

CRITICA

***Turko-Mongol Rulers, Cities and City Life*. Edited by David Durand-Guédy. Brill's Inner Asian Library, Vol. 31. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013. xxii, 451 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-24876-2 (hardback); 978-90-04-25700-9 (e-book). \$ 209.00; individual chapters in electronic format are priced at \$30.00.**

DANIEL C. WAUGH

The papers from an international conference held in Tokyo in September 2009, this volume is concerned with “the location of rule in a context of Turkic and Mongol domination” (p. 1). The subject is not new. As Dr. Durand-Guédy sketches in his introduction, beginning nearly half a century ago, there have been important articles by John Andrew Boyle, Jean Aubin, Masashi Haneda, Charles Melville and others examining the itineraries of Asian rulers and re-conceptualizing the nature of cities in their domains. Yet that pioneering work but scratched the surface of a subject that invites the kind of in-depth and specific research embodied in the essays here, whose authors all recognize that there is yet much to be done.

It is important to emphasize that these essays are not merely another set of contributions to the now familiar discussion of the degree to which “nomads” in fact sedentarized, even if that topic is one of those addressed. Indeed, “if the volume as a whole may hope to have accomplished only one thing, it is to dispel a spectre that has been haunting scholarship on the Turco-Mongol rulers: the spectre of nomadism. There has been an enduring tendency ... to systematically interpret some features of Turco-Mongol rule as relics of their Inner Asian origins... The so-called ‘nomadic features’ [such as itinerancy] are not exclusive to nomadic societies.... The location of rule did not depend on the nature of the ruler, but on the nature of the rule: its legitimacy, its resources, and its networks” (pp. 13-15). “[R]ulers were not nomadic out of atavism, but out of agency” (p. 15), and “nomad identity” might be “manipulated ... in order to gain political advantage” (p. 16).

Peter Golden’s opening essay, “Courts and Court Culture in the Proto-Urban and Urban Development among the Pre-Chinggisid Turkic Peoples,” demonstrates his unique ability to synthesize evidence spread across all of northern Asia over more than a millennium. Not surprisingly, he shows the importance of court ceremonial which generally took place in mobile settings, at the same time that, even if far from uniformly, urban centers occupied for many of the polities an important place. His expertise in languages and texts is evident in his discussion of terminology regarding “cities,” a concern evident in some of the other essays here, which clarify in important ways what the written sources may (or may not) mean in referring to settlements, encampments, etc. Golden’s appendix of translated selections from classic descriptions of the Khazars will be very useful for those who do not read the origi-

nal languages. Another laudatory feature of his essay and others in the collection is the inclusion of several good maps.

One of the major challenges for anyone addressing the subject of this volume is how to incorporate archaeological evidence, given the huge volume of what is available if scattered in publications that often are not of easy access. Golden uses the archaeological material judiciously, pointing out that conclusions regarding the nature and degree of urbanization (something which has often been exaggerated in the interest of countering older views that there was little of it in pre-modern Inner Asia) still need to be tested. Some of the controversies involving interpretation of the evidence concerning Khazar “cities” are too recent for him to have referred to them here, although I sense he remains to be convinced that Samosdelka on the lower Volga is, as its excavator has claimed, the site of the Khazar capital Itil.¹

As Durand-Guédy emphasized in his Preface, part of the inspiration for the original conference and this volume was the fact that there is significant Japanese scholarship on the subject which is not widely known. We can be thankful, therefore, to have in English here the work of Japanese scholars. Minoru Inaba’s “Sedentary Rulers on the Move: the Travels of the Early Ghaznavid Sultans” tabulates, maps and explains the itineraries of Maḥmūd and his son Mas’ūd between 998 and 1040. The choice has been governed by the availability of detailed narrative sources for this period. As Inaba emphasizes, the early Ghaznavids did build and live in palaces, and spent anywhere from a third to half their time in or near their capital Ghazni, situated as it was in a very strategic location for movement along standard routes in all directions. While much of their travel is to be connected with military campaigns, it also was seasonal. An interesting part of the argument here involves consideration of climate, local ecology, and the relative ease or difficulty of certain routes of travel. Inaba also introduces suggestive comparative evidence, referring, for example, to the practice of the early rulers of Rus’, who reportedly engaged in regular travel to collect tribute. Perhaps an even better documented example to invoke would be the early dukes of Normandy. The point here is “that the ‘itinerant royal court’ is to be seen as related not only to the (possible) nomadic background of the rulers, but also to the process of state formation and the development of social structure in the medieval period” (p. 94). Inaba notes in conclusion other factors that might be considered in further exploration of the phenomenon of itinerant courts—among them the challenges of supplying the court’s material needs and the security and ease of the transport network.

The only archaeologist among the distinguished group of authors here is Yury Karev, one of the lead excavators at Afrasiab (on the outskirts of Samarqand) under the auspices of the French-Uzbek archaeological mission. The best-known of the

1 See, for example, V. S. Flërov, “*Goroda: i “zamki” Khazarskogo kaganata. Arkheologicheskaia real’nost’*”. Moskva: Mosty kul’tury; Jerusalem: Gersharim, 2001, reviewed by me in *The Silk Road* 9 (2011): 156-9. Inter alia, Flërov criticizes E. A. Zilivinskaia’s assertions that Itil was located at the Samosdelka site; see his book for references to her work.

discoveries at Afrasiab is the remarkable set of Sogdian paintings which are still the subject of much controversy and arguably have attracted, if anything, too much attention. Yet there is so much more of interest on Afrasiab, not the least being the Qarakhanid material from the citadel, whose excavation Karev has supervised. Preliminary results of this work have been published,² but his essay, illustrated with numerous drawings and photographs, "From Tents to City. The Royal Court of the Western Qarakhanids between Bukhara and Samarqand," provides a fresh overview of what has been accomplished and ranges more widely over the evidence concerning Qarakhanid building activity in Central Asia. Given the fact that sources for Qarakhanid history until recently have been scanty (numismatic evidence looms large), the study of material remains is extremely important. The focus here is on the Western Qaghanate and in particular Samarqand and Bukhara, even though, as Karev carefully notes, much work is also needed regarding the evidence about the relationship between pastoral nomads and sedentary centers in the Eastern Qaghanate.

Karev emphasizes the complementary nature of the evidence from Bukhara and Samarqand. For the former, there is quite a lot of information in the written sources regarding Qarakhanid building activity, but relatively little archaeological material. For Samarqand, the situation is the reverse. The 12th-century Qarakhanid-era pavilions in the Afrasiab citadel include one with striking remains of murals which provide evidence regarding the rulers and their court culture. Even though Samarqand became the Western Qarakhanid capital starting in the second quarter of the 11th century, there is to date no clear evidence for the location of their actual residence in the first century of their rule. Karev posits that they engaged in regular movement between Bukhara and Samarqand, not so much because of any seasonal considerations but rather for other, presumably political purposes. There is good reason to think they resided outside of city walls, and indeed they established permanent structures for that purpose. In the early 12th century, they erected residences in several different places in Bukhara, but not in the citadel, as they did when they turned their attention to Samarqand in the second half of the 12th century. What we have here, then, is evidence for a gradual change in the degree to which the Western Qarakhanids accommodated themselves to and became integrated into the existing urban culture. Taking up residence in the citadel at least in part is to be explained by threats to the political stability of the regime, faced with Qarluq revolts exacerbated by what one might imagine was a growing gap between the increasingly sedentarized ruling elite and the still strong pastoralist traditions amongst the Qarluqs.

If the Qarakhanid rulers seem gradually to have sedentarized, the same pattern cannot be observed for the Saljuqs in Iran, in the argument of David Durand-Guédy's "The Tents of the Saljuqs." Oddly, given their importance, the subject of where they resided has received little attention. Before one can even begin to study

2 Among the previous publications, one can recommend especially his richly illustrated "Qarakhanid wall paintings in the citadel of Samarqand. First report and preliminary observations," *Muqarnas* 22 (2005): 43-81.

the topic though, it is necessary, as he does in the first half of his essay (with a summary table at the end), to look closely at the terminology of the sources: what exactly is to be understood by terms such as *khayma*, *nawbatī*, *bārgāh* or *sarāparda/surādiq* referring to royal tentage or the enclosures in which it was contained? What we get here then is a careful explication of the layout and function of the various parts of a royal camp, in which access was limited and there were definite symbolic associations. Among other things, color was important, though what was perceived of as the royal color varied across Asia in earlier times. He concludes emphatically “The Saljuqs were not sedentary rulers. It can be said that, until the end of the dynasty, they pursued an itinerant lifestyle, not from town to town, but rather from pasture to pasture” (p. 172). This is not to say that there were no structures erected to accommodate that lifestyle or to secure their rule—for example, Malik Shah had a walled garden with some kind of pavilions (*kūshks*) in it outside of Isfahan and a nearby fortress (pp. 173-4). A constructed *kūshk* could be an integral part of the tented enclosure (see the diagram, p. 180, and the miniature on the facing p. 181). Apart from whatever their cultural preferences might have been, the explanation for the continuing residence in tents probably lies in the political exigencies of needing to ensure control over far-flung territories and in particular cultivate relations with important pastoral nomadic groups such as the Türkmens.

This question of the relationship between Saljuq rulers and the Türkmens is at the heart of A.C.S. Peacock’s essay on “Court and Nomadic Life in Saljuq Anatolia.” That the Saljuqs of Rūm were great builders is well known [Fig. 1], and there is a longstanding assumption that their increasingly sedentary ways placed them in opposition to the Anatolian pastoral nomads and ultimately brought an end to their rule. Peacock argues instead: “The relationship between the Saljuq rulers, the built environment they created and their nomadic subjects was much more complex than scholarship has to date credited... [E]ven at the dynasty’s zenith in the early seventh/thirteenth century, the sultans maintained a close relationship with at least some groups of Türkmens” (p. 193). However, this is not to say that the situation in Anatolia simply replicated that of the Saljuqs in Iran. Konya was of particular importance to them especially as the location of the family mausoleum, they did build palaces, and yet in their extensive itineraries, where tentage was indeed significant, they shared territories and interests with the Türkmens. To the degree that one can in fact document those itineraries, there seems to be a significant correlation between them and the locations that were significant for the Türkmens, probably for reasons of political accommodation and interaction, more so than because of nostalgia for nomadic ways (even if there was some element of that too). In sum, even if one must recognize that a great deal of Peacock’s argument is hypothetical, “to describe mediaeval Anatolian society and politics in terms of a sharp opposition between settled and nomad is misleading” (p. 216).

Tomoko Masuya, who has written earlier on Ilkhanid courtly life, picks up where Peter Golden left off, her contribution here “Seasonal Capitals with Permanent Buildings in the Mongol Empire.” Like other contributors to the volume, she is careful to note terminological distinctions, especially in the Chinese sources, but at

the same time, she is less than cautious in her use of the term “city” and in interpreting the archaeological data. That there were permanent structures erected in Mongol territories, even out in Mongolia itself, is now well known. But even those who have excavated and written much about them such as Noriyuki Shiraishi, are careful to qualify how they may relate to the Great Ordu of Chinggis Khan or his heirs.³ My feeling is that Shiraishi’s discussion of the khans’ seasonal migrations around Karakorum⁴ provides a much clearer understanding than does she of the relationship among the various Mongol Empire built sites in the Orkhon Valley. Even though Masuya references the reports of the important recent Mongolian-German excavations at Karakorum, she seems not to have read them carefully, as they explicitly refute Sergei Kiselev’s argument that what he had found was the Mongol palace. Masuya indicates this is yet to be proven, ignoring the excavators’ evidence that the building was a Buddhist temple [Fig 2].⁵ In fact it now seems that some part of the palace foundations has been located under the walls of the more recent Erdene Zuu Monastery. Even though she raises (p. 248) the interesting question of the degree to which Ilkhanid sites such as Takht-i Sulaymān or Sulṭāniyya, with archaeologically documented artisan quarters, might compare with, say, Karakorum, it is unclear (p. 248) whether she has actually looked at the extensively documented archaeology for the craftsman quarter in the latter whose publication she lists.⁶

Masuya’s purview here takes us into the Yuan period and the building of Shangdu and Dadu (now, Beijing). She has an interesting section discussing the sites along the way between the two capitals, and she is careful to emphasize how Chinese urban models accommodated nomad traditions. For Shangdu, she uses the substantial archaeological reports published by Wei Jian in 2008, though it would have been worth emphasizing how little of the site actually had been excavated at that point. As I witnessed in 2009, more recent work has finally begun to tackle some of the major buildings along the northern edge of the inner city [Fig. 3]. One might as well wish to consult the very interesting article on Shangdu by Hok-lam Chan which appeared too late to have been included here.⁷

Michal Biran has an admirable record of focusing scholarly attention on neglected areas of Inner Asian history whose study is made the more difficult by the pauci-

3 See Noriyuki Shiraishi, “Searching for Genghis: Excavation of the Ruins at Avraga,” in *Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire*, ed. William Fitzhugh et al. Arctic Studies Center, Smithsonian Institution and Mongolian Preservation Foundation in collaboration with Odyssey Books & Maps, 2013 (reprint of 2009 ed.): 132-5.

4 “Seasonal Migrations of the Mongol Emperors and the Peri-urban Area of Kharakhorum” *The International Journal of Asian Studies* 1/1 (2004): 105-19.

5 Hans-Georg Hüttel, “The Search for Khara Khorum and the Palace of the Great Khan,” in *Ghengis Khan*, p. 148: “Kiselev’s so-called palace sector in fact holds the ruins of a Buddhist temple...”

6 *Mongolian-German Karakorum Expedition. Volume 1. Excavations in the Craftsmen Quarter at the Main Road*. ed. Jan Bemmann et al. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2010.

7 “Exorcising the Dragon. A Legend About the Building of the Mongolian Upper Capital (Shangdu),” *Central Asiatic Journal* 55/1 (2011): 1-31.

ty of sources and/or the necessity of mining both Middle Eastern and East Asian ones. Her essay here, “Rulers and City Life in Mongol Central Asia (1220-1370)” builds on the foundations established in her first book on Qaidu (1997) and in her more recent volume on the Empire of the Qara Khitai (2005). To set up her discussion of the Chaghadaid realm, she reminds readers how much evidence there is regarding extensive urban or settled life in various other parts of the Mongol Empire. “Against this background, the relative lack of urban development in Mongol Central Asia calls for an explanation” (p. 258). As I read in some of the recent archaeological reports coming out of Central Asia, I cannot but wonder a bit whether we might not have here an exaggeration of the degree of “urban” development prior to the Mongols and/or the degree of devastation left by the Mongols. Granted, these important questions are very much open to debate. The fact is though, that there has been a tendency amongst Central Asian archaeologists to exaggerate the importance of settlements and the built environment in areas such as Semirech’e, and emphasize that the Mongol invasion was not as destructive as commonly assumed (on the basis of written sources) in important centers such as Otrar.⁸

Granted, Biran does recognize that recovery of such towns often was quite rapid, and part of her argument accurately emphasizes that some of the most urbanized areas (notably Transoxania) for a long time were outside the political control of the Chaghadaids. Their capital, Almaliq, seems not to have housed their actual residence, which was somewhere outside its territory. The better established and more important cities such as Taraz and Bukhara seem to have done well, but lesser centers did not flourish, especially in Semirech’e. As Biran explains it, this was due to “the growing presence of nomads... and... the continuous bran- and labour-drain caused by Mongol policies” (p. 264). Of course, as her elaboration on the latter point makes clear, the imperial policies of conscription and forced re-settlement worked in opposite directions—certain groups were relocated, others imported. So in fact it is a little difficult here to arrive at any kind of a balance sheet.

Political disruptions, as she goes on to discuss, clearly must have had a significant impact on urban life. Under Qaidu in the late 13th century, once he had established some stability, there was, however, a period of urban prosperity, even though for political reasons he deliberately “did not choose to use the city as a source of legitimacy, nor did the Central Asian Mongols establish under him a capital equivalent to those of the other khanates” (p. 268). In the fragmented late Chaghadaid period of the first half of the 14th century, Almaliq revived, and Qarshi, built by Kebek Khan (r. 1320-7) in the Kashkadarya Valley, emerged as an important center. This attests, if not to sedentarization, at least to “a growing rapprochement between the

8 The first tendency can be seen in K. M. Baipakov’s substantial compendium of older and recent excavation evidence, *Drevniaia i srednevekovaiia urbanizatsiia Kazakhstana (po materialam issledovaniia Iuzhno-Kazakhstanskoi kompleksnoi arkheologicheskoi ekspeditsii)*, 2 vols. (Almaty, 2012-13). For a forceful statement about the lack of archaeological evidence for Mongol destruction of Otrar, see Erbulat Smagulov, *Drevnii Sauran* (Almaty, 2011), pp. 74-7.

Chaghadaid Mongols and their sedentary subjects” (p. 273). “This rapprochement was expressed physically by the beginning of modest monumental building initiated by the Chaghadaid royal house,” an example being the mausoleum of Tughluq Temür in Almaliq, “and the rise in the importance of well-established cities, notably Samarqand” (p. 279). In developing Samarqand as his capital subsequently, Temür built on this legacy, but went well beyond it.

Charles Melville’s “The Itineraries of Shāhrukh b. Timur (1405-47)” offers an analysis similar to that which he provided in his valuable studies of the itineraries of Ilkhan Öljeitü and Safavid Shah ‘Abbās. His goal here is “to see to what extent he [Shāhrukh] can be described as an itinerant monarch...and perhaps also to begin to consider the role of the ‘capital’ and the familiarity of the ruler with city life” (p. 285). To the extent then that he bridges the gap between the Ilkhanids and Safavids, he may be able to show something of the process of acculturation to Persian norms in “a rather extended period of transition between the more overtly military and coercive preceding periods of state formation...and a period of consolidation” (p. 285). For Shāhrukh’s reign there are detailed narrative sources on which to draw, although, as he discusses, the use of terminology in them for summer and winter pastures is far from consistent. Melville admits to being challenged by the absence of ideally detailed maps, apparently unaware that one way to have filled the gap might have been with Soviet military topos.⁹

Shāhrukh traveled for some of the usual reasons: military campaigns, hunting, and importantly, seasonal movement from summer to winter pastures and back. One of the more interesting aspects of his itineraries was his regular visitation to important shrines, at which his public demonstration of his piety would have been significant. Such ritual/religious functions by others among the Central Asian rulers treated in these essays may be worth further consideration, especially since there is some discussion here of “mausoleum cities” located in their territories. While Melville draws an analogy between Shāhrukh’s summer/winter movements and that of the rulers of the Golden Horde, he probably is wrong in suggesting (p. 297) the route of the latter was along the Volga between Old and New Saray, given what we know about the chronology of their building and the evidence for a substantial variation in the seasonal migrations.¹⁰ However, that is a minor point, the important thing here being his emphasis on climate and ecology.

Shāhrukh did not neglect cities, especially Herat, but “it is difficult to discern how [he] spent his time in the capital or its environs, and how he engaged in urban life” (p. 301). He seems to have presided over ceremonial functions in garden set-

9 Both 1:50,000 and 1:200,000 series are available, granted at a price most libraries would not be able to afford. See <<http://www.omnimap.com/catalog/int/iran-top.htm#p1>>, accessed 14 August 2014.

10 On the two Sarays, see G. A. Fedorov-Davydov, *Zolotoordynskie goroda Povolzh'ia* (Moskva: Izd-vo. Moskovskogo universiteta, 1994), pp. 20-31; on the seasonal movement, idem, *Obshchestvennyi stroi Zolotoi Ordy* (Moskva: Izd-vo. Moskovskogo universiteta, 1973), pp. 66-67.

tings, but there is little to suggest he specifically arranged to be in his capital for particular holidays.

One of Melville's valuable contributions here is to break down the travels of Shāhrukh into several periods, which then allows for more precise analysis of travel times and the explanations for the trips. In a few instances, if we can trust the sources, the speed of travel is astonishing. It is somewhat surprising that Shāhrukh seems to have spent more of his time in or near his capital than Shah 'Abbās did in his, the tentative explanation here being that he was primarily concerned with securing the central territories of his apanage. Yet he spent so much time away from Herat that one has to wonder to what degree it really functioned as a "capital." In raising this question, Melville admits that it is not entirely clear to what degree the full apparatus of government traveled with the ruler when he was away. The Timurids may have been confident enough of their control over the urban centers, at the same time that they attached some priority to maintaining close and direct ties with their nomad subjects.

Better organization of the introductory pages would have helped readers of Jürgen Paul's focused essay on "A Landscape of Fortresses: Central Anatolia in Astarābādī's *Razm wa Bazm*." He admits to circumscribing the topic in a way that may discourage generalization, but his concentration on the political role of fortresses is very revealing about local power structures. He emphasizes that citadels generally were not co-equal with cities, a distinction which I believe sometimes has been lost in the discussion of Central Asian "urbanism." In the case of central Anatolia, "a fortress...went together with a rural district, and one of the points of being in control of a fortress was that the lord of the fortress was thereby enable to feed a certain number of retainers" (p. 325). The process whereby fortresses were assigned to vassals are revealing of the hierarchies of power and the regional networks. The assignments might go to sedentary lords or to nomads; in some cases there might be considerations of hereditary succession. Reciprocal obligations and loyalty were expected. Paul concludes: "Central Anatolia in the second half of the fourteenth century is an example of a region where imperial power was absent for most of the time and in most places. Regional and local lords therefore came to the fore much more than is apparent in Timurid historiography. Castles were the mainstay of power 'on the spot' and formed a very particular network of power throughout the landscape...[C]astles (together with their surrounding cojntryside and its himan resojuices) were part of the spoils of battle which the (regional) lord had to distribute among his retainers..." (pp. 342-3). Given the fact that so little good illustration of the remains of these fortresses is available (see his p. 322, n.11), one could but wish that he had included some photographs [Fig. 4].

The policies of the Qipchaq Mamluqs in balancing administrative centralization with the necessity of some decentralization (especially in Syria) is the subject of Kurt Franz's "The Castle and the Country: Spatial Orientations of Qipchaq Mamluk Rule." His "argument is that Qipchaq Mamluk rule had a specific spatial fabric in that it was characterized by two simultaneous tendencies: a centripetal one that focused on an imperial capital [Cairo] and several second-tier cities...and a centrifu-

gal one related to the vast tracts of land beyond the urban-rural areas, but with a 'territorial' implication that nevertheless tied these outlying expanses back to the centre" (p. 349). If in other areas of Turko-Mongol Asia, there might be considerable differences in the degree to which ruling elites "urbanized," this was not the case for the Qipchaq Mamluks, who were integrated into the existing urban fabric and invested substantial resources in developing it, even if, by the placement of their citadel, they separated themselves from the rest of the urban population. If anything, what is more interesting here is the analysis of the way in which the Mamluks tried to control the more distant countryside, especially through developing rapid communications and coopting various nomad groups. By elevating the status of certain tribal leaders, it was possible to establish territorial control over regions that might contain several tribes. A network of fortresses [Fig. 5] and postal stations was enough to hold things together. In his conclusion, Franz offers some very suggestive ideas about the changes in spatial organization and control over the *longue durée* of Islamic rule in the Middle East and the need to study much more closely that history.

The concluding essay is Nobuaki Kondo's "Between Tehran and Sulṭāniyya. Early Qajar Rulers and Their Itineraries," which highlights the amount of time Āqā Muḥammad Khān (r. 1785-1797) and Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh (r. 1797-1834) spent at Sulṭāniyya [Fig. 6] and in their capital of Tehran. His essay benefits from its reliance in the first instance on Persian sources (not on the European accounts so often mined for Qajar history), including some archival materials housed in the Golestan Palace. Kondo argues that the apparent similarities between the itineraries of Ilkhan Öljeytü and the Qajars are deceptive, in that the frequent residence of the latter at Sulṭāniyya may be explained in the first instance by military considerations. And the Qajars spent significant time in their capital, Tehran. Even though there is clear evidence that the Qajar encampments at Sulṭāniyya were similar to those of earlier nomad rulers, they did undertake to build a palace there and then used it as their primary residence. Their patronage of building projects in and around Tehran was impressive, the suburban palaces apparently little used except as way stations when they were setting out or returning from more distant travel. To leave the rather inhospitable summer climate of the city was quite normal. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of their residence in town was their regular participation in the Nawrūz ceremony, which invoked important traditional connections with Persian rulership and its symbols. For the Qajars, presiding over this ritual observance seems to have been more important than it had been for their Safavid and Zand predecessors. Even if most of the early Golestan palace is now gone, replaced by later structures, one can still see in the pavilion where the Nawrūz ceremony took place the marble throne from which the Qajar ruler presided [Fig. 7].

All of the essays in this book offer real substance and stimulating ideas for future research. The production values meet the high standards we expect from Brill, and there are indexes of places, persons, dynasties and groups, and primary sources. The availability of individual chapters in electronic format at substantially less cost than the very expensive entire book can certainly help some scholars who need access to

what their libraries may not nowadays be able to afford. Of course the price for each of those chapters would be a good target for a paperback version of the entire book and the many others Brill publishes which a lot of poor academics would wish to own.

FIGURES

All photos are copyright Daniel C. Waugh



FIG. 1. THE GÖK MADRASA IN SIVAS, BUILT IN 1271 AND CURRENTLY UNDERGOING RESTORATION. PHOTO JUNE 2014



FIG. 2. LOOKING ACROSS THE REMAINS OF THE BUILDING AT KARAKORUM WHICH KISELEV CLAIMED WAS THE 13TH-CENTURY PALACE OF THE MONGOL RULERS, BUT NOW IS KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN A BUDDHIST TEMPLE. THE INSERT SHOWS ONE OF THE DEVOTIONAL MINIATURE STUPAS AND ITS MOULD, WHICH STILL LITTER THE SITE. THE WALLS OF THE ERDENE ZUU MONASTERY ARE IN THE BACKGROUND. PHOTOS 2005



FIG. 3. EXCAVATIONS UNDERWAY AT SHANGDU IN THE SUMMER OF 2009



FIG. 4. THE FORTRESS WHICH LOOMS OVER HISTORIC AMASYA, MUCH REBUILT OVER THE CENTURIES AND RECENTLY RESTORED. PHOTO JUNE 2014



FIG. 5. QALAAAT SHIRKŪH, DATING FROM CA. 1230, AND USED IN SUBSEQUENT PERIODS TO CONTROL THE AREA AROUND PALMYRA IN EASTERN SYRIA. PHOTO 2010



FIG. 6. THE GREAT EARLY 14TH-CENTURY MAUSOLEUM OF ILKHAN ÖLJEYTÜ IN ITS LUSH SETTING AT SULTĀNIYYA. PHOTO 2010



FIG. 7. THE TAKHT-I MARMAR (MARBLE THRONE), 1813 IN THE GOLESTAN PALACE, TEHRAN. PHOTO 2010