

## Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 26, No 2 (2016)

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA 26



**Book Review: Der Doppeladler. Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert (ed. N. ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER - F. DAIM), Mainz 2014**

Charalampos CHOTZAKOGLOU

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.10079](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.10079)

Copyright © 2016, Charalampos CHOTZAKOGLOU



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

### To cite this article:

CHOTZAKOGLOU, C. (2016). Book Review: Der Doppeladler. Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert (ed. N. ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER - F. DAIM), Mainz 2014. *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 26(2), 433–442. <https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.10079>

*Der Doppeladler. Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (ed. N. ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER - F. DAIM), Mainz 2014, pp. 179 with coloured and B/W figures and plans. ISBN 978-3-88467-235-8

*Although the Byzantine was one of the most important empires of the medieval period, it is not well known in the today western world. Without the knowledge of the Byzantine history our efforts to understand the European history remain insufficient; therefore it is not possible without the knowledge of Byzantium to study the development of Southeastern and East Europe.* With such remarks the scientific team of the Leibniz-Wissenschaftscampus Mainz explains its vision to create in 2005 the “Byzantine Archaeology Mainz” as cooperation of the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum and the Johannes Gutenberg-University in order to institutionalize the interdisciplinary cooperation among Byzantine Studies (Christian Archaeology, Art, Roman Archaeology, Egyptian Studies, Antiquity). The creation in 2011 of the Forum “Leibniz-WissenschaftsCampus Mainz: Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident” enabled the cooperation with other Institutes and Museums of the region in order to research the role of Byzantium as bridge between Antiquity and Modern Times and between Western Europe and the Orient. This book constitutes the first volume of a publications’ series, which focuses on the relation between the Byzantine Empire and the Seljuqs between the late 11th and the 13th centuries. As N. Asutay-Effenberger and F. Daim in their Introduction explain (p. 9) the defeat of the byzantine Army in Manzikert (1071) enabled the foundation of vassals’ dominions of Seljuqs in Asia Minor, who were the eastern neighbors of the Byzantine Empire up to the beginning of the 14th c. In order to examine the relations between the Byzantines and the Seljuqs an international symposium was organized in 2010 and its Proceedings are published in this volume.

The volume contains twelve papers with summaries in English, German and French (pp. 11-176), a list of the authors (p. 177) and an Abbreviation-list

of the periodicals (p. 179). The first article under the title “Byzantium between cultural competition and dominant culture” (pp. 11-24) signs PETER SCHREINER. The prominent scholar describes the role of Byzantium among the development of other entities around the Byzantine Empire from the 6th to the 14th century and the cultural exchanges between Byzantium on the one hand and West, East and North on the other hand. Although the paper does not enrich considerably the discussion of the specific topic of this congress, as Seljuqs are scarcely mentioned, it offers a notable outline of the means and the obstacles of the Byzantine cultural expansion, even if the writer chooses specific facts and generalizes them in order to deliver a compressed insight on cultural competition and dominant cultures in the area.

The interesting paper of G. PRINZING under the title “Byzantines and Seljuqs between Alliance, Coexistence and Confrontation in the period ca. 1180-1261” (pp. 25-37) offers essential insights to the political relations between Byzantines and Seljuqs and their diplomatic and military expressions. The author delivers a very detailed paper on the forced coexistence of the Byzantines in Nicaea and Trebizond, the Seljuqs and the Latins up to the arrival of the Mongols and the reconquest of Constantinople by Michael VIII. Palaiologos. The author offers a comprehensive image of the political and military events of the period in that region.

R. SHUKUROV deals with “Sultan Izz al-Din Kaykawus II in Byzantium (1262-1264/5)” (pp. 39-52) after he was exiled and with the fate of his followers, who accompanied him according to Greek, Persian and Arabic sources. The author argues for their forcible conversion to Christianity. Shukurov examines in his detailed study the fate of the Seljuq Sultan Kaykâwus’ –the editors should have uniformed names and toponyms, which appear in different form in the articles of the volume (e.g. Kaykâwus’, Kaikaus p. 33)– and his family members and companions, who were hosted in Constantinople. Furthermore he investigates the traces of these Seljuqs in the Byzantine Empire and presents impressive prosopographic information on families and persons, who were assimilated or remained in the Byzantine Empire. Shukurov focuses also in the episode of the conversion of these Seljuqs to Christians after their unsuccessful conspiracy against Michael VIII Palaiologos.

R. WARLAND in his fascinating paper “Byzantine wall paintings of the 13th century in Cappadocia. Visual evidence of the coexistence of Byzantines and Seljuqs” (pp. 53-69) examines the byzantine art as expression of pictorial rhetoric and court ideology of Nicaea. He presents a number of churches decorated in the

13th century and argues on their creation during the period of the political alliance between Byzantines and Seljuqs. He mentions several dedicatory inscriptions (pp. 54-5) in Cappadocian churches, which imply the respect to the Byzantines, who lived under the Seljuqs. Furthermore he examines portraits of donors in order to conclude a peaceful coexistence between Byzantines and Seljuqs in Cappadocia during the 13th century. His statement, that the standing donors constitute an innovation of the 13th century, which replaced the kneeling donors, is not confirmed by donors' depictions in other Byzantine churches<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore such a theory would contradict his own revision to the 13th century of the Karanlik Kilise frescoes, where all donors are represented kneeling. The iconography of the Karabaş Kilise with saint Menas in Orans and the clipeus with Jesus finds a parallel in the 14th c. depictions of saint Paraskeue in Cyprus<sup>2</sup>, as well as the placement of donors in the Prothesis-wall of the Holy Virgin Moutoulas (1280)<sup>3</sup> in Cyprus. Warland supports the revision of the frescoes' dating in the so-called "Dark church" (Karanlik Kilise) from the 11th to the 13th century. We share the view that a careful iconographical examination and comparison with other frescoes (e.g. Holy Virgin Phorbiotissa in Niketari, Cyprus) points to a later period of their creation, than the 11th century. His theory regarding a dogmatic content of the three depictions of Jesus in the domes and the apse appears plausible, although his suggestion of reconstructing the holy figure of the medallion in the semi-circular wall of apse with the presentation of Jesus does not appear very convincing based

---

1. In Cyprus for example we find standing donors dated before the 13th century (e.g. St. Nicolaus of the Roof in Kakopetria and Holy Virgin Phorbiotissa) and kneeling donors in the 14th and 15th centuries (St. Aikaterine in Pyrga, Holy Virgin Chrysokourdaliotissa in Kourdali): Ch. CHOTZAKOGLU, Βυζαντινή ἀρχιτεκτονική καὶ τέχνη στὴν Κύπρο, in: *Ἱστορία τῆς Κύπρου* (ed. Th. PΑΡΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΛΟΣ), Lefkosia 2005, III. 465-787 and spec. 644-5, fig. 386; Io. ELIADES, *The Holy Virgin Chrysokourdaliotissa in Kourdali*, Lefkosia 2012, 23-5 with fig.; Ch. CHOTZAKOGLU, Φωτίζοντας τὴ χριστιανικὴ τέχνη τῆς Κύπρου: ἀπὸ τὴν αὐγὴ τῶν πρώτων βασιλικῶν μέχρι τὴν ὀθωμανικὴ ἡμισέληνο (4ος-16ος αἰ.), in: *Κύπρος, ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀρχαιότητα ἕως σήμερα* (ed. A. MARAGKOU – G. GEORGIS – K. STAIKOS – TR. SKLAVENTITES), Athens 2007, 160-207 and spec. 196-7, fig. 32; A. and J. STYLIANOU, Ἡ βυζαντινὴ τέχνη κατὰ τὴν περίοδο τῆς Φραγκοκρατίας (1191-1570), in: *Ἱστορία τῆς Κύπρου* (ed. Th. PΑΡΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΛΟΣ), Lefkosia 2005, V.2, 1229-1407, fig. 49, 74, 77, 123.

2. C. CONNOR, Female saints in church decoration of the Troodos mountains in Cyprus, in: *Medieval Cyprus* (ed. N. PATTERSON-SEVCENKO – CHR. MOSS), New Jersey 1999, 213-228 and spec. 218-9, fig. 12.

3. A. and J. STYLIANOU, *The painted churches of Cyprus*, Lefkosia <sup>3</sup>1997, 323-330, fig. 192.

on iconographical parallels. In Byzantine churches of Cyprus for example appear at the same spot similar medallions with representations of local prelates<sup>4</sup>.

A. EASTMOND in his article on “Inscriptions and Authority in Ani” (pp. 71-84) deals with the monumental inscriptions used in Ani, the medieval capital of Armenia, which between 970-1320 came under the control of seven different ruling elites, who used at least six different religious and administrative languages. Methodologically, we do not share the author’s view that the reader instead of the writer of this paper should check the accuracy of the translations used (p. 71 note 2). Eastmond argues that the visual contact with the “*inscriptions, would have immediately given a sense of the city’s self-identity*” (p. 71). In this frame it would be interested to look into how the Byzantines understood the pseudo-Kufic inscriptions, which decorated middle-byzantine churches and frescoes. The writer examines the visual and verbal meaning of the multi-lingual inscriptions in order to trace the role of every language and set questions, on who was capable of reading inscriptions on different languages (p. 76). He also examines some bilingual texts presenting the various dimensions regarding the choice of the language. Characteristic are bilingual texts, where their content was reordered in order to flatter each ruler in his language (p. 79). Eastmond concludes that the majority of the Armenian population made necessary the translation of several inscriptions into Armenian, although the initial language of every inscription reveals the language –and consequently the ethnic origin of the ruler– in which the law was issued, stating characteristically, that “*the inscriptions reveal the authority of words*”.

TH. MATHEWS and TH. MAARTEN VAN LINT present in their exciting paper under the title “The Kars-Tsamandos Group of Armenian illuminated manuscripts of the 11th century” (pp. 85-95) the production of the Kars-Scriptorium and trace information on the life in Anatolia during the period of the Seljuq conquest. They present the illuminated Mss Jerusalem St. James 2556 out of the 50 of the Kars-Tsamandos-group, which preserves the portrait of Marem, the Armenian ruler of Tsamandos, who is related with several manuscripts of that group. Her Byzantine title of *kouropalatissa* is witnessed by a bilingual lead seal, which is surely rare, but not unique, as stated in the paper<sup>5</sup>. The authors reveal that the manuscript was

4. CHOTZAKOGLU, Βυζαντινὴ ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ (as in note 1) 391, 456b.

5. For similar, bilingual lead seals in Greek and Armenian see: N. OIKONOMIDES, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, Washington D.C. 1985, 18-19; B. COULIE – J. NESBITT, A bilingual rarity in the Dumbarton Collection of Lead Seals, *DOP* 43 (1989), 121-3.

mutilated and the major part of its illuminations was carefully cut out and robbed, a fact that was concealed by Der Nersessian. The manuscript preserves a unique iconographic illumination, which the authors identify with the Temptation of Jesus. These manuscripts were possibly transferred to Tsamandos after the Seljuq conquest of Kars (1054). The authors recognize a possible Constantinopolitan influence, although not exclusively (p. 89) and bring it in connection with the intellectual dialogue between Christianity and Islam on the eve of the Seljuq conquest, as documented in the Letters of Gregor Magistros (pp. 90-1).

N. IAMANIDZE in her interesting paper “The Dragon-slayer horseman from its origin to the Seljuqs: missing Georgian archaeological evidence” (pp. 97-110) argues on pictorial motives of Georgian art, which were possibly used in Seljuq art on the example of the dragon-slayer. A clear message from this article is the problematic dating for several Georgian monuments, with the local researchers to date them very early and European scholars to prefer a later dating. Iamanidze presents three Georgian stone-carved crosses with dragon-slayers dated between the 6th-8th centuries and identifies the rider with St. George, although no inscription supports this identification. Her aim to present the Xozorni-stela as the oldest pictorial evidence of St. George as dragon-slayer is based on only two letters of its fragmentary inscription; the further archaeological evidence, which she presents in order to argue that the motive of St. George as dragon-slayer was created in Georgia before the earliest written reference to the 11th c. in his Vita (p. 102) constitutes a single stela from Kataula (7th c.), where the inscription contains actually a supplication to St. George, but no reference to him as dragon-slayer (p. 101). Regarding the pillar of Gveldes templon she rightly notes that the iconographical features of the depicted dragon-slayer point to St. Theodore, whose Vita and iconography as dragon-slayer goes back at least to the 8th c.<sup>6</sup> and not to St. George, while the reliefs of the Martvili church, apart from their early dating, betray Cappadocian iconographical influence, as she herself underlines, and not Georgian (pp. 102-3). The dating of the sculptures in Iq’alt’o and Joisubani to the 10th c. and the C’edelda to the 9th c. is not supported by any solid argumentation. In that point we have to underline that the motive of the rider killing a snake or a dragon goes back to the pre-Christian period with the myths of Perseus and the

---

6. T. ΠΑΡΑΜΑΣΤΟΡΑΚΗΣ, *Ιστορίες και ιστορήσεις βυζαντινών παλληκαριών*, ΔΧΑΕ 20 (1998), 213-230 and spec. 215-9.

Thracian rider<sup>7</sup>; riders killing persons or dragons appear outside Georgia already before the 11th c. not only as holy figures (e.g. St. Sissinios<sup>8</sup> or Salomon<sup>9</sup>) but also as byzantine emperors in the epic poetry (e.g. Constantine V.)<sup>10</sup> following the literary tradition of the romans of the Late Antiquity<sup>11</sup>. If St. George as dragon-slayer would have appeared so early in the pictorial art of Georgia, we should have in our disposal a considerable number of relevant representations and not such a problematic material. On the contrary, after the introduction of the episode of St. George with the dragon in his Vita (11th c.), the iconography of St. George as dragon-slayer is spread all over the Byzantine Empire using iconographical motives available to the Graeco-Roman world. Coming to the subject of the Symposium, the author refers to copper coins of Seljuq rulers (1196-1204) with the depiction of a dragon slayer and argues in favor of the Georgian influence on the Seljuq coinage. As far as the arguments of such a theory are not solid, we can also argue that Seljuqs possibly inherited the dragon-slayer motive on the coins from their predecessors, the Danishmendid rulers (1162- 1170) of Melitene (Malatya). As Melitene was the frontier region of the battles between Byzantines and Danishmendids, it is more possible that these Muslim rulers were influenced by the strong iconographical tradition of St. Theodore as dragon-slayer, after his town, Euchaita and his shrine were conquered by the Danishmendids, who built there a dervish lodge<sup>12</sup>. Although the paper was aiming at the occurrence of Georgian elements in Seljuq art (p. 97), the last example, the C'edelda templon with several elements of hunting scenes (105-8) demonstrates rather a Sassanid iconographical influence on the Georgian art, which can be easily explained, if ones considers the role of the Persian literature to the Byzantine epic poetry (e.g. Digenes Akritas)<sup>13</sup> and their interaction.

TH. DITTELBAACH argues in his paper under the title “Seljuqs and Normans. Transmediterranean perspectives” (pp. 111-127) for the Seljuq influence on the

7. ΠΑΠΑΜΑΣΤΟΡΑΚΗΣ, *Ιστορίες και ιστορήσεις*, 214.

8. O. ΠΑΝΚΑΡΟΓΛΟΥ, The itinerant Dragon-Slayer: forging paths of Image and Identity in Medieval Anatolia, *Gesta* XLIII.2 (2004), 151-164 and spec. 152-3.

9. G. SCHLUMBERGER, Amulettes byzantins anciens, *REG* 5 (1892), 73- 93.

10. H. G. BECK, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, München 1971, 50 and n. 3.

11. I. DILLER, Märchenmotive in Kallimachos und Chrysorrhoe, *Folia Neohellenica* 2 (1977), 25-40.

12. ΠΑΝΚΑΡΟΓΛΟΥ, The itinerant Dragon-Slayer, (as in note 8), 156-7.

13. BECK, *Volksliteratur*, 49, 63ff; ΠΑΝΚΑΡΟΓΛΟΥ, The itinerant Dragon-Slayer, 159-161.

architectural form of the Bohemond I.'s mausoleum in Canosa (S. Italy), on the ornamental form of its bronze doors and on the structural and iconographical concepts of the muqarnas in the Palatine chapel in Palermo and suspects the textiles as the possible media carrier. Dittelbach presents the importance of Ikonion/Konya as cultural centre of the Seljuq state. He compares archaeological and architectural remains in Italy and Turkey and tries to establish the frame of Islamic influences on art. In his effort to trace ways and routes of artistic transmission he refers also to literature, poetry, pattern-books and carpets. Although the comparisons remain on a visual level of iconographic similarities, the suggestions of the writer could offer the starting point for specific and documented studies, in order to prove also the artistic channels and the cultural influence of the Seljuq world in Anatolia.

Ö. BAKIRER investigates under the title "The palace of 'Alā'ad-Dīn Kay-Qubād I at Alanya and its Glass finds" (pp. 129-138) the provenance of a small group of glass finds excavated in the Palace of the inner citadel of Alanya, which is ascribed to the Sultan Alā'ad-Dīn Kay-Qubād I. Bakirer refers to the excavations of the site and presents the problems, which arise regarding their provenance and workshops. He summarizes in his paper the relevant information of the excavation reports and continues with a brief comparison of that material with relevant finds in other excavations, mainly in Turkey. The author leaves actually open for further discussion all the questions on the provenance, workshops and artisans.

R. ARIK in his paper "New information and perspectives on Seljuq art obtained throughout the Kubad Abad Palace excavations" (pp. 139-151) presents the finds of the site and especially of the "Maiden Castle" and provides photographic material and ground plans. He dates the Seljuq palace complex between the 13th and the 14th centuries (p. 147), although early and middle Byzantine coins, stone and fresco-fragments (p. 142, 148) point to the existence of Byzantine settlements and fortification well before the Seljuqs. The author discusses extensively the discovered tile works that were assumed to have been Persian products and influenced even European areas. New excavation discoveries point Anatolia as their production center. Their iconography with fable animals (p. 141) or the unpublished lead seals with the Seljuq rulers' portrait (p. 148) deserve a comparative study in order to locate their provenance and influences. The interesting presence of tiles with double-headed eagles bearing the inscription "Al Sultan" and "mu'azzam" (=glorified) does not allow us to identify them with "coats of arms", as the writer



suggests (p. 141), but rather with a decorative motive<sup>14</sup>. If they were coats of arms, they should have been placed centrally in order to emphasize their symbolism and not among hundreds of other tiles with various motives covering extensive walls (pp. 147-8, fig. 10, 17, 20-22). It would be advisable to support general references on the provenance, dating or comparison to excavated items (e.g. Chinese celadon sherds, star and cross-motives or frescoes and manuscripts) (pp. 147-8, p. 149 note 35) with the necessary bibliography and not just with opinions of scholars, who shared their views with the excavator. The writer underlines the strong influence of the Sassanid art to the formation of the Islamic culture, which was even stronger than the Islamic principle of the aniconic representations.

N. ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER in her article “Reflections on a ruler’s insignia in Byzantium: the parasol” (pp. 153-160) states that the parasol was known in ancient Persia and the Islamic East as ruler’s insignium. The author claims, that the written Byzantine sources indicate two types of parasol, at least in the Palaeologan period and supposes that the Seljuqs were the intermediaries of the “umbrella-type”, who spread it to Byzantium. Although we could share the views on the difficulty to distinct the different kinds of *σκιιάδειον* in the byzantine sources, namely the tent and the umbrella, if we accept the argumentation, that the “umbrella-type” was spread to Byzantium through Seljuqs, then we have to explain satisfactory other questions, which arise: the author takes for granted that such parasols are exclusively of old Persian origin (p. 153) and wonders on how they found their way to Europe (through Byzantium or Sicily?), either for the Pope and the medieval West or for the Byzantine court (p. 154). We do not see the reason to assume the course of parasol from Persia to Europe in the medieval times, when we have literary and pictorial representations of it already since the classical Graeco-Roman period in the Mediterranean as a god’s or ruler’s insignium. Roman representations of umbrella-type parasols related to that use are well documented, as the Nile mosaic (II. c. B.C.) in Palestrina<sup>15</sup> (which was visible up to the 15th A.D. c.)<sup>16</sup>, the fresco

---

14. On the appearance of the double headed eagle as the symbol of the Byzantine empire see Ch. CHOTZAKOGLU, *Die Palaiologen und das früheste Auftreten des byzantinischen Doppeladlers*, *Bsl* 62 (1996), 60-68.

15. P. G. P. MEYBOOM, *The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina: Early Evidence of Egyptian Religion in Italy*, Leiden-N. York-Cologne 1995, 65-70.

16. CL. LA MALFA, *Reassessing the Renaissance of the Palestrina Nile Mosaic*, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 66 (2003), 267-272.

in Casa di Meleagro in Pompeii (ca. 1<sup>st</sup> A.D. c.)<sup>17</sup> or even the coinage of Herod Agrippa I., king of Judea (37-44 A.D.)<sup>18</sup>. Already in the early Christian period Gregor of Nyssa in his II. Oratio of the Comments to *Canticum Canticorum* refers possibly to umbrellas (6, 52), as he separates the covered chariots (*λαμπήναις*) from that kind of parasols (*σκιάδεια*). A reference of the Byzantine writer Ioannes Tzetzes (12th c.) describing the mythical Sciapods<sup>19</sup>, who used their big foot to shade themselves, resulted to their comparison with an umbrella, which shows, that this kind of parasol was known to him. The fact that this comparison is not found in the Hellenistic texts, which offered the sources of these monsters for the Byzantine writers, suggests an original comparison of the time of Tzetzes. If the Byzantine court with its long tradition on court honorific connotation used the umbrella-type parasol, which was already well-known to the Roman practice, why should they borrow it from the Seljuqs?

A. EFFENBERGER describes in his absorbing paper “Victoria and angels in Seljuq sculpture” (pp. 161-175) the decoration of the city walls of the Seljuq capital of Ikonion (Konya) with ancient, Byzantine and Seljuq spolia and examines the possibility that this practice of inserting ancient sculptures goes back to Constantinopolitan trends, which were adopted by Seljuqs (p. 170). Referring to a specific sculpture, he proposes the adjustment of the early Christian Christogram to a solar disc by the Seljuqs (pp. 166-7) and identifies the sculpture of the Nike-representation (fig. 7) at the Istanbul Archaeological Museum with the sculpture of the city walls of Ikonion, described in the travelers’ texts (p. 169). The writer underlines the intentional use of spolia in the walls of Ikonion (p. 172). We believe that worths further consideration the possibility, that Seljuqs were influenced by the Macedonian Renaissance in Byzantium regarding the reuse of mainly sculptures and images of the ancient world.

In conclusion, the Proceedings of that Symposium dedicated to the presence and activity of the Seljuqs between the 11th and the 13th centuries offer a valuable

---

17. R. WILSON, On the identification of the figure in the south apse of the Great Hunt corridor at Piazza Armerina, *Sicilia Antiqua* 1 (2004), 153-70 and spec. 165-7; R. LING - L. LING, *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii vol. II: The decorations*, Oxford 2005, 72ff.

18. M. WACKS, *The handbook of Biblical Numismatics*, Houston 1976, 11.

19. Ioannis Tzetis, *Χιλιάδες* VII. 144, lines 624-628; P. A. M. LEONE, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Galatina 2007, 274: *ὁμοίως σκέπουσιν αὐτοὺς τρόπῳ τῶν σκιαδείων*; cf. Ch. CHOTZAKOGLU, *Sciapods, Sternophthalmos and Cynocephales* (in Greek with English summary), Lefkosia 2003, 28-9.

contribution towards a better understanding of their interaction, mainly with the Byzantines, as well as with the Sassanids. In this context the volume confirms the necessity to support and strengthen the relevant research, to discuss among a wider academic audience the archaeological finds of that area, the relevant sources and their interpretation in order to give credible answers, and underlines the great importance of that pilot-initiation by the organizers of the Symposium, to shed light on such a less known, but crucial chapter of the Byzantine history as well. The lack of contributions from present-day Turkmenistan, Iran, Iraq and Syria gives somehow the false impression that the Seljuqs' vast territory was limited only in the present-day borders of Turkey.

Now that Seljuq objects, which were preserved inside and outside of their empire<sup>20</sup> are presented in the exhibition "Court and Cosmos: the Great Age of the Seljuqs" of the Metropolitan Museum in New York (27/4-24/7/2016), thematic areas as the incompatibility of the aniconic Islamic art and the iconic Seljuq art<sup>21</sup>, the influence of the two great strands of Sunni and Shi'a Islam and specially of Persian to Seljuq art and life<sup>22</sup>, the perception and loans of the Sassanid art, manuscripts and epic poetry, as well as funerary customs in comparison to the Byzantine practices could offer ground for a further successful Symposium.

CHARALAMPOS G. CHOTZAKOGLU  
Society of Cypriot Studies, Lefkosia  
Hellenic Open University

---

20. For Greece see also: N. GKIOLES, *Μεταλλοτεχνία*, in: *Παρουσία Ίερῶς Μονῆς Δοχειαρίου* (ed. St. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ), Hagion Oros 2001, 368-391 and spec. 391-2, fig. 31a-b.

21. Regarding the hostility of Islam to the iconic representations see G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Mosaics as History. The Near East from Late Antiquity to Islam*, Harvard 2006 and recently CH. CHOTZAKOGLU, *Εἰκονομαχία (726-787 καὶ 813-843) καὶ Τέχνη στὴν Κύπρο καὶ τὸ θεωρητικὸ τῆς ὑπόβαθρο: μὴ κριτικὴ ἐξέταση βάσει τῶν πηγῶν καὶ τῶν μνημείων τῆς Μεγαλονήσου*, in: *Κυπριακὴ Ἀγιολογία. Πρακτικὰ Ἀ' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου* (ed. TH. ΓΙΑΓΚΟΥ – Rev. CHR. NASSES), Hagia Napa-Paralimni 2015, 527-566 and spec. 552-566.

22. In. FLASKERUD, *Visualizing Belief and Piety in Iranian Shiism*, London and New York 2010, 249-254.