ministère de l'éducation nationale, de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche



en ligne en ligne

AnIsl 20 (1984), p. 85-101

Bernard O'Kane

Salǧūq Minarets: Some New Data [avec 4 planches].

Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

	9782724710922	Athribis X	Sandra Lippert
	9782724710939	Bagawat	Gérard Roquet, Victor Ghica
	9782724710960	Le décret de Saïs	Anne-Sophie von Bomhard
	9782724710915	Tebtynis VII	Nikos Litinas
	9782724711257	Médecine et environnement dans l'Alexandrie	Jean-Charles Ducène
	médiévale		
	9782724711295	Guide de l'Égypte prédynastique	Béatrix Midant-Reynes, Yann Tristant
	9782724711363	Bulletin archéologique des Écoles françaises à	
l'étranger (BAEFE)			
	9782724710885	Musiciens, fêtes et piété populaire	Christophe Vendries

© Institut français d'archéologie orientale - Le Caire

SALĞŪQ MINARETS: SOME NEW DATA

Bernard O'KANE

Salğūq architecture is particularly rich in minarets, with over forty extant from the territory of modern Iran, and nearly half that number of contemporary examples in Afghanistan and Soviet Central Asia. Such a legacy, unrivalled in any other part of the medieval Islamic world, is all the more impressive in an area which is one of the world's major earthquake zones. If it is surprising that so many have survived earthquakes, it is equally strange, for instance, that so many have been unaffected by the depredations of brickhunters, especially when the mosques which they adjoined have, in many cases, completely disappeared.

One of the three minarets which I propose to discuss in this paper (1), that of Qāsimābād (2), provides a possible solution for this phenomenon: it was attached to a mosque completely built of sundried bricks (3). These would be suitable for the stresses of a structure of modest height, while the tall thin shaft of the minaret would require baked bricks to prevent it from collapsing upon itself. Although sufficient remained of the buildings surrounding the Qāsimābād minaret in the early 20th century to show that it was originally a courtyard structure (4), in the case of other minarets which are now completely free-standing such as those of Ziyār, Fīrūzābād or Ḥusrawgird (5), the perishable nature of an adjacent mud brick mosque might account for their present isolation (6).

(1) An earlier version of this paper was delivered at a symposium on Salǧūq art held in the University of Edinburgh in August-September 1982. I would like to thank Alaa El-Din Shahin for his drawings of Figs. 5-7.

(2) The village of Qāsimābād is situated 7 km. northwest of Zāhidān in Iranian Sīstān.

(3) G.P. Tate, Seistan (Calcutta, 1910), p. 268.
 (4) Ihid

(5) For Ziyār see M.B. Smith, «The Manârs of Işfahân», Āthâr-e Īrân I (1036), pp. 341-6. Firūzābād: E. Diez, Churasanische Baudenkmäler

(Berlin, 1918), pp. 50-1. Husrawgird: *Ibid.*, pp. 48-9.

(6) A « nearly totally disappeared » mud brick building, presumably a mosque, still lies adjacent to the minaret of Ḥwāğa Siyāh Pūš. See K. Fischer, « Interrelations of Islamic Architecture in Afghanistan », Marg XXIV/1 (December 1970), p. 56. For a developement of the argument that isolated minarets may have served as beacons or watch towers see A. Hutt, The Development of the Minaret in Iran under the Saljūqs, M. Phil., University of London 1974, pp. 113-20.

In urban centres which have remained constantly populated, however, the fabric of the main mosques was frequently repaired or renewed as necessary throughout the centuries. A tall minaret of baked brick would be less likely to be altered or replaced in such repair work for a number of reasons: firstly, because of its inherent stability, and secondly, because of the difficulties involved in fully demolishing it. A third consideration could well have been aesthetic: unlike the main body of a Salğūq mosque, the minaret was almost invariably adorned with fanciful decoration in the form of diaper bonding or Kufic inscriptions. These factors may well be responsible for the large number of Salğūq minarets which are attached to mosques of much later date (1).

TAFRIŠ

To these latter examples may be added the minaret of the Friday Mosque of Tafriš, a monument which does not seem to have attracted the attention of scholars previously ⁽²⁾. The town, located to the northwest of Qum, « is so situated that from all sides you must cross passes and descend thereto » ⁽³⁾. In medieval sources it is most frequently mentioned along with Qum, Sāva and Âva as being one of the main centres of Šī°ism ⁽⁴⁾.

The Friday Mosque to which the minaret is attached bears a date of 1273/1856-7 on the entrance portal and apart from the minaret does not bear any sign of earlier work.

DESCRIPTION. The minaret consists of a slightly tapering circular shaft of baked brick (Fig. 1, Pl. XI). It was originally taller than its present height of 16 m., the top course at present consisting of a row of modern bricks.

(1) E.g. Dāmġān, Zarand, Kāšān, Varzana, Gurgān and Nūšābād. Dāmġān: C. Adle and A.S. Melikian-Chirvani, «Les monuments du XI° siècle du Dâmġān», Studia Iranica I (1972), pp. 243-9. Zarand: A. Hutt, «Three Minarets in the Kirmân Region», Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1970), pp. 172-5. Kāšān: A. Hutt and L. Harrow, Iran 1 (London, 1977), pp. 86-7. Varzana: A. Hutt, «Recent Discoveries in Iran, 1969-70: a Major Islamic Monument», Iran IX (1971), p. 160; for illustrations see idem, The Development of the Minaret, Pls. 81-2. Gurgān: Hutt and Harrow, op. cit., p. 123. Nūšābād: R. Hillenbrand, «Saljûq Monuments

in Iran: the Mosques of Nûshâbâd», *Oriental Art* n.s. XXII (1976), pp. 265-72.

(2) The article of Mihdî Bahrâmî, «Āṭâr-i târîḥî-yi Tafriš», *Mağala-yi Āmûziš u Parvariš* XI/1 Farvardīn 1319/1940, pp. 40-8, is concerned only with some of the mausoleums in the town.

(3) Hamd Allāh Mustawfi, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, ed. G. le Strange (Leiden and London, 1915), p. 68; trad. G. le Strange (Leiden and London 1919), p. 72.

(4) A. Bausani, « Religion in the Saljuq Period » in *The Cambridge History of Iran, V, The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, ed. J.A. Boyle (Cambridge, 1968), p. 294.

A flight of eight steps inside the mosque leads to a rectangular doorway beyond which the staircase spirals upwards around a rectangular newel in the usual anticlockwise direction.

The base of the shaft is revetted with modern stone slabs, but above this the shaft is divided into a number of decorative bands. The first section above the socle in plain bond is superseded by one of the most common patterns in Salğūq minarets, interlacing lozenges. The pointing of this section is flush with the brick surface, making the design harder to discern than is usual in other examples (1).

The wider band above this consists of decoration in plain bond, but one which is differentiated from that below by means of wider rising joints, with finger-impressed brick plugs. Although this offers an expanse of relatively plain decoration, the emphasis given to the wide rising joints encourages the eye to find diagonal patterns, speeding one's vision upwards towards the second diaper pattern, one which is closely related to, but not exactly the same as the one below.

Just below the present summit are the scanty remains of a Kufic inscription (Pl. XI b). Unfortunately this is so fragmentary that it is difficult to make out individual letters, much less




Fig. 1. — Tafriš, Friday Mosque. Plan and elevation of minaret.

words. No traces remain of any signs of ornamentation either in the background field or on the letters themselves, an indication that the original inscription may have been as plain as those of the Gurgān or Kāšān Friday Mosques, or that of Sangbast (2).

(1) E.g. in the minarets of Kāšān (see p. 86, n. 1 above) or Kirmān, for which see Hutt, «Three Minarets», pp. 175-8.

(2) For Gurgān and Kāšān see p. 86, n. 1

above, Sangbast: D. Sourdel and J. Sourdel-Thomine, «A propos des monuments de Sangbast», *Iran* XVII (1979), pp. 109-114.

14

DATING. Given the lack of decoration of the inscription and the fairly pedestrian character of the decoration of the rest of the shaft, it is difficult on stylistic grounds to suggest a precise date for the minaret.

The plainness of the inscription, however, is in fact a positive feature which serves to distinguish it from the more elaborate variety which was prevalent in the earlier 11th century or the later 12th century. The minaret of Sangbast, for instance, has recently been ascribed to the early twelfth century on the grounds that the simplicity of its inscription accords well with such other minarets as those of Dawlatābād (502/1108-9). Sāva (503/1109-10 and 504/1110-1), Ḥusrawgird (505/1111-2) and Bisṭām (514/1120-1) (1).

A succession of decorated and plain bands are found in a number of other Salğūq minarets. Apart from those mentioned above, the minarets of Nūšābād, Zavāra Friday Mosque, Varzana and the Iṣfahān manār Guldasta are all broadly similar (2).

One negative feature, the lack of any glazed elements, should also be considered here. There are in fact few dated examples of minarets with glazed tilework between the first dated occurrence at Sīn (526/1132) and those of the end of the twelfth century such as Ğām (590/1193-4) and Vabkent (593/1197) (3). Its sparse use on the minarets of Sīn and the Zavāra Friday Mosque (530/1135-6) suggest that they are at the naissance of its external use, while the numerous Salǧūq minarets of the Iṣfahān area with more elaborate glazed tilework (4) indicate that it was a technique which proved immediately popular. It seems that few minarets erected after that of Sīn (526/1132) failed to avail themselves of the opportunities glazing offered to highlight an inscription or decorative band.

Geographically the nearest Salǧūq minarets to Tafriš which survive are those of Sāva. One was built adjoining the Friday Mosque by Muḥammad b. Malikšāh in 504/1110-1 and another, built one year earlier by the local ruler, Abū Dulaf Surḥāb, adjoins the Masǧid-i Maydān (5). They are different in style, the latter being much simpler and bearing

⁽¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁽²⁾ For Nüšābād see p. 86, n. 1 above. Zavāra: Hutt and Harrow, *Iran* 1, Pl. 52. Varzana: Hutt, *Developement*, Pl. 47. Işfahān: Smith, « Manârs », Fig. 219.

⁽³⁾ Sin: M.B. Smith, «Material for a Corpus of Early Iranian Architecture. III. Two Dated Seljuk Monuments at Sîn (Işfahân)», Ars Islamica VI (1938), pp. 1-10. Ğām: A. Maricq and G. Wiet, Le Minaret de Djam (Paris, 1959) (Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en

Afghanistan, T. XVI). Vabkent: B. O'Kane, «The Minaret of Vabkent», Proceedings of the Symposium on the Art of the Saljūqs in Iran and Anatolia, ed R. Hillenbrand (forthcoming).

(4) 'Alī, Sārabān, Ziyār and Rahravān: see Smith, «Manârs», pp. 332-46.

⁽⁵⁾ G.C. Miles, «Inscriptions on the Minarets of Saveh, Iran » in *Studies in Art and Architecture in Honour of K.A.C. Creswell* (Cairo, 1965), pp. 163-78.

a clear resemblance to that of Tafriš. Perhaps Abū Dulaf might have erected minarets in other towns under his dominion at the same time, or perhaps the examples of those of Sāva could have spurred the inhabitants of Tafriš to emulate them. Other nearby towns also have examples of architecture from the first half of the twelfth century, such as the Friday Mosque of Gulpāygān (498-512/1104-18) and the nearby, probably contemporary minaret, or the dome chamber of the Friday Mosque of Burūğird (530/1135-6). While the minaret of Tafriš is less elaborately decorated than any of these, one should remember that it is, and was, a provincial town. In the *Nuzhat al-Qulūb* Mustawfī writes that the annual revenue of the thirteen willages which comprised the district of Tafriš was 6,000 dīnārs, a paltry sum compared to the 117,000 which he ascribes to Kāšān (1).

In conclusion, it seems incontrovertible that minaret of the Tafriš Friday Mosque dates from the Salǧūq period. Unlike other undated brick minarets such as those of 'Alā' near Simnān, Nayrīz or the Mīl-i Nādirī (2), whose anepigraphic character or decoration leaves a nagging doubt as to their Salǧūq dating, the decorative bands of Tafriš and especially the traces of a Kufic inscription provide a clear mandate for one. The absence of glazed elements suggests that this should be earlier than the second half of the twelfth century, while the amount of Salǧūq architectural activity in nearby urban centres in the first half of the twelfth century indicates that the Tafriš minaret could well have been built at that time. Although not a monument of the highest aesthetic importance it provides more evidence to show that even in minor provincial towns Salǧūq architecture of a high standard was being produced.

QĀSIMĀBĀD

In contrast to the minaret of Tafriš, that of Qāsimābād (3) has been long been familiar to Islamicists, mainly through a number of publications in the early twentieth century by G.P. Tate (4). Several attempts were made to read those parts of the inscription which were visible in Tate's photographs; these suggested that the lower inscription bore the name of Tāğ al-Dīn Abu'l-Faḍl Naṣr and the upper one that of his great grandson Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarab (5).

- (1) Text, p. 68, tr. p. 72. Although Mustawfi was writing in the 14th century, the situation is unlikely to have been very different two centuries earlier.
- (2) Hutt and Harrow, *Iran* 1, Pls. 35, 20 and 27 respectively.
 - (3) The village is located some 8 km northwest
- of Zāhidān, the capital of Iranian Sīstān.
- (4) Seistan (Calcutta, 1910), pp. 268-71, ills. opp. pp. 22, 270; The Frontiers of Baluchistan, ill. opp. p. 224; «Inscriptions from Sistan», Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1904, pp. 171-3.
 (5) A.G. Ellis, «Inscriptions from Sistan»,

JRAS 1904, p. 174; R.C.E.A. nos 3259, 3786.

ı 5

Apart from several brief references in later publications to the works of Tate, no one interested in the monument seemed to have visited the site before Anthony Hutt in the early 1970's, who was able to ascertain that the minaret had fallen down around 1955 (1).




Fig. 2. - Qāsimābād, minaret. Sketch of upper and lower inscriptions by Herzfeld.

Fortunately, however, recent research in the Herzfeld archives in the Freer Gallery of Art has uncovered some photographs of the minaret and beautifully detailed transcriptions and readings of the two Kufic inscriptions (Fig. 2, Pls. XIII b, XIV a-b) (2). Two unpublished photographs in the Royal Geographical Society, one of very high quality, are also of considerable help in verifying Herzfeld's work (Pls. XII, XIII a). His readings are as follows:


upper inscription:

- (1) Hutt, Developement, p. 292.
- (2) I would like to thank Esin Atil and Holly Edwards for facilitating my work in the Freer Gallery. Herzfeld's material on the minaret is

contained in Sketchbook XIII, pp. 26-7, which contains on the spot records (see Fig. 4), and Notebook 109, pp. 3-4, which seems to have been written up later (see Fig. 2).

نصير (امير المومنين)

lower inscription:



The numbered brackets underneath and above the text correspond to those portions which can be seen in the plates (1). Although it has not been possible to find complete photographic coverage of the inscriptions, it can nevertheless be seen that virtually all of Herzfeld's reading can be verified, sufficient to suggest that the remainder of his on the spot recording is likely to have been accurate.

The two Tāğ al-Dīns mentioned in the inscription are members of the Ṣaffārid dynasty, an exceptionally long-lived family who survived conquest by several other rulers. The Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr b. Ḥalaf who is mentioned in the lower inscription came to power in

(1) Tate I and II refer to the illustrations in his Seistan opp. pp. 22 and 270 respectively.

Sistan in 499/1106 ⁽¹⁾. In the *Tāriḥ-i Sīstān* his father is given the *laqab* Bahā' al-Dawla, a title given to both Bahā' al-Dawla Ṭāhir and Bahā' al-Dawla Ḥalaf. There was some doubt as to which of these two brothers was the father of Tāğ al-Dīn ⁽²⁾, a doubt which this inscription now resolves in favour of the latter.

Ğuzğānī, the author of the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, is particularly praiseworthy of Tāğ al-Dīn, relating how both in the city and province of Sīstān numerous monuments (āṭār) of his goodness remained (3). As an example of his learning and enlightenment he relates how the sovereign himself occasionally read the Friday *huṭba* (4). Perhaps Tāğ al-Dīn ordered the mausoleum (*rawḍa*) in which Ğūzǧānī says he was buried in Sīstān (5). It seems likely that his reign was one which was conducive to the patronage of public works.

After his death, aged over 100, in Šaʿbān 559 / June-July 1164 ⁽⁶⁾ he was succeeded by his son Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad who promptly blinded one of his brothers, 'Izz al-Mulūk, and put another eighteen to death in one day ⁽⁷⁾. His reign continued in the same blood-thirsty manner until Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb, the son of 'Izz al-Mulūk, organised a coup in concert with the nobles on 11th Šaʿbān 564 / 11 May 1169 ⁽⁸⁾.

Ğūzǧānī is equally laudatory of Tāǧ al-Dīn Ḥarb's reign. He is reputed to have shown extreme favour to the 'ulamā'. He also ordered that a carpet should be woven for every mosque of Bukhārā and that similar floor coverings and other gifts should be sent to the Shrine at Mecca (9).

Since Tāğ al-Dīn ruled for some 60 years, dying in 612/1215-6 (10), one could be excused for thinking that he must have been a very young man when he first occupied the throne. In fact the individual members of the dynasty seem to have reflected the longevity of the dynasty itself — Tāğ al-Dīn was one hundred and twenty (lunar) years old when he died and therefore a mere sixty upon his accession (11). When then in the exceedingly long lifetime of Tāğ al-Dīn might the minaret have been built?

- (1) Tārih-i Sīstān, ed. Malik al-Šu'arā' Bahār (Tehran, 1314/1935), p. 390.
- (2) C.E. Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties* (Edinburgh, 1980), p. 103.
- (3) Ed. H. Ḥabibī (Kabul, 1964), p. 276, tr. H.G. Raverty (London, 1881), II, p. 187.
 - (h) Text, p. 277, tr. p. 189.
 - (5) Loc. cit.
 - (6) Tāriḥ-i Sīstān, p. 391.
 - (7) Tabagāt-i Nāṣiri, text p. 277, tr. p. 189.
 - (8) Tārih-i Sistān, p. 391; Ţabaqāt-i Nāṣirī, text
- pp. 191-2, tr. pp. 278-9. Ğüzğāni makes it clear that Tāğ al-Din Ḥarb was the son of 'Izz al-Mulūk and therefore the grandson of Tāğ al-Din Naṣr, rather than the great grandson, as assumed by Tate and Ellis.
 - (9) Text, p. 279, tr. p. 192.
- (10) Loc. cit.
- (11) *Țabaqăt-i Nāṣirī*, text, p. 279, tr. p. 193. According to the *Tārīḥ-i Sīstān*, p. 393, he died on 3 Raǧab 610/18 November 1213.

One surprising aspect of the inscriptions is the apparently equal prominence which they give to each ruler. Tate suggested that this was because the minaret was begun under Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr and finished later under Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb (1). But there is no sign of any break in bond or differences in epigraphy between the two inscriptions which would support such a theory. It would be quite unprecedented in a Salǧūq foundation inscription for a ruler to devote so much space to his ancestry, but when a tributary or relative of the ruler is the founder it is usual for him to give the full titles of his overlord (2). In fact the protocol of Tāǧ al-Dīn Naṣr is obviously more inflated — al-mu'ayyad al-manṣūr is absent from Tāǧ al-Dīn Ḥarb's titles, and the former is described as sulṭān and šams al-mulūk wa'l-salāṭīn, whereas the latter is merely malik and šams al-mulūk (3).

The presence of the names of both rulers on the minaret indicates that the younger must have been responsible for its erection — had Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr built it, there would have been no need for his grandson Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb to be mentioned. On the other hand, the inflated titulature of Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr and in particular his epithet sulṭān versus the malik of Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb make it equally clear that the minaret must have been erected while Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr was still the reigning sulṭān, i.e. before his death in 559/1164. As Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb had already reached the age of sixty upon his accession to the throne he would have had ample opportunity within the previous forty years or so to exercise his patronage.

At this stage the question may be raised of how or whether the stylistic evidence of the monument's form and decoration corresponds with the historical evidence.

The absence of glazed elements, as with the Tafriš minaret, suggests the earlier rather than the later half of the twelfth century $^{(a)}$. As regards positive evidence, the inscriptions and their borders present a number of features which can be used for comparison. The lower inscription is framed by guard bands above and below consisting of waving terracotta strips forming a double bow pattern alternating with lozenges (Pl. XIV a). The increased

⁽¹⁾ Seistan, p. 271.

⁽²⁾ See, for example, the inscriptions in the name of Abū Manṣūr Ilāldī in the Great Mosque of Diyarbakr which display prominently the name of the reigning Salǧūq Sulṭān: R.C.E.A. nos 2973, 3007.

⁽³⁾ For a contemporary example of the use of these terms see the inscription of 550/1155-6 of Abu'l-Muzaffar Maḥmūd in the Great Mosque of Diyarbakr and in particular the comparative

tables assembled by Herzfeld in Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum. II^o partie: Syrie du nord. Inscriptions et Monuments d'Alep (Cairo, 1955), pp. 178-9. For a discussion of the origin of most of the terms used in the inscription see N. Elisséeff, «La titulature de Nûr ad-Dîn d'après ses inscriptions », Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales XIV (1952-4), pp. 155-96.

⁽⁴⁾ See above, p. 88.

height and elaboration of the inscription in the upper register calls for a more elaborate border, and this is provided by extra terracotta strips forming an interlace which echos that of the inscription itself (Pl. XII). Such guard bands are found in numerous other Salǧūq minarets. At its simplest it appears just below the inscription of the Tafriš minaret (Pl. XI b) and at Kirmān, while more complicated examples akin to those of the upper field at Qāsimābād are found in several early twelfth century minarets: Sāva (504/1110-1), Dawlatābād (502/1108-9) and Ḥusrawgird (505/1111-2) (1). The pattern seems to have been less popular thereafter, although a version of it can be seen on the lowest border of the second tier of the minaret of \check{G} ām (590/1193-4) (2).

The inscriptions themselves are extremely decorative, and call for comment. Three items can be considered here, the flowering tendrils (Fig. 4) and interlacing stems of the upper inscription, and the form of the letters themselves, which seems to be identical in both upper and lower inscriptions.

With the help of Herzfeld's drawings it has been possible to complete an alphabet (Fig. 3). All the letters have a variety of decorative flourishes above the line, the simplest being the swelling and narrowing to a point of alif, $b\bar{a}$, $r\bar{a}$, etc. (Fig. 3 n°s 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17). Another group, the $f\bar{a}$, $m\bar{i}m$ and $w\bar{a}w$ (Fig. 3 n°s 10, 13, 16), have terminals consisting of straight points, trilobes or half-trilobes, and in one case (Fig. 3 n° 13) a crescent-like appendage. The $g\bar{i}m$, $t\bar{a}$ and $k\bar{a}f$ (Fig. 3 n°s 3, 8, 11) have related forms, resembling to a reversed S, with the uprights curving back along the line before bifurcating to the left. The final $n\bar{u}n$ and $y\bar{a}$ (Fig. 3 n°s 14, 17) are also similar to each other, knotting below the base line, with the stem rising vertically and then bifurcating left in a manner similar to the previous group.

The $\check{gum}/h\bar{a}$ with a reverse S-curve ending in bifurcation is common in eleventh-twelfth century epigraphy, appearing on the walls of Diyarbakr in an inscription dated 42x/1029-37 (3) and on the minaret of Dawlatābād (502/1108-9) (4). But an exact correspondence to the horizontal upper fork and the double curling lower fork (Fig. 3 n°s 3, 8, 11) is to be found in the inscriptions of the minarets of Ġazna, e.g. in the $k\bar{a}f$ of malik on Mas'ūd's

⁽¹⁾ Kirmān: Hutt, «Three Minarets», Pl. IV, where a circle, rather than the lozenge of Qāsimābād alternates with the double bow. Sāva Friday Mosque: Miles, «Inscriptions», Fig. 2 d. Dawlatābād: J. Sourdel-Thomine, «Deux minarets d'époque seljoukide en Afghanistan», Syria XXX (1953), Pl. XIX l. Ḥusrawgird: A Survey of Persian Art, ed. A.U. Pope and P. Ackerman

⁽London and New York, 1938) (henceforth *Survey*), Pl. 358 b.

⁽²⁾ Maricq and Wiet, Pl. III.

⁽³⁾ S. Flury, Islamische Schriftbänder: Amida-Diarbekr. XI Jahrhundert (Basel, Paris, 1920), Pl. III.

⁽⁴⁾ Sourdel-Thomine, « Deux minarets », Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. — Qāsimābād, minaret. Alphabet of inscriptions.

minaret (1) or the $z\bar{a}$ of muzaffar of Bahrāmšāh's (2). Other striking similarities with these alphabets are the final $n\bar{u}n$, e.g. in $mu'min\bar{u}n$ on Mas'ūd's minaret (3) and $am\bar{u}n$ and $yam\bar{u}n$ on Bahrāmšāh's (4) the latter displaying exactly the same diagonal pointed termination of Qāsimābād. The S-shaped $d\bar{a}l$ with terminal bifurcation (Fig. 3 n° 4c) is found in the dawla (5) and $Mas'\bar{u}d$ (6) of the earlier and the dawla (7) of the latter Ġazna minaret, while the initial and medial 'ayn (Fig. 3 n° 9) of Qāsimābād have exact counterparts in the a'zam (8) and Sa'd (9) of Mas'ūd's minaret. One more detail shows the close resemblances of this group: the fleur-de-lis on top of the $f\bar{a}$ and $m\bar{u}m$ (10).

- (1) Survey, Pl. 357 A.b.
- (2) Survey, Pl. 357 B.d.
- (3) Survey, Pl. 357 A.e.
- (h) Survey, Pl. 357 B.d and c.
- (5) Survey, Pl. 357 A.b.
- (6) Survey, Pl. 357 A.a.

- (7) Survey, Pl. 357 B.a.
- (8) Survey, Pl. 357 A.c.
- (9) Survey, Pl. 357 A.a.
- $^{(10)}$ Cf. Fig. 3 n^{os} 10 and 13 with Survey, Pl. 357 A.e.

The links between the inscriptions of the minarets of Gazna and those of the later Gaznavids and Gūrids can be traced in a number of monuments: Bust, Čišt, Šāh-i Mašhad, Gām and Herat (1). The concept of a family grouping of these monuments is reinforced by the incorporation in their inscriptions of knotted stems and elaborate terracotta foliation above the letters. While each of these elements is common enough on its own (2), their combination is a feature typical of epigraphy only in the eastern Salǧūq world.

The knotted stems of the Ġazna minarets and the mausoleum of Čišt are relatively simple. With the advent of Šāh-i Mašhad riotous contortions appear which are only slightly mitigated in the last of the series, the Herat Friday Mosque. The regular knotting of Qāsimābād (Pl. XII) clearly has more in common with the earlier Ġaznavid examples.

The foliation of this group also displays differences, with the attenuated tendrils and trilobed blossoms in two tiers of Mas'ūd's minaret standing out from the generally




Fig. 4. — Qāsimābād, minaret. Detail of decoration by Herzfeld.

coarser later work. The trilobed arch between the uprights of Mas'ūd's minaret is repeated exactly at Qāsimābād (Fig. 4) and the trilobed buds which surround this area at Qāsimābād are those of Mas'ūd's minaret writ large. The same trilobed arch and lobed buds or blossoms can also be found on the dado of Mas'ūd's palace at Ġazna (3).

As the reattribution of the minaret formerly thought to have been the work of Maḥmūd to Bahrāmšāh showed, archaicisms can play havoc with the criteria used for dating by stylistic comparison. With this caveat in mind, however, the accumulated evidence of the decoration of the Qāsimābād minaret

(1) Bust: J. Sourdel-Thomine, Lashkari Bazar. IB. Le Décor non figuratif et les Inscriptions (Paris, 1978) (Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan t. XVIII), especially Ch. IV. Čišt: Maricq and Wiet, Djam, App. 1. Šāh-i Mašhad: M.J. Casimir and B. Glatzer, «Šāh-i Mašhad, a Recently Discovered Madrasah of the Ghurid Period in Ġarğistân (Afghanistan) », East and West n.s. XXI/1-2 (1971), pp. 53-68. Ğām: Maricq and Wiet. Herat: B. Glatzer, «Das Mausoleum und die Moschee des Ghoriden Ghiyât ud-Dîn in Herat», Afghanistan Journal

VII/1, (1980), pp. 6-22.

(2) For an early example of knotting see the minaret of Termez (423/1031-2), Flury, *Islamiche Schriftbänder*, Pl. XX, and for a list of others, see Sourdel-Thomine, «Deux minarets», p. 120, nn. 3-4. Examples of terracotta folioation without knotting include Ḥargird: A. Godard, «Khorâsân», Āthâr-ē Īrân IV (1949), Fig. 61; Ribāt-i Šaraf: *ibid.*, Fig. 3; Zawzan: *ibid.*, Fig. 99; Ğām: Maricq and Wiet, *Djam*, Pl. VII.1.

(3) D. Hill and O. Grabar, *Islamic Architecture* and its Decoration (London, 1967), Fig. 613.

— guard bands, epigraphy, knotting, foliate ornament, and the very specific resemblances to the minaret of Mas'ūd' suggest a date in the earliest range permissable on historical grounds i.e. the second quarter of the twelfth century. Indeed as the minaret of Bahrāmšāh itself shows, the simplification of Qāsimābād versus Mas'ūd's minaret is precisely what one would expect in this period.


NĀD-I 'ALĪ

The ruinfield of Nād-i 'Alī is situated just across the Afghan border from Zāhidān. It has been identified as the location of Zaranǧ, the medieval capital of Sīstān. Like the minaret of Qāsimābād, that located here was first published by Tate (1). It has received scant subsequent attention for the good reason that it too later collapsed (2).

The Royal Geographical Society in London has a print of the minaret in its collection which is identical to that published by Tate $^{(3)}$, but whose clearer definition permits a more detailed description and analysis (Pl. XIV c).

It was built of baked brick, and was described by Tate as standing at one corner of a rectangular building which contained rooms around a central courtyard (a). The scanty remains of these structures also seemed to have been built of baked brick, unlike the mud brick mosque surrounding the Mīl-i Oāsimābād.

The lower tier of the minaret consisted of a sharply tapering octagon with a circular buttress in the middle of each face. While one can see from the plan (Fig. 5 a) that this is an accurate description, looking at the photograph (Pl. XIV c)



a) Nād-i 'Alī. Plan of minaret (after Ball).



 b) Hwāğa Siyāh Pūš. Plan of minaret (after Ball).

Fig. 5.

it is possible to detect a visual ambiguity between the essentially octagonal plan and one which is composed of wide flanges alternating with smaller buttresses. The latter

⁽¹⁾ Seistan, pp. 202-3, Pl. opp. p. 202.

⁽²⁾ For a recent bibliography of the site see W. Ball, Archaeological Gazetteer of Afghanistan (Paris 1982), n° 752, pp. 189-90.

⁽³⁾ The photograph, like Pl. III a, is attributed

to T. Ward, 1921, although the date, eleven years after the publication of the same photograph by Tate, is an obvious discrepency.

⁽h) Seistan, p. 203.

interpretation calls to mind immediately the nearby minaret of Ḥwāğa Siyāh Pūš (1) with its plan of regularly alternating flanges and round buttresses of equal diameter (Fig. 5 b). In Zarand, northwest of Kirmān, the minaret of the Friday Mosque also has a low base of this plan (2), while further afield the Qutb Minar of Dehli provides an obvious parallel. Although on a much larger scale, the use of alternating circular and flanged bastions is also found on the medieval fortress of Čihil Burğ, located some 25 km. east of Nād-i 'Alī (3).

Because of the accumulation of debris at the base of the minaret of Nād-i 'Alī it is difficult to be sure of the original height of the lower octagonal tier although, as can be judged from the photograph (Pl. XIV c), it does not seem to have been much more than 10 m., roughly equal to its greatest diameter at the base. Above this rose a cylindrical shaft. Whether the minaret of Ḥwāğa Siyāh Pūš ever had an upper tier is not clear, but the octagonal flanged minarets of Gazna were surmounted, until their collapse in the early twentieth century, by tall cylindrical shafts (h). Compared with the Gazna towers the lower octagonal tier of Nād-i 'Alī was relatively squat. It forms an interesting link between the taller stellar bases of Gazna and Siyāh Pūš and the vestigial ones of Zarand and Nigār (5).

In terms of decoration the minaret of Nād-i 'Alī also presents unusual features. Like Siyāh Pūš, what remained of it was anepigraphic, with patterns produced by simple variations in the lay of the unglazed bricks. Whereas with Siyāh Pūš alternate rows of horizontal and vertical lay form the main decorative theme ⁽⁶⁾, at Nād-i 'Alī deeply recessed grooves with cruciform elements are prominent. On top of these grooves are what appear to be an imitation of a discharging gable over a lintel (Fig. 6), such as that which appears in the minaret at Sangbast (Fig. 7). While recessed cruciform elements form the major decorative scheme of many earlier Salǧūq minarets, such as those of Simnān and Dāmǧān ⁽⁷⁾, the tall narrow slits of Nād-i 'Alī are more like windows in fortified monuments, such as the city walls of Yazd or Herat ⁽⁸⁾. It is possible to view this feature and the strongly

⁽¹⁾ A bibliography is given in Ball, *Gazetteer*, N° 607, p. 162.

⁽²⁾ See p. 86, n. 1 above.

⁽³⁾ Ball, Gazetteer, N° 190; M. Klinkott, Islamische Baukunst in Afghanisch-Sîstân (Berlin, 1982) (Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 8), Figs. 138-9.

⁽⁴⁾ Hill and Grabar, Islamic Architecture, Fig. 145.

⁽⁵⁾ For Nigār see Hutt, «Three Minarets», Fig. 4.

⁽⁶⁾ A close parallel is provided by the decoration on the interior of the dome of the twelfth century mausoleum at Bust: Hill and Grabar, *Islamic Architecture*, Fig. 158.


⁽⁷⁾ Survey, Pls. 359-60.

⁽⁸⁾ Survey, Pls. 373-4.

battered slope of the lower tier as another element which links Nād-i 'Alī to the fortifications of Čihil Burğ mantioned above (1).

In his description Tate mentioned the traces of a balcony which projected beyond the sides (2). He refers to the brackets formed of two widths of brick side by side which curve out and in again at the base and again to a lesser degree above (Pl. XIV c). They may indeed have supported a balcony, although they may also have played a solely decorative role like their only close counterparts, the « bird-like » elements at the top of the duodecagonal zone of the tower of Mihmāndūst (3).

A twelfth century date has been proposed for the minaret of Siyāh Pūš (4), making it contemporary with that of Qāsimābād. There has been little discussion of that of Nād-i 'Alī. Tate did not venture an opinion, while Diez, the next to comment, suggested tentatively that it might be identifiable with one of the minarets of the Great Mosque of Zaranğ built by Ya'qūb b. Layt, the ninth century founder of the Ṣaffārids (5). Fischer



- (2) Seistan, p. 202.
- (3) C. Adle and A.S. Melikian-Chirvani, «Les monuments du XI° siècle du Dāmġān», *Studia Iranica* I/2 (1972), Fig. 1, Pl. XXV.
- (4) See the publications by Fischer listed in Ball, Gazetteer, p. 190.
- (5) Persien. Islamische Baukunst in Churāsān (Darmstadt, 1923), p. 163 and p. 75, n. 1. Ya'qūb's minaret is referred to by Muqaddasī: see G. le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* (London, 1966), p. 337.




Fig. 6. — Nād-i 'Alī, minaret. Detail of brick decoration.




Fig. 7. — Sangbast, minaret.

Detail of window (after Schroeder).


dated it broadly with the Mīl-i Qāsimābād to the beginning of the second millenium A.D. (1) while in the Survey Schroeder mentioned it without discussing it in detail, although including it in the context of other Salǧūq minarets (2). From the discussion above of its form it can be seen that the closest parallels are indeed with monuments of the Salǧūq period, although it would be possible to argue that the slenderer silhouettes of the Ġazna minarets are likely to have been derived from the squatter form of Nād-i 'Alī. The decoration of Nād-i 'Alī is more idiosyncratic, but here too it is possible to adduce Salǧūq parallels. Together with the minarets of Qāsimābād and Ḥwāǧa Siyāh Pūš it forms an addition to the list of monuments which may well have been built within, or shortly before the reign of Tāǧ al-Dīn Abu'l-Faḍl Naṣr.

With the coming of the Salğūqs in the eleventh century the Saffārid political orbit shifted westwards, away from the Ghaznavids, their former overlords. Tāğ al-Dīn Abu'l-Fadl Nașr became a tributary of Sulțān Sanğar, an alliance which the latter cemented by giving Tāğ al-Dīn his sister, Şafiyya Hātūn, in marriage (3). Nevertheless, as we have seen, the remaining Saffarid monuments of the Salguq period have strong similarities with those of Gazna. It is hardly surprising, however, that there should be strong culturalties between the Ṣaffārids and later Gaznavids when Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr had played so valiant a part in the battle which restored Bahrāmšāh to power, his exploits being celebrated in verse by 'Abd al-Wāsi' Ğabalī, court poet of Bahrāmšāh and Sanğar (4). Tāğ al-Dīn was also the recipient of many laudatory gazals of 'Uthman Muhtari, the royal poet of the Gaznavids (5). Both Tāğ al-Dīn Naṣr and Tāğ al-Dīn Ḥarb were thus contemporaries of Bahrāmšāh, and given their familiarity with Mas'ūd III's magnificent minaret, it is interesting to record their varied reaction to it — in the case of Bahrāmšāh a nearly exact copy of inferior workmanship; in the case of Qāsimābād a form in the shape of the more usual circular shaft, but whose inscriptions closely recapture the spirit of the earlier Gaznavid tower. The latter, as suggested above, may even have taken its inspiration in part from another Saffarid monument of the Salguq period, the minaret of Nād-i 'Alī.


(1) «Types of Architectural Remains in the Northern Part of Afghan Seistan», Bulletin of the Asia Institute of Pahlavi University II (1971), p. 47; Interrelations of Islamic Architecture in Afghanistan» Marg XXIV/1 (December 1970), p. 56.

- (2) Survey, pp. 1023, 1027-8.
- (3) Dawlatšāh al-Samarqandī, Tadkirat al-šu'arā'.
- ed. Muḥammad Ramadānī (Tehran, 1338/1959), p. 85.
- (4) C.E. Bosworth, *The Later Ghaznavids:* Splendour and Decay (Edinburgh 1977), pp. 96 and 178, n. 45; G.M. Khan, «A History of Bahram Shah of Ghaznin», *Islamic Culture*, XXIII (1949), pp. 75-6.
 - (5) Bosworth, Later Ghaznavids, p. 178, n. 45.


It would not be right to conclude without recalling the role of Ernst Herzfeld in this paper. Apart from their vital importance to Ṣaffārid architectural history, the inscriptions of Qāsimābād give valuable evidence of genealogy and protocol. It is a tribute to Herzfeld's fieldwork and epigraphic skills that it is possible to discuss them, decades after they have been reduced to rubble.



a — Tafriš, Friday Mosque. General view of minaret.



b - Tafriš, Friday Mosque. Detail of top of minaret.




Qāsimābād, minaret. Photo by N. Ganja Singh, 1906, courtesy of the Royal Geographical Society, London.



a- Qāsimābād, minaret. Photo by T. Ward, courtesy of the Royal Geographical Society, London.




b-Qāsimābād, minaret. Photo by E. Herzfeld, courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington.



a — Qāsimābād, minaret. Detail of lower inscription. Photo by E. Herzfeld, courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington.



b - Qāsimābād, minaret. Detail of lower inscription. Photo by E. Herzfeld,
 courtesy of the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington.



c - Nād-i 'Alī, minaret. Photo by T. Ward, courtesy of the Royal Geographical Society, London.