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Abstract

The Marʿāshī Library of Qum owns an unstudied manuscript containing official documents from the Rum Saljuq dynasty. The manuscript includes an Arabic text for the foundation of a ribāṭ. Its patron was unmistakably the Georgian wife of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II (d. 644/1246), the unfortunate sultan beaten by the Mongols at Kösedağ. The building was a caravanserai, most probably located at the stage of Düden, immediately northeast of Antalya. Its construction can be dated to around 636/1238. It was part of a cluster of buildings erected with sultanic patronage on the road from Antalya to Konya. Gurjī Khātūn’s aim in founding the ribāṭ was to establish her son, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II, as indisputable heir apparent over the other (and older) offspring of the sultan. Beyond the light it casts on her long-term strategy to become wālīna (Tk. valide, queen mother), the text allows us to refine our knowledge of women patrons, a subject that had been tackled so far mostly through the case of Māhparī Khātūn. Finally, the source in which this text was found proves that inscriptions (at least this one) were authored by personnel of the chancery, as supposed by van Berchem and by Redford after him.

In the first part of the seventh/thirteenth century, most of Anatolia fell under the rule of the Saljuq state. The sultans of Konya conquered a large part of the Mediterranean coast and the Black Sea coast and made decisive territorial gains in the east and the southeast (Fig. 1). Three Christian polities continued to exist (the empires of Nicea and Trabzon and the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia), but the Saljuqs were hegemonic. In this move toward political unification, marriage was a powerful tool alongside military conquests.

1. An epistolary exchange with Andrew Peacock about MS Marʿāshī 11136 spurred me to write a short note on this inscription, which eventually took me much further than anticipated. I am grateful to Scott Redford for reading a previous version of this article and for sharing with me his comments and expertise on Saljuq caravanserais. I am also thankful to Emad al-Din Sheykh al-Hokamaee for clearing some reading issues. In addition, I have benefited from the useful remarks and suggestions made by the peer reviewers.
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Many khātūns, as the female sultans were known, were of foreign origin. Their political role behind the curtains has been mentioned, most often to be deplored, in the chronicles.\(^2\) Recent scholarship has focused on their role as “patrons of architecture,” to quote Bates’s pioneering article on the subject.\(^3\) Indeed, a significant number of buildings from this period in Anatolia can be traced to female patrons.\(^4\) The daughters of the Ayyubid wife of sultan ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I (d. 1237), built for her a well-known mausoleum in Kayseri.

---


after her death (Fig. 2). Māhparī Khātūn, a Greek or Armenian noble whose marriage with the same ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn sealed the conquest of Alanya, built a famous complex in Kayseri that has recently been the subject of in-depth publications by Eastmond, Blessing, and Yalman. Another wife of the same sultan, ‘Īṣmat Khātūn, the sister of the deposed ruler of Erzurum, also engaged in building, as Redford has shown. These construction activities took place from the Pamphylian coast to the Yeşilırma River.

Figure 2: Genealogical Tree of the Rum Saljuqs in the Seventh/Thirteenth Century (Spouses Noted in Italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation of Rum Saljuq Sultan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿĪzz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qīlīj Arslan II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 588/1192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Khurraw I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 608/1211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruqūn al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymān II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 1225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughīrī al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughrūshshāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 1225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Qubād I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 634/1237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿĪzz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Qawūs I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 616/1219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruqūn al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāhānshāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Rusudān)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿĪṣmat al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Khurraw II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 644/1246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[with Māḥparī]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qīlīj Arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿĪzz al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Qawūs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. ca. 678/1279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruqūn al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qīlīj Arslan IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 663/1264-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alī al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Qubād II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 655/1257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[with Ayyubid wife]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[with Mengūjēkīd]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghiyāth al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masʿūd II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d. 707/1307)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present article aims to contribute to this active scholarly field, but through a different kind of source: an inscription copied in MS Marʿāshī 11136. The manuscript, long held in private hands in Iran and now kept at the Marʿāshī Library in Qum, is a munshaʿāt, that is,

---


a compilation of official and private writing, primarily designed to serve as a letter-writing handbook for secretaries. This manuscript has a complex history, and it was produced by several hands over a period of several decades in seventh/thirteenth- and early eighth/fourteenth-century Anatolia. The document that sparked this article is copied in a section on the correct use of honorific titles (alqāb, sg. laqab). Laqabs were used since the beginning of Islam, initially for the caliphs, but in the Saljuq period their use ballooned seemingly out of control (the inflation was already deplored by the great Saljuq vizier Niẓām al-Mulk, d.485/1092). Although never-ending laqabs can be disconcerting to modern historians, the phenomenon can tell us a lot about the state and the society in which it took place.

The inscription under study here is preceded by the following introductory words: “Honorific titles (alqāb) of the King of the world and the Queen of the world that are [inscribed] above the doorway of the caravanserai of Dūd.n” (alqāb-i khudāygān-i ʿālam wa malika-yi jahān kī bar dar-i kārawānsarāyi ʿālam wa malika-yi jahān kī bar dar-i kārawānsarāyi dūd.n ast). This text is exceptional on several grounds. First, it is far longer than the lengthiest building inscription of a Saljuq caravanserai known so far. Second, the patron is none other than the Georgian wife of the last independent Saljuq ruler of Rum. Her eventful life is documented in a vast array of written sources, first collected by Vryonis. She is famous for having erected, much later, the mausoleum of the mystic Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 672/1273) in Konya, but nothing was hitherto known of her building activities during the reign of her husband. Third, the text seems also to be the only surviving example of a foundation inscription copied in a munshaʾāt, and as such it can inform us about the relationship between “paper, stone, and scissors,” to use Redford’s words.

---

7. The manuscript was in a private collection in Tabriz before entering the Marʿashi Najafi Library of Qum at the end of the twentieth century. It has never previously been exploited by scholars working on medieval Anatolia. For an introduction to its contents and its complex history, see D. Durand-Guédy, “Manbaʿī-yi muhim dar bāra-yi Saljūquyyān-i Rūm wa dabīr-khāna-yi fārsī-yi ān-hā: Nuskha-yi khaṭṭī-yi Kitābkhāna-yi Āyat Allāh Marʿashī, shumāra 11136,” Mīrāth-i Shahāb 100 (tābistān 1399sh. [2020]): 63–84; D. Durand-Guédy, “A New Source on the Saljuqs of Rum and Their Persian Chancery: Manuscript 11136 of the Marʿashī Library (Qum),” Der Islam, forthcoming in 2022.


9. According to Redford, the lengthiest inscription known to date is Kırkgöz Han’s, near Antalya. See S. Redford, “The Inscription of the Kırkgöz Han and the Problem of Textual Transmission in Seljuk Anatolia,” Adalya 12 (2009): 347–59, at 347. The inscription under study here is 40% longer.

10. On Rūmī’s mausoleum, see Crane, “Notes,” 46 (no. 71); Eastmond, “Gender and Patronage,” 85; Blessing, “Women Patrons,” 480.

11. Redford, “Paper, Stone, Scissors.” I could have started my article with the exact words chosen by Redford (ibid., 151): “This chapter addresses three main issues relating to writing a history of the Seljuks. The first is the accordance, or lack thereof, between two different historical sources: chronicles and inscriptions (the ‘paper’ and ‘stone’ in the title). The second concerns sultans’ wives and their place in the Seljuk social order, and the third is legitimacy.”
I will start by giving a transcription of the Arabic text, followed by a translation and analysis of its content. Beyond the obvious issues of identification (identity of the patron, location of the caravanserai), I will highlight the new insights the text provides about the period in which it was produced. I will also put it in perspective with what we know of the history of the manuscript in which it is included. At the end of the article, I will argue that this document proves the role of the diwān al-inshāʾ (official chancery) in the composition of foundation inscriptions.

1. The Text of the Inscription and Its Translation

The text of the inscription appears on fol. 29v of MS Marʿashī 11136. The author of the manuscript included it in a series of nine documents about the honorific titles suitable for members of the royal family—especially the sultan, but also his appointed heir. In this part of the manuscript the script is handsome and can be deciphered without a problem (Fig. 3).

Figure 3: Text of the inscription in MS Marʿashī 11136

1. أَمْرَتُ بِعمَارَةِ هَذِهِ الْرِبَاطِ مَنْ أَعْمَلَ مَعْلُوبًا عَنْهَا الْمَسَافِرِينَ وَبِهَا النَّازِلِينَ الْخَلَايِقِ عَلَى الْمَوْبَدَةِ المُسْبِلَةِ الرِبَاطِ هَذِهِ بِعَمَارَةِ أَمْرَتِهَا 1

الأمم رقاب ملك العالم في الله ظل الأعظم السلطان دوله الفصحاء وهو صاحب الأفقات سلاطين السلطان داوود بن أبي المصلمين وهو الاستلام مغيث الدين ودنيا غيث النطاق واللواء واللقمة والتمële والمجد والتمثل والخيرات وآخر الأفعال السلطان المعتصم بالله رحمه الله خليف بن خیسرو الفتح المتمني ونجل الملك محمد الرخوي والدها والد مؤتمن الملك بالله في بحبل في بلجه وما منه ما تقبل وعينه والدها ودها وأوقلهما ما منهما وقلبهم في الله بسط البحرين وعجمع الفتح.

2. مغَّلَبَتُ الْحَشَائِشِ وَلِيَةُ الْأَلْهَمِ وَالْكَرَامَاتِ عَصْمَتٌ الْدُنْيَا وَالْإِسْلَامِ وَالسُّلَطَانُ المعْصَمُ عَلَى الْدُنْيَا وَالْإِسْلَامِ فَخْرُ السَّلَطَانِ سُلَطَانُ السُّلَطَانِ آلْدَرْة الْعَالَمِ أَقُاليِمُ مَلْكَهَا الغَالِبَةُ السَّلَطَانِ المعْصَمُ عَلَى الْكَرَامَاتِ وَالاِلْهَامٍ وَلِيَةُ الْحُسُنَاتِ بِبَيْتِهَا رَبِّيَّةُ الْبَرِّ وَالْمَلَكِ والْمَعْصَمُ عَلَى الْإِسْلَامِ وَالْوَلْدَةِ الفخْرِيَّةِ دَرْةَ الْعَالَمِ الرَّحْمَانِيَّةِ والْمَتَّنَّةَ في الْعَلَمِ الرَّحْمَانِيَّةِ.

3. Al-sitr al-ʿāliyya (“the elevated veil”) is more probable than al-sitr al-ghāliyya (“the expansive veil”) for a metaphoric address to a high-ranking lady.
Amarat bi-‘imārat hādhihi al-ribāṭ al-musbala al-mawqūfa al-muʾabbada ‘alā sāʾir al-khalāʾiq al-nāzilīn bihā wa-l-musāfirīn ʿanhā naḥw mashāriq al-arḍ wa-maghāribihā,


The text follows the classical structure of foundation inscriptions. It starts (§1) with a statement of foundation containing a verb (“order”) and an object (here: the construction of a ribāṭ). These are followed by (§2) an adverbial phrase of time (here: during the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II’), (§3) the subject of the action (here: ‘Iṣmat al-Dīn), and finally (§4) the date. The only originality in this text, to which we will come back later, lies in the qualification of the building (its charitable purpose).

The inscription can be translated as follows:

[1] She has ordered the construction of this ribāṭ, dedicated to a charitable purpose, endowed, eternal for all the creatures setting foot in it and [all] the travelers arriving to it and leaving it for the east or the west of the world,

[2] in the days of the greatest sultan, God’s shadow on earth, the master of the necks of the nations, sultan of all the sultans under the sky, possessor of the crown, the flag, and the belt, Ghiyāth al-dunyā wa-l-dīn, Mughīth al-islām wa-l-muslimīn Abū al-Fatḥ Kay-Khusraw b. Kay-Qubād—may God make his rule eternal,

[3] the high lady, queen of the climes of the world, pearl of the crown of the family of David, builder of pious foundations [maybe: mosques], the inspiring woman through whom God works miracles, ‘Iṣmat al-dunyā wa-l-dīn, Ṣafwat


14. The verb is distinctly in the feminine third person (amарат), instead of the usual “amara bi-‘imāra” (sometimes read in the passive voice, umira, or even the passive of the intensive form, ummira) seen in foundation inscriptions for both male and female patrons (see Rogers, “Waqf and Patronage,” 73).

15. The same expression is in the inscription of Kirkgöz Hanı. Contrary to Redford (“Kırkgöz Hanı,” 353, line 2), I understand al-nāzilūn bihā and al-musāfirūn ʿanhā not as people “residing in the caravanserai and travellers”, but as “arriving and departing travellers”.
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al-islām wa-l-muslimīn, holding firm to God’s rope [cf. Quran 3:103], mother of the powerful prince ‘Alāʾ al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn, glory of the Saljuq family, appointed heir by his father, sultan of the land and the two seas—may God make her hand extend her good deeds, and may she be happy with the father of her father,16 may what she has built receive a good reception, and may she obtain in the two worlds [this one and the next] what she desires

[4] on the date of so and so.

2. Identification

Gurjī Khātūn

There is no doubt whatsoever about the identity of the patron. First, the inscription is dated to the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw b. Kay-Qubād, that is, Kay-Khusraw II (r. 634–44/1237–46). Mentioning the name of the reigning sultan was expected when the building was not erected by the sultan himself. Second, the patron is introduced as the “mother of the powerful prince ‘Alāʾ al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn.” This can be none other than the mother of ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II (d. 655/1257) (Fig. 2).17

She bore the name of her grandmother, Tamar, the mighty queen of Georgia at the end of the twelfth century (Fig. 4). Her mother, Rusudan, was also a formidable queen of Georgia, who acceded to the throne at the age of twenty-nine and picked the son of the Saljuq ruler of Erzurum as her husband. Their daughter Tamar was given in marriage to seal the alliance between the Rum Saljuqs and the Bagratid Georgians after the two dynasties became neighbors. Specifically, after his tremendous victory over the Khwārazmians at Yāsī Chaman in 627/1230, ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I of Konya took Erzurum, abolished the independent principality of his cousin Jahān-Shāh, married his sister, and pushed his advantage by sending his army into Georgian territory, where Jahān-Shāh had withdrawn. After the loss of several fortresses, in the troubled context created by the Mongol conquests, Queen Rusudan of Georgia proposed to Kay-Qubād I a marriage between her daughter and his son, the appointed heir Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II.18

16. The manuscript has wālid wālidihā, “father of her father”, but this is obviously a mistake, as Gurjī Khātūn’s grand-father, Mughīth al-Dīn Ṭughrulshāh, was then long dead (Fig. 2). Maybe the copyist meant wālid waladihā, “the father of her son”, i.e. the reigning sultan.


The marriage was eventually concluded in 635/1237, after the prince ascended the throne (634/1237).\textsuperscript{19} At the Saljuq court, Tamar was known as Gurjī Khātūn, as evidenced by Georgian and Persian sources.\textsuperscript{20} Despite Brosset's commented translation of the Georgian Chronicle, Tamar/Gurjī Khātūn has long been overlooked. Canard did not deal with her in his article dedicated to the (often very negative) image of Georgian queens in Muslim sources.\textsuperscript{21} Vryonis totally ignored her in his 1971 monograph on Saljuq Anatolia. However, he made up for the oversight in a later article. Commenting on the painted figure of a woman called "Kira Thamāris" in a church in Cappadocia, Vryonis argued that this "Lady Tamar" is no other than Gurjī Khātūn, of whom he offered a detailed biography.\textsuperscript{22} To this end, he analyzed all the available

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.png}
\caption{The Bagratids of Georgia in the Thirteenth Century}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{22} S. Vryonis Jr., The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); idem, “Another Note
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sources in Georgian (the Royal Chronicle), Syriac (Bar Hebraeus), and Persian (mainly Áqsarāyî’s chronicle of the Saljuqs and Aflākî’s hagiography of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmî). In 1998, Leiser discussed Gurjī Khātūn in an article about the famous Rum Saljuq gold dinar showing a sun and a lion (a passage from Bar Hebraeus had led to the surmise that Kay-Khusraw II had represented himself as a lion and his beloved Georgian queen as the sun). Two other scholars dealt with Gurjī Khātūn from different perspectives. In 2006, Peacock published an important article in which he interpreted the marriage as “a response to the Mongol threat, even if the Georgian-Seljuk alliance proved to be of little concrete use in practice.” And in 2007, Eastmond studied Gurjī Khātūn as a symbol of the “cultural syncretism” visible in the artistic production of seventh/thirteenth-century Anatolia.

**Düden**

The author of the munshaʾāt indicates that the inscription was located “above the doorway of the caravanserai” (bar dar-i kārawānsarā), which was the usual location of such inscriptions. The similar caravanserai of Kırkgöz Han, the inscription is “carved on a single block of limestone and inserted over the entrance into the building.” Understandably, the geographical location of the building did not need to be mentioned in the inscription. The toponym “Dūd.n” given by the author of the munshaʾāt in the “title” on the Inscription of the Church of St. George of Belisirma,” Byzantina 9 (1977): 9–22. The church is located 25 km south of Aksaray. Vryonis believed that “Masʿūd,” the male figure represented next to Kira Thamāris, was the puppet Saljuq sultan Masʿūd II (d. 707/1307). In the image, the woman called Kira Thamâris is about three-quarters the latter’s size and appears as the donor of the portrait. This identification of the principal donor has been questioned, see bibliographical references in T. Uyar, “Thirteenth-century ‘Byzantine’ art in Cappadocia and the question of the Greek painters at the Seljuq Court,” in Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia, ed. A.C.S. Peacock, B. De Nicola and S. Nur Yildiz, 215–231 (Burlington, VT; Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2015), at note 12.


27. Redford, “Kirkgöz Hanı,” 347. Marble was a more frequent alternative to limestone.
of the document is unfamiliar to me. However, Ibn Bībī speaks of a “manzil-i Dūdān.” It appears in the chapter on the conquest of Antalya, which reports that after the conquest, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I (d. 608/1211), the namesake grandfather of Gurjī Khātūn’s husband, wanted to go back to his capital, Konya. According to Ibn Bībī, “as they were one stage (manzil) from the coast, the delegates of the sultan’s divan gave the order to settle at manzil-i Dūdān and to gather the sheep of the sultan.”28 This reference to the flocks belonging to the sultan (akhmās-i khāṣṣ) is interesting, as they are seldom mentioned in the chronicles on the Saljuqs.

Dūdān is the persianized form of Diadion, which fell to the Saljuqs one generation before the capture of Antalya.29 The Düden River now flows from the mountains north of Antalya into the sea east of the city. The Dūdan caravanserai was probably located upstream, east or northeast of the city (Fig. 5).30 Its site is now occupied by the current urban agglomeration of 2.5 million inhabitants. The only evidence we have of Seljuk construction on the Düden River proper is what seems to be a rebuilding of part of a Roman aqueduct as a bridge (see the Soğukasku bridge in Fig. 5).31

The toponym itself may be one of the rare survivals from Hittite, as the Hittite düden refers to a stream or river that disappears only to reappear. The Düden Çayı that flows into the Mediterranean east of Antalya is such a stream: it originates in a series of springs at the

---

29. According to the Christian historians quoted by Cahen, Turquie, 48, Diadion was captured by ʿIzz al-Dīn Qīlïj Arslan II (d. 588/1192).
30. The Greek name for the river, katarraktes, refers to its waterfalls. The Upper Düden Waterfalls, about eight kilometers from the Hadrian Gate, are today a well-known recreation spot for the inhabitants of Antalya.
31. I am indebted to Scott Redford for this information.
base of the foothills of the Taurus mountains (the Kirkgözler springs) and then disappears in the limestone formations (karst) of the region, only to reappear after several kilometers.\textsuperscript{32} There are several other locations called “Düden” in Anatolia (around Niksar, southeast of Malatya, and east of Denizli, respectively), but they are less likely to be the site of our caravanserai. None of them is mentioned in the pre-Ottoman sources, and they are all way out of the center of Saljuq power in that period. The Düden Lake north of Tuz Gölü occupies a more strategic position, and it would have been meaningful to build a caravanserai at the intersection of two key trade roads: the Tarsus-Ankara road (via Niğde and Aksaray) and the Antalya-Ankara road (via Konya). However, I am not aware of any construction in this bare landscape.

Conversely, a caravanserai near Antalya would fit perfectly what we know of the region (Pamphylia) in that period. Redford remarked that “Seljuk sub-sultanic patronage often clustered in certain regions of Anatolia.”\textsuperscript{33} During Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II’s reign, Pamphylia was such a cluster. The conquest of the southern littoral had been the great project of the Saljuqs before they looked eastward. ‘Īzz al-Dīn Qīlīj Arslan II prepared the ground; his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I carried out the conquest of Antalya; and the latter’s son ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I conquered Kalonoros (renamed Alanya). He also launched several building projects to tie the region to the Saljuq Kernland: a road from Alanya to Konya and a caravanserai at Alara (Fig. 6).

\textbf{Figure 6: Women’s Patronage in Rum Anatolia (1232–45)}

(Free Vector Form from Vecteezy.com)


\textsuperscript{33}. Redford, “Kirkgöz Ham,” 350.
His son, Gurjī Khātūn’s husband, was even more dedicated to Antalya: while Kay-Qubād I also built caravanserais in central Anatolia (at Aksaray and Kayseri), Kay-Khusraw II built exclusively on the Mediterranean coast (Sarafşa Han) and in its near hinterland (Kırkgöz Han, İncir Han). The aim was to turn the Pamphylian coast into a commercial hub between the Southwest Asian trade, the eastern Mediterranean (more specifically Cyprus), and even Armenian Cilician territories.

The exact location of the caravanserai is a matter of conjecture. Kırkgöz, where the sources that feed the Düden River emerge, is a possible location. But that would mean that Kırkgöz Han and the caravanserai of Gurjī Khātūn are one and the same building, which would require us to hypothesize a complex building history with a change of patron. The most likely location, however, is somewhere near the Düden River east of Antalya. Its proximity to the city would easily explain the lack of remains. The well-known example of Eğirdir Han reminds us that cut stones were sought-after commodities: built near Lake Eğirdir (110 km north of Antalya), this caravanserai’s monumental portal has been entirely removed and reassembled in the nearby town as the portal for a madrasa.

The author of the munshaʾāt replaced the date of the original inscription with “so-and-so,” following common practice. We know that the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II lasted eight solar years, from 634/1237 to 643/1245. If ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was seven years old at the death of his father, it means he was born within the first year of his parents’ marriage; 636/1238 is a plausible guess. It corresponds to the dates of construction of the caravanserais built by the sultan in the Antalya region. The two that are dated (Eğirdir Han in 635 AH and İncir Han in 636 AH) happen to be on the road linking Antalya to Konya via the lakes of Eğirdir and Beyşehir (site of the palace of Qubād-ābād). So is also Kırkgöz Han, built by Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II’s mother-in-law.

It is tempting to surmise that Gurjī Khātūn, who appears to have been very close to the sultan, launched the Düden building project as soon as her son ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn was born. But a later date cannot be excluded. Although the defeat at Kösedağ (641/1243) had immediate

34. Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II also finished Eğridir Han, located further from the coast and started by his father. See Redford, “Urbs in Rure,” 42–43.
35. Cahen, Turquie, 122, 124.
36. Redford, “Urbs in Rure,” 43. As a consequence, the inscription of Eğirdir Han is still visible, but not at its original site.
37. The place and date mentioned in the colophons of the letters copied in munshaʾāt are systematically left out. Redford (“Kırkgöz Hanı,” 349) believes that on the inscription of Kırkgöz Han, the scribe left out the date because of a lack of space.
38. The date of his death is not recorded in the sources. For long, it was dated to 644/1246, as in C. E. Bosworth, The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 213. But Kaymaz, followed by Turan, opted for 643/1245, see Leiser, “Observations,” 114 n. 56. Cahen mentions only the CE year (Turquie, 230: “end 1245 or 1246”).
40. This is the date assumed by Turan, Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye, 477.
financial repercussions for the Seljuq state, the region of Antalya had not lost its appeal for the sultan, and actually it is the only region in which Seljuq patronage is attested after 641/1243. This is irrefutable for military architecture (the walls of Antalya), but very probably true for commercial buildings, too.\(^{41}\) The reason is obvious: it was the city furthest from the Mongol ordu, with an easy escape route by boat if necessary.

3. Remarks about the Text of the Inscription

To enable a more thorough analysis, I have prepared several tables listing the denominations found in foundation inscriptions. Table 1 references all the foundations by woman patrons in Rum, Table 2 the foundations by male patrons during the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II, and Table 3 the foundations of that particular sultan.

The patron of the Düden caravanserai is referred only by her honorific titles (laqab), without mention of her name (ism) or genealogy (nasab). This is not unusual. The most frequent form of denomination in Table 1 (accounting for seven out of thirteen inscriptions) combines a laqab with an ism, but the dominance of this form is largely due to the many foundations of Māhparī Khātūn, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I’s wife.\(^{42}\) Another of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn’s wives, Ṭughrulshāh’s daughter, is referred to only by her laqab, never her ism (Table 1: items 4 and 11). In fact, in the official documents (sulṭāniyyāt) copied into the munsha’āt, laqab is the denomination by default, and the ism may or may not be given.

In the Düden inscription,\(^{43}\) two of these laqabs are standard for Saljuq queens: “ʿIṣmat al-dunyā wa-l-dīn” (literally, “the virtue of the world and the faith”) and “Ṣafwat al-islām wa-l-muslimīn” (literally, “The quintessence of Islam and the Muslims”). Two other ‘Iṣma are known in the Saljuq family: the daughter of Ṭughrulshāh (himself a Saljuq) who married sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād (Fig. 2)\(^{44}\) and, in the previous generation, a sister of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I.\(^{45}\) According to Uzunçarşılı, followed by Blessing, the title “Ṣafwa” was given to queens of non-royal origin, whereas “ʿIṣma” seems to have been reserved for women born as princesses (indeed, Māhpari, the daughter of the Christian commander of Kalonoros, is never given the laqab ‘Iṣmat al-Dīn).\(^{46}\) However, the titles were not exclusive.

---

\(^{41}\) Blessing (“Women Patrons,” 480) writes that “after 641/1243 Seljuks rulers are no longer recorded as patrons of architecture,” but several royal inscriptions on the walls of Antalya postdate Köseดา. For Redford (“Kırkgöz Hanı,” 350), the “plainer caravansarays” of Pamphylia without decoration (like Şarapsa and Kargi) “were built in the last years of the sultan’s reign […] a time when he had diminished resources, but spent most of his time in these parts”.\(^{42}\) Five of the six inscriptions for Māhpari contain a laqab and an ism.\(^{43}\) I speak hereafter of the “Düden inscription” to refer to the text under study, although the text presently exists only in a manuscript. At the end of this article I address the relationship between the stone and the paper.\(^{44}\) Redford, “Paper, Stone, Scissors,” 155. For the title Şafwat [al-Dīn], see also İ. H. Uzunçarsılı, Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilâtına Medhal (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941), 66; E.S. Wolper, “Princess Safwat al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn and the Production of Sufi Buildings and Hagiographies in Pre-Ottoman Anatolia,” in D. Fairchild Ruggles, Women, Patronage, 35–52, at 42–43

\(^{45}\) ʿIṣmat al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn Gawhar Nasība; see Crane, “Notes,” 41; Blessing, “Women Patrons,” 479 n. 12.

## Table 1: Denominations in Foundation Inscriptions by Women Patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Foundation (AH date)</th>
<th>Patron (ism when known)</th>
<th>Denomination of the sultan (see Appendix)</th>
<th>Denomination of the patron (laqab (first word or in full))</th>
<th>RCEA no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Çifte Medrese in Kayseri (602)</td>
<td>Gawhar</td>
<td>var. 1 + GhD KKh b. QA</td>
<td>ʾIṣma</td>
<td>Gawhar Naṣība b. QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Külük Mosque in Kayseri (607)</td>
<td>Atsüz Altï</td>
<td>var. 1 + ʿIzD AbF KKh b. KKh + 21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Atsūz Altï Khātūn b. Maḥ. b. Yāghibāsān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hospital of Divriği (626)</td>
<td>Tūrān Malik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tūrān Malik bt. Fd Bahramshāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Uluborlu Friday Mosque (629)</td>
<td>ʿUṯrulshāh’s daughter</td>
<td>1–2, var. 24, ʿAD AbF KKh b. KKh</td>
<td>ʾIṣma, ʿṢafwa</td>
<td>bt. Ṭughrulshāh bt. QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Huand Hatun complex in Kayseri (635)</td>
<td>Māḥparī</td>
<td>1 + GhD AbF KKh b. KKh</td>
<td>Ṣafwa, Fāṭihat al-khayrāt</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hatun Han in Pazar (636)</td>
<td>Māḥparī</td>
<td>1, var. 2, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KKh + 21</td>
<td>Ṣafwa, Wālīda</td>
<td>Māḥparī Khātūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hospital of Divriği (626)</td>
<td>Māḥparī</td>
<td>1, var. 2, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KKh + 21</td>
<td>Ṣafwa, Wālīda, Malika</td>
<td>Māḥparī Khātūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hospital of Divriği (626)</td>
<td>Māḥparī</td>
<td>var. 9</td>
<td>Malika, ʿṢafwa, Wālīda</td>
<td>Māḥparī Khātūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Huand Hatun complex in Kayseri (635)</td>
<td>Māḥparī</td>
<td>1, var. 2, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KKh + 21</td>
<td>Ṣafwa, Wālīda</td>
<td>Māḥparī Khātūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>[Düden Ribāṭ (n.d.)]</td>
<td>Tamar/Gurjī Khātūn</td>
<td>1, 22, var. 23, 25 + GhD MghD AbF KKh b. KKh</td>
<td>Sītr, Malika, Durra, Waliyya, ʾIṣma, Ṣafwa, Wālīda</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kirkgöz Han</td>
<td>Ṭughrulshāh’s daughter</td>
<td>1, 22, var. 23, 25, GhD AbF KKh b. KKh</td>
<td>ʾIṣma, Durrat Tāj al-Duwal</td>
<td>4263 (Erdmann no. 56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Denominations in Foundation Inscriptions by Male Patrons during the Sultanate of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Foundation (AH order)</th>
<th>Patron (ism when known)</th>
<th>Denomination of the sultan (see Appendix)</th>
<th>Denomination of the patron</th>
<th>RCEA no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kutahya Mosque (634)</td>
<td>ʿImād al-Dīn Hizār Dīnārī</td>
<td>1, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ</td>
<td>ʿImādD Hizār Dīnārī</td>
<td>4134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>‘Alā’ al-Dīn Mosque in Antalya (637)</td>
<td>atabeg Armaghān</td>
<td>1, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ + 21</td>
<td>Atabak Armaghān</td>
<td>4179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Qarāṭāy Han (638)</td>
<td>Qarāṭāy</td>
<td>1–2, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ + 21</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>4190 (Erdmann no. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Elbistan’s Friday mosque (639)</td>
<td>Chawlī</td>
<td>var. 1 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ + 21</td>
<td>MubārizD Abū al-ʿIzz, Chawlī al-Dhawwāq al-sulṭānī</td>
<td>4199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hidirlik Mosque</td>
<td>ʿImād al-Dīn Hizār Dīnārī</td>
<td>1, 22 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ</td>
<td>ʿImādD Hizār Dīnārī</td>
<td>4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Tower in the walls of Antalya (642)</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. Saʿīd</td>
<td>1–3, var. 4 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ + 21</td>
<td>Abū Bakr b. Saʿīd</td>
<td>4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Burmali Minaret in Amasya (645)</td>
<td>brothers Farrukh &amp; Yusuf al-Khāzin</td>
<td>1 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ+ 21</td>
<td>Farrukh &amp; Yusuf al-Khāzin</td>
<td>4261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Denominations of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II in Buildings He Commissioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Foundation (AH date)</th>
<th>Denomination of the sultan (see Appendix)</th>
<th>RCEA no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eğirdir Han (635)</td>
<td>1–20 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ b. QA b. Mas b. QA + 21 (total: 22)</td>
<td>4148 (Erdmann no. 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Walls of Antalya (636)</td>
<td>1, 22, var. 4 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ + 21 (total: 5)</td>
<td>4159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>İncir Han (636)</td>
<td>1–6, 8, 20 + GhD AbF KKh b. KQ b. KKh + 21 (total: 10)</td>
<td>4162 (Erdmann no. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Walls of Antalya (642)</td>
<td>1–3, 9, var. 4, 23 + GhD + 24, var. 22 + AbF KKh b. KQ + 21 (total: 10)</td>
<td>4238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kay-Qubād I’s two royal spouses (Bint Ṭughrulshāh and al-Malika al-ʿĀdila) are both called “ʿIṣma” and “Ṣafwa” (see Table 1: items 4 and 13). Yalman noted that the inscription for al-Malika al-ʿĀdila does not fit Uzunçarşılı’s theory, but she tried to normalize the exception by arguing that “the Ayyubid princess seemed to be implying descent from the Rum Seljuk dynasty.” Since the princess and her son were slaughtered by her Saljuq “parents,” this assumption is difficult to accept (the daughters of al-Malika al-ʿĀdila took the extraordinary initiative of declining to mention the reigning Saljuq sultan in the inscription on the monument they built for their mother in Kayseri to show their aversion to the dynasty).

Gurjī Khātūn’s rank was even higher than those of Ṭughrulshāh’s daughter and al-Malika al-ʿĀdila. Her mother ruled Georgia, and her father was a Saljuq prince (Fig. 4). The Düden inscription shows that “ʿIṣma” and “Ṣafwa” were usual titles for Rum Saljuq khātūns. This is confirmed by a model of a letter for a khātūn in the manuscript from which our text is drawn. The same was true in Mongol Iran, as evidenced by Muhammad b. Nakhjawānī’s Dastūr al-kātib, a chancery manual completed in Tabriz in 767/1365–66.

The second laqab given to Gurjī Khātūn, “pearl of the crown of the family of David,” signals her origin. The “family of David” is the usual expression used to refer to the Bagratid dynasty, which can be traced back to the start of the ninth century CE and which ruled Georgia and the western Caucasus since the days of David IV the Builder (d. 1125 CE). David had been the emblematic royal first name since Bagratid propagandists advanced the claim of biblical descent. Ibn Bībī uses it in the message Queen Rusudan allegedly sent to ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I to offer peace:

It has come to our mind that now our countries are neighbors. My pure and secluded child, who is descended from the loins of the Saljuqs and the race of David (az ʿulb-i Saljūq u nizhād-i Dāwūd), [should] go to the nuptial room of the prince of Islam, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw.

The son Gurjī Khātūn had with the sultan had the same dual background. Let us note

---

47. Yalman, “‘Dual Identity,’” 235.
48. MS Marʿashī 11136, fol. 10r.
49. We can note that the Dastūr al-kātib gives six possible series of laqabs for khātūns: ʿIṣma appears in two of them and Ṣafwa in three (Nuṣra, a title not recorded for Rum Saljuq khātūns, is also mentioned). See Muḥammad Munshī Nakhjawānī, Dastūr al-kātib fi taʿyīn al-marātib, ed. ʿA. A. Ahmadi Dārānī, 2 vols. (Tehran: Mīrāth-i Maktūb, 1395sh.), 163–64.
52. The links between the Saljuqs and the Bagratids were not exclusive, and Gurjī Khātūn had on her side a formidable range of connections that stretched over the whole of Asia Minor (see Eastmond, “Art and Frontiers”). Contrary to Yalman (“‘Dual Identity’”), I prefer to speak of “background” rather than “identity,” as the latter notion is now being used so extensively and in such a way that its very meaning has become blurred.
that in the Şünbül Zaviye of Tokat (691 AH), the dual descent of Muʿīn al-Dīn Pervaneh’s
dughter is also exalted. The patron, Şünbül, praises her former master as al-malika . . .
 al-mukarrama ilā al-ṭarafayn al-nasībat al-abuwayn (“the queen . . . venerated on both sides
for the genealogy of her two parents”).

Do the honorific titles of Gurji Khātūn tell us something about her faith? The question
deserves to be asked because according to the Georgian chronicle, she had been allowed
to remain a Christian and to practice her religion openly. The same source details the
events that led to her conversion during the reign of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II, but
it is not dated. Many of the titles mentioned in the Düden inscription carry no religious
connotations, but “Ṣafwat al-islām wa-l-muslimīn” followed by a reference to “holding
firm to God’s rope” implies that she was a Muslim. In sum, the Düden inscription portrays
Gurji Khātūn as a woman of royal blood and as a staunch Muslim, but also as the wife of the
sultan and the mother of the appointed heir. It gives her seven ḥaqabs altogether.

The reigning sultan is mentioned in the inscription, as was customary. The sultan’s main
title, “Ghiyāth al-dunyā wa-l-dīn”, had been borne already by his homonymous grandfather,
the conqueror of Antalya, Kay-Khusraw I. The other sultanic titles used in the Düden
inscription are also found elsewhere. As can be seen in Tables 2, 3, and in the appendix,
al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam appears every time the name of the sultan is mentioned. “Shadow of
God on earth” also appears recurrently, though not on Eğirdir Han or İncir Han, which were
built by the sultan at the beginning of his reign. However, the evidence is not sufficient to
conclude that the Düden caravanserai was built after Kösedağ, as this title appears on the
walls of Antalya both before and after 641/1243, and also on all the caravanserais built by
female patrons at Kayseri, Pazar, Çinçili, and Kirkgöz (see Tables 2–3).

(Obviously, this already lengthy article is not the place to engage with this issue).

53. Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe, ed. E. Combe, J. Sauvaget, and G. Wiet, 18 vols (Cairo:
IFAO, 1931–91) [henceforth RCEA], inscription no. 4959. This Sufi lodge is discussed by Wolper, “Princess Safwat
al-Dunyā,” 41–43.

54. Georgian Chronicle, 1:502 and 524 (“en effet elle avait un prêtre, des images et des croix, non secrètement

55. According to the Georgian Chronicle, Gurji Khātūn’s conversion was the unforeseen consequence of her
mother Rusudan’s schemes to get rid of her nephew David (future David VI Ulu; see Fig. 4), who also stayed at
the court of Konya. At some point, Rusudan told the sultan that her daughter Gurji Khātūn and her nephew
David had maintained illicit relations. The sultan beat her, and “the unfortunate woman, tired of suffering,
renounced the true faith she had been keeping until then” (Georgian Chronicle, 1:524; Peacock, “Georgia,” 142).
Vryonis (“Another Note”) put forward the influence of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī as a decisive factor in Gurji Khātūn’s
conversion. Since Rūmī’s father settled in Konya in 626/1228, this is not impossible.

56. Wa-ʿtaṣimū bi-ḥabl Allāhi jamīʿan wa-lā tafarraqū is one of the most famous verses of the Quran. “God’s
rope” has usually been interpreted as a metaphor for the Quran. The sincerity of Gurji Khātūn’s conversion has
been questioned by Vryonis (“Another Note,” 20), but it is not the issue here.

57. Ghiyāth and Mughīth (both meaning “succorer”) are built on the same root, ghātha, meaning “to water
(with rain),” hence “to help.”

58. In some inscriptions, al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam is followed by shāhanshāh al-muʿaẓẓam, but the latter epithet is
not as powerful a title as the superlative aʿẓam.

Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wuṣṭā 29 (2021)
The title “possessor of the crown, the flag, and the belt” is much rarer. It appears only once elsewhere: in the nearby Kırkgöz Han, built by Ṭughrulshāh’s daughter (Table 1: item 11). The two inscriptions are remarkably similar as far as the denominations for the sultan are concerned. Since the text is in Arabic, the word *liwāʾ* (flag) has been preferred over *sanjaq*, the emblematic Turkish word used in Persian chronicles but not in Arabic ones.

Redford noted that the belt (*niṭāq*) is a new and unexpected element of Saljuq regalia, but he meant in an inscriptional sense. In fact it was used in *qaṣīdas* in honor of great Saljuq sultans. For example, Amīr Muʿīzī, the *malik al-shuʿarā* of sultan Malik-Shāh b. Alp Arslan (d. 485/1092), declaimed:

\[
\text{داد جوئی و پیروری و دولت و سیاه و کمر تاج و تخت و شمشیر و افسر و نگین}
\]

The ring, the “hat,” the sword, the throne, the crown, and the belt; they conferred [on this sultan] an army and a state, as well as victory and youth.

The belt is a symbol of determination (the Persian *kamar bastan* is the exact equivalent of the English “to gird one’s loins”), and the image is often used by the same panegyrist. Redford, who surmises that Kırkgöz Han was built after Kösedağ, suggests that “the enumeration of regalia could be read as an insistence on his legitimacy: the sultan actually had these items in his possession, and with them retained the right to rule, despite his defeat at Kösedağ.”

The last person mentioned in the Düden inscription is Gurji Khâtûn’s son with the sultan, ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II. Like all Saljuq princes, he is *al-malik al-muʿaẓẓam*. His title “sultan of the land and the two seas” refers to the Saljuq control over the ports on the Black Sea and the Mediterranean achieved during the reigns of Kay-Khusraw II’s father (Sinop, 1214) and grandfather (Antalya, 1207). Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II himself bore this title at the beginning of his reign, as evidenced by inscriptions dated 635 and 636 AH in the

---

59. *Niṭāq* (pl. *nuṭuq*) is also mentioned as Saljuq regalia elsewhere in MS Marʿashī 11136: we read “*dhū al-tāj wa-l-niṭāq wa-l-liwāʾ wa-l-ʿalam*” on fol. 28v (quoted below). In the Kırkgöz Han inscription, however, Redford (“Kırkgöz Hanı,” 353, line 4, and 355) reads *naṭaq*. The word was left blank in the *RCEA* (no. 4263). Fikri Erten (quoted by Redford, “Kırkgöz Hanı,” 348, line 4) suggested *awṭān*.


63. E.g. Amīr Muʿīzī, *Diwān*, 145, v. 3328: *bast dar shāhī kamar tā lājaram ʿalam gushād*: “in kingship, he put on his belt so that necessarily he will conquer the world.” There are many similar verses in the *Diwān*.

64. Redford, “Kırkgöz Hanı,” 357.

65. In Saljuq Iran, the head of the family was *al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam*, while the princes with an appanage (such as Sanjar b. Malik-Shāh and his nephews in western Iran) were only *al-malik al-muʿaẓẓam*.

66. ‘Izz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs I is called “sultan of the land and the sea” on the walls of Sinop (*RCEA*, inscription no. 3761). Antalya is reconquered afterward, and only then do we see the use of the dual “the two seas.” See G. Leiser and S. Redford, Victory Inscribed: The Seljuk Fetihname on the Citadel Walls of Antalya, Turkey (Istanbul: AKMED, 2008), 101.
region of Antalya (see Table 3: items 1–3 and Table 2: item 8). However, it is not included among the titles inscribed on the walls of Antalya in 642 AH (Table 3: item 4), maybe because it had been granted to ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn in the meantime, possibly when the latter was appointed “heir of his father” (wa‘lī ‘ahd wālīdihi).

Let us now turn to the functions of Gurjī Khātūn’s foundation.

4. Functions of the Foundation

The inscription speaks of a ribāṭ. This is a loaded word. Long thought to denote a kind of “Muslim military monastery” or “fortified convent,” its meaning has been entirely reassessed after Chabbi’s seminal article in the Encyclopaedia of Islam (2nd ed.). The tribal sense had to do with horses, or rather, the action of keeping horses. The term came to be used for buildings after a complex evolution. In fourth/tenth-century geography (first and foremost in the writings of Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Muqaddasi), ribāṭ has a military, religious (synonymous with khānaqāh), or commercial function. In other words, a ribāṭ could mean a caravanserai (that is, a staging post and lodging built on a trade road). Al-Iṣṭakhrī (fl. fourth/tenth century) may be the earliest source on “the evolution from the military ribāṭ to the manzil, i.e. staging post along itineraries.”

In Anatolia, caravanserais were usually called khān. The word was first used in Ayyubid territories at the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century. It also appears in the inscriptions of Eğirdir Han and İncir Han, both built by Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II. Ribāṭ is found in older inscriptions, such as that at Dokuzun Han built north of Konya by Kay-Khusraw II’s grandfather. But it would be wrong to think that the term khān merely


72. RCEA, inscription no. 3668. See also the inscription for Karaçaviran (dated 607/1210) in RCEA, inscription no. 3669.
replaced ribāṭ, as the latter still appears in Kirkgoz Han and Derebuçak Han, two foundations very close in space and time to the Düden caravanserai.73

The Kirkgoz and Düden (and Derebuçak) inscriptions also share mention of the function of the building: it was for the benefit of “all the creatures living in it and [all] the travelers leaving it for the east or the west of the world.”74 The reference to arriving and departing travelers (al-nāzilūn bihā wa-l-musāfirūn ‘anḥā) is enough to conclude it was a caravanserai. That being said, caravanserais were more than instruments of trade, and recent scholarship tends to view them as multifunction institutions that also played a role in tax collection, monitoring rural neighborhoods, royal residence (more on this below), and possibly even defense (the original meaning of ribāṭ).

Several types of caravanserai buildings could be found in Anatolia. We lack sufficient information to decide whether Gurji Khâtūn built a caravanserai with a monumental entrance giving access to a central rectangular courtyard surrounded by rooms, like Kirkgoz Han, or whether her ribāṭ was of a mixed type, like Dokuzun Han (Fig. 7). I would guess the former because of the building’s geographical location (close to Kirkgoz Han), but this is speculative.

By erecting a caravanserai, Gurji Khâtūn was following the example set by her mother-in-law, Māhpārī, who had been very active in construction at the beginning of the reign of her son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II. Not only did Māhpārī finish a vast complex at the gate of Kayseri (a mosque and a madrasa with a mausoleum and a bathhouse); she also built at least two caravanserais in Central Anatolia (five more are attributed to her by tradition) (Fig. 6).75

Building caravanserais was a typical charity work in the Seljuq lands, and women were among the most prolific patrons, both because they could possess fortunes and because these constructions were “a public demonstration of the ruling family’s piety and generosity.”76 But beyond the desire to accommodate travelers and to sustain long-distance trade, Gurji Khâtūn was pursuing more personal goals: strengthening her son’s chances of becoming the next sultan and therefore her own of becoming “mother of the reigning sultan”

---

73. The eight words remaining from the foundation inscription of Derebuçak Han (south of Beyşehir Lake) are quoted in Redford, “Kirkgoz Hanı,” 349.

74. The same formula is also found on what remains of the Derebuçak Han and hence is not as unusual as Redford thought (ibid., with reference to Rogers, “Waqf and Patronage,” 72).

75. See Eastmond, “Gender and Patronage,” 81. Eastmond attributes to Māhpārī a further caravanserai, known only through the report of a seventeenth-century French traveler (ibid., n. 27). Interestingly, this traveler speaks of “Aladin, Roy des Selgiouks,” which is likely to refer to an inscription in the name of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād I, Māhpārī’s husband. However, the possibility that it refers to ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II is not to be totally excluded. Besides, Konyali tentatively attributes the foundation of Kadın Han (620/1223–24), halfway between Konya and Akshehir, to one of the wives of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II. See İ. H. Konyali, Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Konya Tarihi (Konya: Yeni Kitap Basımevi, 1964), 382–86, quoted by Crane, “Notes,” 48–49 and Blessing, “Women Patrons,” 502 and 522 (see RCEA, inscription no. 3896).
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Figure 7: Two Thirteenth-Century Caravanserais

Top: Dokuzun Han (10 km North of Konya); Bottom: Kırgöz Han (30 km North of Antalya)
(Source: Erdmann, Karavansaray, 1, Taffel I, Fig. 4 and Taffel XXX;
Photos from Turkishhan.org)

(wālida, Tk. valide). She knew she was not the sultan’s only wife. And she was not even the only khātūn of royal blood: like his father, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II had sought a matrimonial alliance with the Ayyubids, and in 635/1238, the same year he married Tamar alias Gurji Khātūn, he also married the sister of the ruler of Aleppo.77 The marriage would remain childless, but Gurji Khātūn did not know that. The sultan also married the daughter of one Muẓaffar al-Dīn Muḥammad, the ruler of eastern Karahisar. More critically, he had fathered two sons by Greek wives: ʿIzz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs and Rukn al-Dīn Qīlīj Arslan (Fig. 2). According to Āqsarāyī and Simon de Saint-Quentin, both were older than Gurji Khātūn’s son.78


78. Āqsarāyī, Tārīkh, 47; Simon de Saint-Quentin quoted by Cahen, Turquie, 230 n. 8.
Bar Hebraeus affirms that the sultan was deeply in love with Gurji Khâtûn, to the extent that he neglected the affairs of the state.  

Āqsarâyî insists, however, that her royal lineage was the decisive factor:

[Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw] made [ʿAlāʾ al-Dîn Kay-Qubâd II] his appointed heir (wallî ʿahd), because his mother was Gurji Khâtûn, the queen of the Georgians (malaka-yi Abkhâz). It is by virtue of the lineage of her mother that he succeeded over his brothers; moreover, his father loved him more than he did his other children.

The death of the sultan’s father had shown that succession was unforeseeable and could quickly become bloody. On that occasion, Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw II had seized the chance to ascend the throne in Kayseri and immediately got rid of his half-brothers, the sons of the Ayyubid princess al-Malika al-ʿĀdila (herself first imprisoned and later killed). Redford surmises he may have benefited from the help of ʿIṣmat al-Dîn bt. Țughrulshâh, the unhappy wife of Kay-Qubâd I. In any case, the sultan’s accession showed that double royal descent did not guarantee the throne, and this was not good news for Gurji Khâtûn. If even Saladin’s niece could be ousted this way, she herself must take better precautions.

By having her son mentioned explicitly as wallî-ʿahd in her inscription, already with the royal title “sultan of the land and the two seas” and associated with Saljuq regalia (the crown, the flag, and the belt), Gurji Khâtûn aimed to carve in stone the succession to her husband. The inscription was visible at the beginning of the royal road linking the Mediterranean coast with the capital Konya and, beyond it, with Kayseri and eastern Anatolia. That caravanserais could also serve as royal residences gave further support to her goals, as the inscription would lie in plain view of all the court. If the sultan of Rum traveled like the sultans in Iran did, his departure from his Antalya would have happened in two stages: first the caravan would have been prepared a few kilometers away from the city, and then it would leave for good. The Düden caravanserai would have been ideally located to serve as the first staging post. That it did so is even more plausible since we have seen that Ibn Bībī said that the Saljuq court spent time in the area.

What happened next? If Ibn Bībī is correct (and he was a direct witness to the events), after Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kay-Khusraw II’s death, the great amir Jalâl al-Dîn Qarâṭây and the vizier

---

79. Bar Hebraeus says that “he loved her dearly”; Maktbânît zabnē, ed. and trans. E. A. Budge, The Chronography of Gregory Abûl-Faraj, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 2:403. As mentioned in note 55, the Georgian Chronicle reports that the sultan got mad at his wife and forced her to embrace Islam after Rusudan led him to believe she had been unfaithful. Whether this burst of rage should be interpreted as proof of jealous love is debatable. The whole anecdote rather reads like a tale inspired by Ways-u-Râmin.

80. Āqsarâyî, Târîkh, 47.


82. Rogers (“Royal Caravansarays,” 414) discusses insightfully whether the inscriptions of sultanic titles and motto could have “Chancery force”.

Shams al-Dīn Iṣfahānī agreed to put another son of the late sultan, ʿIzz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II, on the throne. He was of Greek ancestry, like Qarāṭāy, and his background may have played in his favor in the new strategic configuration (Byzantium was very weak but still existed, while Georgia had been occupied by the Mongols). This must have been a disappointment for the partisans of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn and his mother. However, the succession was not as bloody as the previous one. The young Prince ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn even became associated with the crown, at first in a subaltern position and then as an equal in the unusual “indivis sultanate” that Jalāl al-Dīn Qarāṭāy imposed in the name of the three brothers. Unfortunately for Gurjī Khātūn, her son died a few years later, during a diplomatic mission to Mongolia. 84

5. Function of the Text within the Manuscript

Finally, we need to consider the function of this text within the munshaʾāt. I have described elsewhere the complex assemblage making up MS Marʿashi 11136. 85 The only colophon found in the manuscript is dated 716 AH, but the first ninety-two folios were written seven decades or so earlier. On the basis of the incipit and the contents of the documents, I hypothesized that the first author/compiler/copyist (I called him “Author A”) worked in the chancery of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II, and that he started his work shortly before Kösedā and resumed it afterward.

The manuscript opens with eleven folios filled with alqāb/khiṭāb, that is, the various formulas and honorific titles to be used depending on the rank of the addressee. This is a logical start for letter-writing guidelines. This section contains forty-one documents dealing first with officials of the Saljuq state (including the khātūns) and then with a few non-Muslim correspondents the Saljuqs had on their eastern frontier (Mongols, Georgians, Armenians). 86 Interestingly, addressing the sultan is not discussed. This is understandable if the author, as I surmise, was at the service of the sultan. The following section (fols. 11r–28r) contains thirty-two documents organized thematically (letters of felicitation, condolences, etc.). Then, quite unexpectedly, the author adds nine sample documents—including the Düden inscription—on honorific titles suitable for the sultan (alqāb-i salāṭīn; fols. 28r–31r). Except for the Düden inscription, these texts are quoted from official correspondence. The reason these documents are not part of the first section on honorifics is not immediately clear, but a closer examination reveals that six out of the nine deal not with the sultan, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II, but with his son, Prince ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II. Hence, it appears that this section was written by someone who was close to the circles favorable to Gurjī Khātūn and keen to portray her son as the future head of the Saljuq dynasty. ʿAlāʾ

---

84. Gurjī Khātūn managed to keep her position in Konya by marrying Muʿīn al-Dīn Pervaneh (and incidentally by helping Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī), but this part of her career lies outside the scope of this article (the relevant sources have been translated to French by Brosset and Huart and used by Vryonis and Eastmond in their studies of Gurjī Khātūn). See also the standard study of N. Kaymaz, Pervane Muʿīnü’d-dīn Süleyman, index (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1970).

85. See Durand-Guédy, “Manbaʾī,” 80–81; see also idem, “New Source.”

86. I expect to publish this alqāb/khiṭāb section in a future article. The documents dealing with khātūns may have been written for Gurjī Khātūn, but there is nothing to prove it.
al-Dīn is called the appointed heir (waliʿ ‘ahd) in the Düden foundation inscription but also in four other documents in this series.\textsuperscript{87} As a comparandum with the Düden inscription, here is the text of the first document:

\begin{quote}
[1] برسم مثالعه خزانه موالی و موالی العالم موالیه و ملوک أکرآ الإرض عند عتبة ابيه،


[3] اقطار الأفق و انفلاة قسمه (\ldots)\textsuperscript{88} الروم والشام والعراق وقفهم الله و صانهم من التنازل،[4] و هو


[9] قحم اعیادهما تیجان أسندة الرماد، ما جهيل مندادی الفلاح، محمد و آل الرکموین الطاهرین.[91]
\end{quote}

For the transliteration and translation, I have divided the text into eleven units:

\textbf{[1]} According to the study of the archives of my lord—the masters of the world are his slaves (bi-rasm-i muṯallīa-yi khazāna-yi mawlāy al-ʿālam mawlālihi); the kings of the ploughmen of the earth are present on the threshold of his father (mulūk akarat al-ard ʿinda ʿatabat abīhi)—

\textbf{[2]} the appointed heir of the sultan of the age, by whose oath conflicts are appeased and by whose fortunate hardships disappear (waliʿ-ahd sulṭān al-zaman al-ladhi sukina bi-yaminihi al-ﬁtān wa-zāla bi-saʿdihi al-miḥan),

\textbf{[3]} the one by whose face the amirs of the outlying regions have sworn oaths (man ḥallafa bi-wajhihi umarāʾ aqtār al-āfaq), and whom the [lands?] of Rum, Syria, and Iraq, which God gave to him and preserved from costly expenditure, have sworn to obey (wa anqādha li-qasamihi [. . .] al-Rūm al-Shām wa-l-ʿIrāq waffaqahu Allāh wa-ṣānahum min al-niṣāq);

\textbf{[4]} he is the glorious and magnificent prince (wa-ḥuwa al-malik al-muʿizz al-muʿazzam), the master of the necks of the most distant nations (mālik riqāb aqāṣi al-umām), the possessor of the crown, the belt, the flag, and the standard (dhū al-tāj wa-l-niṭāq wa-l-liwāʾ wa-l-ʿalam).

\textbf{[5]} He is the “spirit from God and His Word cast on Maryam” (rūḥ Allāh wa-kalimatihi

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{87} ‘Alī’ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II is also mentioned as waliʿ ‘ahd in other documents included in the manuscript, such as two letters sent from Konya on fols. 37v–38v.

\footnotetext{88} One word starting with kāf has been erased.


\footnotetext{90} One word is not legible.

\footnotetext{91} MS Marʿashī 11136, fol. 28r–v.
\end{footnotes}
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alqāhā ʿalā Maryam), the pearl of His necklace (durrat ʿiqdihi al-nizām), the gift of God and a proof of [God] among all the creatures (faḍl Allāh wa ʿayātihi bayn al-anām).

[6] He is a child with the understanding of mature men, even though he has not been weaned yet (ṭifl bi-ʿuqūl al-kuhūl lam yazal min al-fiṭām), a pure scion of the shining family of David (al-sulāla al-ṭāhira min al-ʿīr āl Dāʾūd), born on an auspicious day (al-mawlūd bi-l-ṭāliʿ al-masʿūd).

[7] ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla wa-l-Dīn; a mark of God’s compassion in all worlds (āthār raḥmat Allāh fī al-ʿālamīn), succorer of Islam and the Muslims (mughith al-islām wa-l-muslimīn), the beauty of the victorious state (jamāl al-dawla al-qāhira), the glory of the shining umma (jalāl al-umma al-bāhira).

[8] Abū al-Muẓaffar Kay-Qubād; son of the greatest sultan (al-sulṭān al-aʿẓam), the shadow of God on earth (ẓill Allāh fī al-ʿālam), Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa-l-Dīn, the gift of God and a proof of [God] among all the creatures (faḍl Allāh wa-ʿayātihi bayn al-anām), the dispenser of mercy in this low world (malik al-raḥma fī al-dunyā), the victorious thanks to heaven (al-manṣūr min al-samāʾ), victorious over the enemies (al-muẓaffar ʿalāʾ al-aʿdāʾ), Abū al-Fatḥ Kay-Khusraw b. Kay-Qubād, the partner of the commander of the faithful (qasīm amīr al-muʾminīn).

[9] May God enhance the greatness of both of them (ʿaẓẓama Allāh shaʾnahumā); may He make their proofs more visible (aẓhara fī al-khāfiqayn burhānahumā); may He transform the dangers posed by their enemies into a crown made of spearheads (wa-jaʿala quḥam aʿd āyihumā tījān asinnat al-rammaḥ), until the herald says, “Hasten to salvation” (mā ḥayyahal munādī al-falāḥ).

This text exhibits many similarities with, but also notable differences from, the Düden inscription. Right away, ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II is designated as the “appointed heir” (§2). Multiple references are made to the “oaths” (yamīn, qasam, ḥallafa bi-) binding the great amirs of the sultanate to him (§§2, 3). We know that oaths were an essential instrument of what Mottahedeh called the “acquired loyalties” that structured Islamic polities. It is perhaps because of these oaths that ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn, still a prince (malik), is adorned with title (“master of the necks of the most distant nations”) and regalia (crown, belt, flag, standard) given to the sultan in the Düden inscription (§4).

92. In the Quranic verse 4:171, the preposition following alqā is ʿalā, replaced here by ilā. Arberry’s translation of this verse reads: “[The Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, was only the Messenger of God], and His Word that He committed to Mary, and a Spirit from Him.”

93. This refers to the muezzin’s call to prayer (adhān): ḥayya ʿalā ʿalā wa-ḥayya ʿalā al-falāḥ.

The following section emphasizes the divine favor enjoyed by the prince. He is not only a “sign of God”, he is the “Spirit of God” (rūḥ Allāh) and the “Word of God,” two expressions from a Quranic verse about Jesus (§5). This may or may not be a reference to the prince’s Christian mother. (The reference to Maryam should not be interpreted as a marker of Christianity, as she is the most venerated female figure in the Quran.) The next sentences provide additional credentials: he may be a child, but he has “the understanding of mature men”; and thanks to his mother, the royal blood of David’s house (ʿirq āl Dāʾūd) flows through his veins (§6).

His main laqab, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (§7), is followed by four others (§8), then a generic kunyā, his ism (§9), and finally his nasab (son of al-sultān al-aʿẓam Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw, whose list of titles ends with the usual “partner of the commander of the faithful,” §10). We can note that two of the sultan’s titles emphasize his victories; two others (faḍl Allāh wa-āyātihi bayn al-anām and malik al-raḥma fī al-dunyā) do not appear in any of the foundation inscriptions (see Tables 1–3). The concluding sentences are prayers (duʿāʾ), one of them explicitly referring to the “dangers” awaiting the Saljuqs (quḥma).

No date is given, but since ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II is described as a child not yet weaned (§6), the text was probably composed around 636/1238–39. But the message is clear: the text describes the prince as the rightful heir, appointed by his father, product of the union of two dynasties, recognized by all the amirs, already invested with Saljuq regalia, and intellectually competent to assume royal power. It is this kind of text that led me to surmise that Author A worked in the chancery of Konya, in the circles advocating the rights of Gurjī Khātūn’s son. The formula chosen for the Düden caravanserai, though shorter, is perfectly in line with this program.

There are other instances of a “Georgian connection” in this part of the munshaʾāt. For example, the malik Abkhāz (meaning the Georgian king) is one of the few non-Muslim rulers to be dealt with in the alqāb/khiṭāb section. Author A also included an interesting oath (sawgand-nāma) sent by Saladin to the king of Georgia. The document, in Persian, is attributed to the famous kātib ʿImād al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī and begins with the words “In the name of the father, the son, and the holy spirit, of God the Unique . . .” (fols. 27v–28r). Further on, the same Author A has copied three answers to the King Dāʾūd of Georgia, obviously David V Narin, who happened to be Gurjī Khātūn’s brother. By contrast, the manuscript contains no correspondence from Konya toward Byzantium or the Ayyubid states.

The Düden inscription tells us something more. In Victory Inscribed, their detailed study of the long Saljuq inscriptions on the walls of Antalya, Leiser and Redford address the issue of authorship. Following the hypothesis of van Berchem, they argue that the

---

95. With about four hundred occurrences, āya (pl. āyār) is one the most ubiquitous terms in the Quran; see Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān, 5:2.

96. The title “beauty of the victorious state” would have rung hollow after the devastating defeat at Kösedağ, but it might have been an instance of wishful thinking. And Ibn Bībī recalls that the vizier sent to negotiate with the Mongols told their general that the bulk of the Saljuq army was still ready to fight.
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inscriptions had been written by members of the Saljuq chancery.\(^97\) The argument is logical: only the secretaries (kātibs) of the chancery (diwān al-inshāʾ) would have had not only the necessary linguistic skills but also the expertise to choose the right honorific titles and the right words. A qāḍī would have known the former, but not the latter. In his later article on Kırkgöz Han, Redford takes up the same argument: “We can hypothesize that the texts of lapidary inscriptions derived indirectly from the Seljuk chancery, through the mediation of the Persianate administrative class of the Anatolian Seljuks, specifically those attached to the retinues of the patrons of those buildings.”\(^98\)

With the evidence available to him, Redford could make only a strong case for his “chancery hypothesis.” MS Marʿashi 11136, with the Düden inscription, provides what we might call the “smoking gun.” The inclusion of a foundation inscription within a munshaʾāt seems less incongruous if we surmise that the inscription had been drafted by the author of the munshaʾāt himself. Of course, in the absence of epigraphic remains, we cannot say whether the text found in the manuscript had really been carved in full on the caravanserai’s portal (it is unusually long). In 1976, Rogers argued that since the Saljuq chancery operated in Persian, it could have only “indirect” control over foundation inscriptions, which were invariably in Arabic.\(^99\) However, this argument is not tenable, as we know that the Anatolian chancery was in fact multilingual, issuing documents in Arabic, Persian, Greek, and possibly Armenian. Indeed, the Antalya inscription published by Redford in Legends of Authority is clearly an Arabic product of the Saljuq chancery.\(^100\) Besides, seventh/thirteenth-century Persian prose was phagocytized by Arabic words and expressions (the chronicles of ʿAṭāʾ Malik Juwaynī and Ibn Bībī, two Khurasanians working in the Ilkhanid administration, are emblematic of this evolution). The recourse to formulaic sentences and the concision of the text meant that the kātīb, whoever he was, had an easy job.\(^101\)

The high likelihood of the “chancery hypothesis” is even more obvious when we compare the Düden inscription with those of the nearby and contemporary Kırkgöz Han (and Derebucak Han). The similarities in the sentences they have in common are striking. The only differences concern one title (durrat tāj al-duwal), the date, and a handful of variants. On that account, the readings of some words in the Kırkgöz Han inscription might


\(^98\). Redford, “Kırkgöz Hanı,” 352.


\(^100\). S. Redford, Legends of Authority: The 1215 Seljuk Inscriptions of Sinop Citadel, Turkey (Istanbul: Koç University Press, 2014).

\(^101\). I do not imply that chancery staff were involved in all the inscriptions found in Anatolia; the case of waqf inscriptions, recently surveyed by Peacock, is of course different, as they often constitute abstracts of legalized paper waqfıyasyas written by the qāḍī, occasionally even complete with witnessed signatures. See A. C. S. Peacock, “Waqq Inscriptions from Medieval Anatolia,” in Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages, ed. O. Tekin, C. Roosevelt, and E. Akyürek, 183–93 (Istanbul: Koç University Press, 2020).

Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā 29 (2021)
be emended. I have already mentioned *nataq* (recte *nitāq*?), but the same may also apply to other words (certainly to *mus'ala/musbala*, and probably to *mu'ayyada/mu'abbada*).102

The wordings of the two inscriptions are so close they can be published as two versions of the same text. If the Kirkgöz Han inscription is chosen as the master copy, it would look as follows (the 40% of text added in Düden appears between brackets):

If Kirkgöz Han was built after Kösedağ, as Redford is inclined to think on the basis of its plain decoration, its inscription could therefore have been copied (with minor modifications) from Düden Han's.

How can we be sure that the caravanserai of Gurjī Khātūn was indeed built? The question needs to be asked because the only evidence we have of its existence is an inscription in a *munsha'āt*. Redford notes that caravanserais “were larger and more impressive than any Seljuq palace that we know, and most mosques as well,” and I am not aware of the remains of a caravanserai on the Düden River.110 Besides, we know that some *munsha'āt* with didactic ambitions included mock documents composed by the authors themselves. However, I believe it is highly likely that the caravanserai existed. Our inscription does not belong to the category of mock documents: not only can the various protagonists be easily identified, but the inscription was copied in the 1240s into a work almost certainly dedicated to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II. Referring explicitly to the caravanserai of Düden if there was in fact no caravanserai there would have made no sense. And it would have defeated the purpose, since the goal of this text, was to enhance the legitimacy of ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kay-Qubād II.

102. *Musbala* is clearly readable in the manuscript. Redford (*Legends of Authority*, 352), who suggested *mus'ala*, admitted he does not know of other parallels for that word in Anatolian Seljuq epigraphy.

103. Düden: أمرت.

104. Recte المسيلة; cf. Düden.

105. Düden: الموصدة.

106. Recte المنطاق; cf. Düden.


Conclusion

The manuscript Marʿashī 11136 reveals a hitherto unknown caravanserai built in Anatolia during the Saljuq period. There were perhaps hundreds of them. New vestiges continue to be discovered. But few are documented by foundation inscriptions, and none of the known inscriptions are as long as this one. The text informs us of the ambitions of the patron, the Georgian wife of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II. It proves that she was indeed active as a patron of architecture during the lifetime of the sultan. It confirms the existence of a cluster of “Saljuq sub-sultanic patronage” (in Redford’s phrase) in the region of Antalya during the reign of this sultan. Incidentally, it allows us to reassess some of the previous readings of inscriptions in the same region. And it confirms the account of the late chronicler Āqsarāyī according to which the son of Gurjī Khātūn was appointed waliʿahd. Ibn Bibi, who was a direct witness to the events, says nothing about her and not much about her son, probably on purpose, since Gurjī Khātūn’s grand plan was foiled at the death of the sultan and she never became an omnipotent queen mother (although she kept her influence through other means). Finally, this source gives a fascinating insight into a subject long of interest to historians of Islam and art historians: the relationships among inscriptions, those who compose them, and those who chisel them onto stone tablets and fit them into architectural spaces. It proves that some foundation inscriptions were drafted by personnel of the diwān al-inshāʿ. These are remarkable results for a few lines that had long waited to be read in a library in Qum.

111. According to Yavuz, up to two hundred caravanserais were built in Anatolia during the Saljuq period. But Erdmann (quoted by Eliséeeff, “Khân,” 1011) speaks of 119 khans built in the seventh/thirteenth century in southwest Asia. He himself cataloged ninety-eight such buildings West of Sivas.

112. A Saljuq caravanserai has been recently identified at Seyitgazi, south of Eskişehir; see Redford, “Urbs in Rure,” 49 n. 12.

Appendix: Honorific Titles Given to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II in Inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>al-sulṭān al-aʿẓām</td>
<td>the greatest sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>shāhanshāh al-muʿazzam</td>
<td>the magnificent king of kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>mālik riqāb al-umām</td>
<td>the master of the necks of the nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>sayyid salāṭin al-ʿarab wa-l-ʿajam</td>
<td>lord of the sultans of the Arabs and the Persians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>sultān al-barr wa-l-baḥrayn</td>
<td>sultan of the land and the two seas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>dhū al-qarnayn al-zamān</td>
<td>the Dhū al-Qarnayn of the age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>šahīb Khusraw al-ʿadil</td>
<td>the just lord Khusraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Iskandar al-thānī</td>
<td>the second Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>sultān al-salāṭin al-ʿālam</td>
<td>sultan of the sultans of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>al-muʿayyad min al-samāʾ</td>
<td>the one assisted by heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>al-muẓaffar ʿalā [al-aʿdāʾ]</td>
<td>the victorious over [the enemies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>qāhir al-kafara wa-l-mushrikin</td>
<td>the conqueror of the infidels and the polytheists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>qāmiʿ al-zanādiqa wa-l-mutammaridin</td>
<td>the suppressor of the atheists and the rebels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>qāṭiʿ al-khawārij wa-l-bāghiyyin</td>
<td>the crusher of whose who revolt and transgress against the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ʿumdat al-ḥaqq</td>
<td>the upholder of the truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>ʿuddat al-khalq</td>
<td>the viaticum of mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>muʿīn khalīfat Allāh</td>
<td>the aide of the caliph of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>mughīth khalīfat Allāh</td>
<td>the helper of the caliph of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>sultān bilād al-Rūm wa-l-ʿālam wa-l-Shām wa-Diyār Bakr wa-l-Ifranj</td>
<td>sultan of the lands of Rum, Armenia, Syria, Diyār Bakr, and the Franks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>tāj āl-i Saljūq</td>
<td>the crown of the Saljuq family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>qaṣīm amīr al-muʾminīn</td>
<td>the partner of the commander of the faithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>ẓill Allāh fī al-ʿālam</td>
<td>shadow of God on earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>marzbān al-āfāq</td>
<td>margrave of the horizons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>ʿalāʾ al-islām wa-l-muslimīn</td>
<td>the elevation of Islam and the Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>šahīb al-tāj wa-l-liwāʾ wa-l-niṭāq</td>
<td>possessor of the crown and the banner and the belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numeration of these 25 items is used in Tables 1, 2, 3 for the denomination of the sultan. The other abbreviations used in the Tables are:

- AbF: Abū al-Faṭḥ
- GhD: Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- ʿIzD: ʿIzz al-Dīn
- QA: Qīzīl Arslan
- Abū al-Faṭḥ
- KQ: Kay-Qubād
- KKh: Kay-Khusraw
- Mas: Masʿūd
- QA: Qīzīl Arslan
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