm’s urban centres, which may have lead to an overall decrease in the production of illuminated manuscripts.⁶⁰⁹

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed a different context to the previous two chapters, namely that of western, coastal Rūm, rather than Konya and Sivas. An analysis of the physical properties of the two manuscripts in question, both copies of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī’s *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād* produced in 1349 and 1351 in İstanos, has demonstrated that although the manuscripts are relatively modest in appearance, they display some unique features. These include watermarked paper (in the 1351 copy) and inscriptions on the doublure (in the 1349 copy). The decoration of the book was perhaps also a way to honour the patrons, or to emphasise their interest in refined activities, like the patronage of the arts of the book. Elements of the illumination, which show some similarities to the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur’an, suggest that the artist (or artists) did not work in isolation but was part of a broader network of craftsmen, either through his own travels or through those instructing him.

⁶⁰⁸ Apparently, the ruler of the Antalya Hamidids Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd (d. after 1377) fled to İstanos when Peter I of Cyprus (r. 1361-8) attacked Antalya in 1361 (Kofçoğlu 2011).

⁶⁰⁹ Current estimations place the death toll in Europe at between one-third to two-thirds of the total population (Ayalon 2015: 22). It seems logical that similar death rates occurred in the Middle East.

The patrons of the manuscripts are not mentioned in historical chronicles but appear to have been well-educated Turkmen *beys* of the ‘*ūj*’ who were interested in Persian-language advice manuals. As I have discussed, *naṣīḥatnāmas* (and *futuwwatnāmas*) seem to have been in demand in this period, relatively speaking, and these two manuscripts are further evidence of this. These and other manuscripts show that the ‘frontier’ *beys* were in fact interested in several genres of Arabic and Persian scholarship, and such material may have formed one facet of a wider effort to present themselves as archetypal Islamic rulers in a context where imperial authority was otherwise lacking.

The manuscripts’ content, alongside their physical properties, challenges divisions between the so-called ‘frontier’ and the ‘centre’, the former supposed to be an abode of nomadic, heterodox, Turcophone activity as opposed to the latter’s urban, ‘Persianate’, orthodox culture. Although the ‘*ūj*’ was a real concept in the medieval period, its boundaries seem to have been somewhat flexible and did not necessarily translate as ‘frontier’, though it did seem to take on this meaning in some instances. What is clear, however, is that the idea of the ‘*ūj*’ did not necessarily imply a lawless land of Turkmen nomads and raiders, even if its inhabitants were aware of their geographical distance from older centres like Cairo, Damascus and Shiraz.

Not only were the Antalya Hamidids evidently concerned with *taṣawwuf* and ideals of good governance, but they also inhabited what was probably one of the most

ethnically and religiously diverse settings in the region. Although İstanos itself was a small town that is hardly mentioned in chronicles, the nearby city of Antalya was one of Rūm's most active ports which probably explains the presence of Italian watermarked paper in the 1351 copy, which is the earliest known instance of watermarked paper in a securely identified manuscript from Rūm. Some of the prosperity this port city brought to the region, however, was likely diminished by the appearance of the bubonic plague in the mid-fourteenth century which may also explain why there are significant gaps in the illuminated manuscript record after this period.

CHAPTER FOUR

The manuscripts of Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan (d. 1386): A Mawlawi *amīr* of eastern Rūm, 1365-72

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the manuscript patronage of a Mawlawi *amīr* named Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan (hereafter 'Sātī'),⁶¹⁰ who was based in Erzincan but whose family were originally from Konya. On the basis of surviving manuscript evidence, Sātī appears to have been the most prolific patron of illuminated manuscripts in the region during this period. Sātī was also the author of a Persian text entitled *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān*, which was based on Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī's (d. 1318) *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* and completed in 1378, apparently for an Aratnid princess.

The emphasis of this chapter on a single patron (and his descendants) is different from the preceding chapters of the thesis which focused on groups of manuscripts produced for several patrons who were Mawlawi devotees or members of Turkmen beyliks. In some cases, they were both, and the possession of multiple affiliations is no less true in Sātī's case. His status as an *amīr* and a Mawlawi from Erzincan with roots in Konya establishes Sātī as someone who defies easy

⁶¹⁰ Sātī's exact date of death was 5 Jumādā al-Ūlā 788 (3 June 1386). Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 2111, fol. 172b.

categorisation. Such affiliations also provide several paths by which we can better understand the nuances of the political and cultural landscapes of late medieval eastern Rūm. Through these connections, and the rich material that Sātī commissioned, this chapter extends and complements some of the discussions of the previous chapters but also introduces new threads. For example, while analyses of Mawlawi activities and the participation of Christians in cultural life, which were discussed in Chapters One and Two, will be expanded upon, this chapter will also introduce the distinctive milieu of late fourteenth-century eastern Rūm.

This chapter is also different from those that have come previously as none of Sātī's manuscripts actually mention where they were produced. The question of provenance is therefore a more substantial issue than in the first three chapters. Although Sātī's manuscripts and their possible copying locations have been discussed by other scholars,⁶¹¹ the physical properties of the material have not been described in depth or analysed in their wider cultural and political contexts. A thorough examination of the manuscripts' physical properties, and the rich historical information contained within, will enable me to make a case for a potential place, or places, of production.

Before outlining the rest of the chapter's content in more depth, it is useful to briefly summarise political developments in eastern Rūm from the 1330s onwards.

⁶¹¹ Çetin 1961: 106, Önder 1968: 519, Duda 1983: 219-21, Richard 1997: 48, Tanındı 2000 and 2012, Gölpınarlı 2003: 89-99, 233-6, Çağman and Tanındı 2005, Demircan Aksoy 2010: 184-208, 261-304 and 319-27 and 2014: 267-8.

The fragmented nature of Rūm's political scene following the 1243 Battle of Köseadağ persisted well into the later fourteenth century. After the fall of the Ilkhanids in 1335 following the death of Abū Sa'īd, and the concurrent absence of an overarching imperial authority, Ilkhanid lands in Rūm, the Jazira and Persia were soon beset by conflict and divided between competing factions. In the east, Mongol successor states, namely the Jalayirids (1335-1432), Chubanids (1335-58), Injuids (1304-53) and Muzaffarids (1314-93), fought for territorial and political control. Lands in central and eastern Rūm were split between the Aratnid dynasty (1327-80) based in Sivas and Kayseri,⁶¹² the Byzantine Empire of Trebizond based in the Pontus region (1204-1461), the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1198-1375), and various other polities that included Mongol tribes, ambitious *amīrs* and *akhīs*.⁶¹³

Of Uyghur origin, Aratnā had originally arrived in Rūm as a subordinate of the governor of Rūm Tīmūrtāsh ibn Chūbān (d. 1328). Following the latter's execution, Aratnā took part in a conspiracy at the Ilkhanid court but was pardoned and sent back to Rūm under the command of the Jalayirid Shaykh Ḥasan-i Buzurg ('the Great', r. 1335-56), becoming de facto governor of the region after 1335.⁶¹⁴ Aratnā appears to have been able to rise to a position of considerable power by seeking out and giving support to various, sometimes opposing, groups. For example, in 1338, Aratnā allied himself with the Chubanid ruler, and son of Tīmūrtāsh, Ḥasan-i

⁶¹² For detailed accounts of the Aratnid dynasty, see Uzunçarşılı 1937: 49-50, Cahen 2016, Yücel 1989 and Göde 1994.

⁶¹³ See Chapter Three for a brief discussion of the *akhīs*.

⁶¹⁴ Melville 2009: 92. Although governor of Rūm at the time, Shaykh Ḥasan would eventually go on to establish the Jalayirid dynasty based in Tabriz and Baghdad (Wing 2016: 69).

Kūchak ('the Little', r. 1335-43), only to change his mind later that year, accepting the suzerainty of the Mamluk sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn (r. 1293-1341, with interruptions).⁶¹⁵ Having captured Sivas in the late 1330s, Aratnā started minting coins in his own name from 1341-42 and adopted the name Sulṭān 'Alā' al-Dīn Aratnā.⁶¹⁶ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who met Aratnā during his travels circa 1331, noted that he was based in Sivas and spoke Arabic. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa also met one of Aratnā's wives in Kayseri and noted that she was a relation of the 'ruler (*malik*) of Iraq', a title which referred to the Ilkhanid ruler Abū Sa'īd.⁶¹⁷

Aratnā eventually amassed a sizeable territory. By the time that he died in 1352, this included Sivas, Kayseri, Ankara, Amasya, Kemah, Erzincan, Erzurum, Bayburt, Tokat, Şebinkarahisar, Niksar, Samsun, Niğde, and Konya. In the decades following his death, however, most of these territories were lost by his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad (r. 1352-65) and grandson 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī (r. 1365-80) to local Turkmen and Mongol beys. Konya, Niğde and Aksaray, for example, were recaptured in 1366-67 by the Qaramanid prince 'Alā' al-Dīn ibn Khalīl (d. 1397-98) and remained in Qaramanid hands until 1475.⁶¹⁸ In the chaos that followed the death of 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī in 1380 and the brief rule of his juvenile son Muḥammad II (r. 1380), remaining Aratnid lands were taken over by a number of independent

⁶¹⁵ Shukurov 1994: 24-5.

⁶¹⁶ Remler 1980: 173.

⁶¹⁷ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa names this wife as Ṭaghī Aghā though Gibb notes that this is probably a misspelling of Ṭughā (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1854: 288; 1962: 433, 434, n. 81). The only reference that I can find for this name is a wife of Ūljaytū who was named Ṭughā Khātūn (Wing 2016: 68). It is possible that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa made a mistake with her name. Aratnā had at least one other wife, who was named Sūlī Pāshā Khātūn. She is buried in the Köşk Medrese in Kayseri which was built for her in 1339 (Göde 1994: 157).

⁶¹⁸ Aside from a brief occupation by Bāyazīd I in 1397 (İnalçık 2016). See also Sümer 1969: 126. 'Alā' al-Dīn's father was the patron of the 1314-15 Qaramanid Qur'an discussed in Chapter Two.

amīrs. These included the Aratnid vizier Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Aḥmad (r. 1381-98), the ruler of Sivas and Kayseri, and Muṭāhhartan (r. 1379-1403), the ruler of Erzincan.

The core manuscripts of this chapter are three illuminated copies of texts by Sulṭān Walad and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. They are an incomplete copy of the *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* (containing the *Rabābnāma* and *Intihānāma* only), a two-volume copy of Rūmī's *Dīvān-i Kabīr* (also known as the *Dīvān-i Shams-i Tabrīzī*) and a copy of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī* in one volume.⁶¹⁹ These are the only manuscripts that can be definitively connected to the patronage of Sātī, illuminated or otherwise. The manuscripts were completed within a few years of each other. The *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* was completed in 1366, the *Dīvān-i Kabīr* was copied in 1367-68, and is the oldest known illuminated copy of this text, and the *Maṣnavī* was finished in 1372. For the sake of clarity and brevity, I will refer to these manuscripts as the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī*.

As in the previous chapters, I will first describe the physical properties of the manuscripts in detail. Since the manuscripts' location of production is unknown, I will then discuss visual connections to other manuscripts in depth. Following this will be a detailed examination of the manuscripts' numerous inscriptions. In the next section, I will place the manuscripts in their wider contexts and consider what the material reveals about illuminated manuscript production in this period and

⁶¹⁹ Respectively, these manuscripts are Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.mixt.1594, Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 68, 69 and 1113. See n. 611 for bibliography.

about Sātī himself. This discussion will be supplemented by information from other historical sources concerning Sātī. Before summarising my arguments concerning Sātī and where his manuscripts might have been produced, I will also outline elements of the contemporary context that relate to Sātī's material. These include further issues in beylik scholarship, Mawlawi activities in Erzincan and the role of Armenians in Rūm's cultural landscape.

The manuscripts of Sātī: Physical properties

All of Sātī's manuscript are large and each is bigger than the last. The 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* is 345mm x 280mm with 159 folios. The 1368 *Dīvān* is 460-470mm x 325-30mm, with the first volume containing 153 folios and the second volume containing 175 folios. The 1372 *Maṣnavī* measures 562mm x 400mm with 197 folios, and is the largest manuscript included in the present thesis. By comparison, the 1278 *Maṣnavī* (examined in Chapter One) measures 495mm x 335mm while the circa 1332 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* (examined in Chapter Two) is 460mm x 314mm. The 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* appear to have been cropped, so it is possible that they were even larger. It is likely that the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* was also cropped but it is difficult to be sure. As the size of Sātī's manuscripts increased over time, so too did the dimensions of their textblocks. In chronological order, they measure 295mm x 239mm, 390mm x 270mm and 492mm x 305mm. The text of both the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1368 *Dīvān* has been arranged into four columns with 33 lines each, while the textblock of the 1372 *Maṣnavī* is in four columns of 39 lines each.

As the dimensions of the manuscripts expanded over time, it appears that the quality of the paper also improved, becoming smoother and shinier (and therefore a better and more durable support for inks and pigments). The paper of the earliest manuscript, the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, is light brown, a little rough to the touch with no visible shine on the surface. It is possible that this lack of shine could in part be attributed to the poorer condition of this manuscript in comparison to the other two. Vertical single chain lines are present and are spaced 35mm apart, while groups of twenty horizontal laid lines measure 29mm across. The paper is relatively thick, with ten folios measuring 3mm. The same paper is used throughout the main text of the manuscript, apart from one bifolio which is found on folios 76-77. The paper of this bifolio is similar in appearance though noticeably thinner than the main paper. The laid lines are identical to the main paper but the single, vertical chain lines measure 18-20mm apart. These pages are blank, apart from folio 77b which contains one of the two illuminated medallions that precede the *Intihānāma*.

The two-volume *Dīvān* employs two types of paper, which have been interleaved. The first paper type is light cream with a few small fibrous inclusions, while the second paper type has a brownish-orange tint and has barely any inclusions. Both papers are smooth with some shine on the surface. The light cream paper features groups of three vertical chain lines that are 40mm apart, while twenty horizontal laid lines measure 30mm. Groups of three vertical chain lines are also present in the brownish-orange paper but are spaced 55mm apart, confirming that the two types of paper did not originate from one batch. Twenty horizontal laid lines

measure 28mm across. Like the previous manuscript, the paper of both volumes of the *Dīvān* is relatively thick, with ten folios measuring 3mm.

The 1372 *Maṣnavī* also features two types of paper that are similarly tinted and interleaved. The first type of paper is cream, smooth and slightly shiny. The second type is brownish-orange, and very smooth and shiny. Ten folios each of both papers measure 2mm in thickness. The cream paper contains horizontal laid lines only, twenty of which measure 30mm. The brownish-orange paper features double vertical chain lines which are spaced 55mm apart with twenty horizontal laid lines measuring 27mm. Though the papers of the *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* are not identical, they are similar and it is possible that they were sourced from the same place.

Coloured paper became more widely available in the Islamic world from the early fourteenth century. The earliest known treatise on paper dyeing dates from 1433-34 and was composed by Sīmī Nīshāpūrī.⁶²⁰ Sheila Blair, who cites examples of grey, pale olive, red and orange paper found in fourteenth-century manuscripts, states that the use of coloured (particularly orange or red) paper became more common in the Ilkhanid period, as a result of the increasing popularity of imported Chinese papers.⁶²¹ At least two other manuscripts dating from the second half of

⁶²⁰ The treatise, entitled *Jawhar-i Sīmī*, is translated in Thackston 1990.

⁶²¹ Blair 2000: 25.

the fourteenth century feature cream and ‘rusty-orange’ interspersed papers but neither of them mention where they were produced.⁶²²

The second volume of the *Dīvān* contains an inscription on folio 147b written by Sātī himself that concerns the purchase of the paper (fig. 209).⁶²³ Sātī mentions that he bought ‘ninety-five large-sized sheets of paper’ (*ṭabaq-i kāghid-i qaṭ‘-i buzburg*) from Damascus for the specific purpose of copying the *Dīvān*.⁶²⁴ The exact date that Sātī purchased the paper for the *Dīvān* is unknown as that part of the inscription has been truncated due to cropping and at present reads only, “22 Jumādā al-Ūlā”. Since the copying of the manuscript commenced on 2 Shawwāl 768 (1 June 1367), according to an inscription by the calligrapher on folio 147a, the latest possible date that Sātī could have purchased the paper is 22 Jumādā al-Ūlā 768 (24 January 1367).

The Mamluk historian al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418) notes that a ‘full Baghdadi’-sized sheet of paper measured about 73cm by 110cm. Half of this paper size (73cm x

⁶²² Blair 2000: 34, n. 14-15. Both manuscripts – in the Chester Beatty Library – are written in Arabic. The first is a copy of *Tajrīd al-Uṣūl* by Ibn al-Bārīzī (d. 1337) which was completed on 12 Jumādā al-Ākhira 754 (15 July 1353) by Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qazwīnī (Arberry 1958: no. 3642). The second is an undated copy of *al-Sa‘āda wa al-Iqbāl* by Khidr ibn ‘Alī al-Āydīnī al-Khaṭṭāb (d. ca 1413) which was copied by Muḥsin ibn Idrīs (Arberry 1963: no. 4923).

⁶²³ See Appendix Two for a full translation of this inscription.

⁶²⁴ If two bifolios could have been cut from one large piece of paper, ninety-five sheets would have produced 380 folios. This is more than sufficient to have produced both volumes of the *Dīvān* which, respectively, consist of 153 and 175 folios (a total of 328 folios). Jonathan Bloom notes that papermaking was still active in Damascus in the fourteenth century despite several blows to the industry. Following the collapse of the Ilkhanid dynasty in 1335, there was a general decline in the number of patrons who were able to afford large sheets of high-quality paper in Baghdad and some papermakers in the city perhaps moved to Damascus or Cairo, bolstering paper manufacture there. However, following repeated bouts of bubonic plague in the middle of the century, as well as fiscal mismanagement at the hands of Mamluk governors, paper production in Damascus declined until finally crumbling following Tīmūr’s sacking of the city in 1401 (Bloom 2001: 56, 60-1).

55cm) corresponds roughly to the size of a bifolio from the now-cropped *Dīvān* (66cm x 47cm). Al-Qalqashandī also mentions a ‘reduced Baghdadi’ size which measured 65cm x 98cm.⁶²⁵ This is slightly larger than the cropped bifolios of the 1372 *Maṣnavī* which measure 56.2cm x 80cm. Tinted paper of this size, as seen in the 1368 *Dīvān*, is not present in any other key manuscript discussed in this thesis, which may be due to its Damascene origin.⁶²⁶ The 1372 *Maṣnavī* also features interleaved cream and brownish-orange paper of a similarly large size (but with different chain and laid line arrangements) so it is possible that these were purchased in Damascus as well, perhaps again by Sātī himself.

As I have mentioned, the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* were almost certainly cropped while the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* was likely cropped as well. All three manuscripts were rebound at a later date and contain watermarked flyleaves, apart from the second volume of the 1368 *Dīvān*, which retains its original binding. The flyleaves of the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* contain the word ‘VIACCAVA’ and a crown with a ‘VA’ monogram.⁶²⁷ The first volume of the 1368 *Dīvān* features a watermark consisting of an anchor in a circle that is topped with a small trefoil. Variations of this watermark appear in numerous fifteenth and sixteenth-century European books.⁶²⁸ The 1372 *Maṣnavī* contains two watermarks. One is a crescent with a face that appears in late sixteenth-century books produced in France,

⁶²⁵ Bloom 2001: 53.

⁶²⁶ Although it is not clear, it is probable that the majority of paper discussed in this thesis was produced locally, i.e. in Rūm.

⁶²⁷ I have not been able to find any information on the origin of this paper.

⁶²⁸ Briquet 1907: I, 41.

Belgium and Luxembourg.⁶²⁹ The other is a crossbow in a circle, variants of which appear in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Italian books.⁶³⁰

Only the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* contains a later ex libris, which was written by one Shaykh ‘Alī Mūsā Riḍā on fol. 1a. The paper on which this inscription is written is the same as that used for later repairs elsewhere in the manuscript. The 1368 *Dīvān* contains several instances of the same seal impression which designates the book as an endowment to the Mawlawi shrine in Konya (*vaqf-i kitābkhāna-yi dargāh-i haẓrat Mawlānā qaddasa Allāh sirrahu*). The application of this seal presumably dates to after 1409, when the manuscript was endowed to the shrine by Mustanjid ibn Sātī. In a long Persian *vaqf* note scribbled on the manuscript’s dedication page (fol. 147b), Mustanjid notes that there was previously no complete copy of the text in the Mawlawi library, and that he hopes its presence will benefit frequenters of the shrine (fig. 210). In this note, he also names himself as ‘Mustanjid ibn Sātī al-Mawlawī al-Arzinjānī’ (i.e. of Erzincan).

The 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* are bound in quinions for the most part. The 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, however, is bound in irregular quires which suggests that it underwent some (perhaps crude) repairs before being rebound. It is quite possible that the 1366 manuscript was originally two separate works that were bound together, since the two texts are not joined by quires. I will discuss this possibility further below when I examine the manuscript’s illumination and inscriptions. The

⁶²⁹ Briquet 1907: II, 313.

⁶³⁰ Ibid: I, 52.

only manuscript of Sāti's to have retained its original binding is the second volume of the *Dīvān*. All of the other manuscripts have nineteenth or early twentieth-century Ottoman bindings. The single original binding is signed by its binder, Abū Bakr the Mawlawi bookbinder of Hama, on the back doublure (*'amal-i Abū Bakr al-Mujallidī al-Mawlawī al-Ḥamawī*) (fig. 211).⁶³¹ The dark brown leather binding features six interlaced hexagons and wide strapwork borders that are divided into six panels (figs 212-213). The back cover is identical but with traces of gold. The geometric decoration of this binding is broadly similar to contemporary Ilkhanid examples (fig. 214).⁶³²

All three manuscripts were copied by the same calligrapher, Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī, in *naskh* script.⁶³³ The handwriting across the group is neat, fluid and reasonably consistent in style, though the overall appearance can vary between manuscripts due to the use of different nibs. This is particularly evident when comparing the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* to the 1368 *Dīvān* (figs 215-217). The scribe's handwriting is characterised by perpendicular, serifless *alifs*; *mīms* with long, sharp tails; deep, almost circular *nūns* with centrally-placed dots; and deep, swooping bowls of *sīns*, *shīns*, *qāfs* and *yā's*. Despite the distinctive *nūns* and the relatively elongated *alifs* and *mīms*, the handwriting is, on the whole, not too dissimilar to examples from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The

⁶³¹ It is unclear why the binder spelled 'Mujallid' (the usual spelling) as 'Mujallidī'.

⁶³² It is certainly possible that there are similar, contemporary Mamluk examples as well but I have not been able to find any.

⁶³³ As mentioned in Chapter Two, it is possible that Ḥasan was the son of 'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh, who copied the 1314 *Intihānāma* (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794) and the 1323 *Maṣnavī* (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177), both of which were produced in Konya. See n. 412.

main ink used in all of the manuscripts is of a consistently pure black colour, with solid red and watery ultramarine blue ink used for the rubrics. There is also one instance of alternating black and gold script. This occurs in the 1372 *Maṣnavī* on folios 153 and 154 (fig. 218). As we have seen in Chapter Two, alternating black and gold script is associated with Qur'ans produced for the Ilkhanids in Baghdad (see fig. 190).

Two other non-illuminated manuscripts may also have been copied by this scribe. Firstly, a copy of the *Dīvān* of Sulṭān Walad produced in 722/1322 which was copied by one Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Waladī.⁶³⁴ Secondly, a manuscript of *Sharḥ al-Shāfiya* (a commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājjib's (d. 1249) *al-Kāfiya al-Naḥw*) by Fakhr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Jārabardī (d. 1345), which was completed by one Ḥasan al-Mawlawī al-Qūnawī in 1337 or 1339.⁶³⁵ Neither of the manuscripts mention where they were produced. The similarity of the handwriting between these two manuscripts strongly suggests that Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Waladī and Ḥasan al-Mawlawī al-Qūnawī are in fact the same individual (figs 219-220). However, it is not clear whether this individual was also the scribe of Sātī's manuscripts which were produced several decades later. The handwriting of these earlier examples and the script of the Sātī manuscripts is noticeably different but, given the chronological gap between the two groups, it is certainly possible that the scribe's handwriting changed over the course of his life.

⁶³⁴ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Halet Efendi EK 139.

⁶³⁵ İnebey Kütüphanesi, Bursa, Ulucami 3330.

All three manuscripts are extensively and expertly illuminated. Since they are all large manuscripts with several pages of decoration, I will discuss the pigments, programme of illumination and motifs of each in detail before making visual comparisons between them. Finally, I will make visual connections to elements of the arts of the book from neighbouring regions, in anticipation of the later discussion on provenance.

The colour palette of the earliest manuscript, the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, is reasonably consistent throughout both chapters (the *Rabābnāma* and the *Intihānāma*), with gold, silver, green and blue used in both. Gold and blue are the most frequently used colours. However, bright red is used in the *Rabābnāma* only, while deep and light pink, light blue and orangey-bronze are only used in the *Intihānāma*. As in many other cases discussed in previous chapters, white is used for inscriptions and in order to draw attention to certain elements of the decoration, such as knotwork.

The *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* opens with an eight-lobed dedicatory medallion on folio 1a naming Sātī as the patron (fig. 221). Both chapters of the manuscript – the *Rabābnāma* (fols 1-76) and the *Intihānāma* (fols 77-159) – open with two full-page illuminations (i.e. a double frontispiece), two framed text pages and a headpiece (figs 222-227). However, the *Rabābnāma* also closes with a double finispiece that consists of two medallions containing Persian verses and a colophon (fols 74b-75a) (figs 228-229). An illuminated medallion containing Persian verse appears on

folio 159a, immediately following the end of the *Intihānāma* (fig. 230). In total, there are fourteen illuminated pages.

Although similar pigments are used, there are noteworthy differences in the ways that the two chapters are decorated. The illuminated double frontispiece of the *Rabābnāma* consists of large, rectangular panels containing ninety-six eight-lobed roundels that are inscribed with the ninety-nine names of Allāh (fig. 222).⁶³⁶ Conversely, the double illuminated frontispiece of the *Intihānāma* consists of circular medallions filled with intricate curvilinear designs, and four elaborate corner pieces that are formed from gold scrollwork and half-palmettes (fig. 225). This frontispiece, furthermore, is clearly different in style and format to the double finispiece medallions of the *Rabābnāma* that appear two folios before (figs 228-229). Additionally, borders consisting of gold half-palmettes on blue ground (see fig. 221 for example) and eight-lobed roundels (fig. 222) feature in the *Rabābnāma* only, while stylized floral motifs on black ground (figs 227 and 230) only appear in the *Intihānāma*.

Despite these differences, there are a few visual similarities between the two texts as well, and there are common motifs in both chapters of the manuscript. For example, the gold strapwork of the *Rabābnāma*'s framed text visually corresponds to the headpieces of both chapters (figs 223-224 and 227). In addition to their stylistic similarities, these headpieces are also nearly identical in size (respectively,

⁶³⁶ Some of the roundels on the bottom two rows of folio 2a contain two 'names' of Allāh.

they measure 220mm x 53mm and 219mm x 45mm). The gold strapwork and silver half-palmettes of the *Intihānāma*'s text pages are analogous to the double finispiece medallions of the *Rabābnāma* (figs 226, 228 and 229).

The decoration of the 1368 *Dīvān* is fairly consistent over both volumes, in terms of colour palette, patterns and motifs. The predominant pigments, gold and blue, are accompanied by smaller instances of green, black, light blue, pinky-purple, bronze, silver and red. White is used for inscriptions and for emphasising borders, knotwork and strapwork.

As listed in the illuminated contents pages on folios 1b-2a of the first volume, the text is divided into twenty-four chapters of varying lengths (fig. 231). Each volume consists of twelve chapters, all of which begin with a slim, illuminated headpiece (figs 232-241). Following the illuminated contents pages, the first volume contains two full-page illuminations and two pages of framed text (figs 242-243). These do not appear in the second volume. Large 'finispieces' appear after the end of each chapter (except the final chapter), and are integrated into the textblock.⁶³⁷

Generally speaking, these finispieces consist of either circular medallions, or quadrilateral panels of varying sizes that contain intricate geometric decorations (figs 244-266). While the panels appear in both volumes, the circular medallions only appear in the first volume. In one case, the finispiece takes the form of a sideways pointed oval, and in another, it is a circle with horizontal half-palmette

⁶³⁷ The only exception being one medallion on fol. 51b in the first volume where the preceding text finishes at the bottom of fol. 51a.

extensions (figs 249-250). Finally, there is a small note by the calligrapher on folio 130b, which is partly framed by illumination (see fig. 266), a gold-framed colophon on folio 147a (fig. 267) and an elaborate illuminated dedication that consists of seven gold, six-lobed roundels within a circular frame on folio 147b (fig. 268). Aside from the forty-nine pages that contain substantial amounts of illumination (thirty in the first volume and nineteen in the second volume), thin, illuminated subtitles, small, decorative bands and gold rosettes also appear frequently throughout both volumes (figs 269-272).

As is clear from most of the illuminated finispieces, many of the motifs and patterns across the two volumes are geometric in nature with four- and eight-lobed roundels, eight-pointed stars, and hexagons being particularly prominent. Eight-lobed roundels are probably the most common shape found in the manuscript. Octagons, six-lobed roundels, pointed ovals and six-pointed stars also feature several times. In addition to these instances of geometric decoration, curvilinear and floral motifs appear frequently, either as their own decorative devices or integrated within larger geometric patterns. There are several examples of floral or curvilinear corner pieces (fig. 231 for example), floral and curvilinear motifs in headpieces (fig. 236), gold and/or silver half-palmette borders on blue ground (fig. 244), lotuses, half-palmettes and scrollwork integrated into geometric shapes, and various types of strapwork.

Much like the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1368 *Dīvān*, the 1372 *Maṣnavī* is dominated by gold and blue pigments. Light blue, green, black, red, purple, and

orangey-bronze are used in smaller quantities, with white used for inscriptions and for enhancing the visibility of certain borders, strapwork and curvilinear decoration.

Each of the six chapters of the *Maṣnavī* begin with two pages of framed text (figs 273-278), followed by a slim headpiece (figs 279-284). In one case, the framed text appears unfinished, as it is missing the blue ground that appears on other framed text pages (fig. 285). However, the beginning of the manuscript also contains a double illuminated frontispiece on folios 3b-4a, which consists of a geometric composition (fig. 286). The frontispiece, framed text pages and headpieces are all accompanied by small marginal vignettes that contain lotuses. A circular dedicatory medallion appears near the end of the manuscript on folio 188b (fig. 287). This dedication appears immediately following the end of the *Maṣnavī*'s main text but before an epilogue authored by Sulṭān Walad (fol. 189a) and another longer text, probably also by Sulṭān Walad (fols 189a-195a), that precedes the colophon.⁶³⁸ There are twenty-one illuminated pages in total, in addition to small, illuminated bands, rosettes and a few gold inscriptions throughout the manuscript (fig. 288). This programme of illumination is broadly similar to those of the 1278 and 1323 *Maṣnavīs*, which were discussed in the first and second chapters, respectively. Each chapter of these earlier manuscripts, which were both copied in Konya, begins with two pages of text that is surrounded by an illuminated frame, followed by a headpiece. In the case of the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, each chapter also begins

⁶³⁸ These additions are noted in the manuscript's contents page (fol. 2b) under the title, "*majmū'a*" (compendium).

with two fully-illuminated pages, which is not the case in the 1372 copy.

The range of patterns and motifs that appear in the 1372 *Maṣnavī* is more limited than in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1368 *Dīvān-i Kabīr*, which overall gives a visually cohesive effect. The majority of motifs in the 1372 manuscript consist of four- and eight-lobed roundels, eight-pointed stars, half-palmette borders on blue ground, and lotuses. The design of the double frontispiece, for example, features eight-pointed stars, eight-lobed roundels and bisections of four-lobed roundels, while the dedication is framed by four-lobed roundels (figs 286-287). Additionally, the text panels of four of the manuscript's twelve illuminated text pages take the form of sixteen-lobed roundels (figs 273-274). Aside from these motifs, lotuses, flowers on black ground and pointed ovals also appear a number of times. Most of the manuscript's headpieces and text pages are framed by gold strapwork and gold half-palmettes on blue ground. However, there are also instances of blue, five-petalled flowers on gold ground, polychrome half-palmettes, gold scrollwork on blue ground, and white and green strapwork (figs 289-292).

Having described the illumination of the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* in detail, I will now make some general comments regarding the group's visual appearance and consider how these properties may connect to the contemporary arts of the book from other regions.

All three of Sāti's manuscripts feature a predominantly gold and blue colour scheme, with other pigments like red, green, light blue, pink and purple also being

employed. In all three manuscripts, white is used for inscriptions and to heighten the visibility of knotwork and strapwork. Silver pigment is employed several times in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and a few times in the first volume of the 1368 *Dīvān*. The use of this pigment is very unusual in Islamic manuscript illumination generally speaking. Priscilla Soucek has suggested that the presence of silver in Islamic illustration and illumination is perhaps derived from the Armenian arts of the book, which often featured gold and/or silver illumination.⁶³⁹ Silver leaf also appears in a copy of Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* produced in Tabriz in 1314-5.⁶⁴⁰ Soucek surmises that Cilician-Mongol alliances, dating from at least 1232, provided one context for interaction, as many Armenians resided at the Mongol court.⁶⁴¹ As I have briefly mentioned in Chapter Two (see fig. 111), there does appear to have been some overlap in the motifs used by both Armenian and Islamic craftsmen but as there is no surviving evidence for Armenian illuminators working for Muslim patrons (or vice versa), it is difficult to know more about the specific mechanics of transmission.⁶⁴²

In terms of motifs and patterns, there are some elements which are common to all three manuscripts. For example, eight-lobed roundels appear in multiple contexts

⁶³⁹ Soucek 1998: 129.

⁶⁴⁰ Khalili Collection, London, MS727, fol. 8a (72a of the reconstructed manuscript) (ibid: 116-29, fig. 50). See also Blair 1995.

⁶⁴¹ Soucek 1998: 116. See also Kouymjian 2006 and 2012 on the appearance of 'Chinese' motifs in Armenian manuscripts, which the author also attributes to the presence of Armenian artists in the Ilkhanid court.

⁶⁴² There are, however, examples of Armenian craftsmen working in other Islamic (broadly-speaking) contexts. In the field of architecture, *muqarnas* vaulting was employed in a thirteenth-century Armenian monastery (see Ghazarian and Ousterhout 2001) while Armenian architects were involved in Seljuk buildings, like the Taşhan caravanserai near Malatya, completed in 1218 (see Cowe 2015: 86). See also p. 118 which discusses Kalūk the architect. Several Armenian scriptoria also operated in and around medieval Sivas (see Coulie 2004).

and, along with four-, six- and sixteen-lobed roundels, are easily the most common motifs found in the group's illuminations overall. Rows of eight-lobed roundels in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*'s double frontispiece are repeated in enlarged form in a finispiece of the 1368 *Dīvān* (figs 222 and 258). Sixteen-lobed roundels appear in the 1368 *Dīvān* and 1372 *Maṣnavī*'s illuminated text pages, which are strikingly similar in their overall format (figs 243 and 273). Four-lobed roundels and multi-lobed cartouches appear in the headpieces of both the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1368 *Dīvān* (figs 224 and 243). In addition to multi-lobed roundels, other motifs appear in all three manuscripts. These include half-palmette borders on blue ground (almost always paired with thick, gold strapwork) (figs 293-295), lotuses (figs 296-298), pointed ovals (figs 299-301), circular, polychrome flowers on black ground, and circular, interlaced half-palmettes (figs 302-304).

The 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī* are closer in terms of their illuminated motifs and patterns. Despite elements of the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* also appearing in the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī*, the latter two are visually much closer to each other than they are to the earlier manuscript. As such, I suggest that the *Dīvān* and *Maṣnavī* were almost certainly illuminated by the same artist, or group of artists. Certain aspects of the 1366 manuscript's decoration, such as the double frontispiece of the *Intihānāma* and the style of the final medallion (figs 225 and 230) are quite distinctive and find no parallel in the *Dīvān* or the *Maṣnavī*. Eight-pointed stars and octagons, which are numerous in the later two manuscripts, do not appear anywhere in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*. The combination of the eight-pointed star surrounding an eight-lobed roundel appears in both later

manuscripts, which also both feature lotuses in the corner ornaments and gold half-palmettes decorating the ground of the roundels' lobes (figs 246 and 286). Other visual elements that are common to the two later manuscripts but not the *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* include selected headpieces (figs 305-306), white strapwork (figs 307-308), and interlaced knotwork with fleur-de-lis finials (figs 309-310).

In a broad sense, the illumination of all three manuscripts does not strongly resemble that of any other tradition in neighbouring regions. To be more specific, the combination of medallions, full-page designs and illuminated textblock formats are not found in any other contemporary manuscripts from the Near East that I have come across, which makes it more challenging to pinpoint a place of production. Despite a lack of surviving manuscripts and gaps in scholarship in some areas, specific elements of the manuscripts' decoration can be linked to early fourteenth-century Ilkhanid, mid-fourteenth-century Injuid and later fourteenth-century Mamluk illumination.

Many of the geometric motifs found in the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī*, such as eight-pointed stars, octagons, hexagons and poly-lobed roundels (including those used for gold inscriptions), are found in manuscripts produced for the Ilkhanid ruler Ūljaytū (r. 1304-16) and vizier Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī in Baghdad, Mosul and Hamadan (figs 311-314; see also fig. 134). Other motifs, such as the combination of strapwork with gold half-palmettes on blue ground, gold interlacing (see fig. 271, for example) and flowers on black ground, are also all found in Ilkhanid manuscripts from the first quarter of the fourteenth century (figs

315-317). Beyond individual motifs, the format of the double frontispiece of the *Intihānāma* in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* finds a precedent with similar designs in a 1311-12 *Majmū‘a* produced for Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī, probably in Tabriz (figs 225 and 318).

As mentioned above, Ilkhanid territories in Iraq and Iran were divided between competing Mongol successor states after 1335. While places like Tabriz and Baghdad (both of which were held by the Jalayirids) remained centres of illuminated manuscript production, artists from other cities in former Ilkhanid territories may well have sought employment elsewhere in the wake of the dynasty’s collapse. Such places may have included Damascus, Cairo and towns in Rūm. Certain motifs that are first seen in manuscripts produced for Ilkhanid patrons, and appear later in Mamluk and Injuīd manuscripts, were presumably transmitted by such migrant craftsmen. The impact of this is seen in the development of particular page formats. For example, the freestanding medallion seen in Rashīd al-Dīn’s abovementioned *Majmū‘a* produced in Tabriz soon became integrated into the rectangular illuminated frame. This design is present in two mid-fourteenth-century manuscripts that Elaine Wright has convincingly attributed to Injuīd Shiraz: the Fārs Malik Khātūn Qur’an (fig. 319) and the Stephens *Shāhnāma* (fig. 320).⁶⁴³ Both Shirazi manuscripts feature illuminations

⁶⁴³ Wright 2006 and 2012: 25-30. The Fārs Malik Khātūn Qur’an and Stephens *Shāhnāma* have been attributed by Wright to Shiraz on the basis of their illuminations, but also supported by the identity of the patron, an Injuīd princess (in the case of the Qur’an), and illustrations (in the case of the *Shāhnāma*).

that bear a resemblance to designs found in the Sātī group (see, for example, figs 221, 243 and 273).

However, these transregional artistic connections are not necessarily totally attributable to the dispersion of artists following the dissolution of the Ilkhanid empire. The format of the freestanding medallion with four corner pieces also appears in a circa 1306-10 Qur'an from Cairo (fig. 321), which predates the 1311-12 Tabriz *Majmū'a*. This particular page was illuminated by one Muḥammad ibn Mubādir who was responsible for another early fourteenth-century Qur'an produced in Mamluk Cairo.⁶⁴⁴ David James has suggested that the presence of this full-page composition (which he notes is relatively unusual for the Mamluk context), in addition to other elements, like hexagons and octagons, and the use of half-palmette borders on all four sides, were probably derived from the Ilkhanid arts of the book.⁶⁴⁵ Whether this is due to the movement of artists from Ilkhanid to Mamluk lands is unclear. The appearance of the framed medallion in both Cairo, Tabriz and Shiraz may perhaps be attributed to an older, common source, as the design also appears in the 1111-12 Qur'an produced in Bost (now known as Lashkargah in Afghanistan) (fig. 72).⁶⁴⁶

Despite some visual similarities between the manuscripts produced for Sātī and these early to mid-fourteenth-century examples (from Mamluk, Ilkhanid and Injuīd manuscripts), chronological gaps remain. In order to gain a fuller picture, it is

⁶⁴⁴ British Library, London, Add.22406-13 (James 1999: Cat. 1).

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid: 43.

⁶⁴⁶ Brend 1991: 114, Contadini 2012: 172.

worth comparing and contrasting illumination from the 1360s and 1370s with Sātī's manuscripts and the examples cited above.

By the 1360s, Shiraz was ruled by the Muzaffarids, following the fall of the Injuids in 1353. Although there seem to be connections between Sātī's manuscripts and Injuid illumination from Shiraz, this is not the case for Muzaffarid manuscripts. Shirazi illumination produced under the Muzaffarids in the 1360s and 1370s is dominated by minute, gold floral sprays on blue ground, triangular vignettes and 'baroque-edged' cartouches (fig. 322). This style, which foreshadows that of Timurid illumination of Shiraz, is clearly quite different to the illumination of Sātī's manuscripts, which at no point feature anything close to such motifs. All things considered, it seems highly unlikely that the manuscripts were produced in Shiraz.⁶⁴⁷

Elaine Wright has noted that, relatively speaking, Jalayirid styles in the later part of the fourteenth century preserved and developed Ilkhanid illumination more so than the floriated manuscripts of Muzaffarid Shiraz.⁶⁴⁸ For example, an illuminated copy of *Kalīla wa Dimna* produced in 1392 in Baghdad for Shāh Walad ibn 'Alī ibn

⁶⁴⁷ It should be noted however that the only fourteenth-century illuminated copy of a Mawlawi text produced outside Rūm that I am aware of was probably produced in Muzaffarid Shiraz, so it cannot be taken for granted that Mawlawi illuminated manuscripts were always products of Rūm (British Library, London, Or.2866). This manuscript is a copy of Rūmī's *Divān-i Kabīr* and was completed by Aḥmad ibn Walī al-Shīrāzī on 1 Jumādā al-Ākhira 774 (27 November 1372). I have attributed this manuscript to Muzaffarid Shiraz on the basis of its headpiece which features the minute, gold floral sprays on bright, blue ground that are very characteristic of Muzaffarid illumination. The manuscript features no other illumination though each page is framed in gold. The lack of marginal annotations suggests that the manuscript was not a madrasa copy but instead perhaps made for a specific patron.

⁶⁴⁸ Wright 2006: 82.

Uways (r. 1410-11) features a circular medallion integrated into a floral frame surrounded by four floral cornerpieces (fig. 323). This is certainly closer to the aesthetic of Ilkhanid and Injuīd manuscripts (and, to a lesser extent, Sātī's manuscripts) than contemporary Muzaffarid examples. However, a question mark remains over whether Sātī's manuscripts may have been produced in Jalayirid Tabriz or Baghdad due to a relative lack of surviving and securely identified illuminated Jalayirid manuscripts. Since most of what is known about Jalayirid illumination is based on one manuscript – the 1407 *Dīvān* of Sulṭān Aḥmad Jalāyir (r. 1382-1410) – it is difficult to extend the discussion any further.⁶⁴⁹

As I have already mentioned, some examples of Mamluk illumination, such as the early fourteenth-century freestanding medallion with four corner pieces by Muḥammad ibn Mubādir, are possibly connected to Ilkhanid precedents and, by extension, to the decoration of Sātī's manuscripts. Since the production location of Sātī's manuscripts remains unresolved, it is worth looking in more detail at Mamluk illumination from the 1360s and 1370s in order to determine whether the manuscripts may have been produced in Mamluk territories, particularly since the paper of one manuscript (the 1368 *Dīvān*) was acquired in Damascus.

The work of Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī, who was the most prolific illuminator in Cairo in the 1360s and 1370s, does not on the whole resemble the relatively conservative, blue and gold aesthetic of Sātī's manuscripts, as his work is rather more colourful and

⁶⁴⁹ Wright 2006: 82. Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi, İstanbul, 2046.

complex. However, al-Āmidī's distinctive style does feature four- and eight-lobed roundels, multi-lobed headpieces, lotuses and floral motifs on black ground, all of which appear in Ilkhanid works and Sātī's manuscripts (fig. 324). In examining al-Āmidī's oeuvre, David James has remarked that some of his motifs – which are otherwise rare in Mamluk manuscripts from Cairo – may well have been the product of his training elsewhere, especially considering that his *nisba*, 'al-Āmidī', connects him to the eastern Jaziran town of Amid, known today as Diyarbakır.⁶⁵⁰ Another of al-Āmidī's compositions is extremely close to that of an unusual pattern in the 1278 *Maṣnavī* from Konya discussed in detail in Chapter One (figs 24 and 325). A similar pattern also appears in an illuminated copy of the Qur'an produced in Sha'bān 723 (August-September 1323) by Mubārakshāh ibn Quṭb who was also known as *zarīn-qalam* (golden pen) (fig. 326).⁶⁵¹ The production location is not mentioned but the calligrapher was a student of the calligrapher Yāqūt Al-Musta'ṣimī (d. 1298) so it is probable that the manuscript was produced in the Ilkhanid realm.⁶⁵² The connections between the 1278 *Maṣnavī*, the 1323 Ilkhanid Qur'an and the work of al-Āmidī cannot be definitively explained but suggest that the motif perhaps moved from Konya to Ilkhanid lands and then to Cairo via travelling artists. Perhaps al-Āmidī visited or trained in Konya and copied the pattern from the 1278 *Maṣnavī* while it was on display in the Mawlawi shrine.

⁶⁵⁰ James 1999: 202.

⁶⁵¹ Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, W.559. The calligrapher's nickname is not mentioned in this manuscript's colophon.

⁶⁵² Blair 2003. David James has suggested that this manuscript was produced in Tabriz or Baghdad (James 1999: Cat. 50).

Since it also appears in a later Ilkhanid manuscript, it is perhaps more likely that al-Āmidī may have had connections to workshops there.⁶⁵³

The presence of Ilkhanid motifs, like poly-lobed roundels and lotuses, in both the illuminations of Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī and in Sātī's manuscripts may also have an earlier common source, namely manuscript production in the mid-fourteenth-century Mamluk Levant. Bisectioned eight-lobed roundels that appear in an al-Āmidī illumination, for example, find a parallel in an illuminated manuscript previously unknown to scholarship. This manuscript, which is a copy of Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafs 'Umar Suhrawardī's (d. 1234) *Awārif al-Ma'ārif*, was produced in Tripoli (Lebanon) on 23 Muḥarram 751 (2 April 1350) by Aḥmad al-Nāsikh (i.e. copyist/clerk) al-Ḥalabī (i.e. from Aleppo) (fig. 327).⁶⁵⁴ Polylobed roundels also appear in mid-fourteenth century manuscripts produced in Damascus, one of which is a Qur'an that was copied in the Umayyad Mosque.⁶⁵⁵ This Qur'an, dated circa 1330-40, also features circles that alternate with pointed ovals, lotuses and a square-framed roundel (figs 328-329), all of which appear in modified forms in the 1368 *Divān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī*.

⁶⁵³ As has been suggested by David James (1999: 152, 202-4).

⁶⁵⁴ Manisa İl Halk Kütüphanesi, Manisa, 4945.

⁶⁵⁵ Another freestanding medallion with head and tailpieces appears in an Arabic copy of *Rasā'il al-Rusūl wa A'māluhum* (The Epistles and Acts of the Apostles) copied in Damascus in 1341 by Thūmā al-Mutarahhib (i.e. Thomas the monk) known as Ibn al-Ṣafī. Институт восточных рукописей Российской академии наук (Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences), Saint Petersburg, D-228 (Petrosyan 1995: Cat. 23). It is noteworthy that these 'Shiraz-style' frontispieces also appear in manuscripts that were clearly produced outside of that city. Even if the majority of manuscripts displaying such frontispieces were produced in Shiraz, it would seem that the style diffused outwards from the town to places like Damascus and it is therefore possible that some manuscripts attributed to Shiraz on the basis of their frontispieces were actually produced elsewhere.

Compared with fourteenth-century Cairo, there are fewer surviving manuscripts that can be securely attributed to Damascus and other Levantine cities, and David James has suggested that illuminated Coptic manuscripts can help to fill in gaps where Mamluk material is sparse.⁶⁵⁶ Indeed, an Arabic copy of the Gospels produced in 1340 in Damascus by one Jirjīs Abū al-Faḍl ibn Luṭf Allāh features lotuses, octagons and a large, sideways-oriented pointed oval (figs 330-332), all of which are motifs that also appear in the 1368 *Dīvān*. Furthermore, this manuscript is decorated in a largely gold and blue colour scheme. Another fourteenth-century Arabic copy of the Gospels contains four-lobed roundels, eight-pointed stars, pointed ovals and lotuses which are somewhat similar to motifs in Sātī's manuscripts, although the overall look of the illumination is quite different (figs 333-334).

Although a place of production cannot be ascertained from the above analysis of the illumination of Sātī's manuscripts, a case can be made for Damascus (and the wider Levant) as a possibility. In addition to the fact that the paper for the *Dīvān-i Kabīr* was purchased from Damascus, I have drawn links between the illumination in Sātī's manuscripts and the illumination of some surviving Islamic and Coptic manuscripts from the mid-fourteenth-century Levant. In the next section, I will explore the wider context of the manuscripts' inscriptions and what is known about Sātī's life.

⁶⁵⁶ James 1999: 46-7. It is also worth noting that gaps remain in the study of non-Qur'anic illuminated manuscripts produced in Mamluk territories, particularly in Levantine cities like Damascus, Aleppo and Tripoli.

The manuscripts of Sātī: Inscriptions

All of Sātī's manuscripts contain a number of informative inscriptions, including dedications and colophons. In some instances, these inscriptions reveal how long the copying of the manuscript took, or what happened to the codex after Sātī died in 1386. Since this documentary evidence is particularly rich, I will examine each manuscript's inscriptions individually.

The 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* opens with an illuminated dedication naming Sātī as the patron of the manuscript (fig. 221). The dedication, which is virtually identical in its composition to Sātī's two other manuscript dedications, describes him as “the best (literally: cream) of the Arab and Persian ministers, governor of the ministers of the [Muslim] people, model of the lords of the pen [and] ... provider of benefits to mankind”. The text also gives his title and name as Sharaf al-Milla wa al-Dawla wa al-Dīn Amīr Sātī the Mawlawi, son of the deceased Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan, and a date of 10 Dhū al-Ḥijja 767 (18 August 1366).

As I have mentioned above, the last folios of the *Rabābnāma* (the manuscript's first volume) feature two medallions that contain Persian verses (figs 228-229). The inscription in these roundels contains the dates 1 Sha'bān 700 and Dhū al-Ḥijja 700 (April-September 1301), which refer to the original completion of the text of the *Rabābnāma* by its author.⁶⁵⁷ An Arabic inscription just below the Persian

⁶⁵⁷ “*Ghurra-yi Sha'bān shud āghāz-i kitāb dar sana saba^c-mā³a-yi zū-yi libāb dar māh-i Zū al-Ḥijja shud īn ham tamām...*”. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.mixt.1594, fol. 74b.

verses on the following folio (75a) notes that the “book of the *Maṣnavī* of Sulṭān Walad” was finished during the last ten days of Jumādā al-Ākhira in 767 (4-13 March 1366) by Ḥasan son of ‘Uthmān the Mawlawi. The decorated Persian verses that appear at the end of the *Intihānāma* note that the “third book” (meaning the *Intihānāma*) was finished during the last day of Dhū al-Qa‘da, “within the eight, seven hundred [years] from that of Hijra”, i.e. the year 708 (fig. 230).⁶⁵⁸ This dating, of 30 Dhū al-Qa‘da 708 (10-11 May 1309), must again refer to the original completion date of the *Intihānāma*.⁶⁵⁹

As it stands, there are two dates that refer to the completion of the manuscript itself. The earlier date, which refers to the completion of the *Rabābnāma*, is March 1366 and the later date, which is contained in the dedication to Sātī, is 18 August 1366. Since there is no date at the end of the text of the *Intihānāma* to indicate when it was produced, it follows logically that it was probably completed before 18 August 1366, when the manuscript was dedicated.

The inscriptions of Sātī’s other two manuscripts are more straightforward. The second volume of the 1368 *Dīvān* contains four dates which clearly outline the process of producing the manuscript. The gold-framed colophon on folio 147a (fig. 267) notes that the copying of the *Dīvān* began on 2 Shawwāl 768 (1 June 1367), which corresponds to less than a year after the completion of the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i*

⁶⁵⁸ “...ākhir-i Zū al-Qa‘da shud andar samān saba‘-mā’a az gah-i hijrat...”. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.mixt.1594, fol. 159a.

⁶⁵⁹ It is not clear when this text was finished but it must have been between 1301 (the completion of the *Rabābnāma*) and 1312 (the death of Sulṭān Walad).

Valadī. A short inscription on folio 130b (fig. 266) states that the scribe finished copying the text on a Friday during the last ten days of Muḥarram 770, which must be 24 Muḥarram 770 (8 September 1368). The colophon on 147a also notes that the corrections were finished on 1 Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 770 (12 November 1368). The dedication on folio 147b (fig. 268) was written on the same day that the corrections were completed. As I mentioned above, the second volume of the *Dīvān* also contains notes on folio 147b by Sātī concerning the manuscript's paper and production costs, and a Persian *waqf* note by Sātī's son Mustanjid (figs 209-210). Aside from the details about the paper and the *waqf*, which I have discussed above, Sātī notes that the copying and illumination of the manuscript cost 6,000 silver dirhams.

The 1372 *Maṣnavī* contains three inscriptions: the dedication, the colophon and a later note in Persian by Mustanjid (figs 287, 335 and 336). The dedication is dated 1 Rajab 773 (8 January 1372) while the colophon is dated slightly later, to the middle ten days of Rajab 773 (18-27 January 1372). The note by Mustanjid, who evidently inherited the 1372 *Maṣnavī* from his father (much like the 1368 *Dīvān*), details his journey back from Otrar, now a ghost town 230km north of Tashkent in Uzbekistan, to his home of Erzincan in 1405-6. Mustanjid writes that he was in Otrar when Tīmūr (r. 1370-1405) died on 17 Shaʿbān 807 (18 February 1405), and that Tīmūr's grandson, Khalīl Sulṭān ibn Mīrān Shāh, who ruled Transoxiana from 1405 to 1409, allowed him to leave Samarqand in April of the same year (Shawwāl 807). According to another inscription by Mustanjid found in a non-illuminated copy of Rūmī's *Fīhi Mā Fīhi*, which will be discussed in more detail below, the exact

date that he left Samarqand was 24 Shawwāl 807 (24 April 1405).⁶⁶⁰ Crossing the Oxus river and arriving in Khurasan in the same month, Mustanjid finally reached Erzincan some eight or nine months later in Rajab 808 (23 December-21 January 1406).

The world of Sātī ibn Ḥasan: The Aratnids, the Mawlawis and Erzincan

The dedications to Sātī in all three of his manuscripts mention that he was an *amīr* and a Mawlawi devotee. The long list of attributes in the dedications suggests that he was a person of some eminence, perhaps a local leader or government official of some kind. The subject matter of the three texts confirms that Sātī was a devoted Mawlawi disciple but, as he is not mentioned in any other Mawlawi sources, it is difficult to know more about his wider contribution to or role within the Sufi group.⁶⁶¹ This is, however, not unusual, as we have seen in Chapters One and Two, where I have dealt with several Mawlawi manuscript patrons who are (as far as I know) not mentioned in historical records or hagiographies.

Two artists are named in the manuscripts: the scribe Ḥasan ibn ‘Uthmān al-Mawlawī, who copied all of the manuscripts, and Abū Bakr al-Mujallidī al-Mawlawī al-Ḥamawī, the binder of the 1368 *Dīvān*. The participation of Mawlawi craftsmen

⁶⁶⁰ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 2111, fol. 172a.

⁶⁶¹ Sātī is not mentioned in either of the main contemporary Mawlawi hagiographies of the fourteenth century (Sipahsālār 2007 or Aflākī 1961/2002). He is also not mentioned in later Mawlawi sources like *Gulshan-i Asrār* which was written in 1544 by Shāhidi Ibrāhīm Dede (d. 1550). See n. 159. I am grateful to Nuri Şimşekler for confirming that neither Sātī nor his descendants are mentioned in this source.

in the production of lavish, illuminated manuscripts is consistent with contexts discussed in Chapters One and Two, which examined several manuscripts copied by Mawlawi scribes. Unlike some of the artists mentioned in previous chapters, however, neither Ḥasan nor Abū Bakr appear to have been converts to Islam. While it is unclear where Ḥasan was from (possibly Konya),⁶⁶² Abū Bakr originally came from Hama in present-day Syria. The involvement of the same Mawlawi scribe in copying all three manuscripts certainly does indicate a patron-scribe relationship between Sātī and Ḥasan ibn ‘Uthmān that lasted over several years.

The size and lavish appearance of Sātī’s manuscripts show that he was not only an ardent bibliophile but also a person of means. As mentioned above, Sātī himself noted that the copying and illumination of the 1368 *Dīvān* cost 6,000 silver dirhams. Although it is difficult to put this expense into its wider context, wage levels can give a rough idea of the relative value of 6,000 dirhams. There are two notable sources that discuss salaries in the fourteenth century. These are al-‘Umarī’s *Masālik al-Abṣār fī Mamālik al-Amṣār* and Munshī Muḥammad ibn Hindūshāh’s *Dastūr al-Kātib fī Ta‘ayin al-Marātib*.⁶⁶³ *Masālik al-Abṣār* discusses wages under the Ilkhanids but notes that these levels mostly remained consistent at the time of writing, which was some time in the 1340s. The author notes that a *beylerbeyi* (literally, ‘*bey of beys*’), which was the highest ranking *amīr* in the state, was paid 18,000,000 dirhams a year, while an *amīr* of 1,000 men received the

⁶⁶² See n. 412.

⁶⁶³ See Togan 1991: 233-40 for translations of the relevant parts of both sources.

relatively low sum of 6,000 dirhams.⁶⁶⁴ Senior *khātūns* could receive around 12,000,000 dirhams annually (as opposed to 80,000 for minor *khātūns*), viziers were paid 9,000,000 dirhams and *qāḍī al-quḍāts* (chief judges) were given around 60,000 dirhams a year.⁶⁶⁵ Munshī Muḥammad ibn Hindūshāh's chronicle provides further information for the year 1360 but is far less detailed than al-'Umarī's source in terms of specific amounts. He notes that an *ulus beyi* (regional/city governor) earned 600,000 dirhams annually while the *mustawfī al-mamālik* (chief financial officer) received 150,000 dirhams a year.⁶⁶⁶ Ibn Hindūshāh also notes that, beyond the individuals who made up the state and military apparatus, there were several positions that received *zakāt* (alms) money, such as the director of *waqfs*, members of the 'ulamā', shaykhs of dervish lodges, imams, *khaṭībs* (preachers) and hospital directors.⁶⁶⁷

While it is impossible to know what proportion of Sātī's income was spent on his manuscripts, the above information suggests that Sātī may have been in a relatively powerful (or at least well-paid) position, since the annual wage of an *amīr* commanding 1,000 men was equivalent to the cost of producing the 1368 *Dīvān*.

Sātī's manuscripts also show that, like many patrons discussed in previous chapters, he was comfortable reading Persian and probably Arabic as well. While

⁶⁶⁴ Togan 1991: 235-6. *Amīrs* commanding 10 or 100 troops, and individual soldiers all received 600 dirhams annually.

⁶⁶⁵ Ibid: 236.

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid: 239.

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid.

the main texts of the manuscripts are in Persian, the dedications and colophons that mention dates are, as usual, in Arabic. It is notable that inscriptions by Sātī and Mustanjid in the manuscripts are also in Persian rather than, say, Turkish, which suggests that the former was their preferred written language. This is unsurprising if both father and son operated within the Persian-speaking Mawlawi milieu.

Beyond what information can be gleaned from the manuscripts discussed above, there are two other manuscripts that were owned by Sātī's grandson Mu'taḍid, which give further details about where in Rūm he was based and about Sātī's ancestors and descendants. These two manuscripts consist of an undated, non-illuminated copy of Rūmī's *Fīhi Mā Fīhi*,⁶⁶⁸ and an illuminated copy of Sulṭān Walad's *Dīvān* from 1391. The *Dīvān* was copied by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Mutafaqqih (i.e. a student of Islamic jurisprudence) al-Mawlawī,⁶⁶⁹ perhaps for Mustanjid ibn Sātī, in an unknown location.⁶⁷⁰ An Arabic inscription by Mu'taḍid written in 1418 appears on folio 1a, and names the previous five generations of his family. It reads: "Mu'taḍid son of Mustanjid son of [Sharaf al-Dīn] Sātī son of

⁶⁶⁸ The scribe in this manuscript is unnamed but Gölpınarlı states that the handwriting is very similar to that of an undated, illuminated partial copy of Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī's *Maqālāt*, which was copied by a calligrapher named Gawharshād: "*Bu mecmuanın yazısı, bütün hususiyetleriyle Gavharşad'ın yazısıdır*" (Gölpınarlı 1967: II, 173). This manuscript is discussed in more detail below.

⁶⁶⁹ The somewhat unusual *laqab* of 'mutafaqqih' is the active participle (*ism fā'il*) of Form V of the verb 'faqiha'. Its usage instead of the more common 'faqih' (jurist) suggests that the scribe is not an expert in the subject but rather a student or an aspiring jurist perhaps.

⁶⁷⁰ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 75, fol. 1a. This scribe also copied two other illuminated manuscripts, neither of which contain any further information concerning ownership or production location. These manuscripts are both complete copies of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*. The first is dated to 25 Rajab 781 (5 November 1379) (Milli Kütüphane, Ankara, Nevşehir Damad İbrahim Paşa Kütüphanesi 36) and the second is dated mid-Rabī' al-Awwal 788 (mid-April 1388) (Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Hacı Selim Ağa 554). The illumination of the Milli Kütüphane manuscript displays some similarities to the 1391 *Dīvān* and the two manuscripts were perhaps decorated by the same artist. The Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi manuscript's illumination, however, is very different and was possibly completed in Shiraz though it is difficult to be sure. For the 1379 manuscript, see Önder 1968: 520 and Demircan Aksoy 2010: 230-5. The 1388 manuscript is unpublished, as far as I know.

[Ḥusām al-Dīn] Ḥasan son of Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd son of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn [...], his forefather, of Konya, the Mawlawi”.⁶⁷¹ It remains unclear who exactly any of Sātī’s named forebears were⁶⁷² but there was a Seljuk *mustawfī* (head treasurer or accountant) named Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who held the post in 1271-72 and 1276-77. This individual later became the *nā’ib al-salṭana* (vice-sultan) for a year, after the execution of his predecessor Amīn al-Dīn Mikā’īl in 1277 at the hands of the Qaramanids.⁶⁷³ He is mentioned twice in Aflākī’s hagiography under the name of Jalāl al-Dīn-i Mustawfī, and apparently became a disciple of Rūmī during the latter’s lifetime.⁶⁷⁴ A Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd-i Mustawfī is also mentioned briefly in *Bazm u Razm*, as the grandfather of an ‘Abdullāh who quashed an uprising against Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn (r. 1381-98).⁶⁷⁵ The copy of *Fīhi Mā Fīhi* contains a note by Mu‘taḍid written in Persian in 1417 on folio 2b, which mentions “the noblemen of the governors, occupants, and scribes of the abode of victory of Erzincan, may Allāh protect it from misfortunes and accidents”.⁶⁷⁶ According to another inscription in this manuscript, it too, like the 1372 *Maṣnavī*, was in Mustanjid’s possession when he travelled from Otrar to Erzincan in the early fifteenth

⁶⁷¹ *Mu‘taḍid ibn Mustanjid ibn Sātī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn al-‘Alā’ [al-Dīn...] abūhu al-Qūniyawī [sic: al-Qūnawī] al-Mawlawī*. Mu‘taḍid and Mustanjid are unusual names that are shared with Abbasid caliphs of the early medieval period. I currently have no explanation for this.

⁶⁷² Franklin Lewis has speculated that Sātī’s father, Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan, could be the grandson of Rūmī’s successor, Ḥusām al-Dīn Chalabī, who died in 1284 (Lewis 2008: 299). There is a tombstone in the Konya shrine of this grandson that names him as ‘Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Chalabī Ḥusām al-Ḥaqq wa al-Milla wa al-Dīn’ and mentions that he died on 29 Shawwāl 747 (10 February 1347). See Gölpınarlı 1953: 358. In the note above, Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan’s father is named as Jalāl al-Dīn Maḥmūd, so this Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan buried in Konya cannot therefore also be the father of Sātī.

⁶⁷³ Cahen 1968: 342-3.

⁶⁷⁴ Aflākī 1961: I, 133-5, 565; 2002: 94-5, 391.

⁶⁷⁵ Al-Astarābādī 1928: 215.

⁶⁷⁶ *Ḥukkām-i nuvāb va mutaṣarrifān va bitikchīyān-i [sic: bitikchīyān-i] dār al-naṣr-i Arzinjān ḥarasha Allāh ta‘ālā ‘an al-āfāt va al-ḥaḍṣān* (Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 2111, fol. 2b).

century.⁶⁷⁷ Considering that it contains later inscriptions by Mu‘taḍid, this manuscript too was probably inherited by him from his father.

Mu‘taḍid’s note in the 1391 *Dīvān* clearly shows that the family were originally from Konya. Their names do not indicate that they were converts to Islam.⁶⁷⁸ The fact that both manuscripts are of Mawlawi texts and that Mu‘taḍid mentioned a Mawlawi affiliation in the 1418 inscription suggests that he too was a Mawlawi devotee like his father and grandfather. If Sātī’s grandfather was indeed Jalāl al-Dīn-i Mustawfī mentioned in Aflākī’s hagiography of Rūmī, Mu‘taḍid may well have been the fifth generation of his family to have been a Mawlawi disciple. His note in the copy of *Fīhi Mā Fīhi* shows that, like Mustanjid, Mu‘taḍid lived in Erzincan and considered it his hometown. Mustanjid’s inscription in the 1368 *Dīvān* concerning its endowment to the Mawlawi shrine in Konya also mentions the *nisba* ‘al-Arzinjānī’. There are two further sources that definitively connect Sātī himself to Erzincan. These are a chronology (*taqwīm*) compiled by Mustanjid some time after

⁶⁷⁷ Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 2111, fol. 172a.

⁶⁷⁸ It is unclear what Sātī’s ethnic origin was. His name was possibly derived from either the Arabic/Persian word, *sātī*‘ (clear or bright) or the Turkish word, *şatılmış*, literally meaning ‘one who is sold/consecrated’ to a saint. According to Ed. (2016) this name was apparently used by “hitherto barren” mothers. Sātī’s name also seems to have been relatively unusual for the time, and the examples cited below of people named Sātī/Şatılmış all have Mongol connections. The only other example I could find of the name ‘Sātī’ being used in this period is Sātī Bey Khātūn, who was the sister of the Ilkhanid ruler Abū Sa‘īd. Sātī Bey is mentioned in several chronicles of the period and was wife of, firstly, Chūbān Suldus (d. 1327), and, secondly, Sulaymān Khān, who was the Ilkhanid puppet ruler of Tīmūrtāsh’s son, Ḥasan-i Kūchak (d. 1343). Sātī Bey and Sulaymān Khān died some time after 1344-5 (Melville and Zaryab 1991, Göde 1994: 70). There was also an *amīr* named Tāj al-Dīn Şatılmış and a princess named Sātılmış Khātūn. The former was the husband of Kūrdūjin Khātūn (d. 1338) whose mother, Abīsh Khātūn (d. 1286), was the last Sulghurid Atabeg ruler and whose father was Tāsh-Mōngke, a son of Hūlāgū (Lambton 1988: 275). According to a seventeenth-century Chaghatai-language source, the princess Sātılmış Khātūn was the wife of Īsan Būghā, ruler of the Chaghatai Khanate (r. 1310-18) (Bahādur 1871: I, 155-6; II, 165).

he returned to Erzincan following Tīmūr's death in 1405,⁶⁷⁹ and a Persian-language book on Chingizid history composed by Sātī himself in 1378.

According to the *taqwīm*, a young prince (*amīrzāda-yi javān*) named Pīr Ḥusayn (d. 1379), who was the *bey* of Köğonya (also known as Şarki Karahisar, and today known as Şebinkarahisar), became the ruler of Erzincan on 14 Sha'bān 763 (8 June 1362), following the death of the previous ruler of Erzurum, Erzincan and Bayburt, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Akhī Ayna Bey (r. 1348-62).⁶⁸⁰ According to coins minted in Erzincan over the 1350s and 1360s, both Ayna Bey and Pīr Ḥusayn recognised Aratnid authority.⁶⁸¹ By the end of July 1362, Pīr Ḥusayn had also defeated the *amīrs* of Erzincan, who then fled to the nearby towns of Tercan and Bayburt. Pīr Ḥusayn then captured the fortress of Bayburt on 21 Dhū al-Qa'da 763 (11 September 1362) following a thirty-two-day siege. The *taqwīm* notes that, before its conquest, this fortress was held by Malik al-Dīn Ḥasan Jānbag, 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī and 'Sātī-i Mawlawī', so it is therefore likely that Sātī was one of the *amīrs* who had fled Erzincan in July.⁶⁸²

⁶⁷⁹ Osman Turan, who published this *taqwīm*, notes that Mustanjid 'compiled' it (*tertip etmiştir*) but it is not clear what that means in practical terms (Turan 1984: 2).

⁶⁸⁰ Turan 1984: 80-1, Sinclair 2016. The original chronology is no. 2120 in the Konya Müzesi Kütüphanesi. It is not clear what the relationship was between Ayna Bey and Pīr Ḥusayn but Rustam Shukurov has questioned whether they could have been father and son (Shukurov 1994: 36). Shukurov also notes that, surprisingly, Ayna Bey purchased control of Erzincan, rather than conquering it (ibid: 32). *Bazm u Razm* describes Pīr Ḥusayn as the '*wālī*' (ruler or governor) of Erzincan (al-Astarābādī 1928: 151).

⁶⁸¹ Shukurov 1994: 32, Remler 1980: 174, 176.

⁶⁸² Turan 1984: 80. It is unclear who Malik al-Dīn Ḥasan Jānbag and 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī were. Neither are mentioned in *Bazm u Razm*, the main chronicle of this period (al-Astarābādī 1928). This 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī is not the same 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī who was the Aratnid ruler from 1365 to 1380 as he was still a minor when he ascended to that position, and so he could not have defended the fortress of Bayburt (Paul 2011: 122).

Sātī's text on Chingizid history, which appears to have survived in a single illustrated copy, is entitled *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān*.⁶⁸³ Although there are no other works known to have been authored by him, the existence of the *Tārīkh* goes some way in validating the description of Sātī in his manuscripts' dedications as a "model of the lords of the pen". For the most part, the text is based on the Persian version of Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī's *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* and replicates sections of this work verbatim.⁶⁸⁴ The manuscript's contents indicate that Sātī was familiar with *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* specifically, and with Chingizid history more generally. While the manuscript is on the whole a history of Chingīz Khān's descendants, with particular reference to the Ilkhanids, it focuses in particular on genealogical matters and concepts of good governance.⁶⁸⁵ The author is described on folio 9b as "Sātī, son of Ḥasan, son of Maḥmūd, originating from Konya, born in Erzincan, Ḥanafī by *madhhab* (Islamic school of jurisprudence) and Mawlawī by breeding".⁶⁸⁶ Although it is unclear whether this copy dates from Sātī's time, the inscription continues to note that the author started writing the text on 1 Ramaḍān 779 (1 January 1378).⁶⁸⁷

The manuscript does not mention where it was produced but Zeren Tanındı has claimed that it was produced in Konya though it is not clear on what basis she

⁶⁸³ Научная Библиотека им. Горького СПбГУ (Saint Petersburg State University Library), Saint Petersburg, O.P.950(b).

⁶⁸⁴ Melville 2010: 130.

⁶⁸⁵ Melville notes, for example, that the career and conquests of Chingīz Khān are omitted in favour of information concerning his wives and sons (ibid: 132-5).

⁶⁸⁶ 'Sātī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥmūd al-Qūnawī maḥtīdan wa al-Arzinjānī muwallīdan al-Ḥanafī madhhaban wa al-Mawlawī ta'adduban'. The final word in this phrase (*ta'adduban*) is derived from the root *aduba* which means to be well-bred, cultured or educated in literature.

⁶⁸⁷ Melville says Rajab which is incorrect (ibid: 136).

makes this assertion.⁶⁸⁸ Both Charles Melville and Zeren Tanındı have suggested that the manuscript was probably produced in the late fourteenth century but that the illustrations are certainly of a later date (possibly the fifteenth century) and perhaps have a Central Asian provenance.⁶⁸⁹ Melville does however leave room for the possibility that the whole manuscript was made in the fifteenth century in an unknown location.⁶⁹⁰

The patron for whom Sātī wrote the text is named on folio 9b. She is called “the lady of this hereditary land, oyster pearl of the supreme, decoration of the palanquin of sublime matters, the Bilqīs of the era and epoch, the Khadīja of the time and age, chastity of the world and the faith, queen of queens of all that exists [...] best of the chaste and holy women, may her state be eternal and her power persist”.⁶⁹¹ Melville has transcribed the patron’s name as Khwand Islāmshāh Khātūn and suggested that she may be the mother or a wife of the Aratnid ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aratnā (r. 1365-80).⁶⁹² The text on folio 73b identifies the two illustrated figures as ‘Shāhzāda Shaykh ‘Alī’ and ‘Khwand-gār Khātūn’, and there are references to a ‘Shāhzāda Shaykh ‘Alī’ and ‘Shāhzāda-yi

⁶⁸⁸ Tanındı 2012: 222. Melville does not mention a possible production location in his 2010 article.

⁶⁸⁹ Melville 2010: 139-46, Tanındı 2012: 222.

⁶⁹⁰ Melville 2010: 145.

⁶⁹¹ *‘Bānū-yi īn mān-i zamīn durr-i ṣadafa al-a‘la zīnat havdaj al-ma‘ālī Bilqīs al-‘ahd va al-zamān Khadīja al-‘aşr va al-darān [sic: dawrān] ‘iṣmat al-dunya va al-dīn malika al-malikāt fī al-‘ālamīn [...] zubdat ‘iṣmatiyān va khalladat dawlatahā va abbadat shawkatahā’.*

⁶⁹² Melville 2010: 137. Only one woman is interred in the tomb of the Aratnid rulers, the Köşk Medrese in Kayseri, which was built in 1339. This is Sūlī Pāshā Khātūn, one of Aratnā’s wives. There is a ‘Khwānd Khātūn’ who is buried in the Emir Mirza Bey Türbe which was built in 1381 in Bafra. She died in 1378 of the plague and is noted to be a daughter of the Isfandiyarid *amīr* Mirza Bey (Oral 1956: 390-2, 406) but the lengthy, elaborate titles of the manuscript’s patron suggest that she was perhaps a more major figure than this Isfandiyarid princess.

Jahān’ throughout the text. Elsewhere, the patron is referred to as the “pride of the illustrious family (*urugh*) of Chingīz Khān”.⁶⁹³

I have, thus far, not been able to find any reference to a woman named Khwand Islāmshāh Khātūn. It is possible that the patron’s name is in fact not Khwand Islāmshāh Khātūn, but Khwand Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn. It is unclear whether this manuscript is contemporary to the time of its original composition and if it is indeed a later copy, it is possible that the scribe incorrectly copied the patron’s name. Furthermore, the *lām-alif* part of the word ‘Islām’ does not resemble the other *lām-alifs* that are present on the page, suggesting that the word could be something other than ‘Islāmshāh’ (fig. 337). In any case, there is an ‘Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn’ mentioned in *Bazm u Razm* as the grandmother (*jidat*) of one “‘Alī Bey’, which refers to the Aratnid ruler, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī.⁶⁹⁴ The text does not say whether Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn was the maternal or paternal grandmother of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī (i.e. the wife of Aratnā).⁶⁹⁵ Nevertheless, since he was ruling at the time that the text of *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān* was composed, it would make sense that he is mentioned in the manuscript alongside the patron.⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹³ Quoted and translated in Melville 2010: 137.

⁶⁹⁴ Al-Astarābādī 1928: 167-8.

⁶⁹⁵ Göde states that Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn was the mother of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad (r. 1352-65), the previous Aratnid ruler, but does not give a source for this claim (Göde 1995). Sūlī Pāshā Khātūn, one of Aratnā’s wives, is the only woman buried in the Aratnid mausoleum (see notes 617 and 692) and, because of this, it might make more sense that she was the mother of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, rather than Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn.

⁶⁹⁶ If Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn was the patron, she may not even have been particularly old seeing as ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī was still a minor when he ascended the throne. See n. 682 above.

Melville notes that the Aratnids could not claim to be Chingizids. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (who, admittedly, is not always the most reliable source) did state that Aratnā was married to a relative of the Ilkhanid ruler, which would have made her Chingizid.⁶⁹⁷ It is therefore possible that ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī did have Chingizid ancestors but it is impossible to know for sure. It is conceivable that Khwand Islāmshāh/Iṣfahānshāh Khātūn herself was a Chingizid. Whether or not this was the case, the manuscript does reveal a preoccupation on the part of the patron with emphasising her family’s Mongol associations, imagined or not. If the patron was an Aratnid princess, the text was perhaps then a private facet of a wider drive to legitimise the Aratnids’ status as one of the (Mongol) successor states to the Ilkhanids in the region.⁶⁹⁸

Assuming that Melville’s identification of Khwand Islāmshāh Khātūn as a member of the Aratnid dynasty is correct, the information in this manuscript suggests that Sātī was affiliated with the polity and perhaps part of their inner circle, maybe even serving them as an official historian. As well as reiterating Sātī’s status as a Mawlawi and his family’s origins in Konya, the text also confirms that Sātī was from Erzincan though it is not clear where he composed *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān*. It could have been written in Sātī’s hometown of Erzincan, or possibly Sivas or Kayseri, where the Aratnids were based.

⁶⁹⁷ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 433-4. See n. 617 above.

⁶⁹⁸ Melville 2010: 139.

As far as I am aware, there are no mentions of Sātī or his family in any further historical sources. To briefly recap, the analysis above suggests that Sātī was an *amīr* and Mawlawi devotee, who had grown up in Erzincan but whose family were originally from Konya. He probably held a position that paid him well, and was able to exercise a certain amount of power on a local but not regional level. He appears to have been affiliated with the Aratnids, but is not mentioned in *Bazm u Razm* which indicates that he probably did not play a prominent role in politics in the later part of his life, perhaps after ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī’s death in 1380. Since the production location of Sātī’s manuscripts remains unknown, it is worth looking in more depth at the milieu in which Sātī lived in order to gain a clearer sense of where his manuscripts might have been completed. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the political and cultural landscapes of eastern Rūm, and particularly Erzincan, in more detail with the hope of further contextualising the world that Sātī inhabited.

During the years in which Sātī is known to have been active (between 1362 and 1378), eastern Rūm’s political landscape was very fractured, particularly due to the gradual erosion of Aratnid lands after the death of Aratnā in 1352. In the complete absence of any stable imperial government, territories and de facto power were contested by urban Turkmen and Mongol *amīrs*, nomadic Mongol groups, the Mamluks (who occupied Malatya from 1315 and Ayas from 1347), Byzantine Trebizond and Armenian Cilicia.⁶⁹⁹ Aside from Pīr Ḥusayn of Erzincan

⁶⁹⁹ Paul 2011.

and Bayburt, ambitious, local lords and families included Ḥājjī Ibrāhīm who temporarily held Sivas in the late 1370s, Ḥājjī Shād Galdī of Amasya (d. after 1381), Qilich Arslān (d. 1380-81) of Koyulhisar and Şebinkarahisar, Tāj al-Dīn (d. 1386) of Niksar,⁷⁰⁰ the sons of Ḥājjī Amīr, who ruled an area between Ordu and Giresun (fl. late 14th-early 15th c.),⁷⁰¹ Shaykh Junayd of Kayseri (fl. 1380s), the Mongol Samāghār tribe and the Bābūq family.⁷⁰²

The relative lack of contemporary source material for the period⁷⁰³ makes it difficult to identify certain individuals (like Sātī), their relative status and those to whom they were allied or hostile. The sources do give the distinct impression, however, that eastern Rūm was beset by near-constant hostilities and characterised by complex networks of affiliation and suzerainty.⁷⁰⁴ Kayseri, for example, while ostensibly controlled by one Shaykh Junayd, was in fact heavily contested throughout the last quarter of the fourteenth century by the Aratnids, Qaramanids, and Mongol Samāghār and Jayghāzān tribes. So much so that Jürgen Paul has termed it a “no-man’s-land ... and a land of many lords”.⁷⁰⁵ This evidently fluid political scene serves to emphasise the problematic nature of the “Turkish

⁷⁰⁰ Sümer 1969: 125, Paul 2011: 139.

⁷⁰¹ Shukurov 1994: 46.

⁷⁰² Paul 2011: 121-6.

⁷⁰³ Most of the sources discussed in the Introduction and used in previous chapters (such as Ibn Bībī, al-Aqsarāyī, al-‘Umarī, the Anonymous *Tārīkh*, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Aflākī and Sipahsālār) pertain to a period from the late thirteenth to the mid-fourteenth centuries. The main chronicle for this period is *Bazm u Razm* (al-Astarābādī 1928) which has a relatively narrow focus on the rise and career of Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn from circa 1380 until his death in 1398. Due to language constraints, I have been unable to use Byzantine, Latin, Armenian or Georgian sources but it is possible that Sātī is mentioned in these. For studies of this period that use such sources, see Vyronis 1971, Zachariadou 1979, 1980 and 1983, Shukurov 1994, 2012 and 2016, and Korobeinikov 2005 and 2014.

⁷⁰⁴ Paul 2011 and 2013. See also Shukurov 1994 and Korobeinikov 2005.

⁷⁰⁵ Paul 2011: 147, al-Astarābādī 1928: 96.

beylik' model that I have discussed in Chapters Two and Three. Before discussing cultural life in the region in more depth, it is worth briefly considering how scholarship on the beyliks has shaped understandings of the political and cultural life of eastern Rūm in the late fourteenth century.

As I have discussed in Chapter Two and Three, perceptions of the beyliks have, particularly in Turkish scholarship, been guided by Osman Turan's view that they were, generally speaking, Turkish, 'half-shamanistic', frontier polities that existed beyond the reach of Mongol and Persian culture.⁷⁰⁶ The emphasis on the beyliks' role in the 'Turkification' of Anatolia has prevented more multifaceted understandings of the people and polities of eastern Rūm, by obscuring the significant variations that could exist between the beyliks themselves, and between the individual actors who comprised them. The Aratnids, for example, are categorised as a Turkish beylik in Turkish scholarship, presumably due to their Uyghur origins.⁷⁰⁷ Kemal Göde has stated that 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī thought of himself as a Mongol despite being Turkish, and that all of eastern Rūm's 'important *amīrs*' were of non-Mongol origin.⁷⁰⁸ Whether this is true or not,⁷⁰⁹ the wider point is that reductive ethnic labels are not helpful in illuminating the practical realities of eastern Rūm's late medieval towns. As in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, identity was a profoundly complex and fluid issue in a milieu where Turks, Arabs, Persians, Mongols, Greeks and Armenians lived and mixed, and

⁷⁰⁶ Turan 1977: 251-53.

⁷⁰⁷ Yücel 1989, Göde 1994 and 1995.

⁷⁰⁸ Göde 1994: 102-4, citing information from Sümer 1969: 125.

⁷⁰⁹ Jürgen Paul states that it is not, arguing that Shaykh Junayd of Kayseri may well have been a Mongol (2011: 137-47).

neither conversion nor intermarriage was uncommon.⁷¹⁰ Sātī, as a Persian- and Arabic-speaking Muslim with connections to Konya and Erzincan, Mawlawi and possibly Aratnid affiliations, and knowledge of Chingizid and Ilkhanid genealogy and governance, embodies this cultural complexity.

Jürgen Paul has argued that applying the ‘beylik’ model in this splintered geopolitical context is of limited usefulness, as it excludes smaller polities or rulers whose histories have not survived from the political landscape. Whether Sātī was a person of political weight or not, his history has remained relatively unknown in scholarship, like those of many other manuscript patrons and local *beys*. Since such individuals are generally not the focus of imperial or beylik-centred narratives, they are often relegated to the peripheries. This is the case with Sātī who is not often mentioned in secondary literature concerning this period, except in studies on the arts of the book. His manuscripts, and the details of his life, however, illuminate lesser-known aspects of late medieval Erzincan, such as the activities of the Mawlawi.

As a result of near-constant conflict in the region and the frequency with which cities and fortresses changed hands, the political scene was particularly complicated and changeable. However, cultural life persevered, albeit perhaps diminished somewhat by the persistent presence of the bubonic plague, which was

⁷¹⁰ Some examples include the 1352 marriage between Maria, sister of Alexios III of Trebizond (r. 1349-90), and Qutlugh Bey (r. 1360-78/9) of the Āq Qūyūnlū, the 1358 marriage between Theodora, sister of Alexios III, and Ḥājji Amīr, and the 1379 marriage between Eudokia, daughter of Alexios III, and Tāj al-Dīn of Niksar (Korobeinikov 2005: 22-3, n. 71).

discussed in detail in the previous chapter.⁷¹¹ Nevertheless, the cities of eastern Rūm were home to communities of active intellectuals, artists and dervishes. Erzincan in particular was home to an active *akhī* community, which included both Muslim and Armenian Christian adherents.⁷¹² The Mawlawi too were present in the city, though the nature and extent of Sātī's involvement with the group (beyond his manuscript patronage) remains unclear.

An undated, illuminated partial copy of Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī's (d. ca 1247) *Maqālāt*, copied by one Gawharshād, suggests that Sātī's son, Mustanjid, was perhaps part of the Mawlawi inner circle in Erzincan.⁷¹³ An undated Persian inscription written by Mustanjid on folio 123a mentions that he inherited the manuscript from one Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad-i Munajjim (the astrologer), son of the deceased Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn.⁷¹⁴ Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn is described in the inscription as one of the vicegerents (*khalīfa*) of Sulṭān Walad. Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı has suggested that this connection between Mustanjid and Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad-i Munajjim shows that the former was very likely himself a vicegerent of the latter.⁷¹⁵ Whether or not this is the case, the father of Muḥammad-i Munajjim – Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn – is indeed mentioned by the contemporary Mawlawi author Farīdūn Sipahsālār as Sulṭān Walad's representative (*qā'im-maqām*) in

⁷¹¹ Although the sources are relatively silent on the matter of plague in eastern Rūm, there were outbreaks in various parts of the Middle East throughout the late medieval period. The Aratnid 'Alī al-Dīn 'Alī himself died of the disease in 1380 (al-Astarābādī 1928: 180).

⁷¹² Goshgarian 2013: 46-8.

⁷¹³ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 2788. Algaç 2000: 159-61, Tamındı 2000: 526 and 2007: 173, Demircan Aksoy 2010: 339-49.

⁷¹⁴ See Appendix Two.

⁷¹⁵ Gölpınarlı 1953: 173.

Erzincan.⁷¹⁶ İsmet Miroğlu names Mustanjid, along with Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn, Muḥammad-i Munajjim, ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Arzinjānī, Khalīlullāh and ‘Īsā Chalabī among the important Mawlawi figures of fourteenth-century Erzincan, though provides no further information about them. He also notes that Erzincan was home to one of the first four or five Mawlawi lodges built outside of Konya.⁷¹⁷ Tahir Erdoğan Şahin states that this no-longer-extant lodge was established by Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusayn while Sulṭān Walad was still alive, but does not mention his source for this information.⁷¹⁸

The original brown leather binding of the *Maqālāt* (figs 338-339) is somewhat similar to contemporary bindings that have been attributed to Mamluk Egypt and Syria (figs 340-341), though the small squares on the top and bottom of the front binding are rather unusual. The manuscript is very similar in appearance to another partial copy of the text, which does not contain any inscriptions.⁷¹⁹ The illuminated medallions and headpiece of both manuscripts, which denote their

⁷¹⁶ Sipahsālār 2007: 155.

⁷¹⁷ Miroğlu 1995. He does not name his sources nor does he mention where the other Mawlawi lodges were built. It is possible that Miroğlu is using later Mawlawi sources (discussed in n. 159). Aside from the shrine in Konya, there were Mawlawi *zāwiyas* in Ladik by 1338 and in Larende and Ermenek by the early fourteenth century (see notes 440 and 472). Aflākī also mentions the *zāwiya* of one Shaykh Suhrāb-i Mawlawī in Sultaniye which the author himself visited on Eid al-Adha, 10 Dhū al-Ḥijja 717 (13 February 1318). Aflākī 1961: II, 896; 2002: 627. A no-longer-extant Mawlawi lodge was also built in the late fourteenth century in Bor, near Niğde. This *zāwiya* was completed in 760/1358-59 by one Sulṭān Shāh al-Mawlawī. The foundation inscription pledges allegiance to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aratnā (Özkarcı 1995: 109).

⁷¹⁸ Şahin 1998: 138.

⁷¹⁹ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Darülmünevi 271. The *naskh* script, illuminated medallions and headpieces are virtually identical, and the text of both manuscripts does not overlap in any way so it is therefore very likely that they were part of a multi-volume copy of the work. While there are some notable differences between the manuscripts and published versions of the text, Fatih 2788, broadly speaking, consists of material from Book 1 of the *Maqālāt*, and Darülmünevi 271 corresponds to parts of Book 2. In Muḥammad ‘Alī Muvahhid’s edited version of the text, folio 2a of Fatih 2788 appears on p. 165, line 14 of Book 1, and folio 1b of Darülmünevi 271 appears on p. 85, line 1 of Book 2 (Tabrīzī 1990). See also Demircan Aksoy 2010: 350-5.

various chapters, are fairly close in colour and composition to medallions seen in the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and headpieces in the 1368 *Dīvān* (figs 342-345) suggesting a common production place for all the manuscripts, perhaps Erzincan.

Late medieval Erzincan shared some of the characteristics that were common to many of Rūm's cities like Konya and Sivas. Erzincan too was an economic hub, and a centre of intellectual activity. However, the town was notably different from places like Konya and Sivas in that the majority of the population was Armenian, with several, active Armenian monasteries nearby.⁷²⁰ On the whole, contemporary accounts suggest that Erzincan was a prosperous and bustling metropolis. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited the city around 1331, stated that it was part of Ilkhanid territories, and that the minority Muslim population spoke Turkish.⁷²¹ He seems to have had a predominantly positive impression of the town, noting its majority Armenian population, "well-organized bazaars" and the local manufacture of fine fabrics and copperware.⁷²² Erzincan was a stop on a major trade route that stretched from Ayas (Yumurtalık) to Tabriz.⁷²³ Its economic importance at the time is corroborated by Ḥamdullāh al-Mustawfī al-Qazwīnī's (d. after 1340) *Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, which lists the town's annual budget at 332,000 dinars out of *mamālik-i Rūm*'s 3.3 million dinar total.⁷²⁴ *Risāla-yi Falakiyya*, which was composed by 'Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Kiyā al-Māzandarānī between 1340 and 1367, notes

⁷²⁰ These included the monasteries of Awag, Surb Lusavorič (Hayrapēt), T'ili, Surb Nersēs (Tirašēn), Tataski, Surb Geworg, Surb Asdouacacin and Surb Kirakos (Goshgarian 2013: 46).

⁷²¹ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 437.

⁷²² Ibid. Marco Polo, who visited Erzincan in the second half of the thirteenth century, also mentioned that it produced "the best buckrams in the world" (Marco Polo 1871: I, 45). Pegolotti wrote that this buckram was sold in the markets of Constantinople and Pisa (Pegolotti 1936: 208).

⁷²³ Goshgarian 2013: 47.

⁷²⁴ By way of comparison, Mosul's annual budget was 328,000 dinars (Togan 1991: 223, 227).

that the town was one of several in *mamālik-i Rūm* that paid taxes to the Jalayirid administration in Tabriz.⁷²⁵

Earlier sources paint a less positive view of the town. Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī's (d. 1229) *Mu'jam al-Buldān* which was written around 1224-8 describes the town as "one of Armenia's most beautiful, famous, pleasant, active and populated cities" but also points out that "wine drinking and inappropriate behaviour" were common.⁷²⁶

Najm al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1256) went even further calling the local population, "a people void of all humanity, with the seed of vileness sown in their souls".⁷²⁷ Erzincan is only mentioned a few times in Aflākī's hagiography, and the author's attitude can be described as ambivalent at best. In one anecdote, Rūmī's father, Bahā' al-Dīn Walad (d. 1232) refuses to enter the town, noting that "there are many bad persons in that place".⁷²⁸ Rūmī himself seemingly had no such qualms, visiting Erzincan and inspiring a local physician 'Alā' al-Dīn-i Ṭabīb-i Arzinjānī and his wife to become Mawlawi disciples.⁷²⁹ In some instances, the relationships between Armenians and Mawlawis are depicted as reasonably amicable.⁷³⁰ However, other Armenian figures, such as slaves and dervishes, are portrayed as base and inferior.⁷³¹

⁷²⁵ The tax bill relates to 1349-50 specifically. In addition to the section on *mamālik-i Rūm*, there are also sections for *Wilāyat-i Arman* (Armenia) and *Wilāyat-i Diyār-Bakr-i 'Arabī* (Togan 1991: 232-3).

⁷²⁶ Quoted in Goshgarian 2012: 240.

⁷²⁷ Rāzī 1982: 13.

⁷²⁸ Aflākī 1961: I, 24; 2002: 19.

⁷²⁹ Aflākī 1961: I, 347-8; 2002: 240.

⁷³⁰ Aflākī 1961: I, 153, 489; 2002: 107, 337.

⁷³¹ Aflākī 1961: I, 115, II, 853; 2002: 83, 596.

Much like the participation of Greek-speaking people in Rūm's cultural and artistic scenes that was discussed in Chapter One, Armenians too lived and worked alongside Muslims in the region's urban centres as merchants, slaves, religious figures, scholars, craftsmen and scribes.⁷³² Rachel Goshgarian has discussed the relationships between the activities of Muslim and Armenian urban *akhī* brotherhoods in depth. She notes that, while Erzincan was not a multicultural utopia, "linguistic plurality and interfaith interaction were part and parcel of everyday life",⁷³³ citing the use of Persian and Turkish poetic metres in Armenian *futuwwa* treatises of the period.⁷³⁴

With regard to manuscripts, it is difficult to know what, if any, involvement Armenian artists had in producing Islamic manuscripts and vice versa. While Priscilla Soucek has suggested that the Mongol court was a possible context for interaction or the exchange of ideas and techniques, Erzincan was also a possible alternative for such activities, since the town and its surrounds were sites of illuminated Armenian manuscript production in the thirteenth century. Although not as prolific as better-known centres like Cilicia, lavish illuminated manuscripts had been produced in Erzincan in the thirteenth century. These include the *Homilies of Mush* copied between 1200 and 1202⁷³⁵ and an early thirteenth-century Gospels,⁷³⁶ both completed in the Avak Vank' monastery about 30

⁷³² Dadoyan 2013-14.

⁷³³ Goshgarian 2012: 246. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's description of Erzincan also shows that the town was an important centre for intellectual and cultural activities, and was home to a leading *futuwwa* chief (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962: 437).

⁷³⁴ Goshgarian 2012: 244.

⁷³⁵ Մեսրոպ Մաշտոցի անվան հին ձեռագրերի ինստիտուտ (The Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts), Yerevan, 7729.

⁷³⁶ Korkhmazian et al. 1984: Cat. 4.

kilometres from Erzincan, and a bible commissioned by Bishop Sargīs of Erzincan in 1269.⁷³⁷ Although I have not been able to find an illuminated Armenian manuscript from the fourteenth century produced in Erzincan, non-illuminated manuscripts were certainly produced there at that time, and illuminated manuscripts from fifteenth-century Erzincan have also survived.⁷³⁸

Possible centres of production

It is impossible to come to a definitive answer for where Sātī's manuscripts were produced (if, indeed, they were all produced in the same place) since the overall visual style of the material is quite idiosyncratic. Also, significant gaps remain in the body of surviving manuscript material. There are, for example, relatively few securely identified Jalayirid manuscripts from the fourteenth century. The comparative ease by which artists travelled only serves to further complicate matters and blur the boundaries between regional styles. Through a review and analysis of the evidence presented above, I suggest that Erzincan, Konya and Damascus are the most likely candidates for the place(s) of production.

Although some of the motifs and patterns in Sātī's manuscripts, such as the medallion with four corner pieces and the related square-framed medallion, appear in early to mid-fourteenth-century illuminations produced in Shiraz and Cairo, they bear little resemblance to later fourteenth-century illuminations from

⁷³⁷ Narkiss 1980: 66-74.

⁷³⁸ Sanjian 1969: 90, Mathews and Wieck 1994: Cat. 68.

these places. Some of these same motifs and patterns appear in early fourteenth-century illuminations from Baghdad and Tabriz. It is difficult to determine to what extent Sātī's manuscripts could have been produced in western Persia or the Jazira since few securely identified illuminated manuscripts from later fourteenth-century Baghdad and Tabriz survive. However, the few identified and illuminated manuscripts from this context, such as the 1392 *Kalīla wa Dimna* produced in Baghdad for Shāh Walad, are all written in *nasta'liq* script (unlike the *naskh* of Sātī's manuscripts), making a Persian or Jaziran provenance for Sātī's manuscripts less likely in comparison to other possibilities.

As I have said, illuminated manuscripts of 1360s and 1370s Mamluk Cairo are not particularly similar to the Sātī group. However, a small number of elements in the work of the late fourteenth-century Mamluk illuminator, Ibrāhīm al-Āmidī, parallel motifs seen in Sātī's manuscripts. This illuminator, who originally came from Amid, may well have had some training in Konya as one of his distinctive designs is very similar to decoration found in the 1278 *Maṣnavī*. This connection to Konya raises the question of whether the city could have been the place of production of Sātī's manuscripts.

Chapters One and Two have shown that there is ample evidence to indicate that Konya was an important centre for illuminated manuscript production, and that Mawlawi patrons were significant contributors to this industry. Although Mawlawis produced books in many places in Rūm in the fourteenth century, most

identified, illuminated Mawlawi texts were produced in Konya.⁷³⁹ Both craftsmen who are named in Sātī's manuscripts are Mawlawis, and Sātī himself was a Mawlawi whose family was originally from Konya. Visually-speaking however the evidence for a connection to Konya is relatively meagre, mainly because no illuminated manuscripts produced in Konya after the 1330s survive. The 1372 *Maṣnavī*'s programme of illumination is similar to those of the 1278 and 1323 *Maṣnavīs*, and the *naskh* script of Sātī's manuscripts broadly resembles the calligraphy of fourteenth-century Konya (certainly more so than contemporary Iran and Iraq). Beyond this however there is not much which physically links the manuscripts produced for Sātī with the arts of the book of late medieval Konya.

The connection to Damascus is both circumstantial and visual, and the city is thus a stronger contender for the place of production. As Sātī wrote in the second volume of the 1368 *Dīvān*, he purchased paper made in the city. However, one could argue that Sātī's inscription about the paper implies that the connection to Damascus was unusual or noteworthy, which could indicate that the manuscript's production took place elsewhere. If Sātī was actually in Damascus to purchase the paper, it is possible that he commissioned a manuscript or manuscripts from the scribe, Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī, local illuminators, and a binder from Hama (Abū Bakr al-Mujallidī al-Mawlawī al-Ḥamawī) while there. Although not many survive, illuminated Islamic and Coptic manuscripts from Damascus and Tripoli provide probably the closest visual parallel to Sātī's manuscripts, featuring many of the

⁷³⁹ The two exceptions being the 1318 *Maṣnavī* from Sivas (see Chapter Two) and the Shirazi copy of Rūmī's *Dīvān-i Kabīr* mentioned in notes 30, 441 and 647.

same motifs, such as eight-pointed stars, pointed ovals and lotuses. On the basis of these visual parallels, as well as the possibility that Sātī was at some point in Damascus, the city is a plausible location for the production of the manuscripts.

Nonetheless, these Levantine manuscripts date from circa 1330-50, and I have been unable to find examples produced in the region from subsequent decades. It is possible that by the 1360s and 1370s the styles and motifs seen in these manuscripts had diffused outwards through the migration of artists to neighbouring areas, like eastern Rūm. Apart from the 1272-6 copy of *Kitāb al-Shifā'*, which was completed in Harput (see Chapter One), and the 1318 *Maṣnavī* from Sivas, there are no other identified illuminated manuscripts from eastern Rūm from this period. Like Konya, the evidence for Erzincan as a place of production is circumstantial. Sātī as well as his son and grandson all appear to have lived in Erzincan, or at least retained close links with the town. However, as I have shown in Chapters One and Two,⁷⁴⁰ a patron did not have to be based where a manuscript was produced, though commissioning from a distance does seem to have been relatively unusual.

At least one of Sātī's manuscripts was definitely in Erzincan at some point. This is the 1372 *Maṣnavī* which contains an inscription by Mustanjid that details his journey from Otrar to Erzincan. It is very likely that Mustanjid's inherited copy of

⁷⁴⁰ Ibn Bībī's *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-'Umūr al-'Alā'iyya* which was produced in Konya was commissioned by the Ilkhanid governor of Baghdad 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī (see Chapter One), and *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafīyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya* which was copied in 1311 in Konya was produced for the Ashrafid *bey* Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad who lived in Beyşehir.

the partial, illuminated *Maqālāt* was also in Erzincan, as its former patron, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad-i Munajjim, was known to be part of Erzincan's Mawlawi community. This manuscript, which bears a degree of visual similarity to aspects of the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, gives credibility to the possibility that it and the Sātī group were all produced in Erzincan. Both patrons are connected to the town and to the Mawlawis who, as we have seen in previous chapters, were some of the most prolific manuscript patrons of the period. Although their specific roles in the Sufi group remain unknown, it is clear that Sātī, Mustanjid and Mu'taḍid were part of this local Sufi network. Perhaps the collaboration with the same Mawlawi scribe in the production of all three manuscripts over roughly seven years (1365-72) was facilitated by Sātī's involvement with Erzincan's local Mawlawi community.⁷⁴¹ Lastly, the presence of silver in two of Sātī's three manuscripts (the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* and the 1368 *Dīvān*) also raises the possibility that the manuscripts were produced in an Armenian-dominated setting, like Erzincan or the Lake Van area. However, it is also possible that the use of this pigment was adopted from its (albeit rare) use in Ilkhanid manuscripts. As far as I know, silver illumination does not appear in Mamluk manuscripts with the exception of one surviving Coptic manuscript completed in 1272 in Cairo.⁷⁴²

⁷⁴¹ However, it is also possible that Sātī spent all of those years in Damascus, as Zeren Tanındı suggests (2012: 223).

⁷⁴² Coptic Museum, Cairo, Bibl.92 (Atalla 2000: 102-3, Gabra and Eaton-Krauss 2006: 125). I am very grateful to Lucy-Anne Hunt for the information regarding this manuscript.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed three illuminated manuscripts that were produced between 1365 and 1372 for Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan, a Mawlawi *amīr* of Erzincan. In addition to describing the manuscripts' physical properties and inscriptions in detail, I have tried to situate the manuscripts' styles of illumination in relation to the arts of the book of Ilkhanid, Injuīd and Mamluk lands. In order to contextualise the manuscripts, the nature of their production and their patron in a broader cultural setting, I have also discussed the identity of the scribe (Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī) and binder (Abū Bakr al-Mujallidī al-Mawlawī al-Ḥamawī) as well as the details of Sātī's life and the activities of his son Mustanjid and grandson Mu'taḍid using other historical sources including a Chingizid history composed by Sātī himself. These sources have in turn enabled a broader discussion concerning the political landscape in eastern Rūm and the character of Erzincan in the late medieval period. Finally, I have evaluated the physical properties of the manuscripts, their patron, and the wider cultural context in order to explore various possibilities for the location of production.

The three manuscripts, the 1366 *Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, the 1368 *Dīvān* and the 1372 *Maṣnavī*, are all large and extensively illuminated, but it has been difficult to convincingly identify a place of production for the material. Part of this difficulty stems from gaps in the survival of the contemporary arts of the book. Furthermore, there are several indications that, as a result of political upheavals or their own ambition, artists continued to travel across the Islamic world looking for work,

thus bringing their skills and ideas with them. The use of silver in two of Sātī's manuscripts, which could have come from Armenian or Ilkhanid workshops, is one example of this. Wherever the three manuscripts were produced, they show that the participation of Mawlawi craftsmen in the copying, illuminating and binding of manuscripts continued well into the later part of the century. Although there is no indication that the manuscripts were produced in Konya, the link to the Mawlawis' ancestral home was evidently important and is mentioned by both Sātī and Mu'taḍid.

It is somewhat unsurprising that there is so little written about Sātī and his family in historical chronicles. As has been the case in the previous chapters, it seems that being a manuscript patron, despite necessitating wealth, did not automatically require political or military renown. Sātī does appear to have had some military experience, but it seems that he may have moved into a different role later in his life. It is possible that, although retaining the title of *amīr*, Sātī was primarily a well-paid bureaucrat or writer, which could explain why he is not mentioned in chronicles of the period. His work on Chingizid history, *Tārīkh-i Chingīz Khān*, indicates that Sātī was at some point probably attached to a princely court, perhaps that of the Aratnids, and was familiar with Mongol genealogy, which adds another interesting dimension to what we know of him from his own manuscripts and the inscriptions of his descendants.

In the absence of an imperial framework in Rūm, following the fall of the Ilkhanids, the rise of local, ambitious *amīrs* was widespread in central and eastern Rūm.

Many of these *amīrs* (and their families), like Sātī, receive only a few mentions in contemporary sources. Analysing illuminated manuscripts commissioned by Sātī helps to redress the emphasis placed on well-known political figures in secondary literature on the period and provides an alternative view into the political and cultural landscapes of late medieval Rūm. Sātī, who was a manuscript patron, an *amīr*, a Mawlawi, a Persian- and Arabic-speaking Muslim from both Konya and Erzincan, a learned author and, possibly, a courtier, demonstrates the multiple roles and fluid identities that one could adopt in this environment of political upheaval and intellectual efflorescence. One could say that Sātī was in fact the quintessential ‘Rūmī’, if there was such a thing.⁷⁴³

⁷⁴³ Kafadar 2007.

EPILOGUE

The arts of the book within and beyond the Lands of Rūm

This dissertation has focused on Islamic illuminated manuscript material produced in Rūm's cities (or, as in the case of Chapter Four, for a Rūmī patron) from the 1270s until the 1370s. In the present study, I have described and analysed the material properties and visual development of illuminated manuscripts in the late medieval Lands of Rūm, and the nature of their production and patronage. By adopting scholarly perspectives that re-examined the historiography of the period, and the codicology of Islamic manuscript material, I have shown that the arts of the book in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Rūm are not only aesthetically rich, but, as historical sources, also revealing about the wider cultural setting.

Before discussing the dissertation's conclusions in light of the frameworks and methodology that I have adopted, I will briefly summarise the contents of the main chapters and discuss the links that I have drawn between them. The opening chapter, which focused on Konya in the 1270s and 1280s, discussed four key manuscripts: a 1278 Qur'an, a 1278 copy of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*, a circa 1282 copy of Ibn Bībī's *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-Umūr al-'Alā'iyya* and a 1286 copy of Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī's *Laṭā'if al-Ḥikma*. An examination of these manuscripts revealed how Konya was an important regional centre for the production of the arts of the book, as well as highlighting the prominent role of slave-converts as manuscript craftsmen and patrons within this production. More specifically, this chapter

demonstrated that, in the apparent absence of courtly or commercial ateliers, madrasas could be used as copying locations. This fact sheds further light on the use and sharing of space, and complicates the academic division between the spheres of Sufis and the *'ulamā'*. In this and the next chapter, manuscript evidence shows that the activities of the two groups indeed overlapped in this context of religious flexibility. Material discussed in this chapter also suggested that Ilkhanid patrons did not play a significant role in the arts of the book of Rūm, despite the region's formal incorporation into Mongol lands after 1277.

Chapter One also laid the foundations for subsequent chapters by highlighting the important role played by Mawlawi dervishes in the arts of the book, and the function that illuminated manuscripts may have had as objects of cultural and ritual importance in Konya. This particular facet of illuminated manuscript production and patronage was expanded upon in Chapter Two, which discussed three Mawlawi manuscripts from early fourteenth-century Konya: a 1314 copy of Sulṭān Walad's *Intihānāma*, a 1323 *Maṣnavī*, and a copy of *Maṣnavī-i Waladī* produced before 1332. In addition to emphasising the participation of Mawlawi artists and patrons in the arts of the book and the continued importance of Konya as a regional centre, these manuscripts also highlight the role of shrines as copying locations and the existence of a local 'school' of illumination in the town.

In addition to these three Mawlawi manuscripts from Konya, this chapter also highlighted production in another city of Rūm – Sivas – by discussing a partial *Maṣnavī* from 1318 that was previously unknown to scholarship. Although this

body of evidence is extremely limited, it does show that Konya was not the only location in the region in which illuminated manuscripts were produced in the early fourteenth century. It is hoped that future research will uncover further locations in which illuminated manuscripts were produced in medieval Rūm. Finally, this chapter also discussed three manuscripts that were dedicated to Turkmen *beys*, one of which was originally produced for ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kayqubād. These were: *al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā‘id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya*, dated to 1311, a Qur’an from 1314-15 and a 1228 copy of *al-Laṭā’if al-‘Alā’iyya* with added illumination from the early fourteenth century. By analysing these manuscripts, this chapter also critically examined the historiography of the beyliks and presented a more nuanced picture of their cultural activities by focusing on individuals, rather than taking their ‘Turkish nomad’ characterisation at face value.

Chapter Three continued the examination of beylik artistic patronage by considering two copies of Najm al-Dīn Rāzī’s *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād min al-Mabdā’ ilā al-Ma‘ād* produced in İstanos for Hamidid *beys* in 1349 and 1351. This chapter critiqued the supposed divide between the urban inland and frontier contexts by providing a close consideration of the manuscripts and historical chronicles. Primary sources suggest that while the ‘*ūj*’ was indeed a western region populated by Turkmen, it was not a peripheral bastion of heterodox, Turkmen nomad culture and its translation as ‘frontier’ has perhaps obscured this complexity. Evidence from manuscripts supports this suggestion by highlighting the multicultural and commercial character of the area, and the interest of Turkmen patrons in Persian literature. This chapter also expanded the dissertation’s scope beyond Konya and

Sivas to look at cultural and literary activities in the western regions of Rūm and the possible impact of plague in the area. The latter factor may explain the relative paucity of illuminated manuscripts securely attributable to Rūm after 1351 but the textual evidence for this remains lacking.

The final chapter discussed three illuminated copies of Mawlawi texts that were produced for the same patron, an Erzincan-based *amīr* named Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan: a partial *Maṣnavī-i Valadī* copied in 1366, a 1367-8 copy of the *Dīvān-i Kabīr* and a 1372 copy of Rūmī's *Maṣnavī*. This chapter further developed previous chapters' analyses of Mawlawi involvement in illuminated manuscript production and patronage, and expanded the geographical scope of the thesis to include eastern Rūm. Unlike the preceding chapters, Chapter Four also included an assessment of the provenance of Sātī's manuscripts based on a detailed aesthetic and codicological analysis. Based on this, I suggested that the manuscripts were probably produced in Erzincan though Damascus also remains a possibility. By focusing on one of the most prolific patrons of illuminated manuscripts in this period, this chapter also underlined how artistic patronage in the region was, generally speaking, carried out by elite figures of local importance who are not extensively mentioned in historical chronicles.

The Mongol conquests may have interrupted the imperial patronage of craftsmen but it is difficult to quantify this since so little survives. Either way, the conquests did not fully disrupt artistic production. As we have seen, the artistic and intellectual landscapes of Rūm's cities were active and engaged with regional

neighbours. Manuscript artists and patrons involved in these local circles were often of varied ethnic origins and religious or cultural identities. Mawlawi dervishes, converts to Islam (who were formerly slaves), and Turkmen *beys* appear to have played a particularly prominent role in the production and patronage of illuminated manuscripts in this period. Through travel, trade and migration, craftsmen and patrons helped to form and maintain broader artistic networks that included (but were not necessarily limited to) the regions of Egypt, the Levant, the Jazira and Persia. Emigré artists with experience gained in the workshops of these areas probably provided the main conduit by which styles and motifs connected to the Ilkhanid and Mamluk arts of the book appeared in examples from Rūm. It is also possible that artists, and other individuals, brought illuminated manuscripts and pattern books that shaped local styles but the evidence for this is lacking.

The relative abundance of manuscripts from late medieval Konya, and the similarities in their appearance, strongly suggests that the town had its own distinctive aesthetic style. This style was characterised by certain motifs like the pointed oval frontispiece, with other elements adopted from Ilkhanid, Mamluk and possibly Injuid ateliers. Although the choice of core material of the dissertation has been shaped by the relative integrity of the Mawlawi shrine in Konya, it is clear that other places like Sivas, İstanos and possibly Erzincan were also locations of illuminated manuscript production. Although non-illuminated manuscripts survive from all over thirteenth and fourteenth-century Rūm, the evidence for illuminated manuscript production beyond Konya remains limited. From what has survived, it

seems that illumination from Sivas appears to have been quite idiosyncratic and, so far, no contemporary parallels to this style have been discovered. By contrast, illumination from İstanbul was comparatively derivative. It is thus difficult to provide an overall assessment of an 'Anatolian/Rūmī' style as such a thing does not seem to have existed, though the evidence for a Konya 'school' is clearer.

Although some of the above findings have been suggested in previous research by Zeren Tanındı and Zeynep Demircan Aksoy, the features of illuminated manuscript production and patronage in their cultural contexts had not been critically examined prior to the present study. Furthermore, the manuscripts which form the core material of this dissertation had previously not been examined using codicological or palaeographical techniques, or systematically compared with contemporary examples from other regions. By adopting a holistic approach to illuminated manuscripts, I hope to have shown that such material can indeed be valuable historical sources for the study of cultural production.

Through the close examination of material and other primary sources such as chronicles and endowment deeds, I have discussed the manuscripts' material and visual properties both in order to trace the development of the arts of the book and features of production and patronage, and to establish a foundation by which it is possible to examine relevant aspects of the contemporary cultural landscape. I have adopted an 'object-centred' approach since illuminated manuscripts – particularly ones produced as private commissions for specific patrons – are inherently intimate, and usually experienced only by small numbers of people. This

'object-centred' approach has enabled me to structure the dissertation by grouping manuscripts together based on the details of their production and patronage, and by focusing closely on relevant aspects of the cultural landscape. In doing so, I hope to have constructed a nuanced and inclusive study that is not shaped by nationalist or essentialist biases. Dynastic narratives or modern geographical divisions hold little-to-no relevance for this particular group of material.

Throughout the dissertation, I have attempted to acknowledge the complex historiography of the period and to redress certain problematic scholarly conceptions, such as the focus on Turkish identity in nationalist schools of thought, the narrative sequence of 'Seljuk-Beylik-Ottoman' history, the division between 'urban' and 'frontier' contexts, and the opposition between 'orthodox' and 'heterodox' Sufism. In the introductory chapter, I discussed twentieth-century Turkish scholarship (from where these concepts originated) and more recent literature that perpetuates or critically engages with this earlier scholarship. Many of the latter group of attempts have focused on Sufis', scholars' and craftsmen's travel and mobility, diversity of ethnic identity and religious affiliation, and the permeability and transience of political borders. Such themes have proven highly relevant for the present study and in consistently highlighting them, I have attempted to place my study alongside similar re-assessments of the late medieval history of Rūm.

While I have attempted to make this study as comprehensive as possible within the scope of the dissertation, there have necessarily been limitations that have

shaped the final analysis. Firstly, as I have already mentioned, the survival of the Mawlawi treasury has undoubtedly shaped the focus of the thesis. This should not be taken as proof that the Mawlawis were more prominent in the production of the arts of the book than other cultural groups. Similarly, it should not be assumed that only Ashrafid, Qaramanid and Hamidid *beys* were interested in illuminated manuscripts, as many commissioned by other local rulers may not have survived or may remain unidentified. Secondly, an analysis of the chemical compositions of the manuscripts' pigments would likely yield further information that could give additional insights into local production processes and allow for further comparisons with contemporary Islamic, Armenian and Byzantine manuscripts.

Aside from the additional information provided by chemical analyses, there are several other ways by which this research could be taken forward. Firstly, the chronological scope of the study could be expanded on both sides. There are very few securely identified manuscripts from Rūm that date from before the Mongol conquest, and there remains a need for further work on these manuscripts and the large number of unidentified manuscripts from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. The possible connections between the arts of the book of the Great Seljuks of Iran and the Rūm Seljuks is one important aspect of this line of enquiry, in addition to the arts of the book of the Seljuks' neighbouring polities, such as the Artuqids, the Saltuqids and the Ayyubids. Similarly, the timespan covered in this dissertation provides a lead-in of sorts to a contextual and codicological consideration of the arts of the book of the fifteenth century, which could include early Ottoman and Qaramanid production. Following the unification of most of the

Anatolian peninsula as well as Thrace under the Ottomans, illuminated manuscript production moved away from Konya towards cities like Bursa, Edirne, Amasya and Istanbul. In this later period, the visual character of illuminated manuscripts as well as other art forms, was shaped by an influx of artists from the eastern Islamic world.

The research undertaken for this dissertation has also highlighted gaps in the study of the contemporary arts of the book in neighbouring regions, and in other aspects of material culture in Rūm. For example, much scholarship has been produced concerning Mamluk and Mongol illuminated and illustrated manuscripts of the fourteenth century. However, there is work yet to be done concerning Jalayirid production and patronage as well as non-Qur'anic Mamluk manuscripts, particularly those produced in the Levant. The relationship between Coptic, Armenian and Byzantine arts of the book with Islamic illuminated manuscripts of late medieval Rūm is another possibly fruitful line of inquiry. Although such subjects are beyond the scope of the present study, further investigations into these areas would certainly complement and potentially enhance (or contradict) some of the findings presented above.

Moreover, this dissertation has laid the groundwork for further inquiries into the material and literary culture of both the Mawlawis, and the late medieval polities of Rūm. The beyliks' architectural patronage and their production of literature has been discussed in several publications, but contextual studies that focus in-depth on the cultural activities of individuals are few and far between. In terms of art and

architecture produced by and for Mawlawis, the pre-modern period remains relatively understudied and the analyses of Mawlawi material in this dissertation may be complemented by closer examinations of contemporary Mawlawi metalwork, woodwork, architecture and textiles of both Rūm and the surrounding regions into which the Sufi network expanded.

This dissertation has brought to light the variety and richness of the late medieval arts of the book of Rūm (and particularly Konya). It has done so by looking closely at the codicological and visual properties of the manuscripts themselves, reading their inscriptions and analysing them within impartial and inclusive frameworks. These manuscripts show that Rūm's cities were home to numerous local and migrant artists, many of whom were Sufi disciples and converts to Islam. Rūm's cities were also home to aristocratic, yet otherwise little-known, patrons who were willing to fund the creation of illuminated manuscript material, despite the period's relative political instability. Due to this fragmented political situation, and the complex communities formed by multiple layers of ethnic identity and religious affiliation, Rūm in the late medieval period is no longer simply 'Beylik' or 'pre-Ottoman'. Neither was Rūm a mere periphery to the rest of the contemporary Islamic world, but was in fact a crucial part of transregional networks that criss-crossed the Islamic world and connected it to its non-Islamic neighbours. Although this material has been neglected in broader surveys of Islamic art, this study has hopefully highlighted its deserved place alongside the Mamluk, Mongol and post-Mongol arts of the book, and demonstrated the value of illuminated manuscripts for the investigation of cultural history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Abū al-Fiḍā' 1840 Ismā'īl ibn 'Alī Abū al-Fiḍā'. 1840. *Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān*. Joseph Toussaint Reinaud and William MacGuckin Slane (eds) Paris: Dār al-Ṭibā'ah al-Sulṭānīyah.
- Aflākī 1961 Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī. 1961. *Manāqib al-'ārifin: metin*. 2 vols. Tahsin Yazıcı (ed.) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Aflākī 2002 Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī. 2002. *The feats of the knowers of God: Manāqeb al-'ārifin*. John O'Kane (ed. and trans.) Leiden: Brill.
- Aḥmad Vafiq Pāshā 1293 Aḥmad Vafiq Pāshā [Ahmed Vefik Paşa]. 1293 (1876). *Lehce-i Osmanī*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Cemiyet-i Tedrisiyye-i Osmaniye.
- Anonymous 1952 Anonymous. 1952. *Anadolu Selçukluları devleti tarihi*. Feridun Nâfiz Uzluk (ed.) Ankara: Çaphane-ye Kemal.
- Anonymous 1999 Anonymous. 1999. *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Saljūq dar Ānāṭulī*. Nādirah Jalālī (ed.) Tehran: Daftar-i Nashr-i Mīrās-i Maktūb, Āyinah-'i Mīrās.
- Anvarī 1929 Anvarī [Enveri]. 1929. *Düsturnamei Enverī*. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç (ed.) Istanbul: Evkaf Matbaası.
- Al-Aqsarāyī 1944 Karīm al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Aqsarāyī. 1944. *Musāmarat al-Akhhbār va Musāyarat al-Akhyār*. Osman Turan (ed.) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Al-Astarābādī 1928 'Azīz ibn Ardashīr al-Astarābādī. 1928. *Bazm va Razm*. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (ed.) Istanbul: Avkaf Matbaası.
- Bahādur 1871 Abū al-Ghāzī Bahādur Khān. 1871. *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatares*. Jean Jacques Pierre Desmaisons (ed.)

and trans.) Saint Petersburg: Imprimerie de l'Académie Impériale des sciences.

- Combe et al. 1931-91 Étienne Combe, Jean Sauvaget and Gaston Wiet. 1931-91. *Repetoire chronologique d'epigraphie Arabe*, 18 vols. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1854 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. 1854. *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah, Texte Arabe, Accompagné d'une Traduction, Tome Second*. C. Defrémery and B.R. Sanguinetti (eds and trans) Paris: L'Imprimerie Impériale.
- Ibn Baṭṭūṭa 1962 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. 1962. *The travels of Ibn Battuta, A.D. 1325-1354, Vol. II*. H.A.R. Gibb (ed. and trans.) Cambridge: Hakluyt Society.
- Ibn Bībī 1956 Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ja'farī al-Rughadī known as Ibn Bībī al-Munajjima. 1956. *Kitāb al-Awāmīr al-'Alā'iyya fī al-'Umūr al-'Alā'iyya*. Adnan Sadık Erzi (ed.) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī 1992 Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. 1992. *Maktūbāt-i Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī*. Tawfīq Subḥānī (ed.) Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī.
- Khwāja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi 1974 Khwāja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi [Hoca Sadeddin]. 1974. *Tācu't-tevārih*. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu (ed.) Ankara: Başbakanlık Kültür Müsteşarlığı Kültür Yayınları; Istanbul: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü.
- Al-Malaṭyawī 1972 Muḥammad ibn Ghāzī al-Malaṭyawī. 1972. *Barīd al-Sa'āda*. M. Shirwani (ed.) Tehran: Danishgah-i Tihran.
- Marco Polo 1871 Marco Polo. 1871. *The book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian: concerning the kingdoms and marvels of the East, 2 vols*. Henry Yule (ed. and trans.) London: John Murray.
- Al-Māzandarānī 1952 'Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Kiyā al-Māzandarānī. 1952. *Die Resalā-ye Falakiyyā des 'Abdollah ibn Moḥammad ibn Kiyā al-Māzandarānī; ein persischer Leitfaden des staatlichen Rechnungswesens (um 1363)*. Walther Hinz (ed.) Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

- Muṣṭafā ‘Alī 2011 Muṣṭafā ‘Alī. 2011. *Mustafa ‘Alī’s Epic Deeds of Artists: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Ottoman Text about the Calligraphers and Painters of the Islamic World*. Esra Akin (ed. and trans.) Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Pavet de Courteille 1859 Kamāl Pāshāzāda. 1859. *Histoire de la campagne de Mohacz [Muhāj-nāmah, a section of pt.10 of the Tawārikh i Al i ‘Uthmān] publ. avec la tr. fr. et des notes par m. Pavet de Courteille*. Abel Jean Pavet de Courteille (ed. and trans.) Paris: L’Imprimerie Impériale.
- Pegolotti 1936 Francesco Balducci Pegolotti. 1936. *La pratica della mercatura*. Allan Evans (ed.) Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America.
- Piloti 1950 Emanuele Piloti. 1950. *L’Égypte au commencement du quinzième siècle, d’après le traité d’Emmanuel Piloti de Crète, incipit 1420*. P.H. Dopp (ed.) Caire: Imp. Université Fouad 1er.
- Al-Qalqashandī 1913 Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Qalqashandī. 1913. *Kitāb ṣubḥ al-a’shā*. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Khidīwīyah.
- Al-Qazwīnī 1919 Ḥamdullāh al-Mustawfī al-Qazwīnī. 1919. *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat al-Qulub*. Guy Le Strange (ed. and trans.) London: Luzac.
- Rāwandī 1921 Abū Bakr Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Rāwandī. 1921. *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr, being a history of the Saljūqs*. Muḥammad Iqbāl (ed.) London: Luzac.
- Rāzī 1352 Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya. 1352 (1933-4). *Mirṣād al-‘Ibād*. Muḥammad Amīn Riyāḥī (ed.) Tehran: Shirkāt-i Intishārāt-i ‘Ilmī va Farhangī.
- Rāzī 1982 Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya. 1982. *The path of God’s bondsmen from origin to return = (Merṣād al-‘ebād men al-mabdā’ elā’l-ma‘ād): a Sufi compendium*. Hamid Algar (ed. and trans.) Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.
- Sāqib Muṣṭafā Dede 1866 Sāqib Muṣṭafā Dede. 1866. *Sefine-i Nefise-i Mevlevīyan*. Cairo: Matbaa-i Vehbiye.

- Schiltberger 1879 Johannes Schiltberger. 1879. *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1396-1427*. J. Buchan Telfer (trans.) London: Hakluyt Society.
- Shikārī 2005 Aḥmad Beg Shikārī [Şikari]. 2005. *Şikârî Karamannâme: Zamanın Kahramanı Karamanîler'in Tarihi*. Metin Sözen and Necdet Sakaoğlu (eds) Istanbul: Karaman Valiliği, Karaman Belediyesi.
- Sipahsâlâr 2007 Farîdûn ibn Aḥmad Sipahsâlâr. 2007. *Risâlah-i Sipahsâlâr dar manâqib-i ḥazrat khudāvandgâr*. Muḥammad Afshîn Vafâyî (ed.) Tehran: Sukhan.
- Sulṭân Walad 1936 Sulṭân Walad. 1936. *Valad'nâmah: maşnavî-i Valadî*. Tehran: Kitâbfurûshî va Châpkhânah-i Iqbâ.
- Tabrîzî 1990 Shams al-Dîn Tabrîzî. 1990. *Maqâlât-i Shams-i Tabrîzî*. Muḥammad 'Alî Muvahḥid (ed.) Tehran: Khvârazmî.
- Al-'Umarî 1929 Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyâ ibn Faḍl Allâh al-'Umarî. 1929. *Al-Bâb al-khâmis fî mamlakat al-Atrâk bi-al-Rûm min al-naw' al-thânî min al-qism al-awwal min kitâb Masâlik al-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşâr*. Franz Taeschner (ed.) Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Urmavî 1972 Sirâj al-Dîn Urmavî. 1972. *Laṭâ'if al-Ḥikma*. Ghulâm Ḥusayn Yûsufî (ed.) Tehran: Intishârât-i Bunyâd-i Farhang-i Îrân.
- William of Rubruck 1900 William of Rubruck [Willem van Ruysbroeck]. 1900. *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253-55*. William Woodville Rockhill (ed.) London: Hakluyt Society.
- Yaḥyâ ibn Şâ'id ibn Aḥmad 1982 Niẓâm al-Dîn Yaḥyâ ibn Şâ'id ibn Aḥmad. 1982. *Ḥadâ'iq al-Siyar fî Adab al-Mulûk*. 'Abbâs Şadrî (ed.) *Farhang-i Îrân Zamîn* 25: 240-371.
- Yâqût al-Ḥamawî 1869 Yâqût ibn 'Abdullâh al-Ḥamawî. 1869. *Jacut's Geographisches Wörterbuch: aus den Handschriften zu Berlin, St. Petersburg und Paris: Kitâb Mu'jam al-Buldân, Vol. 4*. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (ed.) Beirut: Dâr Şâdir.

- Al-Zanjānī 2005 Aḥmad ibn Sa‘d ibn Maḥdī ibn ‘Abd al-Şamad al-Zanjānī al-‘Uthmānī. 2005. *Sultana Öğütler: Alaeddin Keykubata Sunulan Siyasetname*, H. Hüseyin Adalıoğlu (ed.) Istanbul: Yeditepe.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbott 1939 Nabia Abbott. 1939. *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Ku’rānic Development, with a full description of the Kur’ān manuscripts in the Oriental Institute*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Adamova 2015 Adel Adamova with Manijeh Bayani. 2015. *Persian Painting: the arts of the book and portraiture*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Ağa-Oğlu 1938 Mehmet Ağa-Oğlu. 1938. “Unpublished Wooden Doors of the Seljuk Period”. *Parnassus* 10(1): 24-5.
- Akın 1966 Himmet Akın. 1966. *Aydınöğulları tarih hakkında bir araştırma*. Istanbul: Pulhan Matbaası.
- Aksu 1992 Hatice Aksu. 1992. “Anadolu Selçuklu Tezhip Sanatı ve Osmanlı (Klasik Dönem) Tezhip Sanatının Mukayesesi”. MA Thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University.
- Algaç 2000 Şeyda Algaç. 2000. *Anadolu Selçukluları ve Beylikleri Dönemi Tezhip Sanatı*. PhD Thesis, Istanbul University.
- Algaç 2006 Şeyda Algaç. 2006. “İstanos (Korkuteli)'da 1349-1352 (750-752) Tarihleri Arasında Hazırlanmış Tezhipli İki Yazma”. *Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi* 17: 1-14.
- Allan 1978 James Allan. 1978. “From Tabrīz to Siirt: Relocation of a 13th Century Metalworking School”. *Iran* 16: 182-3.
- Amitai-Preiss 1995 Reuven Amitai-Preiss. 1995. *Mongols and Mamluks: the Mamluk-İlkhānid war, 1260-1281*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Amitai-Preiss 1999 Reuven Amitai-Preiss. 1999. "Sufis and Shamans: Some Remarks on the Islamization of the Mongols in the Ilkhanate". *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 42(1): 27-46.
- Anderson 1983 Benedict Anderson. 1983. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Arberry 1958 Arthur J. Arberry. 1958. *The Chester Beatty Library. A Handlist of the Arabic Manuscripts. Vol. III*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.
- Arberry 1963 Arthur J. Arberry. 1963. *The Chester Beatty Library. A Handlist of the Arabic Manuscripts. Vol. VI*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.
- Arberry 1967 Arthur J. Arberry. 1967. *The Koran: A Handlist of the Korans in the Chester Beatty Library*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.
- Arik 2008 Rüşhan Arik. 2008. *Treasures of Anatolian Soil: Tiles of the Seljuk and Beylik Periods*. Istanbul: Kale Group Culture Publications.
- Arnold and Grohmann 1929 Thomas Walker Arnold and Adolf Grohmann. 1929. *The Islamic book; a contribution to its art and history from the VII-XVIII century*. Paris: Pegasus Press.
- Arseven 1928 Celal Esad Arseven. 1928. *Türk Sanatı*. Istanbul: Akşam Mathaasi.
- Aslanapa 1971 Oktay Aslanapa. 1971. *Turkish art and architecture*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Atalla 2000 Nabil Selim Atalla. 2000. *Illustrations from Coptic Manuscripts*. Cairo: Lehnert & Landrock.
- Atcil 2010 Abdurrahman Atcil. 2010. *The Formation of the Ottoman Learned Class and Legal Scholarship (1300-1600)*. PhD Thesis, The University of Chicago.
- Ayalon 2015 Yaron Ayalon. 2015. *Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Empire: Plague, Famine, and Other Misfortunes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Aydın 1994 Şennur Aydın. 1994. *Selçuklular: Doğu-Batı arası bir gökkuşağı = The Seljuks: a rainbow linking East and West*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, Kültür Merkezi.
- Bacqué-Grammont 2015 J.L. Bacqué-Grammont. 2015. "al-Aksarāyī". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/11/2015.
- Bağcı 2003 Serpil Bağcı. 2003. *Konya Mevlânâ Müzesi: resimli elyazmaları*. Konya: Konya ve Mülhakatı Eski Eserler Sevenler Derneği.
- Baker 2007 Colin F. Baker. 2007. *Qur'an Manuscripts: Calligraphy, Illumination, Design*. London: British Library.
- Barrucand 1991 Marianne Barrucand. 1991. "The Miniatures of the *Daqā'iq Al-Ḥaqā'iq* (Bibliothèque Nationale Pers.174): A Testimony to the Cultural Diversity of Medieval Anatolia". *Islamic Art IV*: 113-28.
- Başan 2010 Aziz Başan. 2010. *The Great Seljuqs: A History*. Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bashir 2011 Shahzad Bashir. 2011. *Sufi Bodies: Religion and Society in Medieval Islam*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bayburtluoğlu 1988 Zafer Bayburtluoğlu. 1988. *Anadolu'da Selçuklu dönemi sanatçıları*. Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Bayram and Karabacak 1981 Sadi Bayram and Ahmet Hamdi Karabacak. 1981. "Sahib Ata Fahrü'd-Din Ali'nin Konya, İmaret ve Sivas Gökmedrese Vakfiyeleri". *Vakıflar Dergisi* 13: 31-70.
- Beaulieu and Roberts 2002 Jill Beaulieu and Mary Roberts. 2002. *Orientalism's interlocutors: painting, architecture, photography*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ben Azzouna 2009 Nourane Ben Azzouna. 2009. "Manuscripts Attributed to Yāqūt Al-Musta'şimī (d.698/1298) in Ottoman Collections. Thoughts on the Significance of Yāqūt's Legacy in the Ottoman Calligraphic Tradition". *Thirteenth International Congress of Turkish Art: Proceedings. International Congress of Turkish Art (13th: 2007: Hungarian National Museum, Budapest,*

- Hungary*). Géza Dávid and Ibolya Gerelyes (eds) Budapest: Hungarian National Museum.
- Ben Azzouna 2012 Nourane Ben Azzouna. 2012. "The Gulistān of Sa'dī attributed to Yāqūt al-Musta'şimī and its multiple identities". *Ars Orientalis* 42: 139-149.
- Ben Azzouna 2013 Nourane Ben Azzouna. 2013. "Rashīd al-Dīn Faḡl-Allāh al-Hamadhānī's Manuscript Production Project in Tabriz Reconsidered". *Politics, Patronage and the Transmission of Knowledge in 13th-15th Century Tabriz*. Judith Pfeiffer (ed.) Leiden: Brill.
- Benouniche 1995 Leila Benouniche. 1995. *Le Kalila et Dimna de Genève: histoire d'un recueil de fables illustré*. Geneva: Slatkine.
- van Berchem and Edhem 1917 Max van Berchem and Halil Edhem. 1917. *Matériaux pour un corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum. Troisième partie, Asie Mineure*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Berkey 2003 Jonathan Berkey. 2003. *The Formation of Islam: religion and society in the Near East, 600-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berktoy 1983 Halil Berktoy. 1983. *Cumhuriyet ideolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü*. Istanbul: Kaynak yayınları.
- Bibliothèque nationale de France 1987 Bibliothèque nationale de France. 1987. *Splendeur et Majesté: Corans de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris: Institut du Monde Arabe, Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- Bierman 1998 Irene Bierman. 1998. *Writing Signs: The Fatimid Public Text*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.
- Binbaş 2005 İlker Evrim Binbaş. 2005. "Music and Samā' of the Mavlaviyya in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: Origins, Ritual and Formation". *Sufism, music and society in Turkey and the Middle East: papers read at a conference held at the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, November 27-29, 1997*. Anders Hammarlund, Tord Olsson and Elisabeth Özdalga (eds) Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul.

- Blair 1990 Sheila Blair. 1990. "Sufi Saints and Shrine Architecture in the Early Fourteenth Century". *Muqarnas* 7: 35-49.
- Blair 1995 Sheila Blair. 1995. *A Compendium of Chronicles: Rashid al-Din's Illustrated History of the World*. London: The Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press.
- Blair 2000 Sheila Blair. 2000. "Color and Gold: The Decorated Papers Used in Manuscripts in Later Islamic Times". *Muqarnas* 17: 24-36.
- Blair 2003 Sheila Blair. 2003 "Yāqūt and his followers". *Manuscripta Orientalia* 9(3): 39-47.
- Blair 2006a Sheila Blair. 2006. *Islamic Calligraphy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blair 2006b Sheila Blair. 2006. "Calligraphers, Illuminators, and Painters in the Ilkhanid Scriptorium". *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*. Linda Komaroff (ed.) Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Blair 2017 Sheila Blair. 2017. "Kufic". *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Lutz Edzard and Rudolf de Jong (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 2/3/2017.
- Blair and Bloom 1994 Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom. 1994. *The art and architecture of Islam, 1250-1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Blair and Bloom 2003 Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom. 2003. "The Mirage of Islamic Art: Reflections on the Study of an Unwieldy Field". *The Art Bulletin* 85(1): 152-84.
- Blessing 2012 Patricia Blessing. 2012. *Reframing the Lands of Rūm: Architecture and Style in Eastern Anatolia, 1240-1320*. PhD Thesis, Princeton University.
- Blessing 2014a Patricia Blessing. 2014. *Rebuilding Anatolia after the Mongol Conquest: Islamic Architecture in the Lands of Rūm, 1240-1330*. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Blessing 2014b Patricia Blessing. 2014. "Friedrich Sarre and the Discovery of Seljuk Anatolia". *Journal of Art Historiography* 11: 1-20.
- Blochet 1928 Edgar Blochet. 1928. *Catalogue des manuscrits Persans. Tome Troisième*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Blochet 1929 Edgar Blochet. 1929. *Musulman painting, XIIth-XVIIth century*. Cicely M. Binyon (trans.) London: Methuen.
- Bloom 2001 Jonathan Bloom. 2001. *Paper before Print: The History and Impact of Paper in the Islamic World*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Bosch 1981 Gulnar Bosch with John Carswell and Guy Petherbridge. 1981. *Islamic bindings & bookmaking*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, University of Chicago.
- Bosworth 2017a C.E. Bosworth. 2017. "Rūm". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 13/7/2017.
- Bosworth 2017b C.E. Bosworth. 2017. "al-Thughūr". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 25/7/2017.
- Bozer 2007 Rüstem Bozer. 2007. "The Kundekari Technique in Middle Age Anatolian Turkish Woodwork Art". *Prilozi Za Orijentalnu Filologiju* 57: 187-204.
- Brend 1991 Barbara Brend. 1991. *Islamic Art*. London: British Museum Press.
- Briquet 1907 Charles-Moïse Briquet. 1907. *Les filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition ver 1282 jusqu'en 1600*. 4 vols. Paris: A. Picard & fils.
- Brock 2005 Sebastian Brock. 2005. "The Use of Hijra Dating in Syriac Manuscripts. A Preliminary Investigation". *Redefining Christian Identity: Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the rise of Islam*. J.J. van Ginkel, H.L. Murre-van den Berg and T.M. van Lint (eds) Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Dep. Oosterse Studies.

- Broome 2011 Michael Broome. 2011. *A Survey of the Coinage of the Seljuqs of Rūm*. London: Royal Numismatic Society.
- Bryer 1981 A.M. Bryer. 1981. "Greek Historians on the Turks: The Case of the First Byzantine-Ottoman Marriage". *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*. R.H.C. Davis, J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, J.I. Catto and M.H. Keen (eds) Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buchthal 1978 Hugo Buchthal. 1978. *Patronage in Thirteenth-Century Constantinople: An Atelier of Late Byzantine Book Illumination and Calligraphy*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies.
- Buchthal 1983 Hugo Buchthal. 1983. "Studies in Byzantine Illumination of the Thirteenth Century". *Jahrbuch Der Berliner Museen* 25: 27-102.
- Bulliet 1979 Richard Bulliet. 1979. *Conversion to Islam in the medieval period: an essay in quantitative history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Çağman et al. 1983 Filiz Çağman, Serap Aykoç and Nazan Tapan. 1983. *The Anatolian Civilisations, III: Seljuk/Ottoman*. Esin Atıl (trans.). Istanbul: Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism.
- Çağman and Tanındı 2005 Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı. 2005. "Illustration and the art of the book in the Sufi orders of the Ottoman Empire". *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman society: sources, doctrine, rituals, Turuq, architecture, literature and fine arts, modernism*. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed.) Ankara: Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History.
- Çağrıçı 2009 Mustafa Çağrıçı. 2009. "Sirâceddin el-Urmevî". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 37. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Cahen 1968 Claude Cahen. 1968. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History C. 1071-1330*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson.
- Cahen 2015 Claude Cahen. 2015. "Bābā'ī". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E.

- Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/12/2015.
- Cahen 2016
 Claude Cahen. 2016. "Eretna". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 21/11/2016.
- Canby et al. 2016
 Sheila Canby, Deniz Beyazıt, Martina Rugiadi and A.C.S. Peacock. 2016. *Court and Cosmos: The Great Age of the Seljuqs*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Carboni and Komaroff 2002
 Stefano Carboni and Linda Komaroff. 2002. *The legacy of Genghis Khan: courtly art and culture in western Asia, 1256-1353*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Carr 1982
 Annemarie Weyl Carr. 1982. "Gospel Frontispieces from the Comnenian Period". *Gesta* 21(1): 3-20.
- Carr 1987
 Annemarie Weyl Carr. 1987. *Byzantine Illumination, 1150-1250: The Study of a Provincial Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Çaycı 2004
 Ahmet Çaycı. 2004. "Korkuteli (İstanoz) Tarihi ve Korkuteli Alaaddin Camii Üzerine Bir Araştırma". *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 16: 107-28.
- Çelebi 1998
 İlyas Çelebi. 1998. "Hindî". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 18. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Çetin 1961
 Nihad M. Çetin. 1961. "Maṭnawî'nin Konya Kütüphanelerindeki Eski Yazmaları". *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* IV: 97-118.
- Chittick 1978
 William Chittick. 1978, "The Last Will and Testament of Ibn 'Arabi's Foremost Disciple, Sadr al-Din Qunawî". <<http://www.ibnarabisociety.org.uk/articles/sadraldinwill.html>>. Accessed: 12/12/2016.
- Contadini 2012
 Anna Contadini. 2012. *A World of Beasts: A Thirteenth-Century Illustrated Arabic Books on Animals (the Kitāb Na't al-Ḥayawān) in the Ibn Bakhtīshū' Tradition*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Copeaux 1997 Étienne Copeaux. 1997. *Espaces et temps de la nation turque - Analyse d'une historiographie nationaliste 1931-1993*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Coşan 1981 M. Esad Coşan. 1981. "XV. Asır Türk Yazarlarından Muslihu'd-Din Hamid-Oğulları ve Hızır Bey". *Vakıflar Dergisi* 13: 101-12.
- Coulie 2004 Bernard Coulie. 2004. "Armenian Manuscripts and Scriptoria of Sebastia". *Armenian Sebastia/Sivas and Lesser Armenia*. R.G. Hovannisian (ed.) Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers.
- Cowe 2015 S. Peter Cowe. 2015. "Patterns of Armeno-Muslim Interchange on the Armenian Plateau in the Interstice between Byzantine and Ottoman Hegemony". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Crane 2009 Howard Crane. 2009. "Art and Architecture, 1300-1453". *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Kate Fleet and Suraiya Faroqhi (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dadoyan 2013-14 Seta B. Dadoyan. 2013-14. *The Armenians in the Medieval Islamic World: Paradigms of Interaction, Seventh to Fourteenth Centuries, vols 2-3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Dalkesen 2007 Nilgün Dalkesen. 2007. *Gender Roles and Women's Status in Central Asia and Anatolia Between the Thirteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. PhD Thesis, Middle East Technical University.
- Danielyan 2016 Gagik Danielyan. "Hayoc' xalifan. Hromklayi kat'olikosakan at'ori patmut'yan arabakan skzbnalbyurnerə". *Cilician Armenia in the Perceptions of Adjacent Political Entities (Historical-Philological Essays)*. A.A. Bozoyan, R.M. Shukurov, V.A. Ter-Ghevondian and G.G. Danielyan (eds) Yerevan: Institute of Oriental Studies, National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia.

- Darling 2004 Linda Darling. 2004. "Persianate Sources on Anatolia and the Early History of the Ottomans". *Studies on Persianate Societies* 2: 126-44.
- DeJong 1989 Frederick DeJong. 1989. "The Iconography of Bektashiism: A Survey of Themes and Symbolism in Clerical Costume, Liturgical Objects and Pictorial Art". *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 4: 7-29.
- Demircan Aksoy 2010 Zeynep Demircan Aksoy. 2010. *XIV. Yüzyıl Anadolu Türk Tezhip Sanatı Tasarımları*. PhD Thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University.
- Demircan Aksoy 2014 Zeynep Demircan Aksoy. 2014. "İlhanlı ve Memlûk Etkileşiminde XIV. Yüzyıl Anadolu Türk Tezhip Sanatı". *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 7(29): 265-80.
- Derman 1998a M. Uğur Derman. 1998a. *Letters in Gold: Ottoman Calligraphy from the Sakıp Sabancı Collection*. Istanbul and New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Derman 1998b M. Uğur Derman. 1998b. *The Art of Calligraphy in the Islamic Heritage*. Istanbul: IRCICA.
- Derman 2005 M. Uğur Derman. 2005. "Sufi Order Sages in Ottoman Calligraphy". *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society: Sources, Doctrine, Rituals, Turuq, Architecture, Literature and Fine Arts, Modernism*. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed.) Ankara: Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History.
- Der Nersessian 1993 Sirarpie Der Nersessian. 1993. *Miniature painting in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia from the twelfth to the fourteenth century*. Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.
- Déroche 1992 François Déroche. 1992. *The Abbasid Tradition: Qur'ans of the 8th to the 10th centuries AD*. London: The Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press.
- Déroche 2005 François Déroche. 2005. *Islamic Codicology: An Introduction to the Study of Manuscripts in Arabic Script*. London: Al-Furqān Islamic Heritage Foundation.

- DeWeese 2006 Devin DeWeese. 2006. "Foreword" *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*. Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (author), Gary Leiser (ed. and trans.) London: Routledge.
- Diez 1946 Ernst Diez. 1946. *Türk sanatı, başlangıcından günümüze kadar*. Oktay Aslanapa (trans.) Istanbul: Üniversite Matbaası. (2nd ed. published 1955, Istanbul: Doğan Kardeş).
- Dilçimen 1940 Kazım Dilçimen. 1940. *Canik Beyleri*. Samsun: Ahali Matbaası.
- Dols 1977 Michael W. Dols. 1977. *The Black Death in the Middle East*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dressler 2010 Markus Dressler. 2010. "How to Conceptualize Inner-Islamic Plurality/Difference: 'Heterodoxy' and 'Syncretism' in the Writings of Mehmet F. Köprülü (1890-1966)". *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37(3): 241-60.
- Dressler 2013 Markus Dressler. 2013. *Writing religion: the making of Turkish Alevi Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duda 1983 Dorothea Duda. 1983. *Islamische Handschriften*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Durak 2010 Koray Durak. 2010. "Who are the Romans? The Definition of *Bilād al-Rūm* (Land of the Romans) in Medieval Islamic Geographies". *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(3): 285-98.
- Durukan 1999 Aynur Durukan. 1999. "A Medieval Anatolian Architect: Keluk". *Arc Turc: 10e Congrès international d'art turc: Genève, 17-23 Septembre 1995: actes = Turkish Art: 10th International Congress of Turkish Art: Geneva, 17-23 September 1995: proceedings*. François Déroche, Antoinette Harri and Alison Ohta (eds) Geneva: Fondation Max van Berchem.
- Eastmond 2004 Antony Eastmond. 2004. *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-Century Byzantium: Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Ed. 2016 Ed. 2016. "Ism". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 21/11/2016.
- Edhem 1926 Halil Edhem [Eldem]. 1926. *Garbî Anadolu'da Selçukluların Vârisleri Tavâif-i Mülük*. Istanbul: Âmire Matbaası.
- Eldem 2010 Edhem Eldem. 2010. "Ottoman and Turkish Orientalism". *Architectural Design* 80(1): 26-31.
- Emecen 1991 Feridun Emecen. 1991. "Antalya". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 3. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Ernst 2009 Carl W. Ernst. 2009. "Sufism and the Aesthetics of Penmanship in Sirāj Al-Shīrāzī's "Tuḥfat Al-Muḥibbīn" (1454)". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129(3): 431-42.
- Ersoy 1988 Ayla Ersoy. 1988. *Türk Tezhip Sanatı*. Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Ertuğ 1991 Ahmet Ertuğ with Mine Timur Bragner. 1991. *The Seljuks: A Journey Through Anatolian Architecture*. Robert Bragner (trans.) Istanbul: A. Ertuğ.
- Eser and Küçükdağ 2013 Mevlüt Eser and Yusuf Küçükdağ. 2013. "Ermenek Mevlevihanesi/Karamanoğlu Halil Bey Tekkesi". *Tarihçiliğe Adanmış Bir Ömür Prof. Dr. Nejat Göyünç'e Armağan*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Ettinghausen et al. 2001 Richard Ettinghausen, Oleg Grabar and Marilyn Jenkins-Madina. 2001. *Islamic art and architecture, 650-1250*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Eyice 1989 Semavi Eyice. 1989. "Akhan". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 2. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Fathi 2016 Jean Fathi. 2016. "Yūhannā ibn al-Ġurayr, Passeur de la Tradition Syriaque et Arabe Chrétienne au XVII^e

- Siècle". *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 68(1-2): 81-209.
- Fazlıođlu 1997 İhsan Fazlıođlu. 1997. "Sultân I. Alâuddîn Keykudâd'A Sunulan Siyâsetnâme: El-Letâifu'L-Alâiyye Fî'L-Fedâili'S-Seniyye". *Dîvân İlmî Arařtırmalar Dergisi* 1: 225-39.
- Fleet 1999 Kate Fleet. 1999. *European and Islamic trade in the early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fleet 2009 Kate Fleet. 2009. "The Turkish Economy, 1071-1453". *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Kate Fleet and Suraiya Faroqhi (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flemming 1964 Barbara Flemming. 1964. *Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien Und Lykien im Spätmittelalter*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- Flood 2007 Finbarr Barry Flood. 2007. "From the Prophet to Postmodernism? New World Orders and the End of Islamic Art". *Making Art History: A Changing Discipline and its Institutions*. Elizabeth Mansfield (ed.) New York and London: Routledge.
- Gabra and Eaton-Krauss 2006 Gawdat Gabra and Marianne Eaton-Krauss. 2006. *The Treasures of Coptic Art in the Coptic Museum and Churches of Old Cairo*. Cairo and New York: American University in Cairo Press.
- Gabriel 1931 Albert Gabriel. 1931. *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*. Paris: Ede Boccard.
- Gabrieli 2017 F. Gabrieli. 2017. "Adab". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 13/3/2017.
- Gacek 2003 Adam Gacek. 2003. "The head-serif (tarwīs) and the typology of Arabic scripts: preliminary observations". *Manuscripta Orientalia* 9(3): 22-33.
- Gacek 2009 Adam Gacek. 2009. *Arabic Manuscripts: A Vademecum for Readers*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

- Gacek 2015a Adam Gacek. 2015. "Nasx". *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Lutz Edzard and Rudolf de Jong (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/11/2015.
- Gacek 2015b Adam Gacek. 2015. "Nasta'liq". *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Lutz Edzard and Rudolf de Jong (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/11/2015.
- Géhin 2015 Paul Géhin. 2015. "L'Étonnant Destin d'Un Psautier Jacobite du XIII^e Siècle: Sinaï Syr. 43 + Vatican Syr. 647, ff. 24-26". *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 18(1): 53-65.
- George 2010 Alain George. 2010. *The Rise of Islamic Calligraphy*. London and Berkeley, CA: Saqi.
- Ghazarian and Ousterhout 2001 Armen Ghazarian and Robert Ousterhout. 2001. "A Muqarnas Drawing from Thirteenth-Century Armenia and the Use of Architectural Drawings during the Middle Ages". *Muqarnas* 18: 141-54.
- Gibbons 1916 Herbert Adams Gibbons. 1916. *The foundation of the Ottoman Empire: a history of the Osmanlis up to the death of Bayezid I, 1300-1403*. London: Cass.
- Glück 1935 Heinrich Glück. 1935. "Türk Sanatının Dünyadaki Mevkii". *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 3 [1926-33]: 119-28.
- Göde 1994 Kemal Göde. 1994. *Eratnalılar (1327-1381)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Göde 1995 Kemal Göde. 1995. "Eretnağulları". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 11. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Gökalp 1923 Mehmed Ziya Gökalp. 1923. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. Ankara: Milli İctimiyat Kitabhanesi.
- Gökalp 1926 Mehmed Ziya Gökalp. 1926. *Türk Medeniyet Tarihi*. Istanbul: Matbaa-yi Âmire.
- Golden 2016 P.B. Golden. 2016. "Ṭarkhān". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 6/5/2016.

- Gölpınarlı 1953 Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı. 1953. *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevilik*. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka Kitabevleri.
- Gölpınarlı 1963 Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı. 1963. *Mevlevî: Âdâb ve Erkânı*. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka Kitabevleri.
- Gölpınarlı 1967 Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı. 1967. *Mevlânâ Müzesi yazmalar kataloğu*. 4 vols. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Gölpınarlı 2003 Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı. 2003. *Mevlânâ Müzesi Müzelik Yazma Kitaplar Kataloğu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Goshgarian 2007 Rachel Goshgarian. 2007. *Beyond the Social and the Spiritual: Redefining the Urban Confraternities of Late Medieval Anatolia*. PhD Thesis, Harvard University.
- Goshgarian 2012 Rachel Goshgarian. 2012. "Futuwwa in Thirteenth-Century Rûm and Armenia: Reform Movements and the Managing of Multiple Allegiances on the Seljuk Periphery". *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) London: I.B. Tauris.
- Goshgarian 2013 Rachel Goshgarian. 2013. "Opening and Closing: Coexistence and Competition in Associations Based on Futuwwa in Late Medieval Anatolian Cities". *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 40(1): 36-52.
- Grabar 2006 Oleg Grabar. 2006. *Islamic Visual Culture, 1100-1800, Vol. 2*. Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum.
- Grabar and Blair 1980 Oleg Grabar and Sheila Blair. 1980. *Epic images and contemporary history: the illustrations of the great Mongol Shahnama*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Graves and Junod 2010 Margaret S. Graves and Benoît Junod. 2010. *Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum: Arts of the Book & Calligraphy*. Geneva: Aga Khan Trust for Culture; İstanbul: Sakıp Sabancı Müzesi.
- Grigor 2007 Talinn Grigor. 2007. "Orient oder Rom? Qajar "Aryan" architecture and Strzygowski's art history". *Art Bulletin* 89(3): 562-90.

- Gürpınar 2012 Doğan Gürpınar. 2012. "Anatolia's eternal destiny was sealed: Seljuks of Rum in the Turkish national(ist) imagination from the late Ottoman Empire to the Republican era". *European Journal of Turkish Studies (Complete List)*: 1-29.
- Haldane 1983 Duncan Haldane. 1983. *Islamic bookbindings in the Victoria and Albert Museum*. London: World of Islam Festival Trust in association with the Victoria and Albert Museum.
- Heywood 2002 Colin Heywood. 2002. "The Frontier in Ottoman History: Old Ideas and New Myth". *Writing Ottoman history: documents and interpretations*. Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum.
- Hillenbrand 2005 Carole Hillenbrand. 2005. "Rāvandī, the Seljuk Court at Konya and the Persianisation of Anatolian Cities". *Mésogeios* 25-26: 157-69.
- Hillenbrand 2003 Robert Hillenbrand. 2003. "Studying Islamic Architecture: Challenges and Perspectives". *Architectural History* 46: 1-18.
- Hillenbrand 2004 Robert Hillenbrand. 2004. *Shahnama: the visual language of the Persian Book of Kings*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillenbrand 2010 Robert Hillenbrand. 2010. "Western Scholarship on Persian Painting Before 1914: Collectors, Exhibitions and Franco-German Rivalry". *After One Hundred Years: The 1910 Exhibition "Meisterwerke Muhammedanischer Kunst" Reconsidered*. Andrea Lerner and Avinoam Shalem (eds) Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Hirschler 2012 Konrad Hirschler. 2012. *The written word in the medieval Arabic lands: a social and cultural history of reading practices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hodgson 1974 Marshall G. S. Hodgson. 1974. *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*. 3 vols. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Honigmann and Bosworth 2015 E. Honigmann and C.E. Bosworth. 2015. "Rūm Ḳal'esi". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 11/12/2015.
- Hopwood 1993 Keith Hopwood. 1993. "People, Territories and States: The Formation of the Beğliks of Pre-Ottoman Turkey". *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*. Caesar E. Farah (ed.) Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press at Northeast Missouri State University.
- Hrbek 1962 Ivan Hrbek. 1962. "The Chronology of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's Travels". *Archiv Orientální: Journal of the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute, Prague* 30: 409-86.
- Huart 1908 Clément Huart. 1908. *Les calligraphes et les miniaturistes de l'Orient musulman*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Hunt 1998 Lucy-Anne Hunt. 1998. "Comnenian Aristocratic Palace Decoration: Descriptions and Islamic Connections". *Byzantium, Eastern Christendom and Islam: art at the crossroads of the medieval Mediterranean*. London: Pindar Press.
- Hunt 2009 Lucy-Anne Hunt. 2009. "A Christian Arab Gospel Book: Cairo, Coptic Museum MS Bibl. 90 in its Mamluk Context". *Mamlūk Studies Review* 13(2): 105-32.
- İnalçık 2016 Halil İnalçık. 2016. "Bāyazīd". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 18/11/2016.
- İz 2016 Fahîr İz. 2016. "Āshik Pasha". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 18/11/2016.
- Jackson 2017 Cailah Jackson. 2017. "Anīs al-Qulūb (MS Ayasofya 2984, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul): an illuminated manuscript of early fourteenth-century Konya?". *Journal of Islamic Manuscripts* 8(1): 85-122.

- James 1902 William James. 1902. *The varieties of religious experience: a study in human nature*. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- James 1992a David James. 1992. *The Master Scribes: Qur'ans of the 10th to 14th centuries AD*. London: The Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press.
- James 1992b David James. 1992. *After Timur: Qur'ans of the 15th and 16th centuries*. London: The Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press.
- James 1999 David James. 1999. *Manuscripts of the Holy Qur'an From the Mamluk Era*. Riyadh: Alexandria Press in London.
- de Jerphanion 1928 Guillaume de Jerphanion. 1928. *Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne: monuments préhelléniques, gréco-romains, byzantins et musulmans de Pont, de Cappadoce et de Galatie*. Bayreuth: Impr. Catholique.
- Junod et al. 2012 Benoît Junod, Georges Khalil, Stefan Weber and Gerhard Wolf (eds) 2012. *Islamic art and the museum: approaches to art and archaeology of the Muslim world in the twenty-first century*. London: Saqi.
- Kafadar 1995 Cemal Kafadar. 1995. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kafadar 2007 Cemal Kafadar. 2007. "Introduction: A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum". *Muqarnas* 24: 7-25.
- Kafesoğlu 1988 İbrahim Kafesoğlu. 1988. *A history of the Seljuks: İbrahim Kafesoğlu's interpretation and the resulting controversy*. Gary Leiser (ed. and trans.) Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kağıtçı 1976 Mehmed Ali Kağıtçı. 1976. *Historical study of paper industry in Turkey*. Istanbul: Grafik Sanatlar Matbaası.

- Kansu 1943 Şevket Aziz Kansu. 1943. "Selçuk Türkleri Hakkında Antropolojik İlk Bir Tetkik ve Neticeleri". *İkinci Türk Tarih Kongresi*. Istanbul: Kenan Matbaası.
- von Karabacek 2001 Joseph von Karabacek with additional notes by Don Baker. 2001. *Arab Paper*. Don Baker and Suzy Dittmar (trans) London: Archetype.
- Karakaya-Stump 2013 Ayfer Karakaya-Stump. 2013. "The *Vefā'iyye*, the Bektashiyye and Genealogies of 'Heterodox' Islam in Anatolia: Rethinking the Köprülü Paradigm". *Turcica* 44: 279-300.
- Karamustafa 1993 Ahmet T. Karamustafa. 1993. "Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia". *Classical Persian Sufism: From Its Origins to Rumi*. Leonard Lewisohn (ed.) London: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi.
- Kaymaz 1970 Nejat Kaymaz. 1970. *Pervâne Mu'înü'd-dîn Süleyman*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Kehr 1724 Georg Jakob Kehr. 1724. *Monarchiæ Asiatico-Saracenicæ status: qualis VIII. et IX. post Christum natum seculo fuit, ex nummis argenteis prisca Arabum scriptura kufica, a monarchis Arabicis Al-Mansor, Harun Raschid, Al-Mamon, aliisque in metropolibus Chaldææ, Persiæ, Transoxanæque cusis, et nuper in littore maris balthici prope gedanum effossis, illustratus*. Leipzig: Jakob Schuster.
- Khan 1994 Muhammad Muhsin Khan. 1994. *The Translation of the Meanings of Summarized Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Arabic-English*. Riyadh: Dār al-Salām.
- Kickingereder 2009 Dieter F. Kickingereder. 2009. *Celal Esad Arseven: ein Leben zwischen Kunst, Politik und Wissenschaft*. Berlin: Schwarz.
- Kite 2004 Stephen Kite. 2004. "South Opposed to East and North': Adrian Stokes and Josef Strzygowski. A study in the aesthetics and historiography of Orientalism". *Art History* 26(4): 505-33.
- Koca 2002 Salim Koca. 2002. "Anatolian Turkish Beyliks". *The Turks*. Hasan Celâl Güzel, C. Cem Oğuz, and Osman Karatay (eds) Ankara: Yeni Türkiye.

- Kofođlu 1995 Sait Kofođlu. 1995. "Emîr Sinâneddin Medresesi". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 11. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Kofođlu 1997 Sait Kofođlu. 1997. "Hamîdođulları". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 15. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Kofođlu 2006 Sait Kofođlu. 2006. *Hamidođulları Beyliđi*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu.
- Kofođlu 2011 Sait Kofođlu. 2011. "Tekeođulları". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 40. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Konyalı 1967 İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı. 1967. *Âbideleri ve kitâbeleri ile Karaman tarihi: Ermenek ve Mut âbideleri*. Istanbul: Baha Maatbası.
- Konyalı 1968 İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı. 1968. "Bir Hücçet İki Vakfiye". *Vakıflar Dergisi* 7: 91-110.
- Köprülü 1929 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. 1929. *Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol sur les ordres mystiques musulmans*. Istanbul: Imp. Zellitch frères.
- Köprülü 1943 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. 1943. "Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi'nin Yerli Kaynakları I: Anîs Al-Kulûb". *Belleten* 7: 459-522.
- Köprülü 1992 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. 1992. *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture according to Local Muslim Sources*. Gary Leiser (ed. and trans.) Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Köprülü 1993 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. 1993. *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion: Prolegomena*. Gary Leiser (ed. and trans.) Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Köprülü 2006 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. 2006. *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*. Gary Leiser (ed. and trans.). London: Routledge.
- Korkhmazian et al. 1984 Emma Korkhmazian, Irina Drampian and Gravard Hakopian. 1984. *Armenian miniatures of the 13th and 14th centuries, from the Matenadaran Collection*,

Yerevan. Ashkhen Mikoyan (trans.) Saint Petersburg: Aurora Art Publishers.

- Korobeinikov 2005 Dimitri Korobeinikov. 2005. "Orthodox Communities in Eastern Anatolia in the Thirteenth to Fourteenth Centuries. Part 2: The Time of Troubles". *Al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 17(1): 1-29.
- Korobeinikov 2014 Dimitri Korobeinikov. 2014. *Byzantium and the Turks in the thirteenth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kouymjian 2006 Dickran Kouymjian. 2006. "Chinese Motifs in Thirteenth-Century Armenian Art: The Mongol Connection". *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*. Linda Komaroff (ed.) Leiden: Brill.
- Kouymjian 2012 Dickran Kouymjian. 2012. "Chinese Dragons and Phoenixes Among the Armenians". *Caucasus during the Mongol period*. Jürgen Tubach, Sophia G. Vashalomidze and Manfred Zimmer (eds) Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Köymen 1976 Mehmet Altay Köymen. 1976. "Selçuklu Devrinin Özellikleri". *Atsız Armağanı*. Erol Güngör et al. (eds) Istanbul: Ötüken.
- Kuban 1969 Doğan Kuban. 1969. "Celal Esad Arseven ve Türk Sanatı Kavramı". *Mimarlık* 7: 18-20.
- Küçükhüseyin 2013 Şevket Küçükhüseyin. 2013. "Some Reflections on Hagiology with Reference to the Early Mawlawī-Christian Relations in the Light of the Manaqib al-ʿarifīn". *Al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 25(2): 240-51.
- Kuehn 2011 Sara Kuehn. 2011. *The Dragon in Medieval East Christian and Islamic Art*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lambton 1988 Ann K.S. Lambton. 1988. *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia: Aspects of Administrative, Economic and Social History, 11th-14th Century*. Albany: Persian Heritage Foundation.
- Leiser 2004 Gary Leiser. 2004. "The Madrasah and the Islamization of Anatolia before the Ottomans". *Law and Education*

in Medieval Islam: Studies in Memory of Professor George Makdisi. Joseph E. Lowry, Devin J. Stewart and Shawkat M. Toorawa (eds) Cambridge: E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Trust.

- Leiser 2016 Gary Leiser. 2016. "Teke-Oghullari". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/12/2016.
- Leiser 2017 Gary Leiser. 2017. "The Waqf as an Instrument of Cultural Transformation in Seljuq Anatolia". *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent: The Turkish Presence in the Islamic World*. Ismail Poonawala (ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lemerle 1957 P. Lemerle. 1957. *L'emirat d'Aydin. Byzance et l'Occident: recherches sur "La geste d'Umur pacha"*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Lewis 2008 Franklin Lewis. 2008. *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West: The Life, Teaching and Poetry of Jalâl Al-Din Rumi*. London: Oneworld.
- Liechti 2008 Stacy Liechti. 2008. *Books, Book Endowments, and Communities of Knowledge in the Bukharan Khanate*. PhD Thesis, New York University.
- Lifchez 1992 Raymond Lifchez (ed.) 1992. *The Dervish Lodge: Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford: University of California Press.
- Lindner 1999 Rudi Paul Lindner. 1999. "How Mongol were the Early Ottomans?". *The Mongol empire and its legacy*. Reuven Amitai-Preiss and David Morgan (eds) Leiden: Brill.
- Lindner 2009 Rudi Paul Lindner. 2009. "Anatolia, 1300-1451". *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Kate Fleet and Suraiya Faroqhi (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lings 1976 Martin Lings. 1976. *The Quranic art of calligraphy and illumination*. London: World of Islam Festival Trust.
- Lings 2005 Martin Lings. 2005. *Splendours of Qur'an Calligraphy & Illumination*. Vaduz: Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation.

- Loveday 2001 Helen Loveday. 2001. *Islamic Paper: A Study of the Ancient Craft*. London: Don Baker Memorial Fund.
- Lowry 2003 Heath Lowry. 2003. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Luisier 1998 Philippe Luisier. 1998. *La Turquie de Guillaume de Jerphanion, S.J.: actes du colloque de Rome (9-10 mai 1997), Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Moyen Age* 110: 773-970.
- MacKenzie 1995 John M. MacKenzie. 1995. *Orientalism: history, theory and the arts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Madelung 1971 Wilferd Madelung. 1971. "The Spread of Māturīdism and the Turks". *Actas, IV Congresso de Estudos Arabes e Islamicos, Coimbra-Lisboa, 1 a 8 de setembro de 1968*. Leiden: Brill.
- Makdisi 1973 George Makdisi. 1973. "The Sunni Revival". *Islamic Civilisation, 950-1150*. D.S. Richards (ed.) Oxford: Cassirer.
- Makuljević 2013 Nenad Makuljević. 2013. "The political reception of the Vienna School: Josef Strzygowski and Serbian art history". *Journal of Art Historiography* 8: 1-13.
- Marchand 1994 Suzanne L. Marchand. 1994. "The Rhetoric of Artifacts and the Decline of Classical Humanism: The Case of Josef Strzygowski". *History and Theory* 33(4): 106-30.
- Marlow 2010 Louise Marlow. 2010. "A Thirteenth-Century Scholar in the Eastern Mediterranean: Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī, Jurist, Logician, Diplomat". *Al-Masāq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean* 22(3): 279-313.
- Marlow 2016 Louise Marlow. 2016. "Advice and Advice Literature". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas and Everett Rowson (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 18/11/2016. Originally published in 2007.

- Martin 1912 F.R. Martin. 1912. *The miniature painting and painters of Persia, India and Turkey from the 8th to the 18th century*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
- Mathews and Wieck 1994 Thomas F. Mathews and Roger S. Wieck (eds). 1994. *Treasures in Heaven: Armenian Illuminated Manuscripts*. New York and Princeton: Pierpont Morgan Library; Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- Melikian 1970 Souren Melikian. 1970. "Le Roman de Varqe et Golšâh". *Arts Asiatiques* 22: 1-264.
- Melikian 1985 Souren Melikian. 1985. "Anatolian Candlesticks: The Eastern Element and the Konya School". *Rivista Degli Studi Orientali* 59(i-iv): 225-66.
- Melville 2001 Charles Melville. 2001. "From Adam to Abaqa: Qādī Baiḍāwī's Rearrangement of History". *Studia Iranica* 30: 67-86.
- Melville 2006 Charles Melville. 2006. "The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia". *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*. Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn (eds) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Melville 2009 Charles Melville. 2009. "Anatolia under the Mongols". *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Kate Fleet and Suraiya Faroqhi (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melville 2010 Charles Melville. 2010. "Genealogy and Exemplary Rulership in the Tarikh-i Chingiz Khan". *Living Islamic history: studies in honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand*. Yasir Suleiman (ed.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Melville and Zaryab 1991 Charles Melville and Abbas Zaryab. 1991. "Chobanids". *Encyclopaedia Iranica, Vol. V*. <<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/chobanids-chupanids-pers>>. Accessed: 21/11/2016.
- Merian 1993 Sylvie Merian. 1993. *The Structure of Armenian Bookbinding and Its Relation to Near Eastern*

Bookmaking Traditions. PhD Thesis, Columbia University.

- Mevlana Müzesi 1992
Mevlana Müzesi. 1992. *Maṣnavī-i ma'navī: chāp-i 'aksī az rū-yi nuskhah-'i khattī-i Qūnyah (Mūzah-'i Mawlānā): tāriḫ-i kitābat 677 Hijrī-i Qamarī*. Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī.
- Miroğlu 1995
İsmet Miroğlu. 1995. "Erzincan". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 11. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Mordtmann and de Planhol 2017
J.H. Mordtmann and X. de Planhol. 2017. "Karā Ḥiṣār". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 13/3/2017.
- Morton 1994
A.H. Morton. 1994. "The *Mu'nis al-aḥrār* and Its Twenty-ninth Chapter". *Illustrated Poetry and Epic Images: Persian Painting of the 1330s and 1340s*. Marie Lukens Swietochowski and Stefano Carboni (eds) New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Mutman 1992
Mahmut Mutman. 1992. "Under the Sign of Orientalism: The West vs. Islam". *Cultural Critique* 23: 165-97.
- Narkiss 1980
Bezalel Narkiss (ed.) with Michael E. Stone. 1980. *Armenian Art Treasures of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Phaidon.
- Nebes et al. 1997
Norbert Nebes et al. 1997. *Orientalische Buchkunst in Gotha: Ausstellung zum 350jährigen Jubiläum der Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek Gotha: Spiegelsaal 11. September 1997 bis 14. Dezember 1997*. Gotha: Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek.
- Necipoğlu 2007
Gülru Necipoğlu. 2007. "Creation of a national genius: Sinan and the historiography of "classical" Ottoman architecture". *Muqarnas* 24: 140-83.
- Necipoğlu 2012
Gülru Necipoğlu. 2012. "The Concept of Islamic Art: Inherited Discourses and New Approaches". *Islamic art and the museum: approaches to art and archaeology of the Muslim world in the twenty-first century*. Benoît Junod, Georges Khalil, Stefan Weber and Gerhard Wolf (eds) London: Saqi Books.

- Necipoğlu and Bozdoğan 2007 Gülru Necipoğlu and Sibel Bozdoğan. 2007. "Entangled Discourses: Scrutinizing Orientalist and Nationalist Legacies in the Architectural Historiography of the "Lands of Rum"". *Muqarnas* 24: 1-6.
- Nelson 1988 Robert S. Nelson. 1988. "Palaeologan Illuminated Ornament and the Arabesque". *Wiener Jahrbuch Für Kunstgeschichte* 41: 7-22.
- Niazi 2011 Kaveh Farzad Niazi. 2011. *A Comparative Study of Qutb al-Dīn Shīrāzī's Texts and Models on the Configuration of the Heavens*. PhD Thesis, Columbia University.
- De Nicola 2014 Bruno De Nicola. 2014. "The Ladies of Rūm: A Hagiographic View of Women in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Anatolia". *Journal of Sufi Studies* 3(2): 132-56.
- Niebuhr 1772 Carsten Niebuhr. 1772. *Beschreibung von Arabien: Aus eigenen Beobachtungen und im Lande selbst gesammelten Nachrichten*. Copenhagen: Nicolaus Møller.
- Nochlin 1991 Linda Nochlin. 1991. *The politics of vision: essays on nineteenth-century art and society*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Ocak 1989 Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. 1989. *La révolte de Baba Resul, ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIIIe siècle*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ocak 2009 Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. 2009. "Social, Cultural and Intellectual Life, 1071-1453". *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Kate Fleet and Suraiya Faroqhi (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Öden 1999 Zerrin Günel Öden. 1999. *Karası Beyliği*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ohta 2012 Alison Ohta. 2012. *Covering the book: bindings of the Mamluk period, 1250-1516 CE*. PhD Thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies.

- Okuyan 2006 Mehmet Okuyan. 2006. "Necmeddîn-i Dâye". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 32. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Ölçer 2005 Nazan Ölçer. 2005. "The Seljuks and Artuqids of Medieval Anatolia". *Turks: A Journey of a Thousand Years, 600 - 1600*. David J. Roxburgh (ed.) London: Royal Academy of Arts.
- Önder 1968 Mehmet Önder. 1968. "XV. Yüzyıl Sonuna Kadar En Eski Mesnevi Nüshaları". *Necati Lugal Armağani*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Öney 1969 Gönül Öney. 1969. "Anadolu Selçuk Sanatında Ejder Figürleri". *Belleten* 33: 193-216.
- Öney 1989 Gönül Öney. 1989. *Beylikler devri sanatı: XIV.-XV. yüzyıl (1300-1453)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Önge 2007 Mustafa Önge. 2007. "Caravanserais as Symbols of Power in Seljuk Anatolia". *Power and Culture: Identity, Ideology, Representation*. Jonathan Osmond and Ausma Cimdina (eds) Pisa: Edizioni PLUS-Pisa University Press.
- Oral 1956 M. Zeki Oral. 1956. "Durağan ve Bafra'da iki Türbe". *Belleten* 20: 385-410.
- Orhonlu et al. 2016 Cengiz Orhonlu, G. Baer and Ed. 2016. "Ketkhudā". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 18/11/2016.
- Ousterhout 1999 Robert G. Ousterhout. 1999. *Master Builders of Byzantium*. Princeton, NJ and Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- Özergin 1970 M. Kemal Özergin. 1970. "Selçuklu Sanatçısı Nakkaş 'Abdü'l-Mü'min El-Hoyî Hakkında". *Belleten* 34: 219-29.
- Özkan 2008 Mustafa Özkan. 2008. "Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Döneminde Ortaya Konan Kuran Tercümelere Üzerine - I". *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 39: 115-59.

- Özkarcı 1995 Mehmet Özkarcı. 1995. "Niğde-Bor'da Eretnaoğulları'na Ait İki Kitabe". *Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2: 105-14.
- Özönder 1994 Hasan Özönder. 1994. "Karaman (Lârende) Mevlevî-hânesi". *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 14: 143-52.
- Pamuk 2000 Şevket Pamuk. 2000. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pancaroğlu 2004 Oya Pancaroğlu. 2004. "The Itinerant Dragon-Slayer: Forging Paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia". *Gesta* 43(2): 151-64.
- Pancaroğlu 2007 Oya Pancaroğlu. 2007. "Formalism and the Academic Foundation of Turkish Art in the Early Twentieth Century". *Muqarnas* 24: 67-78.
- Pancaroğlu 2011 Oya Pancaroğlu. 2011. "Fin-de-Siècle Reconnaissance of Seljuk Architecture in Anatolia: Friedrich Sarre and His Reise in Kleinasien". *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914*. Zainab Bahrani, Zeynep Çelik and Edhem Eldem (eds) Istanbul: SALT.
- Paul 2011 Jürgen Paul. 2011. "Mongol Aristocrats and Beyliks in Anatolia. A Study of Astarâbâdî's Bazm va Razm". *Eurasian Studies* 9: 105-58.
- Paul 2013 Jürgen Paul. 2013. "A Landscape of Fortresses: Central Anatolia in Astarâbâdî's Bazm Wa Razm". *Turko-Mongol Rulers, Cities and City Life*. David Durand-Guédy (ed.) Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Peacock 2004a A.C.S. Peacock. 2004. "Ahmad of Niğde's "Al-Walad Al-Shafiq" and the Seljuk Past". *Anatolian Studies* 54: 95-107.
- Peacock 2004b A.C.S. Peacock. 2004. "Local Identity and Medieval Anatolian Historiography: Anavi's Anis Al-Qolub and Ahmad of Niğde's Al-Walad Al-Shafiq". *Studies on Persianate Societies* 2: 115-63.

- Peacock 2006 A.C.S. Peacock. 2006. "Georgia and the Anatolian Turks in the 12th and 13th Centuries". *Anatolian Studies* 56: 127-46.
- Peacock 2010 A.C.S. Peacock. 2010. *Early Seljūq History: A New Interpretation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Peacock 2012 A.C.S. Peacock. 2012. "Sufis and the Seljuk Court in Mongol Anatolia: Politics and Patronage in the Works of Jalāl Al-Dīn Rūmī and Sulṭān Walad". *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*. A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) London: I.B. Tauris.
- Peacock 2014 A.C.S. Peacock. 2014. "The Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm and the Turkmen of the Byzantine frontier, 1206-1279". *Al-Masāq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean* 26(3): 267-87.
- Peacock 2015a A.C.S. Peacock. 2015. "An Interfaith Polemic of Medieval Anatolia: Qadi Burhan al-Din al-Anawi on the Armenians and their heresies". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Peacock 2015b A.C.S. Peacock. 2015. "Advice for the Sultans of Rum: The "mirrors for princes" of early thirteenth-century Anatolia". *Turkish Language, Literature, and History: Travelers' Tales, Sultans, and Scholars Since the Eighth Century*. Bill Hickman, Gary Leiser and A.C.S. Peacock (eds) Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.
- Peker 1999 Ali Uzay Peker. 1999. "The Origins of the Seljukid Double-Headed Eagle as a Cosmological Symbol". *Arc Turc: 10e Congrès international d'art turc: Genève, 17-23 Septembre 1995: actes = Turkish Art: 10th International Congress of Turkish Art: Geneva, 17-23 September 1995: proceedings*. François Déroche, Antoinette Harri and Alison Ohta (eds) Geneva: Fondation Max van Berchem.
- Petrosyan 1995 Yuri Petrosyan. 1995. *Pages of Perfection: Islamic paintings and calligraphy from the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg*. Lugano: ARCH Foundation.

- Pfeiffer 2015 Judith Pfeiffer. 2015. "Mevlevi-Bektashi Rivalries and the Islamisation of the Public Space in Late Seljuq Anatolia". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Pfeiffer and Quinn 2006 Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn (eds) 2006. *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pinon 2006 Pierre Pinon. 2006. "La vie et l'oeuvre d'Albert Gabriel". *Albert Gabriel (1883-1972): mimar, arkeolog, ressam, gezgin = Albert Gabriel (1883-1972): architecte, archéologue, artiste, voyageur*. Pierre Pinon (ed.) Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- de Planhol 2016 X. de Planhol. 2016. "Ḥamīd or Ḥamīd Oghullari". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/12/2016.
- Preiser-Kapeller 2015 Johannes Preiser-Kapeller. 2015. "Liquid Frontiers: A Relational Analysis of Maritime Asia Minor as a Religious Contact Zone in the Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Rampley 2013 Matthew Rampley. 2013. *The Vienna School of art history: empire and the politics of scholarship, 1847-1918*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Redford 2006 Scott Redford. 2006. "Albert Gabriel, les turcs, et l'architecture seldjoukide". *Albert Gabriel (1883-1972): mimar, arkeolog, ressam, gezgin = Albert Gabriel (1883-1972): architecte, archéologue, artiste, voyageur*. Pierre Pinon (ed.) Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Redford 2007a Scott Redford. 2007. "Words, Books, and Buildings in Seljuk Anatolia". *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 13(i-ii): 7-16.

- Redford 2007b Scott Redford. 2007. "What Have You Done for Anatolia Today?": Islamic Archaeology in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic". *Muqarnas* 24: 243-52.
- Redford 2010 Scott Redford. 2010. "Sinop in the Summer of 1215: The Beginning of Anatolian Seljuk Architecture". *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 16(1-2): 125-49.
- Redford 2013a Scott Redford. 2013. "The Curtseying Courtier". Paper presented to *A Conference and Workshop in Honour of Gerhard Wolf*, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, Florence, 18 April 2013.
- Redford 2013b Scott Redford. 2013. "Mamālik and Mamālik: Decorative and Epigraphic Programs of Anatolia Seljuk Citadels". *Cities and Citadels in Turkey: From the Iron Age to the Seljuks*. Scott Redford and Nina Ergin (eds) Leuven, Paris and Walpole, MA: Peeters.
- Redford 2015 Scott Redford. 2015. "The Rape of Anatolia". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Redford and Leiser 2008 Scott Redford and Gary Leiser. 2008. *Taşa yazılan zafer: Antalya içkale surlarındaki Selçuklu fetihnâmesi = Victory inscribed: The Seljuk fetihnâme on the citadel walls of Antalya, Turkey*. Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- Remler 1980 Philip Remler. 1980. "Ottoman, Isfendiyarid, and Eretnid Coinage: A Currency Community in Fourteenth-Century Anatolia". *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 25: 167-88.
- Remler 1985 Philip Remler. 1985. "New Light on Economic History of Ilkhanid Accounting Manuals". *Studia Iranica* 14(2): 157-77.
- Rice 1955 D.S. Rice. 1955. "Studies in Islamic Metalwork - V". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 17(2): 206-31.
- Richard 1989a Francis Richard. 1989. "Dīvānī ou Ta'līq: Un calligraphe au service de Mehmet II, Sayyidī

- Mohammad Monši". *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 4: 89-93.
- Richard 1989b Francis Richard. 1989. *Catalogue des manuscrits Persans*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale.
- Richard 1997 Francis Richard. 1997. *Splendeurs Persanes: manuscrits du XIIIe au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France.
- Ridgeon 2014 Lloyd Ridgeon. 2014. "Mysticism in Medieval Sufism". *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridgeon 2016 Lloyd Ridgeon. 2016. "Futuwwa (in Sūfism)". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas and Everett Rowson (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 5/12/2016. Originally published in 2012.
- Riefstahl 1933 Rudolf M. Riefstahl. 1933. "A Seljuq Koran Stand with Lacquer Painted Decoration in the Museum of Konya". *The Art Bulletin* 15(4): 361-73.
- Rizvi 2007 Kishwar Rizvi. 2007. "Art history and the nation: Arthur Upham Pope and the discourse on "Persian art" in the early twentieth century". *Muqarnas* 24: 44-65.
- Robinson 2003 Chase F. Robinson. 2003. *Islamic Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers 1976 J.M. Rogers. 1976. "Waqf and Patronage in Seljuk Anatolia: The Epigraphic Evidence". *Anatolian Studies* 26: 69-103.
- Rogers et al. 1986 J.M. Rogers, Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı. 1986. *The Topkapı Saray Museum. The Albums and Illustrated Manuscripts*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Rosenthal 1948 Franz Rosenthal. 1948. "Abū Ḥaiyān al-Tawḥīdī on Penmanship". *Ars Islamica* 13: 1-30.
- Roxburgh 1998 David J. Roxburgh. 1998. "Disorderly Conduct?: F.R. Martin and the Bahram Mirza Album". *Muqarnas* 15: 32-57.

- Roxburgh 2000a David J. Roxburgh. 2000. "The Study of Painting and the Arts of the Book". *Muqarnas* 17: 1-16.
- Roxburgh 2000b David J. Roxburgh. 2000. "Au Bonheur des Amateurs: Collecting and Exhibiting Islamic Art, ca. 1880-1910". *Ars Orientalis* 30: 9-38.
- Roxburgh 2005 David J. Roxburgh. 2005. *The Persian Album, 1400-1600: From Dispersal to Collection*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
- Roxburgh 2014 David J. Roxburgh. 2014. "'Many a wish has turned to dust': Pir Budaq and the Formation of Turkmen Arts of the Book". *Envisioning Islamic Art and Architecture: Essays in Honor of Renata Holod*. David J. Roxburgh (ed.) Boston: Brill.
- Ruggieri 1997 Vincenzo Ruggieri. 1997. *Guillaume de Jerphanion et la Turquie de jadis*. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino.
- Ruggieri 2010 Vincenzo Ruggieri. 2010. "Guillaume de Jerphanion (1877-1948) as Jesuit and Scholar in Turkey". *Perceptions of the past in the Turkish Republic: Classical and Byzantine periods*. Scott Redford and Nina Ergin (eds) Leuven: Peeters.
- Safi 2000 Omid Safi. 2000. "Bargaining with Baraka: Persian Sufism, "Mysticism," and Pre-modern Politics". *The Muslim World* 90(3-4): 259-88.
- Safi 2006 Omid Safi. 2006. *The politics of knowledge in premodern Islam: negotiating ideology and religious inquiry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Safwat 1996 Nabil F. Safwat. 1996. *The Art of the Pen: Calligraphy of the 14th to 20th Centuries*. London: Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press.
- Şahin 1998 Tahir Erdoğan Şahin. 1998. "Erzincan'da Mevlevîlik Hareketleri". 9. *Millî Mevlâna Kongresi*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Basımevi.

- Said 1978 Edward Said. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saliba 1987 George Saliba. 1987. "The Rôle of Maragha in the Development of Islamic astronomy: A Scientific Revolution before the Renaissance". *Revue de Synthèse* 108(3): 361-73.
- Sanjian 1969 Avedis K. Sanjian (ed.). 1969. *Colophons of Armenian manuscripts, 1301-1480: a source for Middle Eastern history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sarre 1921 Friedrich Paul Theodor Sarre. 1921. *Konia: Seldschukische Baudenkmäler: (Denkmäler Persischer Baukunst Teil I)*. Berlin: E. Wasmuth.
- Sarre 1936 Friedrich Paul Theodor Sarre. 1936. *Der kiosk von Konia: mit 18 lichtdrucktafeln*. Berlin: Verlag für kunstwissenschaft.
- Schamiloglu 2004 Uli Schamiloglu. 2004. "The Rise of the Ottoman Empire: The Black Death in Medieval Anatolia and its Impact on Turkish Civilization". *Views from the Edge: Essays in Honor of Richard W. Bulliet*. Nequín Yavari, Lawrence G. Potter and Jean-Marc Ran Oppenheim (eds) New York: Columbia University Press for the Middle East Institute, Columbia University.
- Scheper 2015 Karin Scheper. 2015. *The Technique of Islamic Bookbinding: Methods, Materials and Regional Varieties*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schick 2008 İrvin Cemil Schick. 2008. "The Iconicity of Islamic Calligraphy in Turkey". *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 53/54: 211-24.
- Schimmel 1989 Annemarie Schimmel. 1989. *Islamic Names*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schimmel 1990 Annemarie Schimmel. 1990. *Calligraphy and Islamic Culture*. London: Tauris.
- Schimmel 1992 Annemarie Schimmel. 1992. "Calligraphy and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey". *The Dervish Lodge: Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*. Raymond Lifchez

(ed.) Berkeley and Oxford: University of California Press.

- Schmitz 1992
Barbara Schmitz. 1992. *Islamic manuscripts in the New York Public Library*. New York and Oxford: New York Public Library and Oxford University Press.
- Şentürk and Johnson 1994
Şennur Şentürk and Brian Johnson. 1994. *Asya'dan Anadolu'ya inen rüzgâr: Beylikler dönemi sikkeleri = The wind blowing from Asia to Anatolia: an exhibition of Beylik period coins*. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, Kültür Merkezi.
- Shalem 2012
Avinoam Shalem. 2012. "What do we mean when we say "Islamic art"? A plea for a critical rewriting of the history of the arts of Islam". *Journal of Art Historiography* 6: 1-18.
- Shani 2012
Raya Shani. 2012. "Calligraphic Lions Symbolising the Esoteric Dimension of 'Alī's Nature". *The Art and Material Culture of Iranian Shi'ism: Iconography and Religious Devotion in Shi'i Islam*. Pedram Khosronejad (ed.) London: I.B. Tauris.
- Shukurov 1994
Rustam Shukurov. 1994. "Between peace and hostility: Trebizond and the Pontic Turkish periphery in the Fourteenth century". *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9(1): 20-72.
- Shukurov 2012
Rustam Shukurov. 2012. "Harem Christianity: The Byzantine identity of Seljuk princes". *The Seljuks of Anatolia: court and society in the medieval Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Shukurov 2016
Rustam Shukurov. 2016. *The Byzantine Turks, 1204-1461*. Leiden: Brill.
- Şimşekler 1998
Nuri Şimşekler. 1998. *Şâhidî İbrâhîm Dede'nin Gülşen-i Esrâr'ı, Tenkitli Metin-Tahlil*. PhD Thesis, Selçuk University.
- Sinclair 2016
Thomas A. Sinclair. 2016. "Erzurum". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas and Everett Rowson (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 14/6/2016. Originally published in 2016.

- Soucek 1998 Priscilla P. Soucek. 1998. "Armenian and Islamic Manuscript Painting: A Visual Dialogue". *Treasures in Heaven: Armenian Art, Religion, and Society*. Thomas F. Mathews and Roger S. Wieck (eds). New York: Pierpont Morgan Library.
- Soucek 2001 Priscilla P. Soucek. 2001. "Walter Pater, Bernard Berenson, and the Reception of Persian Manuscript Illustration". *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 40: 112-28.
- Soudavar 1999 Abolala Soudavar. 1999. "The Concepts of "Al-Aqdamo Aṣaḥḥ" and "Yaḳin-e Sābeq", and the Problem of Semi-Fakes". *Studia Iranica* 28: 255-73.
- Steingass 1884 Francis Joseph Steingass. 1884. *The Student's Arabic-English Dictionary: Companion Volume to the Author's English-Arabic Dictionary*. London: Crosby Lockwood and Son.
- Steingass 1892 Francis Joseph Steingass. 1892. *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary, including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Strohmeier 1984 Martin Strohmeier. 1984. *Seldschukische Geschichte und türkische Geschichtswissenschaft: die Seldschuken im Urteil moderner türkischer Historiker*. Berlin: K. Schwarz.
- Strzygowski 1917 Josef Strzygowski. 1917. *Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung: ziergeschichtliche Untersuchungen über den Eintritt der Wander- und Nordvölker in die Treibhäuser geistigen Lebens, anknüpfend an einen Schatzfund in Albanien*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich.
- Strzygowski 1935 Josef Strzygowski. 1935. "Türkler ve Orta Asya Sanatı Meselesi". *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 3 [1926-33]: 1-80.
- Sumegi 2013 Angela Sumegi. 2013. "On Souls and Subtle Bodies: A Comparison of Shamanic and Buddhist Perspectives". *Religion and the Subtle Body in Asia and the West: Between Mind and Body*. Geoffrey Samuel and Jay Johnston (eds) Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Sümer 1964 Faruk Sümer. 1964. "Çukur-ova Tarihine Dâir Araştırmalar: Fetihden XVI. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısına

Kadar". *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1: 1-98.

- Sümer 1969 Faruk Sümer. 1969. "Anadolu'da Moğollar". *Selçuklu Araştırmalar Dergisi* 1: 1-147.
- Sümer 2001 Faruk Sümer. 2001. "Karamanoğulları". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 24. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Süslü 1989 Özden Süslü. 1989. *Tasvirilere göre Anadolu Selçuklu kıyafetleri*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu.
- Tabbaa 1991 Yasser Tabbaa. 1991. "The Transformation of Arabic Writing: Part 1, Qur'anic Calligraphy". *Ars Orientalis* 21: 119-48.
- Tabbaa 1994 Yasser Tabbaa. 1994. "The Transformation of Arabic Writing: Part 2, the Public Text". *Ars Orientalis* 24: 119-47.
- Tabbaa 2001 Yasser Tabbaa. 2001. *The Transformation of Islamic Art During the Sunni Revival*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Takahashi 2001 Hidemi Takahashi. 2001. "Simeon of Qal'a Rumaita, Patriarch Philoxenus Nemrod and Bar 'Ebroyo". *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 4(1): 45-91.
- Takahashi 2016 Hidemi Takahashi. 2016. "Barhebraeus". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas and Everett Rowson (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 18/11/2016. Originally published in 2014.
- Takahashi 2017 Hidemi Takahashi. 2017. "Re: Nebuchadnezzar son of Simeon the physician". *Email to author*. 10/3/2017.
- Tanıncı 1990a Zeren Tanıncı. 1990. "1278 Tarihli En Eski Mesnevi'nin Tezhipleri". *Kültür ve Sanat* 8: 17-22.
- Tanıncı 1990b Zeren Tanıncı. 1990. "Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi'nde Ortaçağ İslam Ciltleri". *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yıllık* 4: 102-49.

- Tanındı 1991 Zeren Tanındı. 1991. "Konya Mevlâna Müzesi'nde 677 ve 665 Yıllık Kur'an'lar Karamanlı Beyliği'nde Kitap Sanatı". *Kültür ve Sanat* 12: 42-4.
- Tanındı 2000 Zeren Tanındı. 2000. "Seçkin Bir Mevlevî'nin Tezhipli Kitapları". *M. Uğur Derman Armağanı: Altmışbeşinci Yaşı Münasebetiyle Sunulmuş Tebliğler = M. Uğur Derman Festschrift: Papers Presented on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. İrvin Cemil Schick (ed.) İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Tanındı 2001 Zeren Tanındı. 2001. "Anadolu Selçuklu Sanatında Tezhip: Müzehhip Muhlis b. Abdullah el-Hindî ve Halefleri". *Arkeoloji ve sanat tarihi araştırmaları: Yıldız Demiriz'e armağan*. M. Baha Tanman and Uşun Tükel (eds) İstanbul: Simurg.
- Tanındı 2007 Zeren Tanındı. 2007. "Mevlâna Celâleddin Rûmî'nin ve Sultan Veled'in Konya Mevlâna Müzesindeki Eserlerinin Tezhipli İk Örnekleri". *Mevlâna Ocağı*. Mehmed Bayyigit (ed.) Konya: Kombassen Vakfı Yayınları.
- Tanındı 2012 Zeren Tanındı. 2012. "The Arts of the Book: Patrons and Interactions in Erzincan between 1365 and 1410". *At the Crossroads of Empires: 14th-15th Century Eastern Anatolia: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held in Istanbul, 4th-6th May 2007*. Deniz Beyazıt (ed. and trans.) İstanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes Georges Dumézil.
- Tanman and Rifat 2001 M. Baha Tanman and Samih Rifat. 2001. *Alâeddin'in lambası: Anadolu'da Selçuklu çağı sanatı ve Alâeddin Keykubâd = Aladdin's lamp: Sultan Alâeddin Keykubâd and the art of the Anatolian Seljuks*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Tanrıkorur 2001 Ş. Barihüda Tanrıkorur. "Karaman Mevlevîhânesi". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 24. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Taylor 2015 David G.K. Taylor. 2015. "Re: Syriac or Garshuni colophon". *Email to author*. 9/10/2015.

- Tekinalp 2009 V. Macit Tekinalp. 2009. "Palace Churches of the Anatolian Seljuks: Tolerance or Necessity?". *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 33(2): 148-67.
- Temir 1959 Ahmet Temir. 1959. *Kırşehir emiri Caca Oğlu Nur el-Din'in 1272 tarihli Arapça-Moğolca vakfiyesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Tevhid 1910 Ahmed Tevhid. 1910. "Rum Selçûkî Devleti'nin İnkırâziyle Teşekkül Eden Tavâif-i Mülûk". *Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası* 1(1): 35-40; (3): 191-99.
- Tezcan 2013 Baki Tezcan. 2013. "The Memory of the Mongols in Early Ottoman Historiography". *Writing history at the Ottoman court: editing the past, fashioning the future*. Emine Fetvacı and H. Erdem Çıpa (eds) Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Thackston 1990 Wheeler Thackston. 1990. "Treatise on Calligraphic Arts: A Disquisition on Papers, Colors, Inks, and Pen by Simi of Nishapur". *Intellectual Studies on Islam: Essays Written in Honor of Martin B. Dickson*. Michel M. Mazzaoui and Vera B. Moreen (eds) Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Todorova 2013 Rostislava Todorova. 2013. "Visualizing the Divine: Mandorla as a Vision of God in Byzantine Iconography". *IKON Journal of Iconographic Studies* 6: 287-96.
- Togan 2005 İsenbike Togan. 2005. "Beylikler Devri Anadolu Tarihinde Yöntem Sorunları: Germiyan'dan Örnekler". *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına: Uygurlardan Osmanlıya*. Günay Kut and Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz (eds) Istanbul: Simurg.
- Togan 1941 Zeki Velidi Togan. 1941. "Die Vorfahren der Osmanen in Mittelasien". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 95: 367-73.
- Togan 1991 Zeki Velidi Togan. 1991. "Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period". Gary Leiser (trans.) *Annales Islamologiques* 25: 203-40. Originally published in 1941.

- Trepanier 2001 Nicolas Trepanier. 2001. *The Manaqib al-'Arifin as a source for political history*. MA Thesis, McGill University.
- Trimingham 1971 J. Spencer Trimingham. 1971. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tromans 2008 Nicholas Tromans. 2008. *The lure of the east: British orientalist painting*. London: Tate.
- Tulum 2000 Mertol Tulum. 2000. *Tarihî metin çalışmalarında usul: Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye üzerinde bir deneme*. Istanbul: Deniz Kitabevi.
- Turan 1947 Osman Turan. 1947. "Şemseddin Altun-Aba Vakfiyesi ve Hayatı". *Bellekten* 11: 197-235.
- Turan 1958 Osman Turan. 1958. *Türkiye Selçukluları hakkında resmî vesikalar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Turan 1977 Osman Turan. 1977. "Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks". *The Cambridge History of Islam*. P. M. Holt, Ann K. S. Lambton and Bernard Lewis (eds) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turan 1984 Osman Turan. 1984. *İstanbul'un fethinden önce yazılmış tarihî takvimler*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türk Ocağı 2014 Türk Ocağı, Türk Tarihi Heyeti. 2014. *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları. Kemalist Yönetimin Resmi Tarih Tezi*. Sadık Perinçek (ed.) Istanbul: Analiz Basım Yayın. Originally published in 1930.
- Ünver 1948 A. Süheyl Ünver. 1948. "Selçuklular Zamanında Kütüphaneler Üzerine Yeni Örnekler ve Bazı Mülâhazalar". *III. Türk Tarih Kongresi: Ankara, 15-20 Kasım 1943: Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ünver 1967 A. Süheyl Ünver. 1967. "Anadolu Selçuk ve Beylikleri Kur'an-i Kerim Hattatları ve Tezyinatı Üzerine". *VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi: Ankara, 20-26 Ekim 1961: Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

- Uyar 2015 Tolga Uyar. 2015. "Thirteenth-century "Byzantine" art in Cappadocia and the question of Greek painters at the Seljuq court". *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Uzluk 1957 Şahabettin Uzluk. 1957. *Mevlevilikte Resim, Resimde Mevleviler*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Uzunçarşılı 1937 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı. 1937. *Anadolu beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu devletleri. Siyasî, idarî, fikrî, iktisadî, hayat; ilmî ve ictimai muesseseler; halk ve toprak*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Uzunçarşılı 1947 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı. 1947. *Osmanlı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Uzunçarşılı 2016 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı. 2016. "Ashraf Oghullari". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 22/3/2016.
- Varisco 2007 Daniel Martin Varisco. 2007. "Making 'Medieval' Islam Meaningful". *Medieval Encounters: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue* 13(3): 385-412.
- Varlık 1974 Mustafa Çetin Varlık. 1974. *Germiyan-oğulları tarihi, 1300-1429*. Ankara: Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Varlık 2015 Nükhet Varlık. 2015. *Plague and Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean World: The Ottoman Experience, 1347-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasold 2011 Georg Vasold. 2011. "Riegl, Strzygowski and the development of art". *Journal of Art Historiography* 5: 102-15.
- Vernoit 1989 Stephen Vernoit. 1989. *Collectors and Connoisseurs of Islamic Calligraphy and Painting: A Study of Acquisition and the Formation of Cultural Identities through Art*. PhD Thesis, University of Oxford.

- Vernoit 2000 Stephen Vernoit. 2000. "Islamic Art and Architecture: An Overview of Scholarship and Collecting, c.1850-c.1950". *Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors, and Collections: 1850-1950*. Stephen Vernoit (ed.) London: I.B. Tauris.
- Vryonis 1971 Speros Vryonis. 1971. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.
- Wearden 2000 Jennifer Wearden. 2000. "The Acquisition of Persian and Turkish Carpets by the South Kensington Museum". *Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors, and Collections: 1850-1950*. Stephen Vernoit (ed.) London: I.B. Tauris.
- Wehr 1994 Hans Wehr. 1994. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (Arabic-English)*. 4th ed. Urbana, IL: Spoken Language Services, Inc.
- von Weisweiler 1962 Max von Weisweiler. 1962. *Der islamische Bucheinband des Mittelalters: nach Handschriften aus deutschen, holländischen und türkischen Bibliotheken*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wensinck 2017 A.J. Wensinck. 2017. "Khādim". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 26/7/2017.
- Wing 2016 Patrick Wing. 2016. *The Jalayirids: Dynastic State Formation in the Mongol Middle East*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wittek 1934 Paul Wittek. 1934. *Das Fürstentum Mentеше: Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jh.* Istanbul: Universum druckerei.
- Wittek 2012 Paul Wittek. 2012. *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire: Studies in the History of Turkey, 13th-15th Centuries*. Milton Park, Abingdon and New York: Routledge. Originally published in 1938.

- Wright 2006 Elaine Wright. 2006. "Patronage of the Arts of the Book under the Injuids of Shiraz". *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*. Linda Komaroff (ed.) Leiden: Brill.
- Wright 2012 Elaine Wright. 2012. *The Look of the Book: Manuscript Production in Shiraz 1303-1452*. Washington DC: The Freer Gallery of Art in association with the University of Washington Press and the Chester Beatty Library.
- Wolper 1995 Ethel Sara Wolper. 1995. "The Politics of Patronage: Political Change and the Construction of Dervish Lodges in Sivas". *Muqarnas* 12: 39-47.
- Wolper 2003 Ethel Sara Wolper. 2003. *Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Yalman 2010 Suzan A. Yalman. 2010. *Building the Sultanate of Rum: Memory, Urbanism and Mysticism in the Architectural Patronage of 'Ala Al-Din Kayqubad (r. 1220-1237)*. PhD Thesis, Harvard University.
- Yalman 2012 Suzan A. Yalman. 2012. "'Ala al-Din Kaykubad Illuminated: A Rum Seljuq Sultan as Cosmic Ruler". *Muqarnas* 29: 151-86.
- Yıldız 2006 Sara Nur Yıldız. 2006. *Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Seljuk Anatolia: The Politics of Conquest and History Writing, 1243-1282*. PhD Thesis, University of Chicago.
- Yıldız 2010 Sara Nur Yıldız. 2010. "Şikârî". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 39. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.
- Yıldız 2011 Sara Nur Yıldız. 2011. "Manuel Komnenos Maurozomes and His Descendants at the Seljuk Court: The Formation of a Christian Seljuk-Komnenian Elite". *Crossroads between Latin Europe and the Near East: corollaries of the Frankish presence in the Eastern Mediterranean (12th-14th centuries)*. Stefan Leder (ed.) Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Yıldız 2012a Sara Nur Yıldız. 2012. "Karamanoğlu Mehmed Bey: Medieval Anatolian warlord or Kemalist language reformer? Nationalist historiography, language

politics and the celebration of the Language Festival in Karaman, Turkey, 1961-2008". *Religion, ethnicity and contested nationhood in the former Ottoman space*. Jorgen Nielsen (ed.) Leiden: Brill.

- Yıldız 2012b Sara Nur Yıldız. 2012. "Post-Mongol Pastoral Polities in Eastern Anatolia in the Late Middle Ages". *At the Crossroads of Empires: 14th-15th Century Eastern Anatolia: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held in Istanbul, 4th-6th May 2007*. Deniz Beyazıt (ed.) Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes Georges Dumézil.
- Yıldız 2016 Sara Nur Yıldız. 2016. "Aydıncı Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia". *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*. A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds) Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Yinanç 1944 Mükrimin Halil Yinanç. 1944. *Türkiye Tarihi: Selçuklular Devri*. Istanbul: Bürhaneddin Matbaası.
- Yinanç 1989 Refet Yinanç. 1989. *Dulkadir Beyliği*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Yücel 1980 Yaşar Yücel. 1980. *XIII-XV. yüzyıllar kuzey-batı Anadolu tarihi Çoban-oğulları-Candar-oğulları beylikleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Yücel 1989 Yaşar Yücel. 1989. *Anadolu beylikleri hakkında araştırmalar: Eretna devleti, Kadı Burhaneddin Ahmed ve devleti, Mutahharten ve Erzincan emirliği*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Yürekli 2003 Zeynep Yürekli. 2003. "A Building Between the Public and Private Realms of the Ottoman Elite: The Sufi Convent of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Istanbul". *Muqarnas* 20: 159-85.
- Yürekli 2012 Zeynep Yürekli. 2012. *Architecture and hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: the politics of Bektashi shrines in the Classical Age*. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Yürekli 2017 Zeynep Yürekli. 2017. "Architectural Patronage and the Rise of the Ottomans". *The Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture, Volume II: From Mongols to Modernism*. Gülru Necipoğlu and Finbarr Barry Flood (eds) Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zachariadou 1979 Elizabeth Zachariadou. 1979. "Trebizond and the Turks (1352-1402)". *Archeion Pontou* 35: 333-58.
- Zachariadou 1980 Elizabeth Zachariadou. 1980. "Manuel II Palaeologos on the Strife between Bāyezīd I and Ḳāḏī Burhān al-Dīn Aḥmad". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43: 471-81.
- Zachariadou 1983 Elizabeth Zachariadou. 1983. *Trade and crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300-1415)*. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia.
- Zachariadou 2015 Elizabeth Zachariadou. 2015. "Udj". *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (eds) Brill Online. Accessed: 7/12/2015.

APPENDIX ONE

Summary Table of Key Manuscripts

All sizes are length x width (x depth) in mm.

A = Arabic

P = Persian

Title	Author	Lang	Genre	Date	Place	Artist(s)	Patrons and later owner(s)	Fols	Size and textblock	Script/ink	Pigments	Paper	Chain/laid lines	Binding	Condition	Collection info
Qur'an	n/a	A	n/a	30 Rabī' al-Ākhir 677/19 Sep 1278	Konya (madrasa of Sa'd al-Dīn Köpek)	Ḥasan ibn Chūbān ibn 'Abdullāh al-Qūnawī (scribe); Mukhliṣ ibn 'Abdullāh [al-Hindī] (illuminator)	Sayf al-Dīn Sunqur ibn 'Abdullāh al-Şāhibī (patron)	335	105x80x55; 70x50 (15 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; fairly solid black; some gold	Gold, dark blue, small areas of red and green, white	Darkish yellowy-cream; smooth and slightly shiny with several inclusions; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	No visible chain or laid lines	Dark brown leather, no flap (possibly later Mamluk?); mainly quaternions	Cropped substantially on all edges; minor repairs	Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466
Maṣnavī-i Ma'navī	Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	2 Rajab 677/19 Nov 1278	Konya	Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh al-Qūnawī al-Waladī (scribe); Mukhliṣ ibn 'Abdullāh al-Hindī (illuminator)	Jamāl al-Dīn Mubārak ibn 'Abdullāh al-Şāhibī (patron/endower)	325	495x335x80; 368x257 (29 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; solid black; gold rubrics	Gold, bright blue, bright green, red, white	Light brownish cream with slight pinkish hue (fol. 159-229 quite pink); smooth and slightly shiny; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	20 horizontal laid lines = 28mm	Tan leather with flap, embossed ovals and corner panels (17 th c. Ottoman); either quaternions or mix of ternions and quinions	Creasing on several pages; watermarked flyleaves and later paper inserts at beginning	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51
Al-Awāmīr al-'Alā'iyya fī al-Umūr al-'Alā'iyya	Ibn Bībī (d. after 1285)	P	History	Undated (ca 1282)	Konya (probably)	Ibrāhīm ibn Ismā'il ibn Abī Bakr al-Qayṣarī (scribe)	Kaykhusraw III (r. 1265-84, dedicatee); 'Aṭā-Malik Juwaynī (d. 1283, patron); Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54, later owner); inscription/seal of Aḥmad Shaykhzāda, the <i>waqf</i> inspector of Mecca and Medina under Maḥmūd I	372	325x240x65; 221x166 (mostly 21 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; dark brown; red rubrics	Gold, blue, green, bronze, white	Light brownish cream; very smooth and slightly shiny with several inclusions; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	20 horizontal laid lines = 30mm	Dark brown leather, embossed oval, no flap (16 th c. Ottoman?); quinions	Cropped on all edges; minor repairs and tissue flyleaves	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985
Latā'if al-Ḥikma	Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283)	P	Mirror for princes	4 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 684/31 Jan 1286	Konya	Abū al-Maḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn al-Ḥājji, nicknamed Ḥamīd al-Mukhliṣī al-Bukhārī (scribe)	'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs II (r. 1246-57, dedicatee); Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī (d. 1318, later owner); Silāhdār Dāmād 'Alī Pāshā (d. 1716, later owner); Ḥāfiẓ Muṣṭafā 'Iffatī (later owner); L'Abbé Sevin (1682-1741, acquired ms in 1729-30)	182	240x172x34; 165x107 (15 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; solid black; red rubrics	Gold, dark blue, red, light green, white	Pale cream; very smooth and slightly shiny; 1.5mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	Horizontal laid lines present but too faint to measure	Marbled paper with flap (19 th c. Ottoman); quaternions	Slightly cropped on all edges; Watermarked flyleaves and pastedowns	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121

Title	Author	Lang	Genre	Date	Place	Artist(s)	Patrons and later owner(s)	Fols	Size and textblock	Script/ink	Pigments	Paper	Chain/laid lines	Binding	Condition	Collection info
Al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya	[Badr al-Dīn] Muḥammad al-Tustarī (d. 1329-30)	A	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	Middle of Dhū al-Qa'da 710/Apr 1311	Konya	[Badr al-Dīn] Muḥammad al-Tustarī (scribe)	Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad (r. ca 1302-26, patron); Bāyazīd II (r. 1481-1512, later owner), Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54, later owner); inscription/seal of Aḥmad Shaykhzāda, the <i>waqf</i> inspector of Mecca and Medina under Maḥmūd I	64	162x120x12; 102x73 (13 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; brown and somewhat watery	Gold, dark blue, light blue, green, red, light brown, white	Light brownish cream with several inclusions; smooth and a little shiny; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	None visible	Dark red and yellow plaid fabric with leather frame and flap (15 th -16 th c Ottoman); front board unattached; quaternions	Cropped on all edges; first six folios and last two folios are later paper	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2445
Qur'an (vol.1)	n/a	A	n/a	714/1314-15	Konya	Ismā'īl ibn Yūsuf (scribe); Ya'qūb ibn Ghāzī al-Qūnawī (illuminator)	Khalīl ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. 1340s, patron)	415	475x335x90; 360x200 (7 lines in 1 col)	<i>Muḥaqqaq</i> ; black with some parts watery or scratchy	Gold, dark blue, light blue, dark green, light green, red, dark pink, light pink, bronze, white	Light cream; smooth and quite shiny; 1.5mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	20 horizontal laid lines measure 25mm	Original dark brown leather stamped binding and doublures preserved on front and back of each volume; no flaps; quaternions	Cropped on all edges; edges of first three folios of each manuscripts repaired using later paper; later flyleaves	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12-1
Qur'an (vol.2)					401			485x335x90; (as above)	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12-2							
Al-Laṭā'if al-'Alā'iyya	Aḥmad ibn Sa'd ibn Maḥdī ibn 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī al-'Uthmānī (fl. 13 th c.)	A	Mirror for princes	Dhū al-Qa'da 625/Oct 1228; additional illumination from early 14 th c.	Alanya	Aḥmad ibn Sa'd ibn Maḥdī ibn 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī al-'Uthmānī (scribe)	'Alā' al-Dīn Kayqubād I (r. 1220-37, patron); Badr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān (d. after 1341, later owner)	106	227x167; 150x110 (11 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; brown	Gold, bronze, red, blue, white (1228); Gold, green, blue, red, white (e. 14 th c.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Aṣīr Efendi 316

Title	Author	Lang	Genre	Date	Place	Artist(s)	Patrons and later owner(s)	Fols	Size and textblock	Script/ink	Pigments	Paper	Chain/laid lines	Binding	Condition	Collection info
Intihānāma	Sultān Walad (d. 1312)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	21 Sha'bān 714/30 Nov 1314	Konya (probably)	'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh (scribe)	Jean-Adolphe Decourdemanche (1844-1916, later owner)	222	235x160x50; 170x110 (19 lines in 2 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; mostly solid black but brownish in some places; red rubrics	Gold, bright blue, green, white	Dark cream with very small inclusions; smooth but very little shine; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets) [fol. 216 is a different paper but may be contemporary to manuscript - same colour but thinner]	Horizontal laid lines present on some folios but too faint to measure [fol. 216 - 20 horizontal laid lines measure 25mm]	Paper-covered boards (18 th c Ottoman) no flap; quaternions	Cropped (probably on all edges); some large wormholes; new paper added (1a) and used for repair (222b)	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794
Maṣnavī-i Ma'navī (vol. 3)	Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	24 Rabī' al-Awwal 718/26 May 1318	Sivas (Çifte Minareli Medrese)	Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīb al-Mawlawī, nicknamed Tāj (scribe)	Later endowed to Mawlawi lodge of Yenikapı (<i>vaqf-i Mawlawi-khāna-yi bāb-i jadīd</i>)	158	235x160x60; 178x112 (17 lines in 2 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; brown and quite watery	Gold, bright blue	Cream with lots of visible inclusions; smooth but not shiny; 2.5mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	Horizontal laid lines present on some folios but too faint to measure	Covered in green fabric (possibly leather underneath); flap present; quaternions	Cropped (probably on all edges); watermarked later papers	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, Nafiz Paşa 650
Maṣnavī-i Ma'navī	Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	14 Rabī' al-Awwal-25 Ramaḍān 723/22 Mar-28 Sep 1323	Konya (madrasa and tomb of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī)	'Uthmān ibn 'Abdullāh (scribe); Necmeddin Okyay (1883-1976, binder)	'Ummān ibn Muḥammad al-Mawlawī (d. after 1545, later owner)	320	310x240x70; 252x184 (25 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; solid black, a bit watery in places; red rubrics	Gold, blue, green, orange	Light brownish cream with lots of small inclusions; smooth and a little shiny; 1.5mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	20 vertical laid lines measure 33mm	Black leather embossed without flap (20 th c); quaternions	Cropped on all sides; watermarked flyleaves and later papers	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177
Maṣnavī-i Valadī (Ibtidānāma, Rabābnāma and Intihānāma)	Sultān Walad (d. 1312)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	Before 30 Shawwāl 732/24 Jul 1332	Konya (probably)	Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib [known as (<i>al-ma'rūf bi-</i>) Ibn al-Nassāj al-Mawlawī al-Aḥadī] (scribe)	'Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Waladī (patron/endower)	315	460x314x85; 336x236 (25 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; solid black; red rubrics	Gold, bright blue, dark blue, purple, red, green, white	(1) light cream with few inclusions; smoothish but not shiny; 3mm (thickness of 10 sheets) (2) appearance is identical to main paper 1 [from fol. 298 onwards]	(1) No laid or chain lines visible (2) 20 horizontal laid lines measure 20mm; groups of three vertical chain lines measure 10-15mm between lines and 20-25mm between groups	Dark red leather with gold stamped decorations; no flap (17 th c Ottoman); quaternions	Cropped on all sides; first few folios clumsily repaired with later watermarked paper; same paper used for flyleaf	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 74

Title	Author	Lang	Genre	Date	Place	Artist(s)	Patrons and later owner(s)	Fols	Size and textblock	Script/ink	Pigments	Paper	Chain/laid lines	Binding	Condition	Collection info
Miršād al-‘Ibād min al-Mabdā’ ilā al-Ma‘ād	Najm al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1256)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)/ Mirror for princes	End of Muḥarrām 750/Mar 1349	İstanos (probably)	Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Muqarrab (scribe)	‘Īsā ibn Zakariyyā’ (patron); Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54, later owner); inscription/seal of Darwīsh Muṣṭafā, the <i>waqf</i> inspector of Mecca and Medina under Maḥmūd I	173	255x175x42; 197x114 (21 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; dark brown, a little watery in places	Gold, red, dark blue, white, brown	Light cream with a few inclusions; smooth and a little shiny; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	Groups of two horizontal chain lines measure 10mm between lines and 45mm between groups; 20 vertical laid lines measure 36mm	Red leather with leather doublures (15 th c. Ottoman perhaps); flap present; ternions and quinions	Does not appear to have been cropped; flyleaves at front quite damaged	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih 2841
Miršād al-‘Ibād min al-Mabdā’ ilā al-Ma‘ād	Najm al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1256)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)/ Mirror for princes	23 Jumādā al-Ūlā 752/18 Jul 1351	İstanos	Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Muqarrab (scribe)	Ghīyāth al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Yūnus (patron); Bāyazīd II (r. 1481-1512, later owner), Maḥmūd I (r. 1730-54, later owner); inscription/seal of Aḥmad Shaykhzāda, the <i>waqf</i> inspector of Mecca and Medina under Maḥmūd I	200	250x170x45; 170x102 (19 lines in 1 col)	<i>Naskh</i> ; black with some red and green, a little watery in places	Gold, red, dark blue, green, white, brown	(1) Dark yellowy cream; smooth with minimal shine; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets) (2) Used intermittently from fols 152-200; pale cream; very smooth and shiny; watermark present; unable to measure thickness	(1) Groups of 2 horizontal chain lines measure 10mm between lines and 35mm between groups; 20 vertical laid lines measure 35mm (2) 20 laid lines measure 50mm	Boards covered in blue and link marbled paper with tan leather spine; flap present; ternions and quinions	Appears to have been slightly cropped; otherwise, good condition	Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2067
Maṣnavī-i Valadī (Rabābnāma and Intihānāma)	Sultān Walad (d. 1312)	P	<i>Taṣawwuf</i> (Sufism)	10 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 767/18 Aug 1366	Erzincan (possibly)	Ḥasan ibn ‘Uthmān al-Mawlawī (scribe)	Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Mawlawī (d. 1386, patron)	159	345x280x42; 295x239 (33 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; black, red and blue	Gold, silver, blue, light blue green, bronze white, black, red, purple, pink	Light brown; soft, somewhat like felt, not shiny; 3mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	Vertical single chain lines = 35mm between lines; 20 horizontal laid lines = 29mm	Bright red leather with gold stamped decoration and envelope flap (103mm at widest point) (19 th -c. Ottoman); irregular quires	Probably cropped; first few folios in poor condition and heavily stained; staining on several folios throughout manuscript	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.Mixt.1594

Title	Author	Lang	Genre	Date	Place	Artist(s)	Patrons and later owner(s)	Fols	Size and textblock	Script/ink	Pigments	Paper	Chain/laid lines	Binding	Condition	Collection info
Dīvān-i Kabīr (vol. 1)	Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273)	P	<i>Taşawwuf</i> (Sufism)	2 Shawwāl 768-1 Rabī' al-Ākhir 770/1 Jun 1367-12 Nov 1368	Erzincan (possibly)	Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī (scribe); Abū Bakr al-Mujallidī al-Mawlawī al-Ḥamawī (binder of vol. 2)	Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Mawlawī (d. 1386, patron); Mustanjid ibn Sātī al-Mawlawī al-Arzinjānī (d. before 1418, later owner)	153	460x330x55; 390x270 (33 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; black, red and blue	Gold, silver, blue, light blue, green, white, black, bronze, red, purple, pink	Two papers used interchangeably throughout mss: (1) Cream; smooth and slightly shiny; 3mm (2) Light brownish-orange; smooth and slightly shiny; very few inclusions; 3mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	(1) Vertical triple chain lines = 15mm between lines, 40mm between groups; 20 horizontal laid lines = 30mm (2)	Dark brown leather with gold stamped decorations; detached envelope flap measure 129mm at widest point (19 th /20 th c. Ottoman); quinions	Cropped on all sides; relatively intact but first few folios of vol. 1 are somewhat worn	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 68
Dīvān-i Kabīr (vol. 2)								175	470x325x60; (as above)				Vertical triple chain lines = 16mm between lines, 55mm between groups; 20 horizontal laid lines = 28mm			
Maṣnavī-i Ma'navī	Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273)	P	<i>Taşawwuf</i> (Sufism)	Middle of Rajab 773/Jan 1372	Erzincan (possibly)	Ḥasan ibn 'Uthmān al-Mawlawī (scribe)	Sharaf al-Dīn Sātī ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Mawlawī (d. 1386, patron); Mustanjid ibn Sātī al-Mawlawī al-Arzinjānī (d. before 1418, later owner)	197	562x400x60; 492x305 (39 lines in 4 cols)	<i>Naskh</i> ; black, red and blue (and sometimes green)	Gold, blue, light blue, green, white, black, red, purple, bronze	(1) Cream; smooth and slightly shiny; 2mm (2) Light brownish-orange; very smooth and shiny; 2mm (thickness of 10 sheets)	1) 20 horizontal laid lines = 30mm (2) Vertical double chain lines = 15mm between lines, 55mm between groups; 20 horizontal laid lines = 27mm	20 th c. binding covered for restoration; probably quinions (difficult to tell)	Cropped on all sides; relatively good condition with some creasing and wear on several illuminations	Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1113

APPENDIX TWO

Translations of Colophons and Other Inscriptions

Manuscripts from Chapter One

Qur'an, 677/1278, Konya (madrasa of Sa'd al-Din Köpek), Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Is.1466

Colophon (fols 329b-330a) [see fig. 9, p. 3 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Faragha min kitbati⁷⁴⁴ hādhā al-muṣḥaf al-karīm al-‘abd al-ḍa‘īf al-muḥtāj ilā raḥmati rabbīhi al-laṭīf al-Ḥaṣan ibn Chūbān ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Qūnawī fī Qūniya al- maḥrūsa ḥarasahā Allāh bi-madrasati Sa‘d al-Dīn Kūbak raḥimahu Allāh fī ākhir Rabī‘ al-Ākhir sana saba‘ wa sab‘īn wa sitta-mā’a</i></p>	<p>The weak servant in need of the mercy of his Gentle Lord, Ḥaṣan son of Chūbān son of ‘Abdullāh of Konya, completed the writing of this glorious Qur’an volume in the protected city of Konya, may Allāh protect it, at the madrasa of Sa‘d al-Dīn Köpek, may Allāh have mercy upon him, on the last day of Rabī‘ al-Ākhir, in the year six hundred and seventy-seven (19 September 1278).</p>
--	--

Illuminator’s signature (fols 329b-330a, in four medallions framing the colophon) [see fig. 9, p. 3 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Dhahhabahu hādhā al-muṣḥaf al-karīm Mukhliṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh</i></p>	<p>Mukhliṣ son of ‘Abdullāh gilded it, this glorious Qur’an volume.</p>
---	---

Dedication (fols 332b-333a) [see fig. 12, p. 4 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Būrika hādhā al-muṣḥaf al-karīm bi-ṣāḥibihi wa mustansikhihi al-ṣadr</i></p>	<p>Blessed is this glorious Qur’an volume by its owner and copier,⁷⁴⁵ the great</p>
--	--

⁷⁴⁴ A more unusual *maṣḍar* of the verb ‘*kataba*’ (to write). The more common form is ‘*kitāba(t)*’.

⁷⁴⁵ *Mustansikh* could also mean ‘the one who asked for its copying’, i.e. the patron.

<p><i>al-kabīr malik al-khawāṣṣ wa al-ḥujjāb</i> <i>qudwati al-kufā wa al-kuttāb</i> <i>sayf al-milla wa al-dawla wa al-dīn</i> <i>‘arīn al-islām wa al-muslimīn</i> <i>mukhtār al-mulūk wa al-salāṭīn</i></p> <p><i>Khāṣṣ ‘āqil kāfī kadkhudā bey</i> <i>Sunqur ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Ṣāhibī</i> <i>al-a‘zamī waffaqahu Allāh ta‘ālā</i> <i>li-al-khayrāt wa ṣānahu bi-fadlihi</i> <i>‘an al-ḥawādith wa al-āfāt ‘alā</i> <i>ta‘āqub al-layl wa al-nahār</i> <i>naḥwa Muḥammad wa ālihi wa ṣaḥbihi</i> <i>al-akhyār</i></p>	<p>minister, head of the courtly elites and the chamberlains, model of skilled people and of scribes, sword of the people, the state, and the religion, a safe haven [lit: lair] for Islam and the Muslims, the choice of kings and emperors, an intelligent and skilful senior courtier (<i>kadkhudā bey</i>)⁷⁴⁶</p> <p>Sunqur son of ‘Abdullāh of the great Ṣāhib (companion), may Allāh, exalted be He, make him prosper with good deeds, and may He defend him through His favour against accidents and pestilence throughout the nights and days, just like Muḥammad, his family, and his choicest companions.</p>
--	--

***Maṣnavī*, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), 677/1278, Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 51**

Colophon (fol. 325b) [see fig. 40, p. 26 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 50-51]

<p><i>Raṣṣa‘ahu wa zayyanahu bi-al-tadhhīb</i> <i>Mukhliṣ ibn ‘Abdullāh al-Hindī</i></p> <p><i>Tamma al-kitāb al-Mathnawī al-hādī ilā</i> <i>al-ṣirāṭ al-sawīy al-ḥamdu li-llāh</i> <i>‘alā itmāmihi wa al-ṣalawāt wa al-</i> <i>salām ‘alā Muḥammad nabīyihī</i></p>	<p>Mukhliṣ son of ‘Abdullāh of Hindustan ornamented and decorated it with gold.</p> <p>The book of the <i>Maṣnavī</i> (spiritual couplets), the guide to the straight path, has been finished, thanks to Allāh</p>
---	--

⁷⁴⁶ According to Osman Turan, *kadkhuda* was used in Rūm from the thirteenth century (Turan 1958: 13). Orhonlu notes that the term was also used in Ilkhanid lands to designate a village’s representative concerning governmental affairs (Orhonlu 2016).

<p><i>khīrati rusulihī wa khayr anāmihi</i> <i>‘alā yad al-‘abd al-ḍa‘īf al-faqīr al-</i> <i>muḥtāj ilā raḥmati rabbihi</i> <i>Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh</i> <i>al-Qūnawī al-Waladī wa kāna</i> <i>istinsākhuhu min al-nuskha al-</i> <i>aṣliyya al-maqrū‘a</i> <i>al-muṣaḥḥaḥa al-muhadhdhaba al-</i> <i>munaqqaḥa ‘alā ḥaḍrat al-shaykh</i> <i>mu’allifihī wa ḥuḍūr</i> <i>khalīfatihī wa khalafihī fī majālis ‘idda</i> <i>qaddasa Allāh sirrahu al-‘azīz wa</i> <i>adām</i> <i>ni‘mata baqā’ wujūdihumā ‘alā al-</i> <i>muslimīn āmīn yā rabb al-‘ālamīn</i> <i>yawm al-ithnayn min shahr Allāh al-</i> <i>aṣamm Rajab sanata sab‘a wa</i> <i>sab‘īn wa sitta-mā’a</i> <i>wa raḥama Allāh man qirā’a wa ṭāla‘a</i> <i>wa nazara fīhi wa intafa‘a wa da‘ā</i> <i>li-kātibihī wa wāqifihī bi-al-khayr</i></p>	<p>for its completion and prayers and peace upon Muḥammad, His Prophet, the best of His messengers, and the choicest of His creatures, by the hand of the weak and poor servant who is in need of the mercy of his Lord, Muḥammad son of ‘Abdullāh of Konya and follower of the son [of Rūmī, i.e. Sulṭān Walad], having been copied from the original and legible transcript that was authenticated, corrected, and revised by his excellence the shaykh, who is its author, in the presence of his successor (i.e. Ḥusām al-Dīn Chalabī) and his heir (i.e. Sulṭān Walad) in numerous meetings, may Allāh sanctify his glorious secret, and make the blessing of the continued existence of the latter two upon the Muslims long-lasting, Amen, O Lord of all that exists. On the second day of Allāh’s silent month of Rajab,⁷⁴⁷ in the year six hundred and seventy-seven (19 November 1278). May Allāh have mercy on those who recite, read and contemplate it and benefit [from it] and pray with good wishes on behalf of its scribe and its donor.</p>
--	---

⁷⁴⁷ ‘Al-aṣamm’ is a common epithet of the month of Rajab, literally meaning ‘deaf’ or ‘silent’ (Wehr 1994: 612).

Waqf note (fol. 325b) [see fig. 40, p. 26 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 51-53]

<p><i>Wuqifa hādhā al-kitāb al-muwaṭṭad al-karīm wa al-khiṭāb al-mumajjad al-‘azīm ilā al-turbati al-muqaddasa al-muṭahhara wa al-rawḍa al-ma’nūsa al-mumajjada allatī hīya ṣadaf durrati al-asrār al-lāhūtīya wa ṣadaf [sic: sadaf] ‘izzati al-anwāri al-malakūtīya wa muntaqā al-abrār dhawī al-maqāmāt wa al-karāmāt wa multaqā al-salām min Allāh fihā wa al-taḥīyātu wa mubtaghā al-ṭālibīn al-sālikīn min al-qāṭinīn minhum wa al-mutaqarribīn wa muntahā al-wāṣilīn al-nāsikīn min al-sākinīn minhum wa al-mutanaqqibīn al-mansūbat ilā mawlānā wa sayyidinā wa mu’tamad yawminā wa ghadinā al-shaykh ibn al-shaykh ibn al-shaykh al-ilahī wa al-imām ibn al-imām ibn al-imām al-ḥanafī al-rabbānī al-mustaghni bi-al-ishāb ‘an al-iṭnāb fī al-alqāb idh hūwa</i></p>	<p>This established honourable text and glorious magnificent address has been endowed to the pure sacred tomb and sublime familiar⁷⁴⁸ garden, which is the mother-of-pearl of the pearl of the theological secrets and the twilight of the lights of the heavenly Kingdom; the choice of righteous people with dignity and esteem; the gathering place of greeting from Allāh and salutation within; the goal of desperate pursuers of the Sufi path among them and of devotees; the final destination of ascetic incomers among them who dwell there and of explorers attached to our lord and master, in whom we shall trust forever, the divine shaykh, son of a shaykh, son of a shaykh, the divine Ḥanafī imam, son of an imam, son of an imam, who does not need elaboration through lengthy titles as he is the sun that one cannot make disappear by hiding away or covering with a veil. However, as far as mentioning some of his qualities is concerned, the possibility of selecting [some of them] is not easy to do in this passage, nor is it permissible. Jalāl al-</p>
--	--

⁷⁴⁸ Essentially the feeling of comfort and familiarity that one can feel in a place of holiness.

<p><i>shams lā yatawārā bi-iḥtijāb wa intiqāb</i> <i>‘alā</i> <i>anna lā yata’attā fī hādhā al-mawḍi‘ mā</i> <i>yasūghu lahu min dhikr</i> <i>ba‘ḍ nu‘ūtihi masāgh istinjāb Jalāl al-</i> <i>Milla</i> <i>wa al-Ḥaqq wa al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn</i> <i>Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-</i> <i>Balkhī raḍiya Allāh ‘anhu</i> <i>wa ‘an aslāfihi alladhīna ‘atabātuhum li-</i> <i>jibāh al-‘āshiqīn</i> <i>masājid wa mawālātuhum li-qulūb al-</i> <i>‘arīfīn ‘aqāi’d</i> <i>wa maqālātuhum li-afīdati al-muqirrīn</i> <i>bi-him maqālīd wa ruwāyātuhum</i> <i>li-āṣmikhāt al-munkirīn ‘alayhim</i> <i>aghshīya wa makāyid man</i> <i>ḥādī al-nās qāṭibatan sirran sabaqahum</i> <i>sabaqa</i> <i>‘Ukkāsha fī al-dārayn jahran bi-fawz al-</i> <i>sa‘āda al-‘uzmā wa ḥawz al-siyāda</i> <i>al-kubrā wa dhalika</i></p> <p><i>lammā attafaqa lahu min Allāh tabāraka</i> <i>wa ta‘ālā ‘ināyat</i> <i>azalīya fa-ṣaḥḥat ‘aqīdatuhu fī ḥaqq</i> <i>awlīyā’ihi wa</i></p>	<p>Milla wa al-Ḥaqq wa al-Dīn (glory of the people, of truth, and of religion) Muḥammad son of Muḥammad son of Ḥusayn of Balkh, may Allāh be pleased with him and with his ancestors, whose thresholds are places of worship for the foreheads of the lovers [of Allāh], whose songs/love are professions of faith in the hearts of the knowers [of Allāh], whose treatises are keys for the hearts of those who believe in them, and whose stories are veils and artifices upon the ears of the deniers. He who is the leader of all people attained before them secretly (i.e. humbly), as ‘Ukkāsha⁷⁴⁹ did so openly in Heaven and on Earth, the triumph of most glorious happiness and the possession of greatest supremacy. This was because Allāh, blessed and exalted be He, gave him eternal kindness so that his belief in the righteousness of his saints was confirmed, his conscience was aligned with the loyalty of his intimates, his will to follow the pious was sincere, and his affection for the desire of his friends/favourites was abundant, and</p>
--	--

⁷⁴⁹ Refers to ‘Ukkāsha ibn Miḥsan, a follower of the Prophet. According to a *ḥadīth*, he spoke up first from amongst a crowd and asked Muḥammad for entrance into Paradise, which Muḥammad granted. When another asked for the same, Muḥammad replied, “‘Ukkāsha has preceded you” (*sabaqaka bi-hā ‘Ukkāshatu*) (Khan 1994: 940).

<p><i>ṣana‘at ṭawīyyatuhu bi-muṭāwa‘at aṣfīyā’ihi wa ṣadaqat niyya [sic: niyyatuhu] li-mutāba‘at atqīyā’ihi wa kathurat raghabatuhu fī irādat aḥibbā’ihi wa huwa al-amīr al- khaṭīr al-ajall al-kabīr al-zāhid al-‘ābid al-nāsik al- mu‘taqid al-muntaqid al-ṣāliḥ al-mutadayyin sayyid al-khuddām malik al-umarā’ wa al-ḥujjāb muqarrab al- ḥaḍrat ṣaffīy al-mamlakat safīr al-dawlat Jamāl al-Dīn Mubārak ibn ‘Abdullāh ‘atīq al-ṣāḥib al-mu‘azzam wa al-dustūr al-mukarram Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ballaghahu Allāh fī al-dārayn mubtaghāhu wa ja‘la lahu fī sidrat al- muntahā muntahāhi qāṣidan bi-hi manna Allāh ta‘ālā dharī‘atan li-ibtighā’ murā‘īhi wa jā‘ilan li-nafsihi wasīlatan fī a‘lā darajātihi wa marāqīhi wa li- yabqā lahu al-dhikru al-jamīlu mukhalladan a‘lā [sic: ‘alā] ṣafahāti al-ayyāmi wa yaḥzī</i></p>	<p>his is the powerful, illustrious and great commander, the abstinent, the worshipper, the pious devotee of the faith, the righteous critic, the devout, the master of the servants, head of commanders and chamberlains, the close companion of his excellency, true friend of the kingdom, ambassador of the state, Jamāl al-Dīn Mubārak son of ‘Abdullāh, freed slave of the Great Sāḥib, venerable minister Fakhr al-Dīn (glory of religion) ‘Alī son of Ḥusayn, may Allāh deliver his wishes to him in Heaven and Earth and reward him directly with the furthest edge of <i>Sidrat al-Muntahā</i>.⁷⁵⁰ May Allāh, exalted be He, grant the means for the honouring of [his] desire and a reward for himself as a way of praising his stages and steps,⁷⁵¹ so that he remains well-remembered on the pages of the days (i.e. forever), and obtain abundant reward eternally in the courtyards [of Judgment] on the Day of Resurrection. And it is the condition that it (the manuscript) must not leave from the shrine unless the borrower [can provide] firm security and compensation. It is suitable [as it is]</p>
---	--

⁷⁵⁰ The Lote tree marking the end of the seventh Heaven.

⁷⁵¹ ‘*Marāqī*’ only appears in Persian with this meaning as the plural of *marqāt* (Steingass 1892: 1207). Arabic meanings of ‘*marāqī*’ make no sense in this context.

<p><i>bi-al-ajr al-jazīl mu'abbadan fī 'arṣāt yawm al-qiyām[a] wa shart an lā yakhrij minhā ilā musta'ir il-lā bi-rahnin wathīqin wa 'iwaḍin yaliq wa lā yughayyar wa lā yubaddal wa lā yūhab wa lā yunqqal bal yuqrā' wa yanfa' wa yuntasikh wa yuṭāli' wa yud'ā li-wāqifihi bi-al-raḥma wa al- ghufrān wa 'alā khā'inihi bi-al-la'na wa al-khidhlān fa-min baddalihi ba'd-mā sami'ihī fa- innamā ithmihi 'alā alladhīna yubaddilūnahu inna Allāh samī' 'alīm fī thamān wa sab'in wa sitt-mā'a.</i></p>	<p>and it must not be altered, amended, gifted or transferred. However, one can recite it, make use of it, copy it, and read it. Mercy and forgiveness are prayed for the endower, and may there be a curse and failure on its betrayer, as it is therefore a sin on whoever amends it after he has heard it. Indeed, Allāh, the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing, in six hundred and seventy-eight (1279-80).</p>
--	--

***Al-Awāmir al-'Alā'iyya fī al-Umūr al-'Alā'iyya*, Ibn Bibī (d. after 1285), circa 680/1282, Konya (probably), Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2985**

Dedication (fol. 1a) [see fig. 69, p. 37 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Bi-rasm khizānat al-sulṭān al-a'zam ḡill Allāh fī al-'ālam kahf al- umam ghiyāth al-dunyā wa al-dīn rukn al-islām wa al-muslimīn abū al-faḥ Kaykhusraw ibn Qilich Arslān ibn Kaykhusraw khallda Allāh mulkahu wa dawlatahu</i></p>	<p>[This book] is for the treasury of the supreme sultan, Allāh's shadow on Earth, refuge of the people, aid of the state and the religion, supporter of Islam and Muslims, father of victory, Kaykhusraw (III, r. 1265-84) son of Qilich Arslān son of Kaykhusraw, may</p>
--	---

	Allāh make his reign and empire everlasting.
--	--

Colophon (fol. 372b) [see fig. 68, p. 37 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Tamma al-kitāb</i> <i>bi-ʿawn Allāh wa ḥusn tawfīqihi wa ṣallā</i> <i>Allāhu ʿalā sayyidinā Muḥammad</i> <i>wa ālihi ajmaʿīn</i> <i>kutibat ʿalā yad al-ʿabd al-ḍaʿīf al-marjū</i> <i>ilā raḥmati rabbihi Ibrāhīm ibn</i> <i>Ismāʿīl ibn Abī Bakr</i> <i>al-Qayṣarī ghafara Allāh lahu wa li-</i> <i>wāli-dayhi wa li-ustādinā wa ʿan</i> <i>jamāʿa al-muslimīn ajmaʿīn</i> <i>bi-raḥmatika yā arḥam al-rāḥimīn</i></p>	<p>By the help of Allāh and the goodness of His guidance, the book has been finished, Allāh’s blessings upon our Lord Muḥammad and all of his family. It (the book) has been written by the hand of the weak servant, who hopes for the mercy of his Lord, Ibrāhīm son of Ismāʿīl son of Abī Bakr of Kayseri, may Allāh forgive him and his relations and our master and all Muslims, by Your mercy, O Most Merciful of those who possess mercy.</p>
---	--

***Laṭāʿif al-Ḥikma*, Sirāj al-Dīn Urmavī (d. 1283), 684/1286, Konya,
 Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Persan 121**

Colophon (fol. 182b) [see fig. 73, p. 39 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Tamma kitāb Laṭāʿif al-Ḥikma al-</i> <i>mutawwaj bi-tījān al-niʿma ʿalā</i> <i>yad al-ʿabd al-mudhnib al-khāṭī al-</i> <i>rājī ʿafwa Allāh</i> <i>jalla jalāluhu Abū al-Maḥāmid</i> <i>Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn al-</i> <i>Ḥājji al-mulaqqab bi-Ḥamīd al-</i></p>	<p>The book of <i>Laṭāʿif al-Ḥikma</i> (The Subtleties of Wisdom), crowned with the crowns of grace, has been finished by the hand of the servant, the guilty, the sinner, who seeks the forgiveness of Allāh in all His glory, father of the Muḥammads, Muḥammad son of Maḥmūd son of the pilgrim,</p>
--	---

<p><i>Mukhliṣī al-Bukhārī ghafara Allāh lahu wa li-wālidayhi wa li-jamī‘ al-muslimīn fī baldat Qūniya ṣānahā Allāh min al-balā’ wa al-wabā’ wa al-ghalā’ wa al-hayjā’ wa al-ḥamdu li-llāh rabb al-‘ālamīn wa al-ṣalāt wa al-salām ‘alā afḍal al-barāyā wa al-maḥzūz bi-kull al-mazāyā Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh sayyid al-awwalīn wa al-ākhirīn wa al-makhṣūṣ bi-‘ināyat rabb al-‘ālamīn wa ‘alā ālihi al-muntajabīn wa aṣḥābihi al-muntakhabīn mā gharrada qumrī fī aykihi wa [yā] ṣāḥi wa mā hatafa mu’adhdhin bi-ḥayya ‘alā al-falāḥ āmīn rabb al-‘ālamīn fī bukra al-jum‘a al-jāmi‘ lil-khayr al-rābi‘ min dhī al-ḥijjah sana(?) arba‘ wa thamānīn wa sitt-mā’a</i></p>	<p>nicknamed Ḥamīd the Sincere of Bukhara, may Allāh forgive him and his relations and all the Muslims in the city of Konya, may Allāh defend it from catastrophe, disease, famine, and war. Praise be to Allāh, Lord of all that exists, and prayer and peace upon the best of the [His] creatures and the most fortunate of all of the virtues, Muḥammad son of ‘Abdullāh, Lord of the first and the last, ascribed with the favour of the Lord of all that exists, and upon His choicest family and companions. No turtledove has yet sung in its thicket and, my friend, no caller to prayer has yet cried out up to the point of “come to the salvation”.⁷⁵² Amen, Lord of all that exists, in the early morning of Friday, the day of virtuous congregation, the fourth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah the year(?) six hundred and eighty-four (31 January 1286).</p>
--	--

⁷⁵² If this part of the call to prayer has not yet been heard, it means that this sentence is being written in the early hours of the day.

Manuscripts from Chapter Two

***Al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya*, Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Tustarī (d. 1329-30), 710/1311, Konya, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2445**

Dedication (fol. 2a) [see fig. 83, p. 44 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Kitāb</i> <i>[al-]Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-</i> <i>Burhāniyya</i> <i>wa al-Kashfiyya tā'līf al-faqīr ilā Allāh</i> <i>ta'ālā</i> <i>Muḥammad al-Tustarī 'afā Allāh 'anhu</i> <i>wa waffaqahu</i> <i>li-al-ṣawāb bi-rasm khizānat al-mawlā</i> <i>al-mu'azzam mālik</i> <i>azimmat al-umarā' al-a'āzam ḥāmī al-</i> <i>aṭrāf wa al-amākin</i> <i>kahf al-warā m... al-dunyā</i> <i>wa al-dīn sayf al-...</i> <i>Sulaymān al-...</i></p>	<p>The book of <i>al-Fuṣūl al-Ashrafiyya fī al-Qawā'id al-Burhāniyya wa al-Kashfiyya</i> (The Most Honourable Chapters of the Demonstrative and Revelatory Principles) is the work of one who is in need of Allāh, may He be exalted, Muḥammad of Shushtar,⁷⁵³ may Allāh forgive him and allow him to prosper on the correct path. [The book] is for the treasury of the great lord, the possessor of the reigns of greatest commanders, defender of borders and abodes, refuge of all people [...] of the world and of religion, sword of [...] Sulaymān [...].</p>
---	---

Colophon (fol. 56b) [see fig. 79, p. 42 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Wa faragha min tabyīdihī mū'allifuhu</i> <i>al-faqīr ilā Allāh ta'ālī [sic: ta'ālā]</i> <i>Muḥammad al-Tustarī aḥsana Allāh</i> <i>sha'nahu wa ṣānahu 'ammā</i> <i>shānahu</i></p>	<p>The fair copy was finished by its author, one who is in need of Allāh, may He be exalted, Muḥammad of Shūshtar, may Allāh improve his circumstances and protect him from whatever might disgrace him, in the</p>
--	---

⁷⁵³ A town in the province of Khuzistan in Iran. It is often written in Arabic as 'Tustar'.

<i>awāsiṭ Dhī al-Qa‘da min sana ‘ashara wa sab‘a-mā’a bi-madīnat Qūniya</i>	middle of Dhū al-Qa‘da in the year seven hundred and ten (April 1311) in the city of Konya.
---	---

Qur’an, 714/1314-15, Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 12-2

Illuminator’s signature (vol. 2, fol. 401b) [see fig. 108, p. 58 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 13]

<i>Dhahhabahu wa raṣṣa‘ahu Ya‘qūb ibn Ghāzī al- Qūnawī waffaqahu Allāh ta‘ālā</i>	Ya‘qūb son of Ghāzī of Konya gilded and decorated it, may Allāh, may He be exalted, make him prosper.
---	---

Colophon and dedication (vol. 2, fol. 402a) [see fig. 109, p. 59 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 13]

<i>Hādhā al-muṣḥaf al-karīm ‘azzama Allāh barakatahu wa a‘lā burhānahu bi-rasm qirā’at al-amīr al-mu‘azzam al-‘ālim al-‘ādil al-mu’ayyad al-maṣṣūr al-muṣaffar al-mujāhid al-murābiṭ nuṣrat al-mujāhidīn qāmi‘ al-mutamarridīn ‘awn al-ghuzā mubīd al-ṭughāt maljā li- ḍu‘afā’ malādh al-masākīn murabbī al-‘ulamā’ mu‘īn al-sālikīn shujā‘ al- dawla wa al-dīn ghīyāth al-islām</i>	This glorious Qur’an, may Allāh enhance its blessings and exalt its testimony, is for the reading of the great commander, the learned, the just, the one who strengthens, the victorious, the conqueror, the warrior, the defender of Islam, the one who gives victory to warriors, suppressor of rebels, supporter of holy warriors, destroyer of tyrants, refuge for the weak, protector of the poor, instructor of scholars, supporter of Sufi devotees, hero of the state and the religion, helper of Islam and Muslims, brother
--	---

<p><i>wa al-muslimīn akhī al-mulūk wa al-salāṭīn</i> [Persian] <i>humāyūn-i ḥasīb-i nasīb-i jihān</i> [Arabic] <i>Khalīl ibn Maḥmūd ibn Qaramān</i> [sic: <i>Qarāmān</i>] <i>naṣara Allāh alwīyatahu wa ayyada dawlatahu katabahu al-‘abd al-faqīr Ismā‘īl ibn Yūsuf fī shuhūr sana arba‘ ‘ashara wa sab‘a-mā’a bi-madīnat Qūniya</i></p>	<p>of kings and emperors, the imperial, highborn noble of the world, Khalīl son of Maḥmūd son of Qarāmān, may Allāh confer victory on his banners/brigades and sustain his empire. The poor servant, Ismā‘īl son of Yūsuf, wrote it in the months of the year seven hundred and fourteen in the city of Konya.</p>
---	--

***Al-Laṭā’if al-‘Alā’iyya*, Aḥmad ibn Sa’d ibn Maḥdī ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Zanjānī al-‘Uthmānī (fl. 13th c.), 625/1228, Alanya, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Aşir Efendi 316**

Early fourteenth-century dedication (fol. 106b) [see fig. 131, p. 68 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Bi-rasm muṭāla’a al-amīr al-kabīr al-muqbil al-mu’ayyad al-muzaḥḥar al-mujāhid al-murābiṭ malik al-umarā’ qudwat al-kubarā’ qā’id al-juyūsh sābiq al-‘asākir murabbī al-fuḍalā’ ilā al-maḥārib badr al-dawlatuhu wa al-dīn waṣīy al-Islām wa al-muslimīn akhw/akhū al-mulūk wa al-salāṭīn Ibrāhīm Beg ibn al-amīr al-marḥūm al-maghfūr Maḥmūd ibn Qarāmān</i></p>	<p>For the reading of the great and fortunate commander, the one who strengthens, the conqueror, the warrior, the defender of Islam, head of the commanders, model of the eminent persons, leader of the armies, superior of the troops, instructor of virtuous people towards the mihrabs, full moon of his state and the faith, a trustee of Islam and Muslims, brother of kings and emperors, Ibrāhīm Bey, son of the deceased and forgiven commander, Maḥmūd son of Qarāmān, may Allāh</p>
---	--

<i>a‘azza Allāh anṣārahu wa naṣr a‘wānihi</i>	fortify his followers and the victory of his supporters.
---	--

***Intihānāma*, Sulṭān Walad (d. 1312), 714/1314, Konya (probably),
Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, Supplément persan 1794**

Colophon (fol. 221a) [see fig. 135, p. 70 of Vol. II]

<i>Tamma al-Mathnawī al-Ma‘nawī al- Waladī al-hādī ilā ṣirāṭ al-sawīy al-abadī ‘alā yaday al-‘abd al-ḍa‘īf al-rājī raḥmati rabbihi al-laṭīf ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abdullāh ‘atīq al-Walad nawwaranā Allāh bi-nūrihi al- mu’abbad laylat yawm al-aḥad iḥdā wa ‘ashrīn min shahr Sha‘bān min shuhūr sana arba‘ ‘ashar wa sab‘a- mā’a al-ḥamdu li-llāh waḥdahu</i>	The spiritual <i>Maṣnavī</i> of [Sulṭān] Walad, the guide to the straight and everlasting path, has been finished by the hands of the weak servant, who seeks the gentle mercy of his Lord, ‘Uthmān son of ‘Abdullāh, freed slave of [Sulṭān] Walad, may Allāh illuminate us with his everlasting light, on the night of Sunday, the twenty-first of the month of Sha‘bān from the months of the year seven hundred and fourteen (30 November 1314), praise be to Allāh alone.
--	--

***Maṣnavī* (vol. 3), Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), 1318, Sivas (Çifte Minareli
Medrese), Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Nafiz Paşa 650**

Colophon (fol. 158b) [see fig. 185, p. 98 of Vol. II]

<i>Ittafaqa al-farāgh yawm al-jum‘a al- rābi‘ wa al-‘ashrīn min Rabī‘ al- Awwal sana thamāniya ‘ashar wa sab‘a-mā’a ḥamidān</i>	One who praises and prays/preaches completed [this book] on Friday the twenty-fourth of Rabī‘ al-Awwal in the year seven hundred and eighteen (26
---	---

<p><i>wa muṣallīyan bi-maḥrūsāt Sīwās fī al- madrasa al-shamsiyya ‘ammarahā Allāh wa raḥīma bānīhā ‘alā yad al-‘abd al-rājī Muḥammad ibn al-Naqīb al- Mawlawī al-mulaqqab bi-Tāj ghafara Allāh lahu wa li- wālidayhi wa li-jamī‘ al-muslimīn wa razaqahu ‘ilm al-yaqīn</i></p>	<p>May 1318), in the protected city of Sivas in Madrasa al-Shamsiyya (i.e. the Çifte Minareli Medrese), may Allāh cause it (the madrasa) to thrive and have mercy upon its builder (Shams al-Dīn Juwaynī, presumably), by the hand of the hopeful servant, Muḥammad son of the chief, the Mawlawi, nicknamed Tāj, may Allāh forgive him, his parents and all Muslims, and may He bless him with the knowledge of absolute certainty.</p>
--	--

***Maṣnavī*, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), 723/1323, Konya (tomb and madrasa of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1177**

Calligrapher’s note (fol. 49a) [see fig. 137, p. 70 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 249]

<p><i>Tamma al-mujallad al-awwal min mujalladāt al-Mathnawī al- Ma‘nawī al-Mawlawī bi-‘awn Allāh wa ḥusn tawfiqihī fī rābi‘ ‘ashar min shahr Rabī‘ al-Awwal min shuhūr thalath wa ‘ashrīn wa sab‘a-mā’a ‘alā yad al-‘abd al-faqīr al-muḥtāj raḥmati [ra]bbihī al-qadīr ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abdullāh ‘atīq Mawlānā ibn Mawlānā al-ma‘rūf bi-al-Walad</i></p>	<p>By the help of Allāh and the goodness of His guidance, the first volume of the volumes of the spiritual Mawlawi <i>Maṣnavī</i> of Walad, has been finished on the fourteenth of Rabī‘ al-Awwal in the months of [the year] seven hundred and twenty-three (22 March 1323) by the hand of the poor servant, who needs the mercy of his Almighty Lord, ‘Uthmān son of ‘Abdullāh, freed slave of Mawlānā son of Mawlānā renowned as [Sulṭān] Walad, may Allāh illuminate us with his everlasting light. Amen, O</p>
--	---

<p><i>nawwaranā Allāh bi-nūrihi al- mu'abbad āmīn ya rabb al-‘ālamīn wa al-ḥamdu li-llāh waḥdahu wa sallam</i></p>	<p>Lord of all that exists, praise be to Allāh alone, may He grant salvation.</p>
--	---

Calligrapher's note (fol. 85b) [see fig. 136, p. 70 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 249]

<p><i>Tamām shud rūz-i shanba chahārum-i māh-i Rabī‘ al-Ākhir [Arabic] sana thalath wa ‘ashrīn wa sab‘a-mā’a</i></p>	<p>It [the second volume] has been finished on Saturday the fourth of Rabī‘ al-Ākhir in the year seven hundred and twenty-three (9 April 1323).</p>
--	---

Calligrapher's note (fol. 192b) [see fig. 138, p. 70 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 249]

<p><i>Tamām shud rūz-i panj-shanba nūzdahum-i māh-i Jumādā al-Avval [Arabic] sana thalatha [sic: thalātha] wa ‘ashrīn wa sab‘a-mā’a [Persian] dar turba-yi muṭahhar-i munavvar-i ḥazret-i khudāvandigār qaddasanā Allāh bi-sirrihi al-‘azīz</i></p>	<p>It [the fourth volume] has been finished on Thursday the nineteenth of the month of Jumādā al-Ūlā in the year seven hundred and twenty-three (26 May 1323) in the pure, illuminated tomb of the creator of the world (i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), may Allāh hallow us with His glorious secret.</p>
---	---

Calligrapher's note (fol. 249b) [see fig. 139, p. 70 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Tamām shud daftar-i panjum az daftarhā-yi ma‘navī dar turba-yi muṭahhar-i ḥazret-i khudāvandigār qaddasanā Allāh</i></p>	<p>The fifth book of the spiritual books has been finished in the pure tomb of the creator of the world (i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), may Allāh hallow us with</p>
--	--

<p><i>bi-sirrihi</i> <i>rūz-i panj-shanba shānzdahum-i māh-i</i> <i>Rajab [Arabic] sana thalath wa</i> <i>‘ashrīn wa sab‘a-mā’a al-ḥamdu</i> <i>li-llāh waḥdahu</i></p>	<p>His secret, on Thursday the sixteenth of the month of Rajab in the year seven hundred and twenty-three (21 July 1323), praise be to Allāh alone.</p>
---	---

Colophon (fol. 317b) [see fig. 140, p. 71 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 250]

<p><i>Allāhumma ighfir li-man tāla‘a minhu</i> <i>wa da‘ā li-kātibihī</i></p> <p><i>Tamma al-Mathnawīyyāt al-</i> <i>Ma‘nawīyyāt</i> <i>bi-‘awn Allāh wa ḥusn tawfīqihī ‘alā yad</i> <i>aqall</i> <i>‘ibād Allāh wa aḥqarīhim ‘Uthmān ibn</i> <i>‘Abdullāh</i> <i>‘atīq Sulṭān Walad nawwaranā Allāh</i> <i>bi-nūrihi al-mu‘abbad āmīn rabb</i> <i>al-‘ālamīn</i> <i>yawm al-arba‘ā’ waqt ṣalāt al-‘aṣr</i> <i>khāmis wa al-‘ashrīn</i> <i>min Ramaḍān al-mubārak sana thalath</i> <i>wa ‘ashrīn wa sab‘a-mā’a</i> <i>al-ḥamdu li-llāh waḥdahu</i> <i>fī madīnat Qūniya ḥarasha Allāh ta‘ālā</i> <i>fī madrasat Mawlānā qaddasanā Allāh</i> <i>bi-sirrihi al-‘azīz</i></p> <p><i>Al-khaṭṭ yabqā zamānanā ba‘d kātibihī</i> <i>wa kātib al-khaṭṭ taḥt al-turab madfūn</i></p>	<p>O Allāh, forgive those who read from it and pray for its scribe</p> <p>By the help of Allāh and the goodness of His guidance, the spiritual <i>Maṣnavī</i> has been finished by the hand of the most inferior of the servants of God and the most wretched one of them, ‘Uthmān son of ‘Abdullāh, freed slave of Sulṭān Walad, may Allāh illuminate us with his everlasting light. Amen, Lord of all that exists. On Wednesday at the time of afternoon prayer on the twenty-fifth of blessed Ramaḍān, in the year seven hundred and twenty-three (28 September 1323), praise be to Allāh alone, in the city of Konya, Allāh, may He be exalted, protect it, in the madrasa of Mawlānā (i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), may Allāh hallow us with His glorious secret.</p>
--	---

	May the calligraphy remain beyond our time after its scribe [has died], when the scribe of the calligraphy is buried under the ground.
--	--

***Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, Sulṭān Walad (d. 1312), circa 732/1332, Konya (probably), Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 74**

Waqf note (fol. 315b) [see fig. 142, p. 72 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 110]

<p><i>Waqafa hādihā al-kitāb al-sharīf wa al-khiṭāb al-munīf ‘alā al-mashhad al-mufakkkham wa al-marqad al-mukarram li-ḥaḍrat Mawlānā sirr Allāh al-a‘lā maḥram gharā’ib al-najwā kāshif ghawāmiḍ al-asrār mishkāt ḥaqā’iq al-anwār Jalāl al-Ḥaqq wa al-Milla wa al-Dīn qaddasanā Allāh bi-sirrihi al-matīn al-mubīn wa al-kitāb mansūb ilā ḥaḍrat waladihi sulṭān al-muḥaqqiqīn burhān Allāh ‘alā al-muḥiqqīn Mawlānā Bahā’ al-Ḥaqq wa al-Dīn al-Walad nawwaranā Allāh bi-nūrihi al-mu’ayyad/mu’ayyid āmīn ya rabb al-‘ālamīn al-‘abd al-muwaffaq min ‘ind Allāh ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Bakr</i></p>	<p>This eminent book and exalted treatise was endowed to the honoured shrine and revered resting place of the revered Mawlānā (i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), the supreme secret of Allāh, the secluded place of the wonders of intimate discourse, the discloser of hidden secrets, the niche of the truths of divine light, Jalāl al-Ḥaqq wa al-Milla wa-al-Dīn (glory of truth, the people and religion), may Allāh hallow us with his everlasting and unambiguous secret, the book being by his (i.e. Rūmī’s) revered son, sultan of the truth-seekers, a testimony of Allāh upon those who know the truth, our master Bahā’ al-Ḥaqq wa al-Dīn (magnificence of truth and religion) al-Walad (i.e. Sulṭān Walad), may Allāh illuminate us with his confirmed [or supporting] light – Amen, Lord of all</p>
--	--

<p><i>al-Waladī waffaqahu Allāh ta‘ālā wa taqabbala minhu wa raḍiyya ‘ammā ṣadara ‘an-hu wa ittafaqa hādhā al-waqf fī al-‘ashar al-ākhir min Shawwāl li-sana ithnā wa thalathīn wa sab‘a-mā’a takhaṣṣa bi-kitābat hādhihi al-asrār al-aḥadiyya wa al-mathnawiyyāt al-Waladiyya al-‘abd al-faqīr al-rājī raḥmati rabbihi al-qadīr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Kātib aḥsana Allāh ‘awāqib umūrihi</i></p>	<p>that exists – by the servant whose success is granted by Allāh, ‘Uthmān son of Abī Bakr, follower of the Walad (i.e. Sulṭān Walad), may Allāh, the exalted, make him prosper, and may He accept it [the book], and be pleased with where it came from. This endowment occurred in the last ten days of Shawwāl in the year seven hundred and thirty-two (15-24 July 1332). The poor servant who hopes for the mercy of his Almighty Lord, Aḥmad son of Muḥammad the scribe, specialised in the writing of these unified secrets and the rhyming couplets of [Sulṭān] Walad, may Allāh improve the outcomes of his (the calligrapher’s) affairs.</p>
---	--

Manuscripts from Chapter Three

***Miršād al-'Ibād min al-Mabdā' ilā al-Ma'ād*, Najm al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1256),
750/1349, İstanos (probably), Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Fatih
2841**

Dedication (fol. 1a) [see fig. 198, p. 104 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Qad katabnāhu bi-rasm muṭāla'a al- amīr al-kabīr sulālat al-akābir wa al-a'āzīm dhī al- ḥasab al-ṭāhir wa al-nasab al-fākhir mujammī' al-akhlāf al-malakiyya muṣahhir al-altāf al-ālihī muttabi' al-jūd wa al-karam ṣāḥib al-sayf wa al-qalam amīr 'Īsā Beg ibn al-marḥūm al-sa'īd Zakariyyā' Beg anāra Allāh ḍarīḥ al-salaf wa ḍā'afa jalāl al-khalaf wa razaqahu 'ulamā' yurashshadahu wa 'umalā' yuṣa'adahu āmīn rabb al-'ālamīn wa al-ḥamdu li- llāh waḥdahu</i></p>	<p>Indeed, we wrote it (the book) for the reading of the great commander, descendant of eminent and outstanding men, possessed of noble, virtuous descent, and superior ancestry, accumulator of regal descendants, manifestation of the divine graces, advocate of bounty and generosity, possessor of the sword and the pen, Amīr 'Īsā Bey son of the late, fortunate Zakariyyā' Bey, may Allāh illuminate the tomb of the father and increase the glory of the son, and bestow upon him scholars who guide him well and officers who make him exalted. Amen, O Lord of all that exists, praise be to Allāh alone.</p>
--	--

Colophon (fol. 176a) [see fig. 200, p. 104 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Faragha min tanmīqihī bi-'awn Allāh wa ḥusn tawfīqihī al-'abd al-faqīr al-muḥtāj ilā raḥmat Allāh Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn</i></p>	<p>By the help of Allāh and the goodness of His guidance, its (the book's) elegant composition has been finished [by] the poor servant, who is in need of the mercy of his Almighty Lord,</p>
--	---

<p><i>Muqarrab</i> <i>fī ākhir Muḥarram al-mukarram</i> <i>sana khamsīn</i> <i>wa saba‘-mā’a</i></p>	<p>Raḥmatullāh son of Muḥammad son of Muqarrab at the end of the venerable Muḥarram, the year seven hundred and fifty (10-19 April 1349).</p>
---	---

***Mirṣād al-‘Ibād min al-Mabdā’ ilā al-Ma‘ād*, Najm al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1256), 752/1351, İstanos, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Ayasofya 2067**

Dedication (fol. 1a) [see fig. 201, p. 105 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Qad katabnā hādhā al-kitāb wa</i> <i>athbatnā hādhā</i> <i>al-khiṭāb bi-rasm al-amīr al-kabīr</i> <i>sulālat al-a‘āzim</i> <i>wa al-akābir jāmi‘ al-ma‘āthir wa al-</i> <i>mafākhir karīm</i> <i>al-ṭarafayn sharīf al-jānibayn zayn al-</i> <i>ḥājj [sic: ḥajj]</i> <i>wa al-ḥaramayn ghiyāth al-dawla wa</i> <i>al-dīn mughīth al-islām</i> <i>wa al-muslimīn amīr ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn</i> <i>al-ṣadr</i> <i>al-sa‘īd al-shahīd Yūnus Beg anāra</i> <i>Allāh</i> <i>ḍarīḥ al-salaf wa dā‘afa jalāl al-khalaf</i></p>	<p>Indeed, we wrote this book and we assert this treatise as authentic/correct, for the great commander, descendant of outstanding and eminent men, collector of glorious deeds and exploits, a nobleman from both sides of his parents, leader of the pilgrimage to the Two Holy Places, aid of the state and the religion, helper of Islam and Muslims, the commander ‘Abd al-Raḥīm son of the fortunate, martyred leader Yūnus Bey, may Allāh illuminate the tomb of the father and increase the glory of the son.</p>
--	---

Colophon (fol. 200b) [see fig. 203, p. 106 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Tamma al-kitāb bi-‘awn al-malik al-</i> <i>wahhāb</i> <i>yawm al-ithnayn al-thālith wa al-</i></p>	<p>By the help of the Provider [i.e. Allāh], the book has been finished on Monday, the twenty-third of Jumādā al-Ūlā, the</p>
--	---

<p><i>‘ashrīn min Jumādā al-Awwal sana ithnā wa khamsīn wa saba‘- mā’a</i></p> <p><i>‘alā yad al-‘abd al-faqīr al-muḥtāj ilā raḥmat Allāh Raḥmatullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Muqarrab bi- maḥrūsa Īstanūs</i></p>	<p>year seven hundred and fifty-two (18 July 1351), by the hand of the poor servant, who is in need of the mercy of his Almighty Lord, Raḥmatullāh son of Muḥammad son of Muqarrab, in the protected city of Īstanos.</p>
---	---

Inscription (fol. 200b) [see fig. 203, p. 106 of Vol. II]

<p><i>Mavlūd-i banda-yi za‘īf al-muḥtāj ilā raḥmat Allāh ta‘ālā Vārsākh(?) Beg al-Mavlavī al-Burhānī bi-sana isṇayn va sittīn va saba‘-mā’a</i></p>	<p>The weak slave who is in need of the mercy of his Almighty Lord, exalted be He, Vārsākh Bey the Mawlawi al-Burhānī was born in the year seven hundred and sixty-two (1360-61).</p>
<p><i>Mavlūd-i farzand Muḥammad sana khamsa wa ṣamān-mā’a</i></p>	<p>The son Muḥammad was born [in the] year eight hundred and five (1402-3).</p>
<p><i>Mavlūd-i farzand Aḥmad dāma baqāhu dar vaqt-i [...] shab-i shanba bīst [u] chahārum-i Ramaḍān sana sitt wa ṣamān-mā’a</i></p>	<p>The son Aḥmad, may he survive, was born in the time of [...] on the evening of Saturday, the twenty-fourth of Ramaḍān [in the] year eight hundred and six (5 April 1404).</p>

Manuscripts from Chapter Four

***Maṣnavī-i Valadī*, Sulṭān Walad (d. 1312), 767/1366, Erzincan (possibly),
Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod.Mixt.1594**

Dedication (fol. 1a) [see fig. 221, p. 114 of Vol. II]

<p>[Persian] <i>Bi-rasm muṭāla‘a-i</i> <i>ṣāhib-i a‘zam dustūr-i mu‘azzam zubda-</i> <i>yi dasātīr</i> <i>al-‘arab va al-‘ajam ‘umda-yi vuzarā’ al-</i> <i>umam usvā-yi arbāb al-qalam</i> <i>qudva-yi aṣḥāb al-jūd va al-ni‘ma sāhit</i> [sic: <i>sāhib</i>]-<i>i adhyāl</i> <i>al-majd va al-karam muḥriz-i ma‘ālī al-</i> <i>khayr va al-himam mustajma‘-i</i> <i>makārim al-akhlāq va maḥāsin al-</i> <i>shiyam kāfil-i maṣāliḥ-i banī Ādam</i> <i>Khwāja Sharaf al-Milla va al-Davla va</i> <i>al-Dīn abū al-ma‘ālī amīr Sātī al-</i> <i>Mavlavī</i></p> <p>[Arabic] <i>adāma Allāh tawfīqahu wa</i> <i>ja‘ala al-rushd rafīqahu ibn al-</i> <i>marḥūm</i> <i>al-maghfūr Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan ṭāba</i> <i>tharāhu fī ‘āshar Dhū al-Ḥijja</i> <i>sana saba‘ wa sittīn wa saba‘-mā’a</i></p>	<p>For the reading of the great companion [of Allāh], the venerable minister, the best (literally: cream) of the Arab and Persian ministers, governor of the ministers of the [Muslim] people, model of the lords of the pen, exemplar of companions of generosity and mercy, leader of noble and venerable attendants, achiever of glorious deeds of benefit and ambition, gatherer of noble deeds of good character and merits of innate qualities, provider of benefits to mankind, the lord, glory of the people, the state, and the religion, father of glorious deeds, commander Sātī, the Mawlawi, may Allāh prolong his success and appoint His companion to the right path, son of he who has been forgiven, the deceased Ḥusām al-Dīn (sword of religion) Ḥasan, may his earth be good, on the tenth of Dhū al-Ḥijja, the year seven hundred and sixty-seven (18 August 1366).</p>
---	--

Colophon (fol. 75a) [see fig. 229, p. 119 of Vol. II]

<i>Tamma al-kitāb al-Mathnawī al-Waladī</i>	By the help of Allāh, may He be exalted,
---	--

<p><i>‘alā yad al-‘abd al-ḍa‘īf al-muḥtāj bi-‘awn Allāh ta‘ālā</i></p> <p><i>Ḥasan ibn ‘Uthmān al-Mawlawī fī awākhir Jumādā al-Ākhira li-sana saba‘ wa sittīn wa saba‘-mā’a ghafara Allāh la-hu wa li-jamī‘ al- muslimīn ajma‘īn amīn yā rabb al- ‘ālamīn</i></p>	<p>the book of the <i>Maṣnavī</i> (The spiritual couplets) of Sulṭān Walad has been finished by the hand of the weak, poor servant, Ḥasan son of ‘Uthmān the Mawlawi, in the last ten days of Jumādā al-Ākhira in the year seven hundred and sixty-seven (4-13 March 1366), may Allāh forgive him and all Muslims entirely, Amen O Lord of all things.</p>
---	--

***Dīvān-i Kabīr* (vol. 2), Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), 768-70/1367-68, Erzincan (possibly), Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 69**

Calligrapher’s note (fol. 130b) [see fig. 266, p. 138 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 95]

<p><i>Tammāt al-ghazaliyyāt yawm al-jum‘a awākhir</i></p> <p><i>Muḥarrām al-mukarram sana sab‘īn wa saba‘-mā’a</i></p> <p><i>ḥāmidan Allāh wa muṣalīyān ‘alā nabīyhi</i></p>	<p>The poetry has been finished on Friday, at the end of the venerable Muḥarrām in the year seven hundred and seventy (8 September 1368), praising Allāh and praying for His Prophet.</p>
--	---

Colophon (fol. 147a) [see fig. 267, p. 139 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 95]

<p><i>Ibtidā’-i īn nuskha-yi dīvān-i muqaddas az s̄anī-i Shavvāl-i sana-yi s̄amān va sittīn va saba‘-mā’a va tamām shudan va muqābala kardan bi- ‘avn Allah ‘azza shānuhu va ba- ṣiḥḥat rasānīdan ba-kitābat-i banda-yi za‘īf-i naḥīf al-muḥtāj ilā</i></p>	<p>The commencement of this copy of the sacred Divan [began] from the second of Shawwāl of the year seven hundred and sixty-eight (1 June 1367), and it was completed, collated and corrected by Divine aid, may His power be glorified, by the writing of the weak</p>
---	---

<p><i>raḥmat Allāh ta‘ālā Ḥasan ibn</i> <i>‘Uthmān al-Mavlavī dar ghurra-yi</i> <i>Rabī‘ al-Ākhir li-sana sab‘īn wa</i> <i>saba‘-mā’a</i></p>	<p>and feeble servant who is in need of the mercy of Allāh, exalted be He, Ḥasan son of ‘Uthmān the Mawlawi on the first day of Rabī‘ al-Ākhir of the year seven hundred and seventy (12 November 1368).</p>
--	--

Dedication (fol. 147b) [see fig. 268, p. 140 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 96]

<p>[Persian] <i>Bi-rasm muṭāla‘a-i šāḥib-i</i> <i>a‘zzam</i> <i>dustūr-i mu‘azzam zubda-yi dasātīr al-</i> <i>‘arab va al-‘ajam</i> <i>‘umda-yi vuzarā’ al-umam usvā-yi arbāb</i> <i>al-qalam</i> <i>qudva-yi ašḥāb al-jūd va al-ni‘ma</i> <i>sāḥit [sic: sāḥib]-i adhyāl al-majd va al-</i> <i>karam muḥriz-i ma‘ālī al-khayr</i> <i>va al-himam mustajma‘-i makārim al-</i> <i>akhlāq va maḥāsin al-shiyam kāfil-</i> <i>i maṣāliḥ-i banī Ādam</i> <i>Khwāja Sharaf al-Milla va al-Dīn abū al-</i> <i>ma‘ālī amīr Sātī al-Mavlavī</i> [Arabic] <i>adāma Allāh</i> <i>tawfiqahu wa ja‘ala al-rushd rafīqahu</i> <i>ibn al-marḥūm al-maghfūr Ḥusām al-</i> <i>Dīn Ḥasan</i> <i>ṭāba tharāhu fī ghurrat Rabī‘ al-Ākhir li-</i> <i>sana</i> <i>sab‘īn wa saba‘-mā’a ḥāmidan Allāh</i> <i>wa muṣalīyān ‘alā nabīyhi</i></p>	<p>For the reading of the great companion [of Allāh], the venerable minister, the best (literally: cream) of the Arab and Persian ministers, governor of the ministers of the [Muslim] people, model of the lords of the pen, exemplar of companions of generosity and mercy, leader of noble and venerable attendants, achiever of glorious deeds of benefit and ambition, gatherer of noble deeds of good character and merits of innate qualities, provider of benefits to mankind, the lord, glory of the people and the religion, father of glorious deeds, commander Sātī, the Mawlawi, may Allāh prolong his success and appoint His companion to the right path, son of he who has been forgiven, the deceased Ḥusām al-Dīn (sword of religion) Ḥasan, may his earth be good, on the first day of Rabī‘ al-Ākhir in the year seven hundred and seventy (12 November 1368), praising</p>
---	---

	Allāh and praying for His Prophet.
--	------------------------------------

Waqf note (fol. 147b) [see fig. 210, p. 110 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 96-97]

<p>[Persian] <i>Īn dīvān al-‘ushshāq bar sabīl-i irs ba banda-yi za‘īf-i nahīf</i> <i>Mustanjid ibn Sātī al-Mavlavī al-Arzinjānī aḥmada</i> [sic: <i>aḥsana</i>] <i>Allāh khātimatehu</i> <i>uftād chūn dar haẓrat-i turba-yi muṭahhar-i munavvar-i muqaddas-i</i> <i>khudāvandigār qaddasanā Allāh bi-sirrihi al-‘azīz</i> <i>dīvān-i mukammal nabūd īn dīvān-rā ba-haẓrat-i turba-yi mazkūra irādat-i</i> <i>vaqf nahāda shud ki ‘āshiqān va ṣādiqān</i> <i>dar haẓrat-i turba-yi muṭahhar-i mazkūra muṭāla‘a farmūda</i> <i>istifāda yāband va ba-khayr yād kunand ammā ba-jā-yi dīgar naql</i> <i>nakunand va haẓrat-i chalabīyān va shaykh-i zāviya</i> <i>ba-jā-yi dīgar naql nakunand va nīz ba-dīgarī</i> <i>nabakhshand va nadahand va īn dīvān-rā vaqf-i haẓrat-i turba dānista</i> <i>az āyat-i tawbīkh</i> [Arabic] <i>fa-man baddalahu ba‘d-mā sami‘ahu fa-innamā ithmuhu</i> <i>‘alā alladhīna yubaddilūnahu inna</i></p>	<p>This <i>dīvān</i> (book of poetry) of lovers, [a guide] to the path, is the excellent inheritance of the weak and feeble servant, Mustanjid son of Sātī the Mawlawi of Erzincan, may Allāh make his end good. Because there was no complete Divan at the honourable pure, illuminated, holy tomb of the <i>khudāvandigār</i> (i.e. Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), may Allāh hallow us with His glorious secret, this <i>dīvān</i> has been placed in the aforementioned honourable tomb with the purpose of endowment, so that lovers and truth-seekers in the aforementioned honourable pure tomb derive benefit from studying [it] and remember [him] well. However, they should not take it to another place. Also the honourable <i>chalabīs</i> and the shaykh of the dervish lodge [also] should not take it to another place, or gift or give it to another. Knowing this <i>dīvān</i> as endowment to the honourable tomb, they should be wary and abstaining on the basis of this reprimanding Qur’anic verse: “Then whoever alters the bequest after he has heard it, the sin is only upon those who have altered it.</p>
--	---

<p><i>Allāha samī‘un wa ‘alīmun</i> [Persian] <i>muḥtariz</i> <i>va mujtanib bāshand va tabdīl</i> <i>nakunand taḥrīran fī ghurra Muḥarram</i> <i>al-mukarram li-sana iṣnatā ‘ashar va</i> <i>thamān-mā’a al-hijriyya</i></p>	<p>Indeed, Allah is Hearing and Knowing.” They should thus not alter [it]. Written on the first day of the venerable Muḥarram in the year eight hundred and twelve Hijra (17 May 1409).</p>
--	---

Note by Sātī about paper and artists (fol. 147b) [see fig. 209, p. 109 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 97]

<p><i>Kāghid-i in kitābat-i asrār va ma‘ānī</i> <i>banda-yi za‘īf Sātī ibn al-Ḥasan al-</i> <i>Mavlavī az Dimashq dāda-ast qaṣdan</i> <i>āvard(?)</i> <i>va shish hazār diram [sic: dirham] ba-</i> <i>rusūm-i kātib va tazhīb ba-maṣārif</i> <i>rasānida tā chūn ṣāhib-i dilān</i> <i>va ‘āshiqān ba-muṭāla‘a musharraf</i> <i>shavand ba-du‘ā’ khayr yād</i> <i>āvarand inshā’ Allāh ta‘ālā</i></p> <p><i>Navad-u-panj ṭabaq-i kāghid-i qaṭ‘-i</i> <i>buzurg jihat-i kitābat Maṣnavī-i</i> <i>Ma‘navī ...</i> <i>dar ṣānī ‘ashrīn Jumādā al-Avval ...</i></p>	<p>The weak servant Sātī son of Ḥasan the Mawlawi had the paper for this book of secrets and mystical meanings brought specially from Damascus and paid expenses of six thousand dirhams for the fees of the scribe and the application of gold, so that when the people of the heart and lovers (i.e. dervishes) have the honour of reading [it], they call Him to mind with a favourable prayer, Allāh willing, exalted be He.</p> <p>Ninety-five large-sized sheets of paper for the purpose of copying the spiritual <i>Maṣnavī</i> [...] On the twenty-second of Jumādā al-Ūlā [...]</p>
---	--

Maṣnavī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), 773/1372, Erzincan (possibly), Mevlana Müzesi, Konya, 1113

Dedication (fol. 188b) [see fig. 287, p. 151 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 234]

<p>[Persian] <i>Bi-rasm muṭālaʿa-i</i> <i>dustūr-i muʿazzam ṣāhib-i aʿzam</i> <i>zubda-yi dasātīr al-ʿarab va al-ʿajam</i> <i>ʿumda-yi</i> <i>vuzarāʾ al-umam usvā-yi arbāb al-qalam</i> <i>qudva-yi</i> <i>aṣḥāb al-jūd va al-niʿma sāhit</i> [sic: <i>sāhib]-i adhyāl al-majd</i> <i>va al-karam muḥriz-i maʿālī al-khayr</i> <i>va al-himam mustajmaʿ-i makārim</i> <i>al-akhlāq va maḥāsīn al-shiyam kāfil-i</i> <i>maṣāliḥ-i banī Ādam</i> <i>Khwāja Sharaf al-Milla va al-Dunyā va</i> <i>al-Dīn abū al-maʿālī</i> <i>amīr Sātī al-Mavlavī</i> [Arabic] <i>adāma</i> <i>Allāh tawfīqahī wa jaʿala</i> <i>al-rushd rafīqahū ibn al-marḥūm al-</i> <i>maghfūr Ḥusām al-Dīn</i> <i>Ḥasan ṭāba tharāhu fī ghurrat Rajab al-</i> <i>aṣamm</i> <i>sana thalāth wa sabʿīn wa sabaʿ-māʾa</i> <i>ḥāmidan Allāh wa muṣalīyān ʿalā</i> <i>nabīyhi Muḥammad</i> <i>wa ālihi</i></p>	<p>For the reading of the venerable minister, the great companion [of Allāh], the best (literally: cream) of the Arab and Persian ministers, governor of the ministers of the [Muslim] people, model of the lords of the pen, exemplar of companions of generosity and mercy, leader of noble and venerable attendants, achiever of glorious deeds of benefit and ambition, gatherer of noble deeds of good character and merits of innate qualities, provider of benefits to mankind, the lord, glory of the people, the world, and the religion, father of glorious deeds, commander Sātī, the Mawlawi, may Allāh prolong his success and appoint His companion to the right path, son of he who has been forgiven, the deceased Ḥusām al-Dīn (sword of religion) Ḥasan, may his earth be good, on the first day of Rajab the silent⁷⁵⁴ in the year seven hundred and seventy-three (8 January 1372), praising Allāh and praying for His Prophet, Muḥammad, and His family.</p>
--	--

⁷⁵⁴ See n. 747 above.

Colophon (fol. 195a) [see fig. 335, p. 167 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 235]

<p><i>Tamma al-kitāb</i> <i>bi-ʿawn Allāh al-malik al-wahhāb wa</i> <i>ṣallā Allāh ʿalā sayyidnā</i> <i>Muḥammad</i> <i>wa ālihi ajmaʿīn ʿalā yaday al-ʿabd al-</i> <i>ḍaʿīf al-faqīr</i> <i>ilā rabbihi al-qawī al-kabīr Ḥasan ibn</i> <i>ʿUthmān al-Mawlawī</i> <i>aḥsana Allāh khātīmatahu wa li-jamīʿ</i> <i>al-muslimīn ajmaʿīn</i> <i>fī awāsiṭ Rajab al-aṣamm li-sana thalāth</i> <i>wa sabʿīn wa sabaʿ-<i>māʿa</i></i></p>	<p>By the help of Allāh the Provider, Allāh’s blessing on our Lord Muḥammad and His entire family, the book has been finished by the hands of the weak, poor servant for his powerful, great lord, Ḥasan son of ʿUthmān the Mawlawi, may Allāh make his end good and [the same prayer goes] to all Muslims entirely, in the middle of Rajab the silent⁷⁵⁵ in the year seven hundred and seventy-three (late January 1372).</p>
---	--

Note by Mustanjid ibn Sātī concerning his travels (fol. 195b) [see fig. 336, p. 167 of Vol. II and Gölpınarlı 2003: 236]

<p><i>Vafāt-i amīr Tīmūr Beg dar maqām-i</i> <i>Utrār shab-i chahār shanba sābiʿ</i> <i>ʿashar Shaʿbān al-muʿazzam li-</i> <i>sana sabaʿ va thamān-<i>māʿa</i></i> <i>va kātīb al-ʿabd Mustanjid ibn Sātī al-</i> <i>Mavlavī dar Ūtrār bar-gashtan-i</i> <i>darīn ḥāl ba-ham būd</i> <i>va nishastan bi-salṭanat dar Samarqand</i> <i>ḥazret-i Khalīl Sulṭān Mīrza va</i> <i>bazl-i kunūz va khazāʿīn</i> <i>ki amīr Tīmūr nihāda būd dar māh-i</i> <i>Ramazān sana al-mazkūra va</i> <i>ijāzat-i kātīb al-ʿabd az</i> <i>Samarqand</i></p>	<p>Commander Tīmūr Bey died in the place of Otrar, on Wednesday night, the seventeenth of Shaʿbān the exalted in the year eight hundred and seven (18 February 1405). The writer, the servant Mustanjid son of Sātī the Mawlawi, was also in Otrar during the development of this situation. The accession of the honourable Khalīl Sulṭān Mīrza (Timurid ruler of Transoxiana, r. 1405- 9) to the throne, and the distribution of the treasures which Commander Tīmūr had left behind occurred in the month of Ramazān of the aforementioned year</p>
--	---

⁷⁵⁵ See n. 747 above.

<p><i>ba-jānib-i Rūm va Arzinjān dar māh-i Shavvāl sana al-mazkūra va gozashtan-i āb-i Āmū[daryā] ham darīn māh va rasīdan ba-Khurāsān va āmadan ba- Arzinjān mavṭin-i mā'lūf-i khūd dar māh-i Rajab al-murajjab sana thamān [u] thamān-mā'a</i></p>	<p>(March 1405). Permission [was given] for the writer, the servant, [to go] from Samarqand towards Rūm and Erzincan in the month of Shawwāl of the aforementioned year (April 1405). [His] crossing of the Amu Darya (Oxus river) occurred in the same month, arriving in Khurasan. The arrival in Erzincan, his (the writer's) customary domicile, occurred in the month of the honourable Rajab, the year eight hundred and eight (23 December 1405-21 January 1406).</p>
--	--