



International

Journal of Human Sciences

ISSN:2458-9489

Volume 17 Issue 1 Year: 2020

The conservation and restoration performances under Seljuk Architectural Patronage

Tülay Karadayı Yenice¹

Abstract

The aim of this study is to expose the similarities between the restoration, conservation, and also reparation works focused on the monumental and public building under the Architectural Patronage of Seljuk Sultans in Anatolia. Reparations and present restoration approach through the protection – reparation examples they made in their periods. The research method is based on a comparative analysis of the approaches followed in the restoration and restoration of monumental structures built by previous civilizations in the territories dominated by the Seljuk state of Anatolia. In the scope of the study Aspendos Theatre, Aksaray Sultan Caravanserai and Sultan Alaaddin Bridge will be taken up it will be tried to understand the principles in the restoration efforts of the Anatolian Seljuks and light the way for the present restoration studies with the achieved accumulation and experience. As a result of the research, the findings indicate that the modern Seljuk state era has been applied to the repair-conservation of monumental monuments very close to the contemporary principles of contemporary restoration.

Keywords: Architecture, conservation, culture, renovation. Reparation.

Introduction

Conservation phenomenon – a historical house, a monument, a city or a cultural landscape– they produce complex network of meanings and their symbolic strength contributes to their recognition as relevant cultural properties. Contemporary approaches to conservation consider that cultural heritage is preserved not because of the values, functions or meanings they had in the past, but for the messages and symbolism they communicate in the present time and for the future generations (Pereira, 2007). Thus, the ultimate aim of conservation is not to conserve material for its own sake but, rather, to maintain (and shape) the values embodied by the heritage (Avrami et al., 2000).

One of the basic principles in the conservation-renovation and also reparation works focused on the historical buildings is the preservation of their original forms and characteristics and their transfer to future generations. The sustainable conservation of the cultural heritage that has been eroded in the historical process can be provided by the aesthetical interventions based on a scientific research which can be defined as restoration. Today, to preserve the cultural artefacts of

¹ Asst. Prof. Dr., Hasan Kalyoncu University, Faculty of Fine Arts and Architecture, Department of Architecture, tulay.yenice@hku.edu.tr



various periods, to prevent them from being destroyed and to benefit from them with a modern understanding is perceived as indicators of a nation's cultural level and civilization.

The first regular restoration works that began with the restoration of the buildings that were destroyed after the French Revolution in the early 19th century, were followed by Madrid VI. 1904 The International Architecture Congress, 1931 Athens Conference and Carta del Restauro and the 1933 Athens International Modern Architecture Congress where many principles were set regarding the restoration of antiquities (Locke, 1904; ICOMOS, 1931, Gold, 1998). The Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historical Monuments held in Venice at ay 1964, these principles were reassessed and established on a solid basis and adopted by many countries today. Known as "Venice Charter" was a turning point for the preservation and restoration of antiquities (ICOMOS, 1964). These principles also shape the restoration studies and practices of the world states, including our country. However, although the history of the aforementioned meetings and regulations is very new, it is understood that the restoration process is not very new for the states which owned the big and ancient civilizations, like Anatolia, where interesting activities on this subject took place centuries ago.

After the Malazgirt Victory in 1071, when the Seljuk Turks began to acquire Anatolia, some of them encountered many different types of structures which are still standing today. Especially in the old and big city centres, the city walls, cisterns, bridges, waterways, etc. which have remained intact or half-wrecked, have been restored in accordance with the first construction purposes or tried to be kept standing by providing partial modifications and new functions. However, as in Konya Castle; it is seen that an attempt is made to re-evaluate the works that have art value such as reliefs and sculptures.

The Aspendos Theatre, which was built by The Kingdom of Pergamum in the 2nd century AD, has reached to date thanks to the restoration works under Architectural Patronage of Seljuk Sultans during 13th century. As a similar, Sultan Han near Konya built by Sultan Alaaddin Kayqubadh I which was burnt as a result of a rebellion, and many other similar examples have been survived to the present day thanks to the restoration works in Seljuk Architectural Patronage -Although these interventions belong to centuries ago, these are the best examples of the taken restoration decisions with the long-term debates. During the restoration of the Anatolian Seljuk period, the visual integrity of the structure was fully respected, the form was not touched, and a historical sign was left on the building by using different materials and forms.

Development of Contemporary Restoration Approaches

Although the restoration approaches, which are the main aim of preserving the historical and artistic integrity of the monument, are new in our country, it has been discussed in Europe since the 19th century and it has been developed according to the principles and laws shaped by these discussions.

Despite all criticisms in this context, E. E. Viollet-le-Duc, who is considered to be the important theoretician and implementer of restoration, evaluates the subject with a scientific approach in the first half of the 19th century and defines restoration process as; "restoring a building is not to preserve, restoration, or rebuild it, it is to make it a fully finished structure with a never existed form at a certain time" (Erder, 1975; Hearn, 1990; Durukan, 1992). This approach evolves with the concern of a regulation for random restorations on structures also known as "unity of style principle" aims to restore the structure not only in appearance but also structurally reflecting the style of its own era. Principles of Viollet-le-Duc shed light on today's restoration approach like before starting the restoration documenting the current status of the monument with drawings and photographs, research on the style, local characteristics and construction technique of the construction era may not always dictate to remove the later sections implementations but to preserve them if these implementations reflect authenticity of another era in order to achieve unity of style.

In the second half of the 19th century, under the leadership of J. Ruskin, a new approach has been developed against the practices with the intention of achieving unity of style. The basis of this approach, also called the anti-restoration flow, is the inviolability of the artwork (Ruskin, 1981; Jokilehto, 1999). It rejects in order to reach the unity of style, the additions should be removed and inexact, the so-called initial designs should be rejected. According to Ruskin, instead of creating soulless copies with restoration, old structures can be preserved by protecting and avoiding damage. Towards the end of the 19th century, Italian C. Boito became an important name in the transition to contemporary restoration theory by combining theories and approaches on restoration (Boito, 1893; Chung and Kim, 2010; Aydoğdu and Yenice, 2019). Stating that the monuments are a historical document for all mankind and a wrong intervention can lead to misleading results, Boito emphasized the necessity of accepting the additions made in different periods as part of the structure after the initial design, and the need to document the works done during the restoration with reports, drawings and photographs. These principles of Boito were developed by Giovannoni and adopted at the 1931 Athens Conference. Also in the same meeting, it was accepted to use all the opportunities offered by the modern techniques. In the meeting held in Venice in 1964 with the aim of making decisions on the preservation and restoration of old buildings and placing them on an international basis, it is defined that restoration is a work that requires expertise and that its purpose is to protect and reveal the aesthetic and historical value of the monument (Jokilehto, 1986). However, where the design began, the restoration ends and the required addition should be noticeable from the architectural composition. In addition, it was stated that the monument could be strengthened by the use of modern techniques for conservation where traditional techniques were inadequate.

Historical and Spatial Background

The political boundaries between Christian-Byzantine and Muslim-Turkish culture and civilization in Anatolia at the beginning of the 11th century; Tarsus, Misis, Haruniye, Anazarba, Maras, Besni, Hisn-i Mansur cities in the southwest towards the northeast of Malatya, Erzincan, Erzen-i Rûm, Hınıs, Malazgirt, Ahlat, Erciş cities throughout the city. In 1064, the conquest of Ani, the most important and advanced city of the Byzantine state, followed by 1071 Malazgirt Victory, many Eastern Anatolian cities entered the Turkish-Islamic rule and Turkish civilization began to move westward (Honigmann, 1970; Kırzioğlu, 1970; Özcan 2006a). In this process, the nomadic Turkmen communities organized by Turkish conquerors known as 'alperen's and veterans have spread to the coasts of Western Anatolia. From the 11th century onwards, they began to settle around the Byzantine cities such as Nicaea (Iznik) or Laodiceia (Denizli).

As a result of these developments; mutual social, cultural and economic relations such as shopping, visits or marriages between nomadic Turkmens and urban Byzantines It was established. In many cities, especially in Iznik they are settled as sovereign elements (Laurent, 1988; Sumer, 1967; Akdag, 1949). In this process, which is called the early Turkish conquest period in Anatolia; the region between Erzincan and Ahlat line reached an advanced level of social and economic development as the organizational and operational centres of Turcoman tribes. Regional cities were also equipped with religious and social institutions organized under the Turkish-Islamic synthesis (Özcan, 2006a).

Turks; with all cultures of nomadic and settled life; 9th century, in the process of migration from Central Asia to Anatolia, which started in the 13th century and lasted for about 200 years, it has come into contact with many different nations and cultures. As a product of the interaction of the cultures of Central Asian urban life with the Iran-Islam and Indian culture spread in the regions of Khorasan, Mavera-ün-nehir and the regions of Acem-i Irak and the interactions between Roman and Greek cultures and civilizations in Anatolia; It can be said that they created a new and original city civilization, which is called the Turkish-Islamic culture and civilization (Özcan 2006b)

As a matter of fact, it is possible to read the traces of the Shamanist-Buddhist beliefs and Central Asian living traditions around the city of Tokat, Niksar, Kayseri and Sivas. Similarly, Iranian culture is seen in the old Artuqid region, which includes Malatya-Harput regions, based on the intensity of relations with Iran. It is thought that Central Anatolia region, which is the Anatolian Seljuk capital, covers the capital city of Konya and its hinterland and also it has a unique artistic understanding in the nature of the synthesis of Christian and Islamic cultures (Ögel, 1989; Kuban, 1993; Kuban, 2001).

The architectural principles of the Seljuk Sultans in the repair of the monumental and public buildings, which are often encountered in Anatolia, are usually remarkable. It is interesting to note that many of these principles are compatible with today's restoration principles.

In the scope of this study the conservation/renovation and repairation works focused on monumental and public buildings—under Architectural Patronage of Seljuk Sultanates and Emirs. These works were depended on an architectural synthesis which composed of Roman-Byzantine architectural heritage with Seljuk architectural works in Anatolia, is examined.

Contemporary Restoration Approaches in the Seljuk Patronage

Anatolian geography, which has hosted many civilizations for thousands of years, also reflects the cultural accumulations of each civilization and has reached today; Of course, every civilization itself was created by the interventions carried out by the civilizations of previous civilizations on the protection and use of the works. In this context, it is noteworthy that the Anatolian Seljuks best preserved the heritage they inherited from the ancient Anatolian civilizations in the best way and with the respect of today's restoration approaches and the old respect. When the waqfiyye records of the Seljuk period are examined in detailed, it can be said that a series of methods and order are defined which range from the works to be presented in relation to the forms of presentation of the desired service to the measures taken for the continuity of the service. The waqfiyye, of Seljuk Emir Mubarezeddin Halifet Ghazi's tomb and madrasah next to that, dated 1209, states;

“..income, revenue, profits and performances from some waqifs are stipulated to the development of the waqif, the shape of the waqif, the improvement of the buildings, the cultivation of the soil, the restoration of the deterioration, the construction of the ruined and the construction of the famous madrasah built in the city of Amasya..”

same waqfiyye also states;

“..If the madrasah collapses, its construction and its reclamation become difficult because of various obstacles, then the income from this waqif is spent on the poor and the needy. If it is possible to bring the madrasa to its current state before it comes from the income, profits and profits of the waqif, it should be spent. Then, the surplus of his restoration will be spent on the places mentioned.” (Yinanç, 1982).

It is possible to increase the number of these samples. Such as;

Seljuk Emir Şemseddin Altun-Aba's madrasah and caravansary in Konya dated 1202 (Turan, 1947a).

Seljuk Emir Mubarezeddin Ertokuş' madrasah dated 1271 (Turan, 1947b).

Sultan Izzeddin Kaykavus's hospital (darüşşifa) dated 1220, Seljuk vizier Celaleddin Karatay's Khan near Bünyan built between 1245 and 1247 and also Sahip Ata Fahreddin Ali's madrasah erected in Sivas dated 1279 and many 13th century –waqfiyyes include similar conditions which clearly form the basis of contemporary restoration approaches (Turan, 1948; Çetintaş, 1953; Bayram ve Karabacak, 1981).

Adopted by nations all around the world The Venice Charter 1964, Article 4 declares “It is essential to the conservation of monuments that they be maintained on a permanent basis.” However, in the 13th century waqifs waqfiyya, the expenses for the maintenance of the buildings primarily stated. Although the qualifications, numbers, and salaries of the administrative staff to be employed in the waqif facilities were determined in these documents; no information can be found about the qualifications of the persons to be assigned in the restoration and maintenance works of the waqif facilities, the number of them to be maintained, the salaries they will receive or the cost of these works (Bakırer, 1973). This suggests that those who will work during the maintenance and restoration of the works are brought to these regions when necessary. In these restorations, we are trying to get information by examining the examples of how the path is followed, what are the principles in restorations and how they are applied.

The waqfiyyes of Sultan Han which was built by Sultan Alaaddin Kayqubadh I can be seen an important case according to the Turkish restoration history. In 1129, the famous architect of the time it was built by Havlanoğlu Muhammed from Damascus. According to information obtained from historical documents, Sultan Han used as a fortress in the sultanate struggle between Sultan II. Kaykavus and IV. Kilij Arslan and its gate was destroyed and burned during this chaotic period. In 1278, Sultan III. Gıyaseddin Kayhüsrev period, gate was partially renovated and restored (Yınanç, 2007). The traces of this destruction and subsequent restorations are still visible at the full marble constructed gate of Sultan Han. The entrance of Khan is an arched opening inside this gate mass, framed by various profiled decoration line (Figure 1). The original stones of this opening, which was traversed by a lancet arch, could not survive. However, a curved arch stone can be seen in the photographs taken in the 19th century (Figure 2).



Figure 1. Sultan Han Portal in 2018



Figure 2. Sultan Han Portal 19 century (Y.Önge's archive)

The faces on both sides of the 2.75 meters arch opening, are decorated with a pattern of geometric composition are partly imbalanced. At the level of the keystone of the arch, there is another tectonic belt, which is filtered through stylized floral motifs, with a booklet strip, and a deeply carved geometric pattern filled with floral motifs. The upper level consists of a flat camber arch made of two-coloured roller stones and an inscription (Figure 3).

After inscription this strip, there is a bracelet with a muqarnas covering the door. In this façade layout, the arched opening beneath the flat of camber arch, as can be understood from the restoration tablet, gained this appearance after the restoration. During this restoration, the original style of the door around the door opening we know that the sound of the originals are preserved, using them, if necessary, by adding new additions around the door cavity, has been restored in the form of a pointed arched passage. In accordance with the tradition of the restoration of this restoration, it was placed on the new belt. (Figure 4).



Figure 3. The Flat Camber Arch and The Inscription



Figure 4. The Inscription details

The remaining pieces of old stones and the subsequent patches and the new pieces added are determined by the irregularities in the decorations and the colour differences. The name of the architect placed in two octagons one under the other in the lower part of the geometric composition of the original ornament on the right side of the arch, was lost due to these restorations (Figure 5). The restoration tablet reads; “this sacred gate was destroyed as it was burned is restored by the hands of the Sultan's trustee an poor servant, indigent for God's mercy, Hussein's son, Siracüddin Ahmed in the days of the son of Kilij Arslan Sultan, religion and the world's deputy, the father of the conquest Kayhüsrev in 667” (Konyalı, 1974).



Figure 5. different materials using and architect's name found the octagon decoration

The most prominent theme in this restoration is the re-use of the door. In the restoration done, the same protection from the old door stones to the missing pieces by using the existing pieces of stone, during this process does not contradict the origin, the harmony between the old and the new is remarkable. Another remarkable point is that the name of the architect, written on two stones next to each other in the original stone weave, is left without being written to the new pieces that are replaced by a destroyed piece. This is due to the fact that the original is not known. In other words, the restorer chose not to do something that he not know consciously (was not be) What is the restoration done on the renewed sections, the reason for, by whom, and the date of the inscription on the date of the inscription is a principle applied in today's modern restorations. Indeed, **Article 12** of the Venice Charter states; Replacements of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence. And **Article 13** declares; Additions cannot be allowed except in so far as they do not detract from the interesting parts of the building, its traditional setting, the balance of its composition and its relation with its surroundings (Venice Charter). In 1278, these principles were carried out successfully in the gate restoration of Sultan Han near the capital of Konya.

Aspendos is one of the most prominent Roman theatres standing to date 2nd century AD. The monument, built by the architect Zenon in the 19th century, the Seljuk restorations has provided to reach the present day. The Seljuks found this theatre in a state of ruin, it was restored and reinforced in the reign of Alaaddin Kayqubadh I (Önge, 1971). The building was used as a hunting lodge for the sultans in later periods. At the entrance side of the theatre, the ruins of the destroyed stone half circle arches on sides of the theatre entrance with bricks but as point arches instead and the walls of the galleries above them were also finished with bricks.

Inside the theatre, behind the gallery and above in some parts of the arcade surrounding the theatre, broken and missing parts of the stone arcade column was completed in accordance with the original shapes by using brick material (Akurgal, 1983), (Figure 6).



Figure 6. Arcades behind the cruise terrace and Seljuklu Muqarnasları in Arcade (O.N. Dülgerler's archive)

Considering that the red bricks will affect the overall appearance of the building, constructed with mostly stone and partly with marble, it is observed that the bricks are very smoothly and elegantly plastered with white limestone plaster, close to the marble colour. (Figure 7). The ruined walls of the stage part were also plastered with this plaster and covered with the embroidery of the period and some walls were covered with Seljuk encaustic tiles (Figure 8).



Figure 7. New-Old Difference and the stage and back (O.N. Dülgerler's archive)



Figure 8. Seljuklu Encuastic Tiles and Seljuklu İntervention (O.N. Dülgerler arşivi)

Another case of the Anatolian Seljuks period traces of restoration is the bridge of Sultan Alaaddin which is called Belkıs on Köprüçay, on the Alanya road. This bridge is located 40 km east of Antalya. It is understood from the 60 cm high 6.00 m long Arabic Tablet on the upstream side of the bridge that it was built at the reign of Sultan Alaaddin Kayqubadh I (Figure 9).

However, since some parts of the inscription are fragmented, the date of construction is unknown. This bridge is made of cut stone, with different aperture, extending along a broken line of 116 meters (Figure 10). The largest arch opening is approximately 22 meters and consists of seven eyes (Tunç, 1978; Çulpan, 2002, İlder 1978). The bridge was built by rebuilding the feet of an ancient bridge that was previously in the same place but was destroyed later. The feet of the bridge from the Roman period can be noticed even today at both sides and in the middle. (Figure 11).

The Anatolian Seljuks preferred to build bridges using existing bridges ruins, rather than achieving aesthetic appearance by making a bridge again. As Article 5 of the Venice Charter states; “The conservation of monuments is always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose. Such use is therefore desirable but it must not change the lay-out or decoration of the building. It is within these limits only that modifications demanded by a change of function should be envisaged and may be permitted.”



Figure 9: Arabic inscription of the bridge (O.N. Dülgerler arşivi)



Figure 10. Overview of the Bridge



Figure 11. One of the feet of the bridge from the Roman era

Conclusion

In fact, we see the restoration works of the Anatolian Seljuks, which we try to express with a few examples, on many structures. As it is understood from these examples, the Anatolian Seljuks knew how to preserve as much as they were constructive. When the documents belonging to the Seljuks are examined, it is noteworthy that most of them belong to the restoration. The most important issue that needs to be addressed is the application of these restoration, reinforcement and renewal approaches are surprisingly followed in today's modern restoration principles. It is possible to see similar applications in the period of the Turkish principalities that came after Seljuks.

From this point of view, it is understood that the permanency and continuity of preservation for the monuments in Anatolia is regulated by the waqfiyyes starting from the 13th century Seljuk period. It is considered that these historical evidences also eliminates the claim of E. E. Viollet-le-Duc that as relating with restoration process started with the 19th century on conservation and restoration.

Another important issue is that these cultural heritages, which have an important place among the cultural heritage assets of Turkey, contain overtones of Seljuk architecture on them and survived to present day thanks to restoration applications carried out by the Anatolian Seljuk State; yet the sources that provide information about the definitions and historical information about these structures hesitate to include the facts and tend to label these monuments entirely on pre-Seljuk civilization. This will give false information and a historical misconception. These important evidences should not be ignored and transferred to generations after us as a clear indication that of Turkish civilization has a constructive and conservative culture rather than destructive.

References

- Akdağ, M. (1949). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuruluş ve İnkişafı Devrinde Türkiye'nin İktisadî Vaziyeti. *TTK Belleteni* (XIII: 51); 497-571.
- Akurgal, E. (1970). *Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey: from prehistoric times until the end of the Roman Empire*. İstanbul: Mobil Oil Türk A.Ş.
- Avrami, E., Randall M. and Torre D.L, M. (2000). Research Report. In Erica Avrami et alli (eds). *Values and Heritage Conservation: Research Report*. Los Angeles: GCI.
- Aydoğdu H. & Yenice, M.S. (2019). Uluslararası ve Ulusal Alanda Koruma Kavramının Düşünsel ve Yasal Gelişimi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Turan-Sam Uluslararası Bilimsel Hakemli Dergisi*, 11(42):256-263. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15189/1308-8041>
- Bakırer, Ö. (1973). Vakfiyelerde Binaların Tamirâtı ile İlgili Şartlar ve Bunlara Uyulması. *Vakıflar Dergisi*, X: 113-126.

- Bayram, S. & Karabacak, H. (1981). Sahip Ata Fahreddin Ali'nin Konya, İmaret ve Sivas Gökmedrese Vakfiyeleri. *Vakıflar Dergisi*, XIII,
- Boito, Camilo (1893), 'Restoration in Architecture: First Dialogue (1893),' *Future Anterior* VI, 1 (2009), trans. Cesare Birignani, 68-83.
- Çetintaş, S. (1953). Sivas Darüşşifası. İstanbul.
- Chung, S.J. & Kim, C.S. (2010). The Development of Attitudes to Historic Conservation - From Eurocentrism to Cultural Diversity - *Architectural Research*, 12 (1): 25-32
- Çulpan, C. (2002). *Türk Taş Köprüleri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayını.
- Durukan, (1992). Ortaçağ Türk Mimarisinde Restorasyon Çalışmaları (in) IX Vakıf Haftası Kitabı, Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları,
- Erder, (1975). *Tarihi Çevre Bilinci*. Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi, Yayını.
- Gold, R.J. (1998) Creating the Charter of Athens: CIAM and the Functional City, 1933-43. *The Town Planning Review*, 69(3):225-247.
- Hearn, M. F. (1990). *The Architectural theory of Viollet-le-Duc: Reading and Commentary*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Honigmann, E. (1970). *Bizans Devletinin Doğu Sınırı*. (cev. F. Işıltan), İstanbul : İst. Üniv. Ed. Fak. Yay.
- ICOMOS (1931). The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, Adopted at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Athens 1931, Available:<https://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments> [accessed 14/01/2018].
- ICOMOS (1964). International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter), Venice 1964, Available at: https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf [accessed: 14/01/2017]
- İbn Bîbî, (2007). *Selçuknâme*. çev. M.H Yinanç, Haz: Refet Yinanç ve Ömer Özkan, İstanbul: Kitabevi.
- İlter, F. (1978). *Osmanlılara Kadar Türk Taş Köprüleri*, Ankara: Karayolları Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Jokilehto, J. (1986). A History of Architectural Conservation. Ph.D. thesis, University of York
- Jokilehto, J. (1999). *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Kirzioğlu, M.F. (1970). Selçukluların Anı'yı Fethi ve Buradaki Selçuklu Eserleri. *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* (II); 111-139.
- Konyalı, İ.H. (1974). *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri İle Niğde Aksaray Tarihi*. C. I-III, İstanbul.
- Kuban, D. (1993). *Batıya Göçün Sanatsal Evreleri (Anadolu'dan Önce Türklerin Sanat Ortaklıkları)*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- Kuban, D. (2001). Selçuklu Sanat Dünyası, Alâaddin'in Lambası: Anadolu'da Selçuklu Çağı Sanatı ve Alâaddin Keykubad. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları,
- Laurent, J. (1988). Rum (Anadolu) Sultanlığının Menşei ve Bizans. *TTK Belleteni* (LII:202); 219-226.
- Locke, W. J.(1904). The Sixth International Congress of Architects, Madrid, 1904, Madrid; Report of the Secretary of the Institute. *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* (London), Vol. XI, Series III, p.344.
- Ögel, S. (1989). Anadolu'nun Selçuklu Çehresi. *Türkiyemiz Dergisi* (59):4-11.
- 4-11.Önge, Y. (1971). Anadolu Selçukluları Devrinde Bazı Bina Tamirleri Hakkında. *Önasya*, VI: 70-71.
- Önge, Y. (1985). Modern Restorasyon Prensiplerinin Anadolu Türk Vakıf Abidelerindeki En eski Uygulamaları. II. *Vakıf Haftası Kitabı*. Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları,
- Özcan, K. (2006a). Anadolu'da Selçuklu Kentler Sistemi ve Mekânsal Kademelenme (1). *METU JFA*, 23(2):21-61.
- Özcan, K. (2006b). Anadolu-Türk Kent Tarihinden Bir Kesit: Selçuklu Döneminde Anadolu-Türk Kent Model(ler)i. *bilig*, 38: 161-184.

- Pereira H. N. (2007). Contemporary trends in conservation: culturalization, significance and sustainability. *City & Time*, 3 (2): 15-25.
- Ruskin, John(1981). *Seven Lamps of Architecture*. 8ed. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Sümer, F. (1967). The Turks in Eastern Asia Minor in the Eleventh Century, *Proceedings of the XII.th. International of Byzantine Studies*, Oxford University Press, London; 439-441.
- Tunç, G. (1978). *Taş Köprülerimiz*. Ankara: Karayolları Md. Yayını.
- Turan, O. (1947a). Selçuk Devri Vakfiyeleri–I, Şemseddin Altun-Aba, Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri, *TTK Belleteni* XI(42): 17-145, Ankara.
- Turan, O. (1947b). Selçuk Devri Vakfiyeleri–II, Mübarezeddin Ertokuş, Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri, *TTK Belleteni*, XII(43); 415-429, Ankara.
- Turan, O. (1948). Selçuk Devri Vakfiyeleri–III, Celaleddin Karatay, Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri, *TTK Belleteni*, XII(45); 17-145, Ankara.
- Yınanç, R. (1982). Selçuklu Medreselerinden Amasya Halifet Gazi Medresesi ve Vakıfları. *Vakıflar Dergisi*, XV: 5.22