Pre-Ottoman Minarets in Anatolia

A Thesis Submitted to
The Department of Arab and Islamic Civilizations
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts

By
Mohamed Ibrahim M. Radwan

Under the supervision of Dr. Bernard O’Kane

May/ 2014
To my Mother
And
the Loving Memory of my Father
Acknowledgements

“All praise is due to Allah, to whom belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth, and to Him belongs all praise in the Hereafter. And He is the Wise, the Acquainted.”  

After embracing God’s Grace, this research is never the work of anyone alone. The contributions of many different people, in their different ways, have made this possible. I would like to especially extend my appreciation to the following:

Dr. Bernard O’Kane, for making this research possible. His support, guidance, advice throughout the research project, as well as his painstaking effort in proofreading the drafts, is greatly appreciated. Indeed, without his guidance, I would not have been able to put the topic together. Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Dr. Ellen Kenney and Dr. Jere Bacharach, for their encouragement and insightful comments. I would like to thank Dr. George Scanlon and Dr. Chahinda Karim for their valued seminars. Special thanks to the AUC Office of Graduate Studies for sponsoring my trip to Turkey where I collected the needed data for my research. Also, I would like to thank the staff of the Arab and Islamic Civilizations Department and the Rare Books Library who patiently helped me during the time of my research.

I would like to thank my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to my mother and father for all of the sacrifices that they have made. Their prayers for me were what sustained me thus far. I would like likewise to thank my mother and father-in-law for their ongoing support. I would like to express deep appreciation to my beloved wife Azza for her invaluable suggestions and encouragement. Many thanks to my daughters Laila and Salma, my rays of light and joy throughout the whole writing process. I am also grateful to my friends Amr Salah, Mohammad Shawky and Yasmine Abdullah for their help and support.

---

1 Quran, 34:1
Abstract

It is very difficult to find nowadays a masjid in any of the main Islamic cities, such as Cairo, Istanbul or Baghdad, without a minaret or more flanking any of it’s corners. This is a clear indication of how important this element is in Islamic architecture and may be a good reflection of the symbolic and functional role it played. Studying the origins and different forms of the pre-Ottoman minaret can shed some light on one of the most important aspects of the Islamic architecture in Anatolia and the development of the minaret in the Islamic world.

The form of the Anatolian minaret changed through time and was affected by the various styles preexisted in, or imported to, Anatolia like the Armenian, the Syrian, the Seljuk and the Ilkhanid styles. The form of the Anatolian minaret was also influenced by the different historical periods in the region, with three main pre-Ottoman periods that affected Turkish architecture in Anatolia: the Great Seljuk (Persian) period, the Seljuk Anatolian (Rumi) period and the Beylik period. In the early period, monuments were scattered in the areas close to the southern borders in cities like Harran, Urfa, Siirt, Diarbakir and up to Konya, that later became the capital of the Seljuk Anatolian state and where many of the key monuments of that period were built, beside those in Erzurum and Silvan.

Although the Anatolian Seljuk state was collapsing towards the end of the 13th Century, Seljuk architecture continued without being really affected. It kept almost the same forms and methods of decoration, but now under new flags especially after the proclaiming of independent states, or what is known as the Anatolian Beyliks, scattered all over Anatolia with important key monuments like those located in Birgi, Antalya, Nigde and Sivas.

In this thesis, an analytical catalog of Anatolian key minarets will be provided and for each minaret in this section, the location will be stated, with a discussion of the historical background of the structure and a description of the shape and form of different elements of the minaret and any characteristic features related to it. This will definitely lead to a better understanding of the development of Anatolian pre-Ottoman minarets and how this foreshadowed the later Ottoman examples.
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Pre-Ottoman Minarets in Anatolia
Mohamed Ibrahim M. Radwan
Chapter 1: Minarets: Philology and Function

The Minaret as a Term – A Philological Overview

Minarets are considered to be one of the most distinctive elements of Islamic architecture that ought to be carefully studied, not only because of their shape and decoration, but also because of the symbolism this architectural element might have represented. Minarets are also considered as an important mirror for the evolution and development of Islamic architecture.

The word minaret started to be used in the English language from the seventeenth century, probably derived from the Turkish word minare. This same word was indicated in Arabic through three terms: mi’dhana, sauma’a and manāra. The first of these three terms was derived from the word adhan, the call for prayer, and in many cases is pronounced in colloquial Arabic ma’dhana or mad’na. This term reflects the main function of minarets in Islam as opposed to the other terms, as mi’dhana means the place from which the adhan is called through a mu’adhdhin. It is interesting to know that this term was used in pre-Islamic times for an announcer or herald who used to make important declarations and was usually called the mu’adhdhin.

The second term we have is the sauma’a. This term was used by Arabs to describe the towers where hermits used to stay and have their retreat. Creswell mentions two examples where this term was used to describe that type of tower; “We read that the tower of the Church of St. John the Baptist at Damascus was occupied by a monk, who at first refused to leave when the Khalif al-Walid began to demolish it,

---

2 Bloom, Minaret: Symbol of Islam, 36.
3 Gottheil, "The Origin and History of the Minaret", 133.
4 Lane, Cairo Fifty Years Ago, 78.
5 Hillenbrand, Islamic Architecture, 133.
preparatory to building the Great Mosque, and Ibn Jubayr speaks of a Muslim recluse who occupied the western minaret of the same mosque at the time of his visit. The word used in each case is *sauma‘a*. We can get a sense of the meaning of the term from the previous examples, of being more of a cell where someone decides to shut himself off. The concept is mainly derived from pre-Islamic Byzantine architecture where cells were integrated into tall towers, always rectangular in shape, placed in churches and monasteries.

As time went on, the term *sawma‘a* was frequently used to describe the whole tower, although the cell was only a small part of it, giving a good example of the *pars pro toto* process. The term *sawma‘a*, in our later Islamic context, was used mainly to describe a tall rectangular minaret. A good example was Mu‘awiya’s order to his governor in Egypt, Maslama ibn Mukhallid, to increase the size of the mosque of ‘Amr ibn al-‘As in Fustat and to build *sawami‘* (plural of *sawma‘a*) for *adhan*. Maslama accordingly built small rectangular box-like projections above the roof-line of the mosque. In naming, location and form, these early minarets at Fustat followed the Syrian model as all early Syrian minarets were rectangular in shape. In North Africa and Spain the term *sawma‘a* was invariably employed there to describe minarets, and not the term *manāra*, which was used there for signal towers and lighthouses.

The third term used in Arabic to designate the minaret is the *manār* or *manāra*, and is described by Hillenbrand as the commonest of the three terms. The word

---

7 Creswell, *Early Muslim Architecture*, 1:60.
8 Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture*, 133.
9 Ibid., 133.
12 Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture*, 133.
13 Ibid., 132.
manār means “a place of light” (plural: mana’ir), while the word manāra means originally “a lamp stand” (plural: manārat), and both are derived from the root n-w-r, which means light. The association between the light and this term will be an important point to return to, when discussing the various functions of minarets. The term manāra was used in old Arabic poetry to denote the oil lamp or rush light used by the Christian monks in their cells. It was used also before Islam in the lands of Arabia to describe high places from which signals were made using fire at night and smoke during the day, and this was to continue in the Umayyad period, but without pointing to Islamic religious structures.

It was suggested by many scholars that the usage of the term manāra to describe minarets was due to the light held by the mu’adhdhin while calling for prayers at night, recalling the light-tower impression, an explanation that was thought by Gottheil to be involved and far-fetched. The earliest source using that term for towers attached to a mosque was for those of Prophet’s Mosque at Medina, probably used as boundary markers of the sanctuary, and not for the call to prayer. Thus the term was used to describe minarets before any of the mu’adhdhins had the chance to hold light and call for prayers from there, confirming Gottheil’s objections.

Another important aspect that should be discussed when talking about the term manāra is the symbolic one. The connection between light and the minaret was a base on which a symbolic role was to evolve, with the minaret playing the role of a source

---

14 Bloom, Minaret: Symbol of Islam, 36.
15 Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture, 1:60.
16 Hillenbrand, Islamic Architecture, 132.
17 Bloom, Minaret: Symbol of Islam, 37.
18 Ibid., 39.
19 Gottheil, "The Origin and History of the Minaret", 132.
20 Bloom, Minaret: Symbol of Islam, 41.
Another symbolic interpretation of the minaret is as a sign reflecting advancement and success. This symbolic use of the term *manār* can be seen in an inscription on the Ayyubid minaret of the shrine of al-Husayn that was built “to please God and raise the *manār* of Islam”. This word was used also to express praise of persons as in the expression “may God raise his *manār*” that means “may God acclaim him”. The symbolic usage of the term here came, most probably, after it was fully established as one of the terms to describe high towers with the notion of light. We also have other terms, which are less commonly used, as synonyms for the previous terms. These include the words ‘*alam*/‘alama (meaning signpost, boundary marker, standing stone or flag), *mil* (meaning milestone) and *asās* (meaning a place of watching). It is clear from the variety of terms used to describe the minaret that the philological aspect is important and gives new options for functions that minarets might have been involved in besides the call to prayer.

**Function**

The fame minarets gained must have increased due to the several functions they represented. Trying to understand the role of the minaret throughout its history is a must. This will allow us to analyze some of the critical developments of the various forms of minarets.

Enough has been said about the origins of minarets and how Christian Syria with its tall towers inspired Muslims and gave them a motive to find a way to deliver the *adhan* with pride and formality, especially in comparison with the Christian

---

practice of using clappers\textsuperscript{24} and/or \textit{semantrons}, the Orthodox equivalent of church bells, to summon the monks to prayer.\textsuperscript{25} This background of rivalry affected the way Muslims dealt with church towers and gave this Christian element a symbolic sense that was inherited by minarets. It was considered as a sign of the supremacy of Islam and a visual cue to a Muslim community. The intervention of politics that lead to this symbolic role minarets played was not unusual, and according to Hillenbrand, one of the hallmarks of the Umayyad period was the intrusion of political affairs into the forms of early Islamic architecture, especially those of a religious nature.\textsuperscript{26}

The symbolic role was substantial, yet it was even more the practical importance of the minaret in the Muslim community that gave its fame. What is thought to be one of the main functions of minarets is the call to prayer. According to Hillenbrand, this might be an ostensible function, as it is well known that it can be quite sufficient for the call to prayer to be made from any high roof, and even if made from a high minaret, as the Qub Minar in Delhi, the human voice cannot make itself heard, especially if in a noisy area.\textsuperscript{27} Most probably this function was suggested by, or perhaps to, the Umayyad caliph al-Walid, as a reason to keep or even reuse existing church towers. A debatable example is the minarets of the Great Mosque of Damascus, as we don’t have evidence of the exact date of some of these minarets, and there is nothing confirming that they were the work of any of the early Muslim patrons. According to the geographer Ibn al-Faqih, the minarets in the Damascus mosque were originally Greek watch towers and later belonged to the Church of John.

\textsuperscript{24} Creswell, “The Evolution of the Minaret I”, 137.
\textsuperscript{25} Hillenbrand, \textit{Islamic Architecture}, 130.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 131.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 129.
Ibn al-Faqih also states that when al-Walid turned the area into the mosque, he left these towers in their old condition.\textsuperscript{28}

Since minarets were usually attached to the main congregational mosques in city centers, they could be used for some purposes beside their main symbolic and functional roles. Many minarets, especially in Cairo, had lanterns attached to their tops and by being lit, they were able to announce the time to start fasting during the month of Ramadan. Beside this functional lamp, minarets were also decorated with lamps during religious events in addition to that of Ramadan.\textsuperscript{29} That might explain the use of \textit{manāra}, meaning a place of light, for the minaret, as mentioned earlier.

According to Qalqashandi, the \textit{Manārat al-‘Arus} in the Umayyad mosque at Damascus was used as a link in a chain of towers forming a system of fire signals to warn against any Mongol attack.\textsuperscript{30}

The association of towers with light is a theme with Byzantine and Sasanian origins, as they used to build lighthouses. That practice was borrowed by Muslims, and we have an account by Ibn Serapion of a \textit{manāra} built as a lighthouse to guide ships through the marshes of lower Mesopotamia during the Umayyad period.\textsuperscript{31} Another example of that link can be see in North Africa with a number of towers attached to Islamic fortresses, acting as beacons, which were known there as \textit{manāras}.\textsuperscript{32} We also have the tower attached to Qasr al-Hayr East in Syria that might have been used as a watchtower and/or a minaret.\textsuperscript{33} For all the previous examples of the secular and military usage of towers in the lands of Islam, the minaret was often equated with the lighthouse, and this had clear impact on the religious role of the

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 136.
\textsuperscript{29} Abouseif, \textit{The Minarets of Cairo}, 12.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{31} Bloom, \textit{Minaret: Symbol of Islam}, 37.
\textsuperscript{32} Hillenbrand, \textit{Islamic Architecture}, 132.
\textsuperscript{33} Abouseif, \textit{The Minarets of Cairo}, 12.
minaret as a source of actual light and also instilled the idea of having this religious element as a source of divine light.

The tower as a form was also used as a land marker, and we know that beacon towers and milestones were erected by Abu’l-‘Abbas in 752 along the pilgrimage route to Mecca from Kufa, known as the Darb Zubayda, where two of the ‘Abbasid milestones were found after recent archaeological surveys.\(^{34}\) Milestones were known to be used as ways of stating power, and the earlier Umayyad milestones, built by Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, along the routes leading to Damascus and Jerusalem, were good examples of that.\(^{35}\) The remaining inscriptions on some of these milestones, makes us think that the main function of these towers was to act as signs of the presence and power of the ruler.\(^{36}\)

The use of towers in a religious context was introduced during the reign of al-Walid at the four corners of the mosque of Madina between 707 and 709.\(^{37}\) The symbolic function of these towers as visible markers of the presence of Muslims is clear and their role as indicators of that principal building of the Islamic community is self-evident, but what also seems clear is that these towers were considered as a sign of the authority and supremacy of the Caliph. This background was to affect the role of the minaret and much symbolism was attached to this architectural element.

Due to this growing acceptance of the minaret as a symbol of Islam, sultans and rulers might have thought of using it to announce their authority. Another example that might be initially seen as an act of piety was the construction of a minaret to the northwest of the Tarik-Khana by Abu Harb Bakhtiyar ibn Muhammad

---

\(^{34}\) Bloom, *Minaret: Symbol of Islam*, 44.
\(^{35}\) Sharon, “An Arabic Inscription From the Time of the Caliph 'Abd Al-Malik”, 368.
in his hometown of Damghan (1027).\footnote{Bloom and Blair, \textit{The Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture}, 1:90.} The kufic inscription on the minaret’s shaft reads “In the name of God. The great governor Bakhtiyar ibn Muhammad ordered the construction of this manāra under the sovereignty of the amir, the great lord, Falak al-Maʿali Abu Mansur.” According to Bloom, this might have been meant to honor Bakhtiyar’s nomination and also to acknowledge Ziyarid power more than being a pious act,\footnote{Bloom, \textit{Minaret: Symbol of Islam}, 153.} which is most probably the case. All the previous historical records shed some light on that role of the minaret as a visible symbol of the existence of Islam and Muslims and also its function as a political sign that reflects the power and authority of the ruler.

These towers probably also used to serve a commemorative function on occasion. We have more than one example where towers were built to commemorate the victories of Sultans, as is the case with the minaret of Sultan Masʿud III at Ghazni (1099-1115)\footnote{Pinder-Wilson, "Ghaznavid and Ghurid Minarets", 162.} and the two minarets of Sultan Ghiyath al-Din at Jam (1193-94)\footnote{Ibid., 169.} and Delhi (1198-1215).\footnote{Bloom and Blair, \textit{The Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture}, 1:2.} On almost all the faces of the first minaret, we have a cursive inscription running in a long band surrounding the inlaid and carved brick panels. What remained from these inscriptions were enough to help identify them as the verses of the conquest/victory sura, the 48\textsuperscript{th} sura of the Qur’an that seems likely to be introduced entirely on the minaret.\footnote{Flood, "Between Ghazna and Delhi", 106.} Pinder-Wilson believes that the introduction of that entire sura on the faces of the minaret of Masʿud III is to commemorate the victory of victories of the Sultan over the infidels in Hindustan.\footnote{Pinder-Wilson, "Ghaznavid and Ghurid Minarets", 165.} The spread of Islam is one of the main aims of this religion, and any act that served this aim was
considered religious and pious. This could include military conquests and victories as well as the inauguration of religious foundations. Verse 48:28 confirms the importance of this goal, and states that God sent his Prophet with guidance and the true religion to make it prevail over all religions. The Victory sura was revealed following the Hudaibiya treaty, giving Muslims support and promising them victory. The deep need of this support can be sensed in Prophet Muhammad’s words after this revelation, as he said that this sura is dearer to him than that on which the sun shines.45 This use here of the entire sura on the minaret of Sultan Mas‘ud III, recalling the Prophet’s expected conquest of Mecca and his anticipated victory over the Quraish pagans, together with the unique form of the minaret and its extreme height, are all factors that suggest the likelihood of a commemorative aspect of the minaret.

This suggested usage of minarets made Fergusson apply the term “pillars of victory” or Jaya Stambhas to these monuments,46 recalling the pillars built by medieval Indian rulers to honor their military achievements.47 Many of these highly decorated victory towers are Seljuk and thought to have been free standing or belonging to mosques that have vanished. Many of the Iranian isolated minarets are thought to be once associated with mud brick mosques, such as that at Qasimabad in Iranian Sistan.48 In the case of the Ghazni minarets, an aerial photograph shows that the monuments are standing within huge constructions with ground plans recalling those of mosques, supporting the theory that they were not freestanding ones.49 This theory could lead us to the earlier mentioned symbolic role that these minarets might have played. In the case of the minaret of Sultan Mas‘ud III, beside the suggested

45 Bukhārī, The Translation of the Meanings of Sahīḥ al-Bukhārī, 6:343.
46 Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 2:194.
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commemorative function, this minaret with its decoration might have worked also as a symbol expressing the glory of inaugurating a religious monument, a theory that can as well be supported by the selection of the victory sura to adorn the minaret, as seen in many later Mamluk Cairene monuments.\(^{50}\)

In addition to the previously mentioned functions, we have scattered textual references of some other roles of a different nature that minarets played, some of which were most probably not planned or maybe even welcomed, at least by the rulers. According to the 16\(^{th}\) century historian Ibn Tulun, while talking about Syria during the late Mamluk period, minarets of mosques there were used by protesters to repeat the *takbir*, i.e., “*Allahu akbar*”, as an indication of objection against the existing authorities. This wasn’t the only case, as we have a similar account by al-Jabarti mentioning the usage of the minarets of al-Azhar for the same purpose during the Ottoman period.\(^{51}\)

Minarets were used also for announcements of royal as well as less important notifications. The name of Sultan Mahmud was mentioned from the top of the minarets of Khurasan to announce his authority.\(^{52}\) Again, the minarets of the same region were used by Sultan Mahmud, mentioning the name of the Abbasid Caliph al-Qadir billah, and in return the Caliph appointed the son of Sultan Mahmud as his heir and ordered him “to give full recognition to his right by adding mention of him from the minarets to his own name and putting his title on his coinage.”\(^{53}\) We can tell from these incidents the important role minarets took in supporting these royal statements with enough legitimacy to be followed. Ali Mubarak recorded in the 19\(^{th}\) century another type of announcement, mentioning that *mu’adhdhins* of many of the mosques

\(^{50}\) Montasser, Monumental Quranic Inscriptions, 112.
\(^{52}\) Bloom, *Minaret: Symbol of Islam*, 151.
\(^{53}\) Ibid., 152.
of Cairo, including those of al-Azhar, used to repeat certain prayers from the minarets, to inform people that an important religious man had died.⁵⁴

As the survey above has shown, the functions and roles of minarets are of great diversity, but many are centered around the symbolism that lies behind the minaret as a source of spirituality and authority.

⁵⁴ Abouseif, The Minarets of Cairo, 11.
Chapter 2: Geography and Pre-Ottoman History of Anatolia

Geography of Anatolia

Anatolia is a large almost rectangular peninsula located between Europe and Asia, that now comprises the majority of the Republic of Turkey. It is also known as Asia Minor or the Anatolian Plateau. It is not really known when exactly the peninsula was named Asia Minor, but according to Cramer, the term was not used by any author before Orosius, the great Gallaecian Christian priest, historian and theologian (died after 418). The term Anatolia is of Greek origin and was used by the Turks to denote this part of the Ottoman Empire. For the Arabs and Muslims, this area was known as the lands of the Rûm. Also the Mediterranean Sea was referenced as Bahr al-Rûm or the Roman Sea in pre-Islamic and older Arabic literature. According to the Oxford dictionary of Byzantium, this was because the area was established on territory that was for a long time considered as being Roman.

Anatolia is bounded by the Black Sea to the north, the Mediterranean Sea to the south and the Aegean Sea to the west (figure 2.1). As for the east, its boundaries are considered now to be the modern Turkish borders with the neighboring countries; Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, and Syria. The Black and Aegean Seas are connected to each other by the Sea of Marmara through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits. This long series of connected seas separate Anatolia from the European Continent.

The terrain of Anatolia rises gradually from the lowland coast of the Aegean Sea towards the eastern side and is bordered on the northern side by the Pontus
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Mountains that run close to the southern coast of the Black Sea (figure 2.2). Across southern Turkey, between the coast of the Mediterranean Sea and the plateau, run the Taurus Mountains. So generally speaking, flat, or even smoothly sloping land, is rare and is limited to the narrow coastal strips along the Black, Aegean and Mediterranean Sea coasts as well as some internal high spaces in Anatolia.  

Asia Minor has numerous chains of mountains and from these mountains descend many rivers making the area rich with water resources. These descending rivers form large and fertile valleys before discharging their waters into the surrounding seas. Examples are the Seyhan and Ceyhan rivers running into the Mediterranean Sea irrigating the fertile plain in southern Turkey, the Kızılırmak River in central Turkey flowing into the Black Sea. We also have the Euphrates, the largest river (1263 km long), and the Tigris, both originating in the southeast and flowing into Syria and Iraq.

The climate in Anatolia is of great diversity due to its high altitude and being surrounded by mountains from nearly all directions. The central Anatolian plateau and the eastern areas have a markedly harsh continental climate, with hot dry summers and cold snowy winters. It is milder along the shores and the Aegean region as the mountains play an important role in having more rain especially along the Mediterranean and Black Sea shores, as the mountains there are parallel to the shore. On the other hand, in the Aegean region, the rainfalls reach the internal valleys because the mountains there are perpendicular to the shores, allowing rain clouds to
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reach these areas. The central and eastern parts of Anatolia, being covered by high mountains, receive less rain.⁶²

Many cities were founded in Anatolia from the Euphrates River on the eastern side till the western coastal lines. Among these are the important cities of Konya that was for a long time the capital of the Seljuk Sultanate of the Rum, Aksarai, Kayseri, Sivas, Erzurum and the important ports of Antakya on the Mediterranean Sea and Sinop on the Black Sea. While discussing the historical background of the Seljuks in the region, we’ll get to know the names of many important cities during this period, especially when reading about Kılıç Arslan’s division of the Seljuk Empire among his sons.

A Brief Overview of Anatolian pre-Ottoman History

The origins of the Seljuks are not certain despite several earlier studies. Cahen noted briefly the reasons for this:

Through varying circumstances it so happens that no people outside Europe established or preserved before the modern period a general body of documentation such as is available for European history, either because they had not attained the requisite level of civilization, or because, though civilized, an interest in their own past was foreign to them, or, finally, because the preservation of their documents had suffered either as a result of their social organization or from historical catastrophes.⁶³

⁶² Ergener, About Turkey, 8.
⁶³ Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, xiii.
The *Malik nama* is considered one of the earliest sources on the origins of the Seljuks. An anonymous author wrote it, as per Alp Arslan’s request, towards the middle of the eleventh century, and although this work is now lost, many authors used it extensively and gave us a clear idea of its content.64

**The Great Seljuks of Persia and Their Predecessors**

The Ghaznavid Turko-Islamic state was founded in 977 with its capital at Ghazni. Further to the north the Karakhanids managed to unite the Turkoman tribes in Transoxiana in the 9th century and to their west, the Oguz Turks, from whom the Seljuks descended, were located.65 The Seljukid dynasty, which gave its name to the Empire, derives its name from Seljuk, who most probably was the first of its members recorded to convert to Islam towards the end of the tenth century. Based on the *Malik nama*, Ibn al-Athir stated that Seljuk was the son of Dokak66, and one of the notables of the Khazar Turks.67

Later, Seljuk became the army’s leader after the death of his father but then decided to move with his family and settle in the region of Jand. According to Ibn al-Athir, that was because he came in conflict with his chief, so at Jand he converted to Islam at an old age and lived there with his three sons Mikha’il, Isra’il and Musa until his death.68 Another reason for that move was stated by al-Rawandi, who suggested that this move by Seljuk and his followers was because of the increase of their numbers and the lack of surrounding resources.69

64 Ibid., 19.
Two of the grandsons of Seljuk, Chaghri-Beg and Tughril-Beg, announced the birth of the Seljuk Empire after the decisive battle of Dandanqan (1040) against Sultan Mas'ud of Ghazna. In 1058 Chaghri died, and was replaced by his son Alp Arslan, who continued with his uncle the expansion of the empire. All of these achievements were culminated by the entry of Tughril-Beg into Baghdad, where the Abbasid Caliph gave him the title ‘King of the East and West’\(^70\), and allowed him to marry one of his daughters.\(^71\) At that time Tughril-Beg sent his cousin Kutlumush to Diyarbakır and southern Anatolia to have them added to the Seljuk Empire. Kutlumush managed to accomplish his mission and reach as far as Konya and Aksarai.\(^72\) But Kutulmush was killed after he failed to acknowledge the accession of Alp Arslan after the sudden death of Tughril-Beg in 1063.\(^73\)

At that time, the Byzantines tried to negotiate with Tughril-Beg and later with Alp Arslan to try to stop the endless raids on the Byzantine territories in Asia Minor. It was not a very successful policy, however, and Romanus Diogenes, the new Byzantine emperor, decided to take action using his armed forces.\(^74\) The two armies met in August 1071, near the frontier-fortress of Manzikert and by the end of that encounter the Byzantine emperor was a prisoner of the Seljuks.\(^75\) As a result of that battle, the Turcoman territories were able to enter Anatolia with great freedom and started settling in the area in the form of Beyliks that were employed, after receiving military and financial aid from the Seljuks, to ensure safety against the Byzantines.

\(^{73}\) Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 26.
\(^{74}\) Ibid., 28.
\(^{75}\) al-Isfahānī, *Tarīkh Dawlat Al Suljuq*, 37-42.
The Turcomans coalesced into Beyliks such as the Artuqids in Mardin\textsuperscript{76} and the Danışmandids in Sivas.\textsuperscript{77}

**The Seljuks of Rum** (figure 2.3)

In 1072 Alp Arslan was killed and was succeeded by his son Malik-Shah. It has been said that the sons of Kutlumush, who were captured by Alp Arslan after he had killed their father, managed to escape from surveillance at the time of Alp Arslan’s death, and ran off to Anatolia where they settled among the Turcomans.\textsuperscript{78} Sulayman, one of Kutlumush’s sons, began to strengthen his position, taking advantage of the internal quarrels among the Byzantines, and managed to take over the important Roman and Byzantine city of Iznik (Nicaea) and announced it as his capital in 1077.\textsuperscript{79} From that point he started gradually taking over surrounding areas and very soon he was able to establish at least partial domination over the borders from the Bosphorus to northern Syria.\textsuperscript{80} After reaching for an agreement with Alexis Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, Sulayman decided to move to the south, leaving his subordinate Abu’l-Qasim in the capital, and took over Antakya in 1084.\textsuperscript{81} In 1086 Sulayman, while trying to capture Aleppo, was killed in a battle against the army of Tutush, Malik-Shah’s brother and the ruler of Damascus\textsuperscript{82}, and Sulayman’s sons where captured.

Abu’l-Qasim, Sulayman’s successor couldn’t keep the Turks of Anatolia under his rule, as his character wasn’t as strong as that of Sulayman and also because
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he wasn’t a member of the Seljuk family. That was a strong reason for the establishment of more Beyliks all over Anatolia like those created by Emir Saltuk in Erzurum and by Chaka Bey in Izmir.\(^{83}\) Abu’l-Qasim tried as much as possible to work on expanding his lands to face both Alexis, the Byzantine emperor, and Malik-Shah. But then Abu’l-Qasim decided to ask Alexis for an alliance, and the later thought that this was the best way to prevent Malik-Shah from capturing Anatolia, and so agreed to come to terms with Abu’l-Qasim for a while.\(^{84}\) In 1092, Malik-Shah sent his commander Buzan with an army and managed to occupy enough of Abu’l-Qasim’s terrain to force him to seek the Sultan’s forgiveness. Later Buzan strangled him, but the death of Malik-Shah saved the rest of Abu’l-Qasim’s territories that were later to be taken over by Abu’l-Qasim’s brother Hassan Buldaji (1092-3).\(^{85}\)

Taking advantage of the interruptions that followed the death of Malik-Shah, Sulayman’s sons succeeded in escaping from their prison and fled to Nicaea where they were acknowledged by most of the Turks in the area and where his older son Kılıç Arslan I became the new Sultan in 1094.\(^{86}\) According to Cahen, “The disintegration of the Seljukid Empire which followed Malik-Shah’s death put a stop to any attempt to intervene in Asia Minor. The Turks who were there were thus able to carry on their activities quite independently of their cousins in the East.”\(^{87}\) The following years were all in the form of an endless struggle between the Turks under the leadership of Kılıç Arslan I, and later his son Malik-Shah on one side and the Byzantines under the leadership of Alexis on the other. Also these years recorded the first appearance of the Crusaders who took advantage of the struggle that arose
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between Kılıç Arslan I and his forces against that of the Danışmendids and as a result, many Seljuk territories were lost, forcing Kılıç Arslan I to retreat eastwards. He died few years later.  

After a fight between Kılıç Arslan’s sons, Mas‘ud I managed to take over the rule of the Seljuks with the aid of the Danışmendids and later that of the Byzantines with their new emperor John Comnenus. Mas‘ud I started then to strengthen his empire especially after the death of the Danışmendid Gümüştegin in 1134 as he was able to take lots of their lands. He also combated the second Crusade in 1147. After the death of Mas‘ud I in April 1155, his son Kılıç Arslan II managed, towards the end of his reign, to have almost all of Asia Minor under his control (figure 2.4). But one big mistake that Kılıç Arslan II made in 1186 was his decision to divide his colonies among his sons. According to Cahen, the Empire was divided as follows: “Tokat (to Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah), Niksar (to Nasir al-Din Baryarukshah), Albistan (to Mughith al-Din Tughrilshah), Kayseri (to Nur al-Din Mahmud Sultanshah), Sivas and Akseray (to Qutb al-Din-Malik-shah), Malatya (to Mu‘izz al-Din Qaysarshah), Nigde (to Arslanshah), Ankara (to Muhyi al-Din Mas‘udshah), Uluborlu/Sozoplis (to Ghiyath al-Din Khusraw), and lastly Heraclea in the Taurus and Amasya, given respectively to Sanjarshah and Nizam al-Din Arghunshah, Kılıç Arslan’s brother and nephew.”

That was a perfect environment for jealousy to spring up among the brothers. Their fight ended up with a battle between Rukn al-Din Sulaymanshah (Sulayman II) and Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw leading to Sulayman II as the new Sultan of the
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Seljuks in 1197 after capturing Konya. During his reign, Sulayman II got back Niksar, Amasya, Malatya, Erzurum and finally Ankara in 1204, a few days before his death. Kaykhusraw was then able to recover the Sultanate that he lost seven years previously.

Kaykhusraw sent his eldest son, ‘Izz al-Din Kaykaus, to rule Malatya, another, ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad, to Tokat, and a third, Kay-Faridun Ibrahim to Antalya among other sub-rulers, all under his supervision in the capital Konya. According to Cahen, “On becoming Sultan, Kaykhusraw tried in vain to gain access to the coast.” The most important move on that level was his decision to attack Antakya, which he captured in 1207. Four years later Kaykhusraw was killed right after his victory in the battle of Antioch, the last battle against the Byzantines, in obscure circumstances, and was succeeded by his eldest son ‘Izz al-Din Kaykaus.

During Kaykaus’ reign, the Sultanate made significant political and economic developments. His capture of the harbor of Sinop on the Black Sea (1214) gave the Seljuks full control over vital trade routes, resulting in a flourishing economy. Kaykaus died in 1220 while preparing for one of his campaigns and was succeeded by his brother ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad, who made sure that the Sultanate was to remain strong and stable. With the resulting income from international trade the Anatolian Seljuks, towards the end of the reign of Kayqubad, “were able to increase further the social and economic affluence of the region, which had in any case by now reached a
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certain level of prosperity.” Without much hesitation, it can be said that the reigns of Kaykaus and his successor Kayqabad represent the peak of power and affluence of the Sultanate.

Soon, however, the Mongols appeared on the stage, as the Great Khan Ogodai sent to Kayqabad an embassy demanding annual tribute. Before Kayqabad was able to send his reply, he died and was succeeded by his eldest son Kaykhusraw II in 1237. The six years of the reign of Kaykhusraw II were mainly marked by the revolt of the Turcomans led by a popular Turcoman preacher. This started in 1240 and lasted for two or three years, definitely weakening the Sultanate and permitting the Mongols to enter Anatolia with great ease, ending up with their decisive victory at the battle of Köse Dağ in 1243.

The Mongol Period

The Seljuks accepted defeat and were forced to claim adherence to the Mongols after the battle of Köse Dağ and became their vassals. The Sultan escaped to Antalya and from there managed to have the Mongols agree to evacuate the captured Seljuk territory in return for a heavy annual tribute of 400,000 dinars. The Mongols established Kaykhusraw II as their representative in Rum, but shortly afterwards he died in the winter of 1246, leaving what remained of his Sultanate to be divided among his three sons. To ensure the unity of the Seljukid state, the idea of an undivided regime was introduced, and the three bothers accepted that suggestion after
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a short period of uncertainty.\textsuperscript{106} This joint rule worked fine for a while but after 1254 new confrontations arose between the brothers and the eldest of them, ‘Izz al-Din Kaykaus II took over for a very short period when Möngke, the newly elected Great Han, suddenly moved once more into Anatolia after sending his brother Hülegü there, initiating a new chapter of Mongol rule.\textsuperscript{107}

Taking advantage of the death of Möngke in 1259, Hülegü established the Ilkhanid Empire with Anatolia being part of its territories.\textsuperscript{108} The Seljuk brothers, despite their rivalry, managed to keep their power in the area by maintaining good relations with the Ilkhanids. After the first defeat of the Mongols in 1260 at ‘Ayn-Jalut in Syria by the Mamluks of Egypt, ‘Izz al-Din started to get in touch with Sultan Baybars. The Ilkhans in Iran sent a new army to Konya and ‘Izz al-Din fled to Constantinople, giving the chance to his second brother Rukn al-Din Kılıç Arslan IV to enter Konya as the new Sultan on 1261 under the direct control of the Ilkhanids and with the appointment of Mu’in al-Din Sulayman as vizier, the real head of the government. This was to mark the end of the Seljuk Sultanate as an independent one.\textsuperscript{109}

The young Kılıç Arslan IV was an inactive puppet, with all the power in the hands of his vizier Mu’in al-Din (also known as the Pervane), who tried as much as possible to stay on good terms with the Ilkhanids and their new Khan Abaqa, who took over after the death of Hülegü in 1265, giving the Sultanate a period of respite.\textsuperscript{110} In 1266, after sensing that Kılıç Arslan IV, who had reached manhood, was plotting against him, the Pervane executed him and established in his place his young son
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Kaykhusraw III. According to Kuran, it was also during that period that the Seljuks started looking for ways to save Anatolia from the Ilkhanids’ burden.

The Seljuks were able to conclude an alliance with Mameluke sultan Baybars, and in 1277 the Seljuks and Mameluks together defeated the Ilkhanids at Elbistan. The victory, however, was short-lived. Sensing a strong retaliation, Baybars pulled back his troops from Anatolia. Left alone, Seljuk forces were easily overpowered by the Ilkhanids, who openly dominated the Seljuk state from 1279 onwards.

Determined to reaffirm his power in Anatolia, Abaqa executed the Pervane after accusing him of being responsible for Baybars's venture into Anatolia.

Before leaving back to Tabriz, Abaqa appointed his brother Kongurtay to overall command with the assignment to restore order in Anatolia and to ensure greater amalgamation of it into the Ilkhanid Empire. In 1281 the Ilkhanids replaced Keykhusraw III with Mas'ud II, the eldest of Kaykaus II’s sons. He was a vassal of the Ilkhanids and during the sixteen years of his reign he exercised no real authority. In 1297, Mas'ud II was forced to abdicate in favor of his nephew ‘Ala’ al-Din III. moved the capital from Konya to Sivas and ruled from there until his death in 1302, allowing Mas’ud II to return back to the throne. He ruled from Kayseri and died there in 1307. Mas’ud II was the last of the Seljuks and the Ilkhanids didn’t install a new Sultan, as what was remaining of the Sultanate of the Rum became a province of the Ilkhanid Empire.
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**The Beyliks of the Late Period** (after the Battle of Köse Dağ)

As a result of the gradual weakening of the central Seljuk state after the Mongol invasions and the power that the Ilkhanid commanders gained in the region, the leaders (beys) of different clans in Anatolia were encouraged to proclaim independence. During the first quarter of the fourteenth century the Sultanate disintegrated into smaller principalities or emirates known as Beyliks. These Beyliks can be divided according to their locations into two main types. The first type is the coastal Beyliks and the second type is that of hinterland Beyliks.

Among the first type was the Beylik of Karasi, which borders the Marmara, the Dardanelles and the Aegean. It was centered in Balıkesir after being established by the Oghuz Turks towards the end of the thirteenth century. This Beylik was the first to be taken over by the Osman Beylik, which was later to found the Ottoman Empire. Another Beylik belonging to the same group is that of Saruhan, centered on Lydia with its capital at Manisa, which was established in the early fourteenth century and lasted until 1410, before falling to the Ottomans. One of the most influential coastal Beyliks is that of Aydn. This Beylik was established around 1308 and took Birgi as its central city, although Izmir was part of the principality. The Aydn dynasty was to achieve true prominence as an economic center with trade engagements with the nearby Byzantine Empire. Next to the Aydn Beylik, and also depending mainly on trade, were the Beylik of Menteşe centered in Milas and the Beylik of Teke centered in Antalya (figure 2.5).

The hinterland Beyliks, unlike their neighboring coastal principalities, had more of a Seljuk and Mongol imprint if compared to the Byzantine inheritance of the
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first type. The oldest and the most powerful Turcoman Beylik was that of the Karamanids which appeared in 1276-7.\textsuperscript{120} According to Lindner, the Karamanids appeared first in the area around Ermenek, but it was not until 1327 when they managed to have full control over Konya. Towards the end of the fourteenth century, the dynasty controlled most of the Lycaonian plain and the areas beyond Ermenek to the coast at the south.\textsuperscript{121} Another important Beylik in Anatolia was that of Germiyanids, named after the people and not the ruling dynasty. This Beylik was the main opposing power to the Karamanids with their center in Kutahya.\textsuperscript{122} The Germiyanids depended mainly on the manufacture and marketing of high-quality weaving and horse trading in addition to trade in raw materials such as alum and silver. They became dependent upon the Ottomans for support against the Karamanids, especially after loosing access to seaports in the second half of the fourteenth century, before being fully incorporated in the Ottoman Empire in 1429.\textsuperscript{123}

The last of the three main large internal Beyliks is that of the Hamidids. The center base of this Beylik was Pisidia. The region that was under their control included a major trade route from the Mediterranean up country to the meadows and lakes.\textsuperscript{124} According to several inscriptions, they flourished towards the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth. They are credited with control of Antalya, Egridir and Uluborlu/Burghlu. This territory was to be divided between three members of the Hamidid family.\textsuperscript{125} The Ottoman Emirate goes beyond the bounds of this work, but we can’t ignore mentioning it as the most important Anatolian Beylik that managed to achieve ultimate triumph and succeeded in the

\textsuperscript{120} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 303.
\textsuperscript{121} Lindner, “Anatolia, 1300-1451”, 114.
\textsuperscript{122} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 306.
\textsuperscript{123} Lindner, “Anatolia, 1300-1451”, 113.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 114.
\textsuperscript{125} Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, 306.
gradual unification of Anatolia over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. They were initially centered in Söğüt and according to early Ottoman chronicles; they started acting independently of the Seljuks around 1299.126 This Beylik was later to swallow all other Beyliks creating the great Ottoman Empire after the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed II in 1453.

These were the two main types of Beyliks with the most influential emirates mentioned above, but of course the Ilkhanids were still holding almost all of the eastern regions besides smaller Beyliks scattered around like the Eretna Emirate in Cappadocia and Sivas and the Dulkadir Emirate in the buffer zone between south-east and central Anatolia. There was also the Cander Emirate that extended from central Anatolia northwards to the Black Sea coasts127, the Eshref Emirate in Beyşehir and Akşehir, the Kastamonu Emirate in Jandarids and Sinop and other smaller Beyliks.128

This great complexity of political conditions resulted in wide-ranging disorder with continued conflicts between different Beyliks. These political upheavals had a great influence on architectural development, as we shall see.

126 Lindner, “Anatolia, 1300-1451”, 118.
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Chapter 3: Minarets in Anatolia

Pre-Ottoman Influences on Islamic Anatolian Architecture

Introduction

Turkish art and architecture has an extraordinary history, with a character that has been formed by the integration of different elements from distinct areas and cultures. A good understanding of these elements and their influential role is required when studying the development of architecture in Anatolia. Tracing these elements also requires turning our sight outside the boundaries of Turkey. The peculiar past of Turkish peoples shows how deeply they were affected by events surrounding them. Although Turkish culture was tribal in origin in many cases mutual influences were detected between Turkish art and that of other surrounding regions.

Turkish art went through two main phases of development forming an exceptional mix of different elements; the first phase is pre-Islamic one with contribution of Turkic nomads and settled Turkmen groups to the Central Asian cultures. The second phase of Turkish art is that during the Islamic period where many elements were integrated from Central Asian culture after interaction with the Qarakhanids and the Ghaznavids and later with the monumental architectural forms of the Iranian Seljuk Empire, before transporting this combination to the west.

The Turks absorbed and developed a number of architectural trends and with the conquest of Anatolia by Turkic peoples after the rise of the Great Seljuk Empire, they integrated these eastern forms with local influences from Anatolia itself. “For this reason, Anatolian-Seljuk architecture should be viewed not as an extension of the
Great-Seljuk architecture in Iran but as a new synthesis of Turko-Islamic civilization.”

The minaret was also part of this interactive process and the Anatolian pre-Ottoman minaret was much affected by pre-Islamic and later eastern Islamic influences. This suggests that an overview of these different forms of minarets in the surrounding regions will help us better understand Anatolian pre-Ottoman minarets and their later effect on the development of Ottoman forms.

Early Armenian Churches

Before the first appearance of the Turks in Anatolia, the area was divided between two Armenian sovereignties that occupied the eastern side. The Armenians were migrants who settled in the former Urartian kingdom that was considered the nucleus of the area surrounding Lake Van. Almost all of the cities founded by the Armenians were originally Greek and Roman foundations. At the end of the 5th century or early 6th century a new era in the history of Armenian architecture began, marked by the erection of the Church of Avan, with five domes. During the 7th century, many great monuments were built, like the beautiful church of St. Hripsimé (618) (plate 3.1), located in the city of Vagharshapat (Etchmiadzin), in the Armenian Armavir Province and the superb church of Zvartnots (640-1) (figure 3.1) located at the edge of the same city. In general we can say that this period, starting from the sixth century, is the classical period of Armenian architecture.
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This period lasted until the eleventh century and in some rare examples until the first third of the thirteenth century, as the Byzantines gradually annexed these small Armenian kingdoms, following the Turks' first appearance in Anatolia in the 1010s. Many Armenian churches were scattered in eastern Turkey, both within and outside cities. The Armenians' use of stone both structurally and for decoration had a clear impact on later Seljuk Architecture. A good example is the well-known tenth century church of Aghtamar (plate 3.2).

Anatolian Seljuk architecture, following the battle of Manzikert (1071), was influenced to some extent by Armenian architecture in the region. Some of the Seljuk monuments built during the late eleventh to thirteenth centuries were designed and erected by Christian and Muslim Armenians. This can be seen in Seljuk caravanserais, which according to Curatola, were very much influenced by former Armenian examples. Another important characteristic that is to be very much related to Armenian architecture is the form of funerary monuments. We have at least two suggestions explaining the origin of that form. One suggestion relates them to Central Asian nomadic tents and the other to the lantern of earlier and contemporary Armenian churches. A good example of this Armenian influence is illustrated in the tomb of the Emir Saltuk in Erzurum (12th Century), with a classical design of a

---
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conical roof resting on a high cylindrical drum holding eight triangular niches, corresponding to the corners of the octagonal body of the tomb (plate 3.3).\textsuperscript{143}

Another important Armenian influence that can be detected when studying Seljuk architecture is the usage of conically shaped roofs found mainly on top of Anatolian Seljuk mausolea that were also used frequently on top of minarets epically during the Ottoman era. According to Rice, “Strzygowski and his followers maintain that the form was invented in Armenia, for it first appeared there in the 8\textsuperscript{th} century and may well have existed as early as the 6\textsuperscript{th}.\textsuperscript{144} But Rice also suggested that this shape might be of Central Asian origins and she linked it to early tent-shaped clay ossuaries of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century located in Samarkand and that continued to be used there until the Islamic invasion.\textsuperscript{145}

The Central Asian shape might be the original source of later Christian church towers of Armenia as well as the Seljuk mausoleums and cylindrical tomb towers of Iran.\textsuperscript{146} A good example of this shape in Anatolian Seljuk architecture is the citadel masjid of Erzurum (late 12\textsuperscript{th} century)\textsuperscript{147} (plate 4.9), especially since the city, located on one important caravan route heading east, was geographically positioned close to the Armenian region, and this allowed for influences from there to affect Erzurum’s architectural forms.\textsuperscript{148} In that masjid we have a conical cap topping a drum like those of Armenian churches in the region.
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Syrian Minarets

The idea of having minarets attached to mosques started in Syria under the Umayyad dynasty and was initially inspired by Syrian church towers. During this period, the shafts of Syrian minarets were square.\textsuperscript{149} According to Creswell, this square shape is normal, for the typical Byzantine pre-Islamic Syrian church tower was also square.\textsuperscript{150} We still have some well-preserved examples representing this form like the towers attached to the Umm al-Surab Church (figure 3.2) and the Umm il-Ḳuṭṭên Monastery (figure 3.3), both in southern Syria.\textsuperscript{151} In addition to the square form, most of these towers had large openings separated by colonnades at the topmost storey. These spaces were used to place a nakus or some kind of instrument to produce sounds announcing the time of prayer. A good example of this feature is the Sameh Monastery of Saint George (figure 3.4), also in southern Syria.\textsuperscript{152} These towers were most probably the prototypes for later Syrian minarets.

Almost all early Umayyad minarets have been altered, destroyed or rebuilt, but we still have some photographs that can shed some light on the form of minarets during that early period. One good example of that period was the beautiful square minaret of the Great Mosque in Aleppo (plate 3.4), destroyed in April 2013.\textsuperscript{153} Its square form probably followed an earlier structure that was replaced by one completed in 1094 during the reign of Tutush, the first of the Seljuk sultans of Syria.\textsuperscript{154}
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Other Syrian examples following this square form are the minaret of the Mosque of al-Khidr in Borsa (1134)\textsuperscript{155} (figure 3.5 and plate 3.5), the minaret of the Great Mosque of Ma’arrat an-Nu’man (11\textsuperscript{th} century)\textsuperscript{156} (plate 3.6) and the northern minaret of the Great Mosque of Damascus (831)\textsuperscript{157} (plate 3.7). This square form had a clear influence on later examples in the northern part of Mesopotamia. This can be seen in the minaret of the Great Mosque of Harran (744-50) (plate 4.2) that took after its prototype in the Great Mosque of Damascus, the square form as well as the placement in the center of the north side.\textsuperscript{158} This influence can be seen also in the square minaret of the Great Mosque of Diyarbakır (1115) (plate 4.6) and that of the Sheik Matar Mosque (1500) (plate 4.98) in the same city.

We have also the use of intricate moldings that characterized the decoration of Syrian towers, like that at Ma’arrat al-Nu’man.\textsuperscript{159} This technique was to move to Anatolia and we have more than one example where elaborate moldings are placed on the shafts of many Anatolian minarets, e.g. the minaret of the Great Mosque of Mardin (1176) (plate 4.19) and the Ayyubid Minaret in Silvan (1212) (plate 4.32). Beside these decorative moldings, the carved stone Kufic inscriptions on the tower of the Great Mosque of Aleppo (1094)\textsuperscript{160} had strong relations to contemporary structures in Armenia and Georgia.\textsuperscript{161}
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The influence of Syrian architecture on later constructions in Anatolia is considerable. It is clear that forms and methods of decoration of some Syrian towers had a strong impact on the later architectural forms in the Anatolian region.

**Iranian Seljuk Minarets**

When talking about Seljuk Iran, we’re discussing the cylindrical minarets adopted there starting from the 10th century. For that form we have long cylindrical shafts usually broken by balconies supported on *muqarnas*. Important examples are in the towns of Damghan and Sangbast.

Numerous possible sources for this cylindrical form can be found in areas to the north and east of Iran including China, India and Central Asia. According to Hillenbrand, the multi-storeyed eight- or twelve-sided pagodas that were built from the 5th century onwards and the Buddhist towers built in Central Asia might have introduced this form in Iran. Also the pillars built in the 3rd century B.C. throughout the northern Indian subcontinent must be considered as another possible source for this cylindrical form. One other source that possibly inspired this cylindrical form is Turkish Central Asia, where high towers marked the corners of temples or shrines.\(^{162}\)

A good example of an Iranian Seljuk minaret is that of the *masjid-i-jami*’ in the town of Damghan (1058-1106)\(^{163}\) (plate 3.8). It is cylindrical, strongly tapered and ornamented with inscriptions and brickwork. These features can be found in many other Seljuk examples.

---

\(^{162}\) Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture*, 147.

Brick decoration is thought to be "the hallmark of the medieval Iranian minaret".\textsuperscript{164} The decoration is usually either geometric designs, such as lozenges and interlaced octagons, or inscriptions.\textsuperscript{165} The three main elements were carved terracotta ornament, basket bonds and shadows given by outset bricks.\textsuperscript{166} Examples are the undated minaret at Sangbast\textsuperscript{167} (plate 3.9), the Minar-i Chihil Dukhtaran at Isfahan (1107-8)\textsuperscript{168} (plate 3.10) and the \textit{masjid-i jami'} minaret at Damghan (1058-1106) (plate 3.8). In addition to these designs, a new type appeared where bricks were placed diagonally beside the other flat-laid ones. This can be seen in the window of the minaret at Sangbast, in the designs on the Tarik-khana minaret at Damghan (1027)\textsuperscript{169} (plate 3.11) and later in the more sophisticated motifs placed on the shafts of the minarets at Simnan (1031-35)\textsuperscript{170} (plate 3.12) and Sava (1110-11)\textsuperscript{171} (plate 3.13). Also \textit{muqarnas} was used extensively in the form of tiers supporting some kind of balcony like the case with the Vabkent minaret (1197),\textsuperscript{172} where we have tiers of \textit{muqarnas} supporting the upper part (plate 3.14).

Seljuk minarets usually stood at or near the north corner of mosques. This can be seen in many examples e.g. at Damghan and Kirman.\textsuperscript{173} Paired minarets were probably introduced during the Seljuk period. This feature was used to give additional significance to the entrance portals of buildings. Later paired minarets flanked the
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entrance of qibla iwans. In that, they played the role of indicators of direction as well as signs of importance.\textsuperscript{174}

Later Anatolian Muslim architecture was to develop following the main features of the medieval Iranian architectural model. This can be clearly seen in the form, methods of decoration and even in the usage of paired minarets flanking portals. Getting to know the main features of the Seljuk minaret is then an essential step towards understanding the origins, different forms and techniques of decoration of Anatolian minarets.

\textbf{Ilkhanid Minarets}

In general fourteenth century Ilkhanid minarets became larger in scale with attenuated proportions compared to earlier Seljuk examples. Their shafts were not more than about two-thirds as high as the earlier shafts with a slight taper. The usual theme for ornamenting these minarets was by glazed bricks in two tones of blue alongside the unglazed brick background. These decorations started just above the base with a wide band followed by one continuous surface.\textsuperscript{175}

Twin minarets were more common in this period and were mainly used as framing devices, either at the ends of the façade or flanking an iwan.\textsuperscript{176} This device can be seen in many examples of the period like those founded in the Friday Mosque at Ashtarjan (1315-16)\textsuperscript{177} (plate 3.15) and the Nizamiyya Mosque at Abarquh (1325)\textsuperscript{178} (plate 3.16). Double minarets, in the Ilkhanid model, became better integrated with
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the portal, in that the minarets’ lower parts were smoothly joined to the portal, with no separate emphasis, having only the upper shafts of the minarets rising from the portal or iwan roof.\textsuperscript{179}

In later examples the Ilkhanid minarets started to have their lower elevation more highlighted with the usage of glazed tilework to ornament it. A good example illustrating this new feature is the Minar-i Bagh-i Qush Khana at Isfahan (1330-50)\textsuperscript{180} (plate 3.17) where we have the remaining fragments below the minaret decorated with large square Kufic inscriptions in blue glazed brick against an uncolored fired background. Another important example with same technique is the minaret of the Khwaja ‘Alam (plate 3.18), built probably in the late 14\textsuperscript{th} century, which unfortunately collapsed in 1934, where we have again Kufic epigraphy covered with strapwork in high relief. This same minaret was also ornamented with an unusual decorative technique. Its \textit{muqarnas} cornice, which was usually placed below the topmost tier of earlier Sejuk minarets, was placed here above the plinth at the base of the lower shaft.\textsuperscript{181}

Another important feature that became standard under the Ilkhanids is arched windows in the upper storey; a feature that can be seen in the Minar-i Bagh-i Qush Khana at Isfahan. This feature suggests that minarets at that time might have been used for sending signals as well. So the general form of minarets under the Ilkhanids was kept unchanged, but by time, and with having more emphasis on the lower section of minarets, the sense of having a three-tiered form was to become more obvious.
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After the battle of Köse Dağ in 1243, the Ilkhanids entered Anatolia forcing the Seljuks of Rum to pay a tribute and announcing a new era where Anatolia, or at least the eastern part, to become closely linked to Iran even after the fall of the Ilkhanids. A good example of strong Ilkhanid architectural influence in Anatolia is the Çifte Minareli Madrasa at Sivas (plate 4.79), where many of the features that we have discussed above are to be found. This example among others shows us how important it is to get to understand the Ilkhanid background to better comprehend all factors affecting the Anatolian minaret.

**Different forms of minarets in Anatolia**

**Introduction**

The form of the Anatolian minaret varied depending on two main factors; the model or source of inspiration it followed and the period during which the minaret was built in. Pre-Ottoman Turkey went through three main periods that shaped and clearly affected the form of the Anatolian minaret; the Great Seljuk (Persian) period, the Seljuk Anatolian (Rumi) period and the Beylik period.¹⁸² After the battle of Manzikert in 1071, it took the Seljuks some time before starting to get involved in any major building activities. As a result of this delay, the general development of Anatolian Muslim architecture only came after the main features of Iranian and Syrian medieval architectural forms had been established. This led to a clear influence of these two styles on the newly developing Anatolian architectural style, especially in the early stages.

1040-1194 CE. Great Seljuk Period:183

At the early stage, Anatolia was divided among four main states; in southeast Anatolia we had the Artukids (1101-1402). We also had the Danışmandids (1097-1178), Saltukids (1071-1202) and the Mengüjukids (1118-1252) as small vassal territories.184 These states were used by the Great Seljuks to ensure safety against Byzantines. That might be a good reason for the clear influence of the Persian Seljuks on the developing architectural model in Anatolia.

Persian influence can be mainly seen in the form of the shafts. Surviving examples from that period are the minarets of the Great Mosques at Mardin (plate 4.19) and Erzurum (plate 4.24). The former was built in 1176 by the Artukids,185 according to inscriptions at its base, and has a cylindrical shaft following Persian precedents. The later example at Erzurum is originally a structure that most probably was rebuilt in 1179 by the Saltukids186, and followed this same cylindrical form.

Other early Anatolian minarets adopting this form include the minaret of the Great Mosque of Siirt (plate 3.19), bearing a restoration date of 1129187, and the minaret of the Great Mosque of Harput (early 12th century)188 (plate 4.15).

Persian influence wasn’t the only one to affect the form of the Anatolian minaret, as we have also Syrian influence with the square shaft that can be clearly seen on many Anatolian examples especially those located in the south, close to Syria itself. An important example of this is the minaret of the Great Mosque of Diyarbakır (1115), clearly inspired by the larger Umayyad model at Damascus. The influence of
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the Syrian prototype and how important it is in the region is also illustrated by the
Great Mosque at Harran (744-50) (plate 4.2) and the Halilürrahman Mosque at Urfa
(1211) (plate 4.30), which both have square minarets.

A third form that is not unusual during that early period is the polygonal
shape. In that, the Syrian influence still exists, as we have more than one example
there with this polygonal shaft. A good example is the octagonal minaret of the
Sultaniyya Madrasa at Aleppo (1223)\(^\text{189}\) (plate 3.20). In Anatolia, an important
minaret that follows this form is the one that belongs to the Great Mosque of Urfa
(plate 4.12), the exact date of which is unknown.\(^\text{190}\)

Although stone was the main building material, brick was extensively used in
erecting minarets. This led to flimsy structures that in many cases didn’t survive
except for the lower parts. But on the other hand, the use of bricks as a building
material allowed for the art of bricklaying to appear and develop in Anatolia
following its model in Persia. A good example marked by its brick patterns is the
leaning brick minaret of the Great Mosque of Harput (1156-1157). We will discuss
the development of decorative methods later in this chapter.

At that early stage, the usage of a plinth or base for the minaret with a
different shape than that of the minaret wasn’t that common. Although we have
exceptions like the cylindrical minarets at Siirt and Mardin on square bases, in these
examples the lack of advanced methods of transitional zones is clear. The usual theme
was to have the minaret either with a shaft following the same shape of its base like
the case with the square minaret of the Great Mosque of Harran and the octagonal
minaret of the Great Mosque of Urfa, or having the corners of the square base

\(^{190}\) Sözen, *Evolution of Turkish Art and Architecture*, 44.
gradually rounded as the case with the minaret of the Mardin Great Mosque and that of the Great Mosque of Harput.

To sum up, in the first period, known as that of the Great Seljuks, the minarets of the main Turcoman states followed Persian and Syrian precedents, with cylindrical, polygonal or square brick shafts in contrast with the stone façades below.

**1071-1308 CE. Seljuk Anatolian Period:**

During this second period, and due to the richness of the cultural, social and ethnic assortment, building activity began to spread all over Anatolia, after the decisive battles against the Byzantines, especially in Konya, Erzurum and Sivas. Sensing the danger of the movements of the Mongols, the Anatolian Seljuks focused more on reinforcing their state militarily, politically and economically leading to a golden age of Anatolian Seljuks especially during the reign of Kayqubad I as mentioned earlier. This had a clear reflection on the architectural program in the area and starting from the thirteenth century, the Seljuks of Anatolia embarked on a truly impressive program of building.

This important period took over forms of minarets of the earlier period and began a gradual development. Minarets first started to get thicker and plinths were to be used more frequently. A good example of that phase is the late minaret of the Danışmandid Great Mosque of Sivas (13th century) (plate 4.41), where we slightly have a tapering brick shaft standing on an octagonal plinth topped with one balcony, a number to increase in later stages. Another important feature of this minaret is the use of glazed tiles, a clear influence from earlier Persian models.

---
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The example at Sivas, with others at Erzurum and Konya, are good representatives of the newly developing predominant Seljuk style of architecture in Anatolia. During this phase, minarets started dominating monuments, especially masjids, with their extreme height and twin balconies. In most cases, the upper parts of thirteenth-century masjid minarets have collapsed, but old photographs of some of these minarets showed their great height compared to the domed prayer rooms they belonged to.\(^\text{193}\) So here the minaret was given more importance compared to the prayer area. This arrangement was to extend to madrasas as well and became one of the characteristic features of Anatolian Seljuk architecture.

The domination by minarets extended even to the naming of monuments, as we have more than one example where the monument was named after its minarets, like the case with the Çifte Minareli madrasas in Erzurum (1242-77) (plate 4.58) and Sivas (1271) (plate 4.79). In these examples the visual prominence given to the minarets make them different than their earlier precedents in Iran. In early Ilkhanid examples, as mentioned above, minarets were smoothly joined to portals and iwans, but in Anatolia we started to have the lower structures, or what can be considered the bases of the minarets, projecting from the monuments proper. In the Çifte Minareli Madrasa in Erzurum, each of the two minarets is standing on a square pier, with these piers projecting in plan and creating a rectangular frame to the entrance portal. Another example is the Gök Madrasa in Sivas (1271) (plate 4.82), where we have the minarets standing on decorated buttresses flanking the entrance and framing the portal. The fact that these frames are heavily decorated, adds more emphasis to them and highlights the projection and make it more observable.\(^\text{194}\) These projecting
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buttresses also play an important role in partially supporting those minarets, and thus are architecturally important, and we saw, in 1360, how the lack of these piers around the portal of the Complex of Sultan Hasan in Cairo (1356-63) led to the quick fall of a newly erected minaret above the portal of that Madrasa, an example that tried following 13th century madrasas in Anatolia.

The shafts of Anatolian minarets at that period may be fluted and have bowl-shaped balconies and slender conical terminations. One of the perfect models of a thirteenth-century Anatolian-Seljuk minaret is that of the Gök Madrasa in Sivas with a short shaft decorated with glazed brick and tiles. Its bowl-shaped balconies are carried on tiers of brickwork and the uppermost section is topped by a conical cap, not unlike those of the Armenian churches discussed earlier.

The number of balconies used was sometimes to increase to two. This was not common, but we still can find them in some examples like the İnce Minareli Madrasa at Konya (plate 4.76) and the Taş Madrasa at Akşehir (plate 4.62). This increase in number can be thought of as a departure point from which the later Ottoman minaret was inspired.

In general, after the battle of Manzikert and the opening of Anatolia to Islam, an architectural style continued to develop, but it was not until the turn of the thirteenth century that the Seljuks of Rum managed to exert full control over that style. Anatolian Islamic construction continued in almost all ways the traditions of the earlier Iranian Seljuk model and this can be seen clearly in the form of many of the minarets of that period, especially those located in Konya (e.g. Sahib Ata Complex
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(plate 4.69), 1258 and İnce Minareli Madrasa, 1258-65), Sivas (e.g. Çifte Minareli Madrasa, 1271 and Gök Madrasa, 1271) and Erzurum (e.g. Çifte Minareli Madrasa, 1242-77), with their cylindrical shafts, bowl-shaped balconies and slender terminations. We also have many examples where minarets were placed over portals and framed them, a feature of clear Iranian origin.

1256-1483 CE. Beylik Period:198

After the collapse of the Seljuk rule in the thirteenth century, Anatolia was divided again into Turkish emirates. After the Mongol invasion, many Turkoman emirs formed minor self-governing states, leading to a totally divided region. Regardless of this fragile political status, the architectural program was to continue without being much affected. In fact the existence of so many competitors was a catalyst that helped the program to continue with the same enthusiasm.

The demography of people residing in Anatolia was complicated by external relations with Iran and Central Asia, through a substantial stream of immigrants from Central Asia to Iran and between Iran and Anatolia during the Beylik period. According to Arık, another important factor that affected Anatolian architecture in general and especially during the Beylik period, was the use of those immigrants, especially those coming from Iran, as a labor force, resulting in developments that very much depended on traditions of the Seljuk period.199

The dependence on Seljuk traditions continued throughout the Beylik period; there were, however, some modifications in architectural features and ornamentation.

199 Arık, “Turkish Architecture in the period of Turkish Emirates”, 112.
The local principalities were divided mainly into four distinct Anatolian regions, listed by Sözen as follows:

The west – which was to be dominant source for later developments in Turkish architecture; central Anatolia – an area predominantly under Karamanid rule, where Seljuk trends were largely sustained; the east – where political links with Azerbaijan were very strong, especially after the second half of the 13 century; and southeastern Anatolia – where the artistic traditions of Mesopotamia and Syria have always been markedly influential.\(^{200}\)

These architectural trends are to be considered transitional, linking between the earlier Seljuk style and the newly forming Ottoman style.

Eastern Anatolia came under the control of the Ilkhanids after the battle of Köse Dağ (1243), causing the architectural patronage in the region to stop for a small while, before being revived quickly. An important example of this style is the Çifte Minareli Madrasa in Sivas, dating from towards the end of the thirteenth century\(^{201}\), with twin redbrick minarets rising on either side of the portal. Here we can still see the Seljuk style in the bowl-shaped balcony and slender conical termination to the shaft. Many of the monuments built during this late period are located around the city of Diyarbakır. A good example, dating to the Akkoyunlu period, is the square minaret of the Sheikh Matar Mosque (1500).\(^{202}\) In form, the shaft is following the earlier Syrian model, but what is most important about this minaret, built by Sultan Kasım, is

\(^{200}\) Sözen, *Evolution of Turkish Art and Architecture*, 44.

\(^{201}\) Ibid., 72.

\(^{202}\) Sözen, “Important Monuments in Diyarbakır”, 221.
that it was placed on four columns, making this example one of a kind in the whole Anatolian plateau.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, links to the already existing experiments were becoming apparent in some of the early Ottoman mosques. In Iznik, for example, the Yeşil Mosque, built in 1378-91\textsuperscript{203} (plate 3.21), has a minaret similar to earlier precedents in Anatolia with its tile work and glazed brick decoration. This is a very good example showing how the Beylik period was to play an important role as a transitional period. The developed transitional zones, the usage of bowl-shaped balconies held on tiers of stalactites and slender conical terminations to the shafts are all characteristic features of that period that were to move to the newly developing Ottoman style. We can’t ignore that the final output was to vary from one region to the other, but all under one main idea and that is using local traditions with predominant trends in Turkish architecture.

**Additional Architectural and Decorative Elements**

**Placement**

The placement of minarets in Anatolia didn’t have a fixed position in its early stages. One of the earliest locations for the placement of minarets was on the *qibla* wall. This placement was often followed in Anatolia, especially in those monuments related to the early stages of architectural development. In Diyarbakır, for example, we have the minaret located on the qibla wall, and the same applies to the minarets of the Great Mosque of Sivas. We also had many examples where the minarets were

\textsuperscript{203} Sözen, *Evolution of Turkish Art and Architecture*, 60.
placed opposite the *qibla* wall (e.g. at the Great Mosque of Harran, 744-50, the Great Mosque of Urfa, 1146-91, and the Great Mosque of Mardin, 1176).

According to Tayla, the Great Mosque of Mardin shows for the first time the presence of two minarets in the plan of the mosque.\(^{204}\) These minarets were placed at the northern corners of the wall of the main prayer hall, also on bases supported by that wall. This placement, on the two corners of the north wall, was later to become the classic location for minarets during the Ottoman era. This placement at the corner(s) of the north wall was to continue for a while, and can be seen in many examples of the thirteenth century, as was the case with the minaret of the ‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque at Niğde (1223) (plate 4.49), where we have the minaret placed at the northeast corner. Another example is the Akşehir Taş Madrasa (1250), with its minaret placed against the northwest corner. This feature was also to be found in the following century or so, in some examples as that of the Yakutiye Madrasa at Erzurum (1310) (plate 4.88). The location of minarets at a corner of the monument helped in turning these minarets into a kind of bastion for the monuments and added to their sturdiness.\(^{205}\)

The first appearance of a portal surmounted by two minarets in Anatolia was in the Sahib Ata Complex at Konya (1258).\(^{206}\) This new trend is of eastern origin and was to last throughout the thirteenth century. This feature is well exemplified in the Çifte Minareli *madrasas* at Erzurum (1242-77) and Sivas (1271) and the Gök Madrasa also at Sivas (1271). In Anatolia, however, paired portal minarets did experience some developments. Perhaps the most important lies in the smoothness of the integration of the lower structure of the minaret into the portal. The base of the

\(^{204}\) Ibid., 813.
\(^{205}\) Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture*, 162.
\(^{206}\) Tayla, "L’Emplacement du Minaret", 814.
minaret in Anatolia usually projected from the portal in both plan and elevation and was also highlighted by decorative means,\(^\text{207}\) as mentioned above.

It seems that in the subsequent Beylik period the idea of having a portal topped by twin minarets disappeared for a while until being used again in the Sunqur Bek Mosque at Niğde (1335), known to be the second mosque in Anatolia to have a portal with double minarets, after the Sahib Ata Complex at Konya.\(^\text{208}\) In the early years of the Beylik period, however, the minarets were placed anywhere except on the southeast corner of mosques,\(^\text{209}\) and we have more than one example where the minaret was totally separated from the main building as the case with the Sheik Matar Mosque at Diyarbakır (1500) and the Yivli Minaret at Antalya (1220-37) (plate 4.45).

**Ornamentation**

One of the principal interests of Anatolian Architecture lies in the methods of ornamentation used with their splendid original and imported techniques. Most of the decorated monuments in Anatolia followed Iranian Great Seljuk models with extensive use of patterned brickwork, glazed tiles and inscription bands. It is worth highlighting once more that the use of tall decorative minarets in Anatolian mosques and madrasas was to give a strong vertical accent as opposed to the general horizontality of the overall mass of these monuments.

Anatolian architectural decoration developments were mainly in stonework, tile work and glazed brick bonding. Stone, although not used frequently on minarets, was used extensively throughout Anatolia, and in many cases artisans and craftsmen paid more attention to façades with their decoration. Stonework was to reach high

\(^{207}\) Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture*, 162.

\(^{208}\) Arık, “Turkish Architecture in the period of Turkish Emirates”, 117.

\(^{209}\) Ibid., 113.
levels of skill in the decorative reliefs including vegetal and geometrical compositions in addition to inscription bands. During the pre-Ottoman period, many different techniques of stonework were used in Anatolia. This included both low and high relief carving as well as beveled incising. Three-dimensional relief work on baluster lattices was also frequently used. Steep cut relief was more popular in Erzurum, Divrigi and Sivas, while low relief was more common in Konya and Kayseri. The dependence on making use of shadow and light across surfaces was to play the key role in Seljuk relief work, a trend that was gradually to be replaced, during the Ottoman period, by extremely low-relief designs.210 A good example of stone carving is the minaret of the Great Mosque of Mardin built in the twelfth century.211

Another important decoration scheme that was very popular in Anatolia was the brick bonding technique. For that Iran and Transoxania hold the key to decorative activity in Anatolia. Early Qarakhanid works show a clear impact on later works in Anatolia. Qarakhanid monuments were marked by the high quality of their brick bonding. Among these are the Jar Kurgan minaret near Tirmiz (1108-9) (plate 3.22), and the eleventh century Burana minaret in the Chuy Valley in northern Kyrgyzstan212 (plate 3.23). These decorative techniques appeared in later works in Anatolia e.g. on the minaret of the İnce Minareli Madrasa in Konya.

Glazed bricks were used extensively by the Seljuks of Anatolia to decorate minarets. These were placed alongside unglazed red bricks forming rich compositions of geometrical patterns, circles and inscription bands. Mosaic tiles on the other hand were not used that frequently, and they were usually placed under the balcony of minarets and in borders with bands of inscriptions. Starting from the middle of the

210 Ibid., 210.
211 Sözen, “Important Monuments in Diyarbakır”, 221.
212 Sözen, Evolution of Turkish Art and Architecture, 14.
thirteenth century onwards, mosaic tile decoration became more popular.\textsuperscript{213} Good examples representing this new trend of ornamentation can be seen on the grooved minaret of the Gök Madrasa at Sivas and the minaret of the Taş Madrasa at Akşehir.

During the Beylik period, glazed brick decoration began to be limited and much simpler than the earlier Seljuk period. Also the usage of tile mosaic almost disappeared. Turquoise, eggplant violet and blue continued to be the popular colors for glazing, but yellow and green were added too.\textsuperscript{214} One of the rare examples of the implementation of glazed bricks in minaret decoration during this late Beylik period is the minaret of the Ulu Cami at Birgi (1312) (plate 4.90). With the gradual limited use of tiles and glazed bricks on minarets, we can say that the Beylik period was more of a transitional zone between earlier Seljuk and later Ottoman periods. Although the Ottoman period was considered the peak of Turkish tile art, tiles stopped appearing on minarets as well as domes, and moved to walls, but we do have some early Ottoman examples with minarets which were embroidered with glazed brick and tile work as at the Yeşil Mosque in the city of Iznik.

\textsuperscript{213} Oney, “Architectural Decoration and the Minor Arts”, 175.
\textsuperscript{214} Ibid., 176.
Chapter 4: Catalogue of Pre-Ottoman Anatolian Key Minarets

Chronological Listing of Selected Minarets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minaret</th>
<th>City/Province</th>
<th>Date of Minaret (A.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Harran, Urfa</td>
<td>744-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepsi Minare</td>
<td>Erzurum, Erzurum</td>
<td>1124-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Urfa, Urfa</td>
<td>1146-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kale Mosque</td>
<td>Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Harput, Elazig</td>
<td>1156-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Mardin, Mardin</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Erzurum, Erzurum</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenburi Mosque</td>
<td>Konya, Konya</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halilürrahman Mosque</td>
<td>Urfa, Urfa</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyubid Minaret Mosque</td>
<td>Silvan, Diyarbakır</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Akşehir, Konya</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Sivas, Sivas</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yivli Minare Mosque</td>
<td>Antalya, Antalya</td>
<td>1220-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque</td>
<td>Niğde, Niğde</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güdük Minare Mosque</td>
<td>Akşehir, Konya</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatuniye Mosque</td>
<td>Konya, Konya</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çifte Minareli Madrasa</td>
<td>Erzurum, Erzurum</td>
<td>1242-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taş Medrese Mosque</td>
<td>Akşehir, Konya</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoca Hasan Mosque</td>
<td>Konya, Konya</td>
<td>1250-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahib Ata Complex</td>
<td>Konya, Konya</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İnce Minareli Madrasa</td>
<td>Konya, Konya</td>
<td>1258-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çifte Minareli Madrasa</td>
<td>Sivas, Sivas</td>
<td>1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gök Madrasa</td>
<td>Sivas, Sivas</td>
<td>1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutiyi Madrasa</td>
<td>Erzurum, Erzurum</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mosque</td>
<td>Birgi, Izmir</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunquor Bek Mosque</td>
<td>Niğde, Niğde</td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sheikh Matar Mosque</td>
<td>Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analytical Catalog of Anatolian Minarets

The Great Mosque of Harran (744-50)

Harran, known also as Carrhae, is located at about 50 km southeast of Urfa and is considered as one of the oldest cities on earth, having an age-old association with the Mesopotamian moon-cult. According to the Bible, Harran (Haran) was mentioned as the city where Terah and his son Abram (Abraham, Ibrahim) and his grandson Lot settled for a while after leaving Ur of Chaldees on their way to the land of Canaan. Later, in Roman times, Harran was the place of the well-known battle of Carrhae in which the Parthians defeated the Roman Emperor Crassus in 53 BC. In the early periods of Islam, the city of Harran was the capital of the Umayyad Islamic caliphate during the reign of Marwan II and later saw monumental restoration work during the Ayyubid era, before being fully ruined by the Mongols in A.D. 1260.

The Great Mosque of Harran, known locally as Jami' al-Firdaws, is the oldest mosque built in Anatolia (figure 4.1 and plate 4.1). The Umayyad caliph, Marwan II (r. 744-50), is thought to have taken a role in building this monument and also a fragment of an incomplete and ruined inscription, found in the remnants of a neighboring building, is said to have previously included the name of the Umayyad caliph. The mosque had many of the early Syrian architectural traditions, including the cut stonewalls, the three axial entrances, the shallow prayer halls, the gabled
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timber roofs, and above all the square minarets. The mosque and the square minaret here lie to the north slope of the hill, placed in what seems like a shallow basin. According to Lloyd and Brice, this is a location that confirms the antiquity of the site, with ruins of later monuments to accumulate around it.

Rising on the northern side of the mosque, this stone square shaft of the minaret is thought by Creswell to have been 26 meters high with only the last 8 meters of brick (plate 4.2). At a height of 16 meters, we have a cyma recta molding that breaks the plain stone shaft (plate 4.3). On each of the four sides of the minaret there are a number of narrow slits, each measuring about 50 x 15 cm., illuminating the interior. The entrance to the minaret is on the southern side (plate 4.4), leading to the minaret's wooden staircase, and here we can read Creswell's description of what remained of it: "The staircase begins on the side opposite to the entrance, the first flight, which is 80 cm. wide, resting on an arch with a stepped extrados. Beyond this first flight nothing remains except a number of splay-faced corbels, 77 cm. wide, set at alternate levels, thirteen on the north, and fourteen on the south wall."

The mosque witnessed a major restoration program during the Ayyubid period, and more than one inscription was found in the name of the Ayyubid ruler Salah al-Dunya wa'l-Din. Recently the minaret's staircase was reconstructed with 105 wooden steps matching the original one.
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The Great Mosque of Diyarbakır (1115)

Overlooking the Tigris’ broad valley, the city of Diyarbakır, known earlier as Amida, is located on a bluff inside a bend in the river. After the Muslim capture of the city in 639, and a fruitless architectural period during the Umayyad, Abbasid and Kurdish Marwanid eras, the Great Seljuks occupied the city for a short period and started the city’s architectural program. The Great Seljuks were followed by the Inalids, known in Turkish as “İnaложulları”, and the Nisanids “Nisanoğulları”, in the period from 1096 till 1183, and they had their share in contributing to Islamic monuments in the city, before being ousted by Saladin, when it was the Artukids’ turn to have full control over the city until 1232.

One of the oldest and most important mosques in Diyarbakır, and the whole Anatolian plateau, is the Great Mosque of the city (figure 4.2), inspired by the Great Mosque of Damascus, and was dated to the seventh century, according to Kuran (plate 4.5). He also states, depending on several inscriptions on the walls of the mosque, that it was later rebuilt by Malik Shah in 1091 to 1092 and experienced major renovations during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The Inalids and the Nisanids, while in control of the city, had the chance to work on the Great Mosque, and we have an inscription dating from the period of İnalogical Mahmut, found on the minaret, with the date equivalent to 1115.

The minaret of the mosque is located on the south wall (plate 4.6), where the mihrab is, and is sitting on a base with an entrance on the southern face, reached by a small staircase (plate 4.7). As the case with the mosque itself, the tall square minaret
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recalls the southern examples in Syria with its tall square shaft, and is more or less copied from the Aleppo's tower. Of local style is the usage of running courses of black basalt and the shaft is decorated using inlays of white limestone bands (plate 4.8). There aren't any balconies and most probably the mu’adhdhins performed the call to prayer from the minaret's windows. The minaret is crowned with a cylindrical spire and a short conical roof that was added in a latter date by the Ottomans.

**Tepsi Minare/Erzurum (1124-1132)**

Erzurum, a city that is almost 6,500 feet high, was on one of the most important caravan routes heading east. Being in this strategic location, Erzurum (previously Arx Romanorum, Karin, Theodosiopolis) was always a city to fight for, and it was the stage for repeated battles between Muslims and Byzantines until finally falling in the hands of the Seljuks in 1201. Before that date, Erzurum was under the control of the Saltukids (c. 1071-1202), as one of the many Beyliks created in Anatolia after the death of Kutlumush’s son, Sulayman, in 1086. The Tepsi Minare, or what is known now as the clock-tower, on the south-west corner of Erzurum's citadel wall, together with the small masjid at the southern wall of that citadel were parts of the contribution of the Saltukids to Islamic architecture in the city (plate 4.9).

According to an inscription under its gallery, the minaret was built by the chief of the Saltukids, Muzaffar Gazi (r. 1124-1132). Being placed on a citadel’s wall with a location that is almost equally visible from most parts of the city, strongly
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supports an interesting theory that attributes the minaret to a function other than religious, as it was interpreted by Sinclair as a camouflaged military watch-tower.\textsuperscript{243} Above the square base, the cylindrical shaft of the minaret starts with five rows of \textit{ablāq} stone decoration, and above that we have the main, slightly tapering, brick shaft, that rises for about thirty meters high (plate 4.10). The bricks are aligned in courses of horizontal running bond, until meeting the Kufic inscription band, holding the name of the patron. The inscription band is bordered, on its upper and lower sides, by two thin brick decorative bands, each composed of a row of small brick lozenges, enclosed by two rows of horizontally laid brick (plate 4.11). Above the inscription band we have a wide band of geometrical decorations recalling earlier examples in Iran with the complexity of the bonds achieved. “The final narrow section of the shaft above the şerefe,” writes Sinclair, “which is now represented by a stone moulding, has disappeared. It had already been lost by the mid 17th century, when guns were kept at the top of the tower and were covered by a wooden construction. The guns were used, among other purposes, to announce the sunset during Ramadan. The present wooden cover is an Italianate production of the late 19th century. It is a dome supported on six pairs of pillars.”\textsuperscript{244} The tower was also given a clock and a bell at the time of adding the wooden belfry. The latter is still there but the clock is thought to have been removed by the Russians in 1830.\textsuperscript{245}
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The Great Mosque of Urfa (1146-1191)

The Muslims first captured Urfa from the Byzantines in 639. The city of Urfa, known as Edessa and al-Ruha in earlier periods, was recaptured by the Crusaders in 1099, and remained in Christian hands until 1144, when it was seized by ‘Imad al-Din Zangi, leading to the permanent establishment of Islam there, after the failure of the second Crusade (1147-9) to recover the city.

The exact date of the Great Mosque of Urfa (figure 4.3), known also as the Ulu Cami, is unknown, but one suggestion is that it was built in the period between 1146 and 1191, when the madrasa next to the mosque was added to it. Another suggestion is that it was built between 1146 and 1174, if we accept that Ibn Khallikan meant Urfa's Great Mosque while talking about a mosque built in al-Ruha by Nur al-Din. The mosque is built next to, or over the remains of the former Church of St Stephen, which was known as the Red Church for its red columns. It has a cross-vaulted prayer hall and is accented by a humble dome over its mihrab.

The octagonal minaret of the mosque belongs to the twelfth century according to an inscription that was found near it, stating the date 1191 (plate 4.12). Placed on the northern wall of the mosque, this cut stone minaret is thought to have been originally the belfry of the church that once existed on the same site. The door of the minaret, placed on the southern face of it, is framed by remaining elements of an
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earlier church (plate 4.13). The octagonal stone shaft follows nearby Mesopotamian prototypes, with four of the sides holding slits alternately. The decoration of the minaret's shaft here is a good example of the use of pieces of late antique Christian architecture to accent the overall look of the minaret. Fluted mouldings inspired by Byzantine architecture are integrated along the shaft dividing it into four uneven spaces, with the topmost tier displaying arches on all eight sides (plate 4.14).

The Great Mosque of Harput (1156-7)

The city of Harput, with its historical castle, was built by the Armenians on a hill, known later by the Muslims as Khartabirt, which means rocky fortress. On the skirts of that hill lies now the modern city of Elâziğ. The Muslims encountered the area for the first time in the tenth century, before the second Byzantine occupation in 938. Following the battle of Manzikert in 1071, and after some years as part of an Armenian kingdom, the city was captured in 1085 by Çubuk, a Turkish leader, who managed to get the required approval from Malik Shah in Iran to rule under the Great Seljuk’s flag. The Artukid period that started at Harput with the rule of Balak Gazi remained until 1234, when the full Seljuk occupation of the city took place. The area was later occupied by a succession of Dulkadirids (till 1433), by the Akkoyunlu (till 1478), and finally became part of the Ottoman Empire (1515 onwards), after being taken by Selim I’s army.
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The Artukid ruler Fahrettin Karaaslan built the Great Mosque of Harput in 1156-1157.263 This long rectangular building has a mihrab dome and a small courtyard squeezed into the design (figure 4.4). The present building has been through an extensive rebuilding program, with many additions, probably during the period from the mid fourteenth till mid fifteenth century. Sinclair writes, “The prayer-hall to the south is mostly original, but the porticoed courtyard now at the center of the rectangle is probably for the most part a conversion from a different design in which the now leaning brick minaret was adjacent to the north wall.”264 This suggestion implies the belonging of the minaret to the original mosque (plate 4.15).

The short thick minaret rises on a high stone base with stairs leading to its interior on the eastern and northern faces. A gradual rounding of the corners of the base results in a smooth transition to the cylindrical shaft of the minaret. Just above this transitional zone are lines made of bricks aligned vertically and enclosing a stone skin, like that of the mosque’s outer wall, on the western side of the minaret and brick decoration on the other sides. Above that area lies a wide band encircling the shaft, composed of bricks laid both horizontally and vertically, giving the effect, according to Sinclair, of a series of intersecting diagonal staircase-like lines (plate 4.16).265 Bordering this band are two thin bands, containing the same brick pattern. Above these we have a thinner band of lozenges that precedes two wide bands composed of overlapping floral motifs, with two forms for the petals, triangular for the lower band and oval for the upper one (plate 4.17). Above these bands lies a mu‘adhdhin’s
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balcony with a stone balustrade, a narrow brick cylindrical section and a conical roof; all are later additions,\textsuperscript{266} probably Ottoman.

**Kale Mosque/ Diyarbakır (1160)**

After the death of Malikshah in 1092, areas captured by the Great Seljuks were divided into smaller principalities or Beyliks.\textsuperscript{267} During that time, a Turcoman chief, named Inal, from Diyarbakır announced the independence of the city in 1096, and his descendants, the Inalids (Turkish: İnaloğulları), were to stay in control of it for nearly a century, but with the real power moving gradually in the hands of the rich Nisan family, with the Nisanids (Nisanoğulları) serving as viziers. In 1183, an end was put to the Beylik when the city was captured by Saladin, who was then to pass it over into the hands of his allies, the Artuksids of Hisn Kayfa.\textsuperscript{268}

During this period, the Inalids and the Nisanids had an active architectural restoration program for the Great Mosque of Diyarbakır,\textsuperscript{269} and they also added a square minaret to the Kale Cami (Mosque of the Citadel),\textsuperscript{270} now standing near the later Artukid citadel wall (plate 4.18). This mosque, known also as the Hazrati Süleyman Mosque, has a rectangular prayer hall, and was, according to Sinclair, built on the burial site of some of the companions of the Prophet, who were killed while capturing the city from the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{271} The Great Seljuks originally built the
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mosque, but its plan was altered with many later additions, with the minaret being added in 1160 according to an inscription on its eastern side.

The minaret, placed next to the northeast corner of the mosque (figure 4.5), has a tall square shaft, without balconies, with arrow slits along the shaft and small windows at the top as an alternative for the mu’adhdhins to perform the call for prayers. The shaft is built using black basalt, following Diyarbakır’s local style, and features a number of horizontal moldings, with its interior being lit by narrow slits along the shaft. On top of it, there is a short slim cylindrical section with a conical roof, probably a later Ottoman addition. The overall look of this minaret is typical of Diyarbakır, and is very much close to the minaret of the city’s Great Mosque, except for the lack of decorative white bands here.

The Great Mosque of Mardin (1176)

Mardin (ancient Marida), one of the oldest settled areas in Mesopotamia, is located in southeastern Turkey, attached to the side of a steep slope facing the Syrian border. The origin of the name Mardin comes from the Syriac-Aramaic word “Merdin” meaning a fortress. The city’s citadel was a Byzantine fortress till 640, after being captured by the Ummayads. Mardin changed hands many times before being finally captured by the Seljuks in the late eleventh century and was ruled by the Artukid Turks for the next three centuries. Under the control of the Artukids, the city managed to stand still against the attacks of Saladin and the Mongols before falling to Tamerlane in 1395.

---

272 Williams, Eastern Turkey, 158.
274 Ibid., 160.
275 Ehrlich, Formmer’s Turkey, 428.
276 Williams, Eastern Turkey, 160.
The Great Mosque of Mardin has two inscriptions with the dates 1176 and 1186 confirming the relation of the building to the Artukids.\textsuperscript{277} The mosque has a monumental stone dome over the \textit{mihrab} bay, projecting out of the low roofing that is supported by two rows of columns (figure 4.6). Much alteration has been applied on the plan of the mosque, and this can be reflected in the courtyard that presages later changes. According to Hillenbrand, unlike the foreshortened courtyard, the central dome, emphasizing the \textit{mihrab} bay is following the earlier Iranian model.\textsuperscript{278}

The domed \textit{mihrab} is not the only architectural element following the faraway Iranian model, as Creswell claims that the minaret has, like most Persian examples, a circular shaft (plate 4.19).\textsuperscript{279} This Great Mosque also held another link to the Iranian model, with the presence of two minarets in the plan for the first time in Anatolia. These minarets stood on the northern corners of the courtyard. This placement, three centuries later in the Ottoman era, became the classic location for minarets.\textsuperscript{280} The date 1176 belongs to an inscription on the original square base of the minaret confirming its early date and its stylistic relation to the Artukid period, but due to a an explosion during a Kurdish revolt in 1832, it was partly damaged. In the nineteenth century, and following the original precedent, it was rebuilt preserving the cylindrical form and the distinctive raised ornamentation.\textsuperscript{281} The other minaret was destroyed at the time of Tamerlane.\textsuperscript{282}

The pointed-arch faces of the minaret’s square base are pierced with square motifs holding square Kufic inscription stating the Islamic declaration of faith (\textit{shahada}), with on the western face a carved cartouche holding a Qur’anic verse in
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*thuluth* (plate 4.20). The sides of the stone base are bordered with engaged columns decorated with floral motifs. The corners of the relatively high square base are smoothly rounded to transition to the cylindrical shaft of the minaret. Bands of floral motifs divide the shaft into three equal sections. The lowest section of the shaft is decorated with raindrop motifs. Each motif has a smaller inner drop with the name of prophet Muhammad, surrounded by the names of the Rashidun, with the whole motif surmounted by a crescent enclosing the name of Allah (plate 4.21).

The two upper sections are decorated with carved moldings framing medallions on the lower section and blind niches and arcades on the upper one (plate 4.22). Above these three main decorative sections, we have a *muqarnas* balcony and a thinner octagonal section surmounted by a ribbed dome mirroring the carved ribs of the stone sanctuary dome (plate 4.23). The staircase of the minaret that leads to the balcony is accessed from the courtyard.

**The Great Mosque of Erzurum (1179)**

Under the reign of the Saltukid ruler Nasir al-Din Muhammad, the Great Mosque of Erzurum was built in 1179, despite numerous changes over the course of time. The minaret of the mosque, located on the northwest corner (figure 4.7), starts just above the roof, with a staircase that is accessed from the interior (plate 4.24). The shaft holds a balcony resting on only one tier of *muqarnas* (plate 4.25), and above this balcony we have a narrower cylindrical section crowned by a conical roof that was added later.
Zenburi Mosque/Konya (1203)

Konya, the largest Seljuk city and the capital of its sultanate, is located in Central Anatolia. Known by the Romans as *castrum* of Iconium, Konya was first attacked by the Seljuks under the leadership of Alp Arslan in 1068. After 1176, following the battle of Myriakefalon, the Byzantines were never again able to threat the Seljuks’ territories, and Turkish civilization began to flourish in Konya. It became the most important cultural center in Anatolia, reaching the peak of its power in the thirteenth century.

Although not a very good representative of the splendor of the period, the Zenburi Mosque has an interesting example of a minaret with a unique form (plate 4.26). No published documents have survived to tell about the founder or origin of this mosque. Bakırer has attributed it to the early thirteenth century, and according to a panel next to the mosque, it was built in 1203. The mosque, with its square prayer hall, is entirely built of bricks, having its entrance on the northern side.

Standing on a high slab body, the brick minaret is attached to the northwestern corner of the cubic prayer hall. It consists of a plain octagonal shaft carrying a second cylindrical story with a conical roof on top that was probably added in a later restoration of the mosque in 1992. There is no transitional zone between the two main sections of the minaret, as we only have a thick corbelled cornice band edged by two rows of glazed bricks above and below, of which only few traces still survive (plate 4.27). The upper cylindrical story has a pattern that gives the effect of a series of staircase-like diagonal lines. An old photo of the mosque confirms the late date of the conical roof crowning the minaret (plate 4.28).
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Halilürrahman Mosque/Urfa (1211)

After the failure of the second Crusade in 1149, Urfa was captured by ‘Imad al-Din Zangi and was occupied by the Artukids and Ayyubids. In the thirteenth century, the city moved under the control of the Mamluks until the Ottoman conquest in 1516.\(^{287}\) In 1211, under Ayyubid patronage, the Halilürrahman Mosque was built\(^ {288}\) at the far left-hand corner of what is thought to be a sacred pool (plate 4.29). The pool is said to have been the area where a large fire was set, following the orders of King Nimrod, to burn Abraham to death, after throwing him inside it. Today, an iron grille inside the Halilürrahman Mosque protects the spot where Abraham is believed to have fallen.\(^ {289}\)

Back to square shafts, the minaret of that mosque is giving us another clear example of Syrian influence, common in the southern regions of Anatolia (plate 4.30). Most early Ayyubid minarets in Syria had square stone shafts,\(^ {290}\) such as the minaret of Aleppo's Great Mosque at the citadel and the Aqsab Mosque located to the north of the walled city of Damascus. Rising on the southwest corner of the Halilürrahman Mosque, the minaret is built of courses of yellow stone interrupted by horizontal moldings dividing the shaft into three main sections. The topmost section has double horseshoe arched windows on each side (plate 4.31). The general form of this minaret recalls similar Ayyubid examples in Syria, all inspired by ancient square Syrian church towers,\(^ {291}\) such as the church of Umm al-Surab in the Southern Hawran area.\(^ {292}\)

\(^{287}\) Williams, *Eastern Turkey*, 164.

\(^{288}\) Ehrlich, *Frommer’s Turkey*, 424.

\(^{289}\) Williams, *Eastern Turkey*, 167.


\(^{291}\) Refer to chapter 3.

Ayyubid Minaret/Silvan (1211)

The city of Silvan is located on the western side of the province of Diyarbakır and was part of the Byzantine Empire. This old city was captured by the Muslims in the seventh century, and was known at that period as the city of Mayyafariqin. In 1106, Kılıç Arslan was able to occupy Silvan and add it to the Sultanate of Rum. It later came under the control of the Artukid Turcomans and Ayyubids, after the capture of the city by Saladin in 1185, before being sacked by the Mongols in 1260. The city joined the Ottoman Empire in 1515, after falling into the hands of the Safavids for a while.

In the outskirts of Silvan we have a freestanding minaret with no trace of the mosque to which it once belonged (plate 4.32). In 1199, under the Ayyubid control, al-Afdal started building the minaret, and it was completed by al-Ashraf in 1211. Again we have a minaret with a square shaft with four horizontal inscription and decorative bands, dividing the shaft into five sections. Three courses below the lowest of these four bands we have a break in the masonry that, according to Sinclair, most probably marks the beginning of the part built by al-Ashraf (plate 4.33). Above this lowest band, at the first story on the eastern face, the entrance to the minaret interior is located. Except for the eastern side, the faces of the three sections in the middle contain panels with plain faces and ornamented borders, with most of these panels holding medallions of different sizes (plates 4.34-4.35). Part of the highest section of the minaret has been recently restored, as there are some old photos of the monument,
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dating back to 1911, showing the original state of the minaret before restoration (plate 4.36).  

**The Great Mosque of Akşehir (1213)**

Located in the western side of the province of Konya, the city of Akşehir, which means “White City”, was known earlier with the name Philomelium. It was an important Seljuk city and a center for the Turco-Persian culture that can be easily detected in its architecture. The Great Mosque of Akşehir is a good example illustrating the Persian influence on both architecture and decorative arts. The latter can be seen in the mihrab of the mosque, with its extraordinary use of tile mosaics. Traces of this tile decoration can be seen also on the octagonal base of the minaret. Another feature of the minaret that recalls earlier Persian examples is its brick cylindrical shaft (plates 4.37-4.38).

The minaret is standing separated from the mosque, next to the main façade, on the left hand side of the entrance. According to an inscription on its square base, it was built in 1213, during the reign of Kaykaus I (plate 4.39). Above the high square base of the minaret, we have a second smaller octagonal plinth with arched niches holding traces of old tile decorations. The octagonal plinth is surmounted by one-tier corbelled cornice, and above that plinth stands the thick cylindrical brick shaft. At the top of this shaft, we have a balcony preceded by five-tier corbelled cornice (plate 4.40), whose uppermost section is composed of a narrow cylinder topped by conical roof that seems to be of a later date, as the whole mosque was
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repaired over the course of time. For instance, we know that it was enlarged and repaired by ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I during his reign.  

Great Mosque of Sivas (1213)

The city of Sivas lies in eastern Anatolia, on a slope in the broad valley of the Kızılırmak River. Originally known as Sebaste, Sivas belonged to the Byzantines, and in 1022 became the new Armenian capital, after negotiations between the Byzantine Emperor and the King of Armenia. The Seljuks first encountered the area in 1067, when Alp Arslan defeated the Byzantine armies in Levitane and Sivas. Following the battle of Manzikert in 1071, many Beyliks were created in Anatolia, and among these we had the Danışmendids (1092-1178) in Sivas, Kayseri and Malatya, with Sivas as their capital. The city was captured by the Seljuks in 1172 during the reign of Kılıç Arslan II, and was to become an important trading center under Kay Kubad rule. Sivas was plundered after falling to the Mongols, following the battle of Köse Dağ in 1243.

Located in the heart of Sivas, the Great Mosque of the city belongs to the type of mosques where the prayer hall is arranged in aisles composed of stone arched piers, running perpendicular to the mihrab wall (figure 4.8). This mosque was for a long time attributed to the Danışmendids, but two recently discovered Seljuk inscriptions showed that the mosque was of a later date. According to the first inscription, Kızıl Arslan built the mosque in 1197, during the reign of Qutb al-Din Malikshah, one of
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the sons of Kılıç Arslan II and the ruler of Sivas. The second partially ruined
inscription gives the year 1213, which according to Aslanapa is probably the date of
the minaret, as he claims that the style and decoration of it match this second date.313

This minaret, in its location, form and ornamentation, recalls Iranian Seljuk
examples (plate 4.41). This can be seen in its placement on the western side, next to
the mihrab wall, breaking the plainness of the exterior walls. The short base, on which
the minaret stands, has six faces each holding a keel arch topped by a small
inscription band decorated with turquoise tiles (plate 4.42). On top of this base stands
the long cylindrical brick shaft with courses of brick arranged in basketwork patterns.
A Kufic inscription band surrounds the middle of the slightly tapering shaft, with
traces of tile decoration, adding to its monumentality (plate 4.43). Two narrow bands
with variegated brick patterns border this central inscription band, and there is another
similar inscription band preceding a tier of muqarnas and a two-tier corbelled cornice,
on which rests the minaret balcony (plate 4.44). The tile decoration used in
ornamenting the upper inscription band and the muqarnas tier is almost lost. The
upper storey, above the balcony, is a short slimmer cylinder ending with a conical
roof, probably a later addition.

Yivli Minare/Antalya (1220-37)

Antalya, located in southwest Anatolia, is the main port on the arc-shaped
Gulf of Antalya. The city was known first as Adalya.314 It was one of the most
important Byzantine ports in the region, before being conquered by the Seljuks under
the leadership of Kaykhusraw I in 1207. This strategic move gave the Seljuks access
to the Mediterranean, which proved to be of great help to the newly developing
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Seljukid economy. After a brief Byzantine penetration, Kaykaus I recaptured the city in 1214. Following the Battle of Köse Dağ and the Mongol invasion, the Seljuk Sultan Kaykusraw II escaped to Antalya. The city was later to become the capital of the Teke Beylik after the settlement of the Teke Turcomans, an Antalya branch of the Hamidids.

Standing in the old town center of Antalya, the Yivli Minare (Fluted Minaret) is a Seljuk monument that was built, according to its inscription, during the reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I (1220-37) (plate 4.45). This 38 meters high monument, that is now the symbol of the city, belonged to an old mosque that didn't survive. The minaret is now standing next to the Yivli Minare Mosque that was built in 1373, by Mehmed Bek of Hamidids, on the ruins of a Byzantine Church, and was named after the minaret.

The minaret stands on a square base with chamfered corners, to create the needed octagonal transitional zone of eight faces, each with a blind arched niche. Some of these niches still contain traces of turquoise and cobalt-blue mosaic tiles (plate 4.46). Above a thin circular white band stands the long, slightly tapering, shaft with its eight semi-circular engaged columns, separated from each other by small diagonal flanges, with blue glazed tiles interwoven into every other row of the running brick courses (plate 4.47). The shaft ends with a second circular stone band, preceding the balcony and its stone corbels (plate 4.48). The balcony and the upper

---

316 Ibid., 70.
318 Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 175.
319 Ibid., 77.
320 Levine, *Frommer’s Turkey*, 341.
321 Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 175.
section were rebuilt at a later time. According to a sign next to the minaret, it was restored twice, in 1995 and later in 2010.

This fluted form has been used earlier in several examples. One good early model was the Karakhanid minaret at Jar Kurgan built at the turn of the twelfth century, where we have the same gadrooning effect achieved by the placement of a cluster of round shafts (plate 3.22). According to Pope, this example inspired the tower at Radkan East, dating from the 13th century, and the Qutb Minar (1200). The same effect was also present in the missing upper storey of the minaret of Sultan Mas'ud (1114) at Ghazna that was surrounded by semi-cylindrical fluting.

‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque/Niğde (1223)

Niğde, the capital of a province holding the same name, was known in early Middle Ages as Nakida. The city is located in Central Anatolia on the frontier of Cilician Taurus, and was an important stop on the main trading route heading south from Aksaray. The area was encountered first by the Arabs in 707, when the nearby city of Tyana fell to them, and so the remaining inhabitants of the latter moved to settle in Niğde. During the Seljuk period, Niğde was to become one of the large and important cities in Anatolia, and we have some impressive monuments of the period reflecting this fact.

In 1186, during the reign of Kılıç Arslan II, and after his decision to divide his territories among his sons, Niğde was to move under the control of Arslanshah. In 1211, Niğde was given to the emir Zayn al-Din Bashara, who ruled the area for
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thirteen years. Like many other Seljuk regions, Niğde was to go under the suzerainty of the Mongols, after their invasion of Anatolia, and starting from 1390 it was under Karamanid control, until finally falling to the Ottomans in 1470.

The sources don’t really reveal the nature of the relationship between the local emir of Niğde, Zayn al-Din Bashara, and the new Sutan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I, in the early years of the reign of the latter, but what is mentioned was that Bashara was put to death by ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I, shortly after 1224. We also know that the ‘Ala’ al-Din Congregational Mosque was built by Emir Bashara in 1223, and was so called in honor of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I, perhaps as a last trial from the emir of Niğde to save his own life.

The mosque is situated in a dominant position on a hill in the center of the city, and belongs to the basilica-type group, with three bays wide and five bays deep (figure 4.9). To a great extent, the mosque survived preserving much of its structure with its original plan that is characterized by three domes on the qibla side. The thick stone minaret, being placed at the northeast corner, is seen by Tayla as an example that shows the first developments towards later the Ottoman model, where minarets were usually placed to the left and right of the northern wall of monuments (plate 4.49).

The minaret of the ‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque is placed on a square base with chamfered corners leading to an octagonal second storey that is equal in height to the smaller northern portal. This octagonal section is composed of running courses of
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alternately light and dark stone, and on each of the faces of that octagon we have a blind niche (plate 4.50). On top of this storey there is a cylindrical structure, separated from the lower storey by a cyma recta molding, composed of courses of alternating light and dark stone within the same band. Half the way up, there is a wide horizontal band created by the usage of light stone blocks with two narrow lines of darker blocks in the middle (plate 4.51). The minaret is in its original state as far as the balcony, which is resting on tiers of narrow muqarnas, and above the balcony, the shaft continues, but now a bit slimmer, and ends in a pointed stone cap.

Güdük Minare Mosque/Akşehir (1226)

Another mosque in the small city of Akşehir is the square Güdük Minare Mosque, built using bricks and rubble, covered by a large dome. The mosque is remarkable for its tile decoration, especially those placed on the window pediments, with interesting star motifs, and on the base part of the minaret. According to Bakırer, the Güdük Minare Mosque was built in the first half of the thirteenth century, and we have a panel next to the mosque’s entrance stating that it was built in 1226. The relatively short minaret, placed at the southeast corner of the mosque, is given extra prominence and illusory height through the reduction of the overall surface area of the monument (plate 4.52). The mosque is not far away from the Great mosque of Akşehir, not only in location, but also in style, especially that of the minaret, as the minaret of the Güdük Minare Mosque is almost a copy of the city’s Great Mosque.
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As the case with the nearby Great Mosque, the minaret here is placed on a high square base, through which the minaret is accessed. Over that base, there is an octagonal plinth with its faces decorated with geometrical patterns rendered in turquoise and dark blue tiles (plate 4.53). Standing on this octagonal plinth, the thick cylindrical brick shaft is surmounted by a balcony resting on a four-tier corbelled cornice. Above the balcony, the shaft gets thinner and is topped by a conical cap (plate 4.54). If we accept that the Güdük Minare Mosque was built c. 1226, this would mean that the monument was built during the reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I, which was the same period during which the Great Mosque of Akşehir was enlarged and repaired, and that can somehow explain the great similarity between the minarets of the two monuments.

Hatuniye Mosque/Konya (1230)

Another small mosque, the Hatuniye, is situated very close to the Zenburi Mosque in Konya. Badr al-Din Sutaş built it in 1230 during the reign of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I. Only the minaret survives from the original building. According to Rice, the beauty of this monument might have been the reason for Sutaş to be assigned the construction of the imperial palace at Kubadabad.339

The brick minaret stands on a high square base, with two chamfered upper sides (plate 4.55). On that base stands the octagonal shaft that is divided into two parts, with the upper one a bit slimmer. Unlike the lower section of the minaret with its plain brickwork, the decoration of the shaft is concentrated mainly in the area just below the balcony (plate 4.56). This includes a band holding traces of turquoise tiles creating geometrical motifs that precede a wider band of small arched niches adorned

by similar tiles (plate 4.57). The balcony rests on two tiers of *mugarnas*, with various geometrical patterns, highlighted by the same tiling ornamentation. The shaft, now cylindrical, continues above the balcony and ends in a pointed cap with an octagonal base, probably of a later date.

**Çifte Minareli Madrasa/Erzurum (1242-77)**

The Seljuks captured the Saltukid city of Erzurum in 1202. It stayed under their control, except for the brief victory of Jalal al-Din Khwarazmshah over the Seljuks, that was ended by the victory of the Seljuk-Ayyubid alliance at the battle at Yassi Qimen in 1230. The Mongol invasion in 1242, followed by the decisive defeat of the Seljuks in 1243 at the battle of Köse Dağ, led to the fall of Erzurum, and the Seljuks were forced to pay tribute to the Mongols, in addition to accepting the appointment of Mongol overlords, a setting that allowed for the continuation of the weak Seljuk rule for a while, and didn’t much affect their architectural program in the area. This situation lasted until the 1280s, with the real end of the Seljuk power and the gradual decline of its culture.

During this period, full of ambiguity, the Çifte Minareli Madrasa was built in the southeast corner of the old city, on a site that was occupied earlier by a Saltukid building. It is considered as one of the largest Anatolian madrasas of the period. The madrasa combines many of the elements of Anatolian architecture in an unusual layout, as we have an elongated courtyard with a four-iwan structure that intrudes
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with two-storied arcades (figure 4.10). The entrance façade is dominated by a portal flanked by twin minarets, giving the madrasa its name (plate 4.58). On the opposite side of the portal, behind the southern iwan, a turbe was added at a later date, but the lack of an inscription and the uncompleted state of the madrasa made the dating problem of this monument even worse.

Many debates have been made and lots of theories have evolved trying to suggest the exact date of the Çifte Minareli Madrasa, but they all failed to find a decisive answer to this problem, due to the incomplete amount of evidence concerning the history of the Seljuks in Anatolia in the thirteenth century. It has been suggested by Rogers that the construction of the madrasa begun in 1230, right after the Yassi Qimen battle, and that the incomplete state of it is due to the interruption of the Mongol invasion to the building work in 1242, which I think is the most logical suggestion. The latter date was likewise suggested by Hillenbrand as a possible one for the monument. The madrasa was also for a long time assigned to 1253 relating it to Khawand Khatun, the daughter of ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I. According to Aslanapa’s theory, the Çifte Minareli Madrasa was built shortly after 1271, based on its similarity with the Gök Madrasa at Sivas.

The minarets rest on two great bastions of stone, flanking the doorway. These bastions project in plan and hold decorated panels. Hillenbrand notes this feature as one of the changes applied to the Anatolian twin minaret device, compared to the earlier model in Iran: “The most striking of these changes is the emphasis on massive strength in these portal minarets. Their lower structure, while incorporated into the
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portal proper, does project from it in plan and elevation and is also singled out by decorative means." Each of these two projecting bastions is carved in high relief at the base. At the upper part of each there is a brick square decorated with blue tiles, creating medallions holding the names of Allah, Muhammad and the four companions of the Prophet (plate 4.59). On top of the bastions is an octagonal zone of transition with a decorated blind niche in the center.

The fluted shafts, recalling a central Asian architectural tradition, are decorated with turquoise tiles worked into the brickwork (plate 4.60). Rising to the present top, the inlaid tiling pattern is not identical on the two minarets, with a lozenge motif on the right shaft and simple diagonal lines on the left one (plate 4.61). Unfortunately, not much of the tiling below the cap survived, but what remained indicates the existence of a geometrical decorative band of glazed ceramic that surrounded the topmost section of each.

The Çifte Minareli Madrasa, now used as a museum, is one of the earliest Anatolian examples of a façade with two minarets, which definitely added to the monumentality of the madrasa. This feature that probably originated in Iranian Seljuk architecture became a common architectural composition, especially in later Il-Khanid buildings in Iran. Examples from fourteenth century central Iran include the congregational mosques at Ashtarjan and Yazd.

**Taş Madrasa/ Akşehir (1250)**

The name of Sahib Ata Fakhr al-Din Ali started to appear from the middle of the thirteenth century, first as a diplomatic envoy, during the Seljuk negotiations with
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the Mongols that followed the battle of Köse Dağ battle. Later he held the senior offices of amir-dad, malik al-umara’ and na’ib al-saltana, and acted as vizir from 1260 until his death in 1288. A famous patron of the time, he was known as Abu’l-Khayrat (the father of Good Works) due to the large number of buildings he established in different cities across Anatolia, such as the Înce Minareli Madrasa in Konya, the Gök Madrasa in Sivas and the Taş Madrasa in Akşehir.

The three-iwan Taş Madrasa was built in 1250 in the form of a complex. Only the façade with a minaret, a small domed mosque that was incorporated with the madrasa, and a tomb that was attached to the ruins of a side iwan survive (figure 4.11 and plate 4.62). Here the minaret that stands to the left of the entrance to the madrasa is a good example of Seljuk minarets of the time with its form and decoration.

The brick minaret has a thick cylindrical body and two balconies, a feature that appeared here and in the Înce Minareli Madrasa, also by Sahib Ata, but was then to stay without imitation until reappearing in the later Ottoman period. The decoration of the Taş Madrasa sticks to the Iranian model, like earlier monuments in the Akşehir, but here with more emphasis on patterned brickwork and glazed arabesque decorative bands. The diamond-shaped patterns of the brickwork are formed by the placement of glazed bricks against unglazed red bricks, a technique that was used frequently on minarets of the Seljuk period (plate 4.63). We have two glazed decorative bands, one placed at the very bottom of the minaret’s shaft and the
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other below the first balcony (plate 4.64). Both bands used the same color scheme with turquoise on a contrasting dark blue background. The topmost section of the minaret is slimmer with a conical roof, probably a later Ottoman addition (plate 4.65).

Hoca Hasan Mosque/Konya (1250-75)

According to Kuran, this mosque was built in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, and Bakirer assigned its dome to the year 1260, a possible date for the whole mosque. The sponsor of this monument is not identified, nor is its architect known. It is square with a single-domed prayer hall that opens to a wooden shed on posts (figure 4.12), that was once a stone porch. The walls of the mosque are of brick with only the lower part of the minaret’s high square base is made of stone. The minaret is attached to the northeast corner of the mosque, to the left of its main entrance (plate 4.66).

The minaret’s shaft, with its Greek-cross plan, is made of red brick. We have semi-circular buttresses at the center of each side of the shaft, ending with a tier of muqarnas that precedes the balcony (plate 4.67). Below that muqarnas tier, there is a thin line of glazed bricks, and we can also see traces of glazed tiles inside the muqarnas brackets (plate 4.68). The upper slim shaft is grooved as well, and the fact that the stairs of the minaret extend to this level strongly suggests that the minaret was much higher, with another balcony placed at an upper level. This example, with its unique shaft, displays an arrangement that has no parallel among extant minarets of Anatolia.
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Sahib Ata Complex/Konya (1258)

After 1243 the Seljuk Sultans lost their independence, and were mere puppets in the hands of the Mongols but the Seljuk architectural program didn't really suffer from that. One good example of that period is the Sahib Ata Complex that was built in 1258 during the reign of Izz al-Din Kaykaus II (1246-61), with the later addition of a tomb and a khanqah in 1280 (plate 4.69). The complex with its mosque, also known as the Larende Mosque, was built on orders of the famous Seljuk vizier Sahib Ata by the architect Kölük ibn Abd Allah.

The Sahib Ata Mosque is considered the oldest Seljuk wooden mosque, although nothing of the original construction remains. Unlike the existing mosque, the original one was placed next to the portal. It had a simple layout with aisles perpendicular to the qibla wall (figure 4.13). The stone portal is original with notable muqarnas niche, flanked by two heavily decorated buttresses with two sabils, on their lower sections. The name of the architect is written on the sabil on the right hand side (plate 4.70) This portal is one of the earliest in Anatolia with the two minarets, one of which still existent.

The heavily restored fluted brick shaft is decorated with tiles. These are used to add to the enrichment of the geometrical patterns of the masonry (plate 4.71). The extreme elaboration of the form, the use of tiles, and the ribbing technique all again recall Persian traditions and mark the highest level of artistry. According to Rice, these decorative techniques represent the final stage in the art of the Seljuks, namely
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the baroque phase. A short cylindrical section follows the ribbed shaft and above all is a bowl-shaped balcony resting on corbeled tiers (plate 4.72).

İnce Minareli Madrasa/Konya (1258-65)

Another example in Konya showing the continuation of the Seljuk architectural program is the İnce Minareli Madrasa. It is situated on the western face of the Alaeddin hill (plates 4.73-4.74), and was sponsored by the vizier Sahib Ata and built by the architect Kölük ibn Abd Allah, according to the inscriptions carved around the medallions of the entrance arch (plate 4.75). The madrasa was built in 1258-65.

The madrasa has one iwan at the back of the domed courtyard, flanked by two domed rooms (figure 4.14). To the right and left of the courtyard we have rows of small cells. This monument owns some important architectural and decorative features, like the fan-type pendentives used in the transition section of the dome over the courtyard, and the elaborately carved stone portal of the vestibule leading to the courtyard. Except for this portal, brick was used as the main building material of the whole complex, because the portal is earlier in date. On the façade, there is a small domed mosque with a minaret to the right of the portal, with a minaret. This mosque was an independent building that was incorporated with the madrasa.
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Following the common tradition of naming a monument after its minaret,\(^\text{380}\) the Înce Minare (or Pearl Minaret) Madrasa was named so because of its exceptionally highly decorated minaret. It was also the tallest and slenderest minaret in Seljuk Architecture.\(^\text{381}\) Unfortunately, it was mostly destroyed by lightning in 1901,\(^\text{382}\) leaving only the section below the first balcony standing. An old photograph of the minaret shows that it had two balconies, with unequal spacing between them (plate 4.76). The minaret of the Taş Madrasa in Akşehir, founded by the same patron, also has two minarets, and is seen by Aslanapa as a model that the architect followed in this example.\(^\text{383}\) It was also to be copied in the later Gök Madrasa (1271), also founded by Sahib Ata.

The brick minaret rests on a high square stone base holding beautiful sculptured foliate decoration, displaying a pattern that became dominant in stone relief towards the end of the thirteenth century (plate 4.77).\(^\text{384}\) Extending above the stone base is a low brick plinth with a pyramidal transitional zone leading to the octagonal main shaft (plate 4.78). This octagonal shaft, with its alternate faces, one semi-circular and the other slightly pointed, created a composition that made it one of the most significant decorative structures of the period. The unusual effect was taken to a higher level with the elegant use of glazed bricks and turquoise and dark blue tiles arranged in sophisticated patterns throughout the shaft, unlike the case with earlier periods where these techniques were only used under balconies and in bands with Kufic inscriptions.\(^\text{385}\)

\(^\text{381}\) Ünsal, *Turkish Islamic Architecture*, 104.
\(^\text{382}\) Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 126.
\(^\text{383}\) Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 132.
\(^\text{385}\) Ibid., 175.
Çifte Minareli Madrasa /Sivas (1271)

Anatolian cities and towns didn't suffer much from the Mongol invasion. The Ilkhanids naturally emphasized patronage in towns close to Iran, and thus Sivas was to gain some importance. Among the important monuments of the period was the Çifte Minareli Madrasa (1271), of which only the imposing front wall remains, after destroying the rest of the building (plate 4.79).

According to an inscription above the door of the monument, the Çifte Minareli Madrasa was built by the Ilkhanid vizier Shams al-Din Juvayni. Recent excavations showed that this madrasa was a two-storeyed structure with four iwans, with a hospital, and what is thought to be a bath, attached to the madrasa on the left and right respectively. The inscription mentioning the architect’s name, written on the left outer frame of the portal, is not readable. Aslanapa states that Kölük ibn Abd Allah was suggested as the architect, although that assumption was not supported by any of the existing inscriptions.

The surviving façade has a monumental central portal, articulated by decorative carvings in relief with traces of three-dimensional relief work on the portal’s spandrels. On either sides of the portal there are niches at different heights arranged in asymmetrical rows, with the whole façade being flanked by two cylindrical carved buttresses, with two twin brick minarets surmounting the façade.

The minarets rest on two brick cubes decorated with glazed turquoise insets, with only one face on each of the two cubes decorated with ornamented glazed roundels (plate 4.80). The transition from square to octagon is achieved via a

---

386 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 335.
387 Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, 133.
pyramidal device. The octagonal section of each of the two minarets is faced with blind decorated niches and surmounted by a cylindrical red brick shaft with geometric decorations in black and blue tile. The bowl-shaped balcony is carried on seven tiers of corbelled cornices and is followed by the usual slim shaft, topped by a pointed conical cap (plate 4.81). The brick minarets with their tile decoration contrast beautifully with the stone and marble decorated façade, suggesting that this madrasa was one of the finest monuments of the period.

Gök Madrasa /Sivas (1271)

As we've seen, in the thirteenth century building monumental madrasas became popular, usually open-courted and with a grand portal topped by a minaret or two, adding more to this monumentality. One of the most noticeable examples of that period is the Gök (or Blue) Madrasa at Sivas, built also in 1271, as the case with the Çifte Minareli Madrasa at the same city. This madrasa, also known as the Sahibiye Madrasa, was founded by the famous Seljuk patron, the vizier Sahib Ata. It has the most remarkable façade of any of his buildings, as well as being one of the most decorative edifices in Anatolian Seljuk architecture (plate 4.82).

It was built by the architect Kāluyān ibn Karabuda of Konya. It had 24 rooms arranged in two-storeys, with four iwans and a courtyard bordered on the northern and southern sides by arcades (figure 4.15). There was a domed mosque on the right-hand side of the main entrance. The deep monumental white marble portal is flanked by twin minarets. The portal is ornamented with moldings and panels of geometrical
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patterns, and to the left of it, there is a çeşme (or public water dispensary), creating an overall well-proportioned composition typical of the era.

Seen earlier in his mosque at Konya, Sahib Ata's Gök Madrasa in Sivas also has a portal flanked by two brick minarets, resting on the buttresses framing that portal. Preceding the shafts, we have brick square panels decorated in tiles (plate 4.83). A pyramidal transitional zone is used at the top outer corners of the buttresses, ending with octagonal low plinths upon which stand the minarets' brick shafts. The octagonal shaft of each of the two minarets is composed of two alternate faces with one semi-circular and the other slightly pointed, the faces separated by slender glazed colonnades (plates 4.84-4.85). The faces themselves are decorated with turquoise and dark blue triangular insets, with the whole shaft imitating exactly, in form and decoration, the remaining section of the minaret of the İnce Minareli Madrasa in Konya. However, the decoration here is much better integrated with the façade, compared to Konya's minaret.

A nine-tier corbelled cornice, derived from the Turkish triangles theme, precedes the balcony of each of the two minarets (plate 4.86). Above the balcony, we have a brick cylindrical top, holding a centered chevron band, and topped by a short conical roof, probably a later addition. The minarets have their access doors in the mosque and the room on the right and left of the entrance portal respectively. The minarets were probably much higher originally, like those of the İnce Minareli Madrasa in Konya. In any case the minarets of the Gök Madrasa are among the most developed examples of Anatolian Seljuk decorative architecture.
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Yakutiye Madrasa/Erzurum (1310)

1307 marks the official end of the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum. Erzurum then joined the Ilkhanid Empire as an administrative province and the summer headquarters of the empire’s troops in Asia Minor. The governor of the districts of Erzurum and Bayburt, Khwaja Yakut, built a madrasa in the city on behalf of the Ilkhanid Sultan Il-Khan and his wife Bolughan Khatun in 1310, according to an inscription on its porch, with the construction being partially funded by the Sultan. It was named the Yakutiye Madrasa after the name of its founder, with his tomb at the back, and is considered the earliest architectural example of the Beylik period.

It is a three-iwan madrasa with a domed polygonal mausoleum placed behind the main iwan, imitating the Çifte Minareli Madrasa, with a square courtyard, roofed with a muqarnas decorated cross vault (figure 4.16). The massive façade is undecorated with all the ornamentation being concentrated on the portal and the two minarets flanking the façade with the later being decorated with interlacing three-dimensional lozenges in brick and tile (plate 4.87). As for the portal, it followed the usual trend in the earlier Seljuk period, with decorations in high relief of geometric motifs and figurations in conjunction with the tree-of-life, the frequently used decorative element in Anatolian Seljuk architecture.

Unlike the usual placement of the minaret on top of the portal, the minarets here flank the entire façade, a novelty. Of these two minarets, only the base of the
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left-hand minaret and the lower part of the right-hand one survived. While describing the decoration of the thick remaining part of the right-hand minaret’s shaft, Sinclair says the following: “The tile-work starts above the plain facing-stone of the base, which is the same height as the madrasa’s west wall. Raised zig-zag lines of turquoise tiles bordered in manganese cross the surface diagonally both from left to right and from right to left. Since the zig-zags are composed of long diagonals and short verticals, the network leaves shapes which each resemble the merging of a lozenge and a long hexagon. On the turquoise field in these spaces, small vertical manganese tiles make patterns themselves composed of diagonals” (plates 4.88-4.89). In general, it is clear that the basic architectural elements of the earlier Seljuk era were borrowed in this madrasa, as seen in the case of the courtyard roofing system, the placement of the tomb and the monumental façade with two minarets, giving the whole monument an archaic charm.

The Great Mosque of Birgi (1312)

One important Turcoman principality that gained power in Anatolia was the Aydın Emirate, situated on the Anatolian western borders of Anatolia, covering the area from Aydın (Tralles) to Izmir, with its capital first at Birgi and later at Selçuk. Not much is known about the Aydımds before 1300. This emirate, originally a Germiyan vassal, was founded by Muhammad ibn Aydın, and was to flourish during the reign of his grandson ‘Umar Beg owing to his military activities
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and strong Byzantine affairs, depending mainly on sea expansion, especially in the 14th century, before being fully incorporated into the Ottoman Empire in 1426.

The Aydınid architectural program in Birgi wasn’t to introduce any tangible innovations, and their building activity, that was described as a modest one, was, according to Cahen, only a method “to prove to the town-dwellers that they were worthy successors of their predecessors.” Although Birgi suffered much from a 20th century Greek invasion, and much of the buildings there were destroyed, the city’s Great Mosque (1312), built by Aydınid Mehmed Bek, managed to survive. This stone building belongs to the hypostyle plan group with a rectangular hall of five aisles. The central one is wider and defined by a mihrab dome (figure 4.17). In front of the plain northern façade of the mosque there is a wooden roofed porch, an innovation in the 14th century. Next to the mihrab wall, at the southwest corner, the minaret stands on a high square stone base in an unusual placement (plate 4.90).

In its form it is strongly linked to earlier Seljuk examples, with a tall cylindrical shaft ornamented with turquoise glazed bricks, forming various geometrical patterns. On the lower section we have alternating vertical zigzags in red and turquoise (plate 4.91). The second section is slightly slimmer, with a smooth transition between the two cylindrical sections. This section holds rows of dotted lozenges in turquoise against a red background (plate 4.92). The section above the balcony is ornamented again in zigzags, differing from those on the lower section in
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being aligned horizontally (plate 4.93). According to Riefstahl, this upper part has been preserved in its original state, with ornamental polychrome bands that marked the base of the balcony.\textsuperscript{416} This part below the balcony is now washed out with the whole top section being currently surmounted by a pointed conical cap. The richness of decoration here was exceptional, as glazed brick ornamented minarets during the Beylik period became simpler, with the disappearance of elaborate patterns and decorative bands.\textsuperscript{417} The overall form and decorative theme of the great Mosque of Birgi is a good example that has strong links to earlier Seljuk examples.

\textbf{Sunqur Bek Mosque/ Niğde (1335)}

After the break of the Il-Khanid Empire in 1335, the governor of Anatolia, an Uighur Turk named Eretna,\textsuperscript{418} declared a sovereign emirate around Cappadocia and Sivas.\textsuperscript{419} In the same year Niğde fell to the Eretnids. According to a panel next to the mosque entrance it was built by the Ilkhanid governor of the city Sunqur Bek Agha in 1335 (plate 4.94). This mosque belongs to the basilica group that was used frequently in the central regions of Anatolia.\textsuperscript{420} It is a three-aisled structure, with the aisles perpendicular to the qibla wall, with the central nave being covered with four domes, and ending with a \textit{mihrab} on one side and a portal on the other (figure 4.18). The main portal, however, is placed on the eastern façade, and was surmounted by two high minarets.\textsuperscript{421} In the 18\textsuperscript{th} century the mosque was severely damaged by a fire, and was later covered with a flat wooden roof resting on wooden columns.\textsuperscript{422}
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This monument was constructed entirely of stone, including the twin minarets,423 of which only the one on the right survived (plate 4.95).424 This setting of a portal with twin minarets was frequently encountered in Anatolian Seljuk madrasas, especially those in Erzurum and Sivas, but not as much in mosques. The first mosque in Anatolia to follow this arrangement was the Sahib Ata Mosque at Konya, and this monument is only the second known one to have two minarets over its portal.425 Twin minarets appeared in another later Beylik example, the ‘Isa Bek Mosque (1374), built by the Aydınids in their capital Seljuk.426 The plain octagonal minaret projects directly from the roof, with thick moldings on the shaft's faces. These moldings mirror the decoration on the portal with clear Gothic influence. Above this main octagonal section there is a narrow cylindrical band that precedes the four-tier corbelled cornice supporting the balcony, and following that is a slim cylindrical section topped by a pointed cone, probably an Ottoman addition (plate 4.96). Both in its form and decoration, the style of minaret of the Sunqur Bek Mosque seems to have emerged suddenly in Anatolia, without precedent.

The Sheikh Matar Mosque/Diyarbakır (1500)

Lots of independent Beyliks appeared in Anatolia, following the Ilkhanid break up in 1335, including the Karamanids in Central Anatolia, the Dhulqadarids in the south, the Jandarids in the north, and the Akkoyunlu and Karakoyunlu in the east. The latter were both descendants of Oghuz tribes, with the Akkoyunlu settling in Diyarbakır and announcing it as its capital. They were then to move, trying to bring the Anatolian eastern side under their rule, and were engaged in a struggle with the
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Karakoyunlu, that ended up with destruction of the latter. Later, they had full control over the whole of Caucasia and Iran, and that let to the transfer of their capital to Tabriz.  

Diyarbakır stayed under Akkoyunlu rule for a while until the Ottoman capture of the city in 1515.  

Although eastern Anatolia was somehow more linked with northwestern Iran, at least politically, this did not really affect the architectural program in Diyarbakır, and many of the city’s mosques followed its characteristic local style, with alternating courses of black and white masonry and a tall square minaret. We’ve seen that in the very early Great Mosque of Diyarbakır and in other later examples, and this style was even to continue for a while under the Ottomans, e.g. minaret of the Nebi Mosque (1530) (plate 4.97). One unusual minaret from the period of the Akkoyunlu state is that next to the single domed building, officially known as the Şeykh Matar Mosque (figure 4.19 and plate 4.98). According to an inscription band on the minaret's body, it was built in 1500, inferring that it was built by Sultan Kasım, the independent Akkoyunlu ruler of the Tigris basin and Mardin, although the mosque is possibly of a later date.  

Conforming to the city’s local style, the minaret has a tall square body constructed in black basalt as far as the inscription band. The use of white stone, in the form of wide bands installed in the body's black stone, starts above the inscription band (plate 4.99). What is interesting regarding this minaret is that it stands on four short columns, giving it an unusual appearance (plate 4.100). This minaret, known as

---

429 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 361.
430 Sözen, “Important Monuments in Diyarbakır”, 221.
431 Sinclair, *Eastern Turkey*, 3:188.
the Dört Ayaklı Minare (Four-legged Minaret), with its unique form, recalls the cylindrical minaret sitting on four columns attached to the Ottoman mosque of Timurtaş Pasha in Bursa, and is the only example of this type in the city of Diyarbakır. The usual slim cylinder with its conical roof, possibly of a later date, surmounts the lower square shaft.
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Chapter 5: Conclusions

Introduction

Minarets are very important elements in pre-Ottoman Anatolian architecture, and they were built to fulfill an important role as a symbol of the existence and power of Islam. A closer look at the origins and different forms of the pre-Ottoman Anatolian minarets reveals one important aspect of Islamic architecture in Anatolia. The development of the Anatolian minaret occurred in three main phases. The first is known as the Great Seljuk period and it was clearly influenced by the Iranian Seljuk style, then comes the Anatolian Seljuk period where a new distinct style was formed, with bowl shaped balconies and the placement of minarets in many examples over portals and framing them. Finally there was the Beylik period, that is seen as a transitional period towards the following Ottoman period.

Through careful analysis of all three periods, it becomes clear how the great diversity of local and imported architectural traditions had an undeniable influence on the different forms in Anatolia, creating a blend that gave these forms a new dimension. Certain vital architectural features evolving from this blend can be detected and later became typical of Anatolian architecture.

One other main concern in this work was to highlight the development of specific features, which clearly foreshadowed the later Ottoman forms. These features included, but were not limited to, minaret placement and their general form. The survey that we’ve seen of some of the key minarets in Anatolia helped in showing the variety of forms
Conclusions

Imported architectural traditions

There is a great heritage of minarets in Anatolia, and as we saw in the survey, variation was clearly detected due to the different sources of influence, both local and imported. Imported influences included Armenian, Syrian, Iranian Seljuk and later Ilkhanid sources. Some of the examples that we’ve seen were close copies of their original models, without adding novelties, while other examples were used to introduce innovations.

One main influence that affected Anatolian architecture was the Armenian one. This can be seen mainly in the use of stone. Also the Armenian architecture is a possible source, together with Iranian models, that could have inspired the usage of conically shaped roofs above many later Anatolian monuments, especially Seljuk mausolea and later Ottoman minarets.

Another important influential source was the Syrian model. Although many early Syrian minarets were altered or destroyed, it is still possible to assert that the Syrian square model inspired Anatolian examples in the eastern and southern regions. Many early Byzantine pre-Islamic Syrian church towers and later Syrian minarets were square confirming that this form was the dominant one in Syria. This square form was seen in many examples in the northern part of Mesopotamia as at Harran, Urfa and Diyarbakır, with the later being loyal to the square form even after the occupation of the city by the Ottomans.

No one can deny the importance of the Iranian Seljuk model, after being imported to Anatolia by the Turks and which eventually became one of the main sources of inspiration for Turkish art in the region. We’ve seen in our Anatolian survey many tapering cylindrical examples following their precedents in Iran.
Another feature that was used in Anatolia, following the Great Seljuks, was the brick decoration with all the known techniques including varieties of brick bonding and tiling.

The Ilkhanids inherited the architectural model developed in Iran after the establishment of the Mongol rulers in Persia. This was to keep the Anatolian architectural program uninterrupted after the battle of Köse Dağ in 1243 without applying major changes to the overall style. This included forms and decorative methods used to build minarets. However, one important Ilkhanid feature that took more emphasis in Anatolia and was more common in this period, although it originated in the earlier Seljuk period, was the usage of twin minarets to frame portals and iwans.

Placement

The location of the minaret in the plan of the mosque is the subject of ongoing research. In Anatolia minarets didn’t have a fixed location and we saw the change of the placement of the minarets throughout time. In early examples, minarets were usually placed on the northern side of monuments, opposite the qibla wall (e.g. at the Great Mosques of Harran, 744-50, Mardin, 1176 and Erzurum, 1179). However, this trend was not always followed, as in some examples the minaret was placed on the qibla wall (e.g. at the Great Mosque of Diyarbakır, 1115; and the Halilürrahman Mosque, Urfa, 1211).

In the 13th century, the placement of the minaret started to be more linked to the portals, by either being placed next to it (e.g. at the Great Mosque of Akşehir, 1213, the Hoca Hasan mosque in Konya, 1250-99, and the Sheikh Matar Mosque, Diyarbakır, 1500), or in the form of twin minarets framing these portals (e.g. at the
Çifte Minareli Madrasa, Erzurum, 1242-77; the Sahib Ata complex, Konya, 1258 and the Gök Madrasa, Sivas 1271).

We have traced also through our survey some features that clearly presage the later Ottoman style. The first of these was seen in the placement of the minarets of the Great Mosque of Mardin (1176) at the northern corners of the courtyard, a placement that became three centuries later a classic location for minarets. This corner placement was seen also in the ‘Ala’ al-Din Mosque in Niğde (1223), with the minaret placed on the northeast corner. Another later example was the Yakutiyе Madrasa in Erzurum (1310), where we have the minarets flanking the façade, very close in placement to later Ottoman examples (e.g. Yeşil Cami at Bursa, 1421) (figure 5.1).

**Decoration**

Architectural decoration is a significant element that was used in Anatolia to add to the richness of its monuments. Imported traditions, together with legacies of Byzantine and Armenian art in the region, played the main role in creating a unique combination of different features. Many ornamental techniques were applied in Anatolia including stone carving, stucco decoration and wood carving, but for minarets, the most prominent technique was the usage of glazed bricks and tile mosaic decoration.

Starting from the thirteenth century, Anatolia became one of the main centers for tiles in the Islamic world, with Konya as one of the major manufacturing spots, and we have many examples there, with tiles ornamenting the minarets of Seljuk monuments. At first, the most popular places for placing tiles were on the minaret base and under the balcony (e.g. Great Mosque at Akşehir, 1213; Hatuniye Mosque, Konya, 1230). Towards the middle of the same century, minarets began to be more
extensively decorated and the designs using glazed bricks and tiles were to spread along the whole shaft (e.g. Taş Madrasa, Akşehir, 1250; İnce Minareli Madrasa, Konya, 1258-65; Gök Madrasa, Sivas, 1271).

During the late Beylik period, this type of decoration became more limited on minarets and the designs and patterns were to move back to simplicity, and the geometric and inscription bands adorned with mosaic tiles that we saw on earlier Seljuk minarets disappeared. One good example is the minaret of the Great Mosque of Birgi (1312). We can consider this late Beylik period as a transitional period towards the later Ottoman periods, where this tile glazing technique completely disappeared from Ottoman minarets.

Balconies

The number of balconies in pre-Ottoman Anatolian Seljuk minarets was usually one in a bowl-shaped form carried on muqarnas vaulting, departing from the earlier Iranian model. This form became canonical in both the Seljuk and later Beylik periods (e.g. Great Mosque, Sivas, 1213; Sahib Ata Complex, Konya, 1258; and the Great Mosque, Birgi, 1312). However, we have some examples where the number of balconies was to increase to two (e.g. İnce Minareli Madrasa, Konya, 1258-65), foreshadowing the later Ottoman minaret, where the mature examples of that time were usually holding two or even three balconies (e.g. Süleymaniye Mosque, Istanbul, 1558; and Selimiye Mosque, Edirne, 1574) (plates 5.1-5.2).
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