



ANNALES ISLAMOLOGIQUES

en ligne en ligne

AnIsl 21 (1985), p. 113-128

Bernard O'Kane

The Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī at Fūšanġ [avec 8 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

9782724711714	<i>La pensée et la pratique pharmacologiques d'Avicenne</i>	Sylvie Ayari
9782724711899	<i>BCAI 40</i>	
9782724711288	<i>Karnak-Nord XI</i>	Colin Hope
9782724711622	<i>BIFAO 126</i>	
9782724711059	<i>Les Inscriptions de visiteurs dans les Tombes thébaines</i>	Chloé Ragazzoli
9782724711455	<i>Les émotions dans l'Égypte Ancienne</i>	Rania Y. Merzeban (éd.), Marie-Lys Arnette (éd.), Dimitri Laboury, Cédric Larcher
9782724711639	<i>AnIsl 60</i>	
9782724711448	<i>Athribis XI</i>	Marcus Müller (éd.)

THE TOMB OF MUḤAMMAD ĠĀZĪ AT FŪŠANĠ

Bernard O'KANE

In Šaraf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī's account of Tīmūr's conquest of Ḥurāsān in 782/1381 the siege of the fortress of Fūšanġ is given much prominence. Tīmūr surveyed the deep moat and tall ramparts for three days before ordering an attack in which many of his men were drowned. The defenders paid for their temerity with their lives, while the fortress, despite its exceptional strength, was razed to the ground ⁽¹⁾.

The town never seems to have recovered from this blow, although it continued to be a centre of agricultural produce, cultivating the grapes and melons for which it was famed in Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī's days ⁽²⁾ and which Maitland also commented on in the nineteenth century ⁽³⁾.

The town, which is situated just south of the Herat river some 64 km west of Herat, is today known as Zindaġān ⁽⁴⁾. Its major monument, the Tomb of MuḤammad Ġāzī, dates, as we shall see, from the decades preceding Tīmūr's assault on the town. Nothing of consequence seems to have been built in Fūšanġ after this date, so it is doubly fortunate that the tomb survived Tīmūr's passage.

EXTERIOR From the outside the building is a rather unprepossessing cube of baked brick surmounted by a dome of almost hemispherical profile (Fig. 1, Pl. XIa). It is preceded by a *pīštāq* consisting of a tall portal screen and semi-dome on the west face, with smaller entrances in the middle of each of the other three sides. A window

⁽¹⁾ *Zafar Nāma*, ed. MuḤammad 'Abbāsī (Tehran 1336/1957), I, pp. 229-31.

⁽²⁾ *Nuzhat al-Qulūb, The Geographical Part*, ed. and tr. G. Le Strange (Leiden and London, 1915-1919), text, p. 103, tr. p. 151.

⁽³⁾ L.W. Adamec, ed., *Herat and Northwestern Afghanistan. Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan III* (Graz, 1975), p. 435.

⁽⁴⁾ *Loc. cit.* Unfortunately Barthold, « Būsh-andj », *EI*¹, p. 802 confused it, on Tomaschek's authority, with the town of Ġuriyān which is situated some twenty km. further west. The mistake was repeated in G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 411 and in his edition of the *Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, op. cit., tr. p. 171, n. 1.

just below roof level is the only element which breaks the plain brick bond of these sides. The entrance *ayvān* is similarly plain. The three outer frames are interrupted only by two sets of scaffolding holes, the only ones to remain on the building, and by a row of paired bricks forming a dog-tooth pattern above the central arch (Pl. XI *b*). The semi-dome within the arch is supported on squinches consisting of a series of three flat-headed arches, with the lowest stepped upwards twice, the whole being a variation of the interior squinches (Pl. XII *b*). A staircase, now partially blocked, leads from the side of the *pīštāq* to the roof.

INTERIOR The lower walls of the interior are as plain as those of the exterior (Pl. XII *a*). Visual interest is focused on the zone of transition (Pl. XII *b*). Unusually, this consists of eight unequal sides, the squinch arches being larger than those between them. The lower segment of each squinch is covered by two flat-headed arches, each with an indentation on top. The area above this is first corbelled and then curved out to meet the top of the arch. One almost insignificant detail shows that the construction was not entirely mechanical : smaller bricks in two courses are used to support the base of the squinch arches mirroring the dog-tooth effect of the *pīštāq*. An echo of the squinches there is also found on the stepped arches which bridge the angles of the octagon (Pl. XII *b*). There is a small window between each of them, while above this the dome is quite plain.

DATING The extremely simple way in which the building is constructed makes dating of it problematical. The buildings with which it can be compared range over several centuries and by their very simplicity are themselves frequently the subject of speculative dating.

The dome chambers of Sangān-i Pā'in, Sangān-i Bālā and Barābād in the nearby region of Ḥvāf are securely dateable to the Salḡūq period ⁽¹⁾, and the absence at Fūšanḡ of features which they have in common — stepped brickwork patterns on the squinches

⁽¹⁾ For Sangān-i Pā'in see A. Godard, « Khorāsān », *Āthār-é Irān* IV (1949), p. 15 and Fig. 6 and R. Hillenbrand, « Mosques and Mausolea in Khurāsān and Central Iran », *Iran* IX (1971), pl. VI *b*. For correction of its dating to (5)31/1136-7 see S. Blair, « The Octagonal Pavilion at Natanz : A Reexamination of Early Islamic

Architecture in Iran », *Muqarnas* I (1983), n. 96. For Sangān-i Bālā see D. Wilber, « The Two Structures at Sangan », *Bulletin of the American Institute for Iranian Art and Archaeology* V (1937), pp. 33-7. The dome chamber of Barābād is unpublished.




Fig. 1. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzi : plan and section.

and dome and squinch arches with the bricks laid vertically rather than horizontally — effectively precludes a Salġūq dating.

The horizontal projection of the *pīštāq*, too, is a feature which links it with fourteenth century examples such as the Ḥarūniyya at Ṭūs, the tomb of Bābā Luqmān at Saraḥs the Maẓār of Sayyid Niẓām al-Dīn at 'Iṣqābād and, on the same scale, the mausoleum of Langarak ⁽¹⁾. Many of these examples are associated with religious figures, and it has been suggested that there may have been a link between the appearance of horizontally projecting *pīštāqs* in the fourteenth century in mausoleums and religious rather than secular functions ⁽²⁾. In Transoxiana, however, the mausoleum of Buyān Qulī Ḥān and the numerous fourteenth century tombs of the Šāh-i Zinda are all examples of secular mausoleums with *pīštāqs* ⁽³⁾.

The zone of transition of 'Iṣqābād (Pl. XIII a) also resembles that of Fūšanġ, with an enlarged version of its stepped arches within the squinch. Two dome chambers in Soviet Central Asia also have similar arches : those of Sulṭān Mir Ḥaydār in the Kaska-Darya valley ⁽⁴⁾ and of the Gok Gunbad in Turkmenistan. Those of the latter are vestigial, which together with the dome chamber's articulated outer walls suggest that it is of a latter date than Fūšanġ ⁽⁵⁾. In the Herat area the dome chamber of the so-called Ḥānqāh of Mawlānā Ğalāl al-Dīn Aḥmad (Pl. XIII b) has a broadly similar zone of transition but with a smaller arched instead of stepped element within the squinch ⁽⁶⁾. Further east in Afghanistan the

⁽¹⁾ Ṭūs : D. Wilber, *The Architecture of Islamic Iran : The Il Khānid Period* (Princeton, 1955), pp. 145-6. Saraḥs : E. Diez, *Churasanische Bau-denkmäler* (Berlin, 1918), pp. 62-6. Even though the dome chamber here is earlier, the addition of a *pīštaq* in the fourteenth century shows how this feature had become standard on religious buildings by this date. 'Iṣqābād : Diez, *op. cit.*, p. 28. A fourteenth century date is suggested by the interior (Pl. XIII a). Langarak : W.M. Clevenger, « Some Minor Monuments in Khurāsān », *Iran* VI (1978), pp. 59-60. Even though this latter has a cenotaph dated 818/1415 the architecture, as Clevenger remarks, particularly in the form of the stalactites, is more likely to date from the first half of the fourteenth century.

⁽²⁾ R. Hillenbrand, « The Flanged Tomb Tower at Baṣṭām », *Art et Société dans le Monde Iranien*, ed. C. Adle (Paris, 1982), p. 249.

⁽³⁾ For Buyān Qulī Ḥān see C.-P. Haase, « The Türbe of Buyān Qulī Khān at Bukhara », *Fifth International Congress of Turkish Art*, ed. G. Fehér (Budapest, 1978), pp. 409-16. For the Šāh-i Zinda see N.B. Nemtseva, « Istoki Kompozitsii i Etapy Formirovaniya Ansamblya Shakhi-Zinda (The Origins and Architectural Development of the Shāh-i Zinde) », tr. with additions J.M. Rogers and 'Ā. Yāsīn, *Iran* XV (1977), Fig. 9.

⁽⁴⁾ G.A. Pugachenkova, *Pamyatniki Iskusstva Sovetskogo Soyuz : Srednaya Aziya, Spravochnik-Putevoditel* (Moscow, 1983), p. 396, Pl. 235.

⁽⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 373, Pl. 82. Pugachenkova suggests a 14th-15th century date.

⁽⁶⁾ The dome chamber is most likely fourteenth century, although it may be earlier. See W. Ball, *Archaeological Gazeteer of Afghanistan* (Paris, 1982), monument 948.

dome chamber of Sulṭān Mas'ūd near Ġazna has a similar overall plan with projecting *pīštāq* and inside makes extensive use of the dog-tooth motif found at Fūšanĝ⁽¹⁾. Galdieri compares its use in Sulṭān Mas'ūd with the subsidiary dome chambers of the mausoleum of 'Abd al-Razzāq at Ġazna (late fifteenth century)⁽²⁾ and the elaborate articulation of the interior walls would also support this. Just as nature abhors a vacuum, a large expanse of blank wall is virtually anathema to the Timurid aesthetic. Variety could be achieved either by covering a wall with tiled or bannai-technique⁽³⁾ revetment or by a series of niches or reveals. Their absence at Fūšanĝ is another pointer to a pre-fifteenth century date.

In summary, the architectural features of the dome chamber at Fūšanĝ have most in common with buildings which are known to be or are attributed to the fourteenth century.

THE CENOTAPH This dating is, as we shall see, contemporary with the outstanding aspect of the tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī, its tiled cenotaph. This was originally in four tiers (Fig. 2) but only three are present in the mausoleum today. The remnants of the top tier are preserved in the Herat Museum⁽⁴⁾. Unfortunately what remains of the cenotaph, surrounded and surmounted by fragments of later tombstones, is in poor condition. Whole segments are missing or displaced — in part due to a disastrous flood which occurred a few years before Salĝūqī's notice⁽⁵⁾.

Despite this poor state of preservation the cenotaph is remarkable for a variety of reasons. It presents the only example known outside Transoxiana of a technique which was common there in the fourteenth century : deeply cut moulded terracotta tiles glazed in purple, white and three shades of blue. The inscriptions on the tiles are also of interest, firstly for their style, an extremely cursive form of *nashī* related to chancery script (*riqā'*), and secondly for their content, early examples of Persian verse in an architectural context.

(1) E. Galdieri, *A Few Conservation Problems concerning Several Islamic Monuments in Ghazni (Afghanistan). Technical Report and Notes on a Plan of Action* (Rome, 1978), pp. 18-9, Figs. 13-4, Pls. 5-7.

(2) *Ibid.*, Pl. 9.

(3) For the use of this term see L. Golombek, *The Timurid Shrine at Gazur Gah* (Toronto, 1969), p. 58.

(4) Unfortunately it was not possible to obtain permission to photograph the latter.

(5) Fikrī Salĝūqī, «Ḥāk-i Ḥvāĝa Muḥammad Ġāzī», *Āriyānā* XXIII/7-8 (1344/1965), pp. 441-4, repeated with some amendments in *Rasāla-yi mazārāt-i Harāt, havāšī-yi aḥar musammā bi ta'liqāt* (Kabul, 1967), pp. 141-3. Subsequent references are to the latter.




Fig. 2. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzi : cenotaph (hypothetical reconstruction).

After a description of the cenotaph, these points will be considered in turn.

The tiles were revetted onto a base of bricks ⁽¹⁾. As so many of the original tiles have been displaced it is difficult to reconstruct the original location of all types with certainty. Those that are *in situ* today are as follows (with heights in cm) :

- 1) The lowest border tiles have a white vertical face followed by a dark blue bevel which has now mostly worn away to the yellow biscuit underneath (7 cm) (Pl. XIV).
- 2) The large inscription panels have very pale turquoise letters on a medium turquoise floriated spiral background. This is bordered first by a dark blue frame and then by alternating circles and crosses in light turquoise on a medium turquoise ground (24 cm). The care that went into the design of the cenotaph is evident in the difference between the borders, the upper vertical, the lower bevelled at an angle of forty-five degrees (Pl. XIV).
- 3) This is a medium blue bevel (5 cm) (Pl. XVI, centre right).
- 4) These panels have the greatest range of colours. Quatrefoils alternate with lobed cartouches, outlined in white circles and crosses with a dark blue strip to either side, reinforced by a manganese purple border on the inside (Pl. XIV). Medium turquoise vegetal motifs are used for the background and the surrounding narrow border. Large holes in the side possibly attest the attention of treasure hunters.

⁽¹⁾ These, like those of the dome chamber, are 23.3 × 22.3 × 5 cm.

The narrow side at this level had engaged columns flanking an elaborate polylobed vegetal design, mainly in medium turquoise. This is the only tier on which the panels on the narrow side have survived; the others, by analogy with the cenotaph of Quṭam b. ‘Abbās⁽¹⁾ and Muḥammad Bašāra (Fig. 3) may also have had engaged columns. Those of the latter are very similar to Fūšanĝ, with small bands below the capital and above the base (29 cm).

- 5) The inscription and background vegetal motifs, on which the glaze is much worn in places, is in medium turquoise. It is surrounded first by a light turquoise band and then by the familiar circle and cross motif in dark blue. This is surmounted by a running scroll in manganese purple with a plain blue band above (16 cm) (Pl. XVI).

There are four other types.

- 6) Numerous fragments survive of a reciprocal fleur-de-lys design in light and medium turquoise (17 cm) (Pl. XVI, bottom right). These could have fitted in the horizontal space between types 2 and 3, although the pattern is one which would have been most effective in a vertical position. Another possibility is below type 1 where the mud floor at present slopes upwards to cover the difference between the level of 1 and the ground level of the rest of the interior (Fig. 1).
- 7) In the Herat Museum, not illustrated. This had two faces at right angles, one (14 cm) with an interlace, the other (13 cm) with a simplified version of the fleur-de-lys pattern of type 6.
- 8) Central vegetal scroll in medium turquoise, outer ones in light turquoise surrounded by dark blue stripe. Outer stripe in manganese purple (13 cm) (Pl. XVII a). Fragments of this in the Herat Museum show that it was used vertically just below the prism.
- 9) In the Herat Museum, not illustrated (27 cm). Only fragments of the prism survive. The long sides were decorated with light turquoise flowers on a medium turquoise spiral, surrounded by borders of purple and dark blue. The arched end panels had a border of Kufic in light turquoise on a dark blue scroll. The main historical inscription in medium turquoise *nashī* was in the centre of this.

The drawing of the cenotaph (Fig. 2) thus represents only a sketch of how it may have been originally constructed.

(1) In the Šāh-i Zinda. It is thought to be contemporary with the adjoining *ziyārat-hāna* (735/1334-5). See Nemtseva, *op. cit.*, p. 58.




Fig. 3. — a) Samarqand, Šāh-i Zinda : Quṭam b. ʿAbbās. b) Tāǧikistān, Mausoleum of Muḥammad Bašāra. c) Samarqand, Šāh-i Zinda : Mausoleum of Ḥvāǧa Aḥmad. d) Beshkent, Qāǧār Tepe (after Mankovskaya).

THE TECHNIQUE Although the tiles at Fūšanġ are used exclusively for interior decoration, their technique is one which ultimately owed its development to the unsuitability of stucco for exterior revetment. Deeply cut terracotta tiles provided the same stylistic features with longer lasting materials, while the addition of a coloured glaze enhanced both its aesthetic appeal and its legibility and durability. One of the earliest examples is the frieze of knotted and floriated Kufic from the minaret of the Friday Mosque of Dāmġān ⁽¹⁾. Later examples, closer in style to those of the fourteenth century, are the inscription framing the arch of the facade of the Maġāk-i 'Aṭṭārī Mosque in Buḡara ⁽²⁾ and the inscription below the lantern of the minaret of Vabkent (595/1198-9) ⁽³⁾. The latter has the same regularly undulating spiral background that is found on many of the fourteenth century examples from Transoxiana.

The next stage was the addition of more colours, and indeed the three main colours of Fūšanġ, light and medium turquoise and dark blue, can be found together in the *qibla ayvān* of the mosque at Zawzan (616/1219-20) ⁽⁴⁾. With the advent of the Mongol invasion, however, development of this type of tilework seems to have come to a standstill. Instead other forms of architectural tilework dominated — lustre, underglaze-painted and mosaic faience. In the Šāh-i Zinda in Samarqand, however, moulded and glazed tiles reappear in a highly developed form in the *ziyārat-hāna* of the Shrine of Quṭam b. 'Abbās. The inscription which surrounds the base of the dome is dated 735/1334-5 ⁽⁵⁾ and is set amidst a deeply carved foliate scroll. The same technique is used for the stalactite squinches of the dome chamber (Pl. VIII *a*) which display lotuses or arabesques in white against a background of medium and dark blue scrolls and arabesques.

With its series of fourteenth century mausoleums, the Šāh-i Zinda provides a useful mirror of the vagaries of changing fashions in architectural tilework in Transoxiana.

⁽¹⁾ C. Adle, « Recherches archéologiques en Iran sur le Kumeš médiéval. Rapport préliminaire pour 1982-3 », *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (April-June 1984), p. 292, Fig. 8. The author dates it to the middle of the 5th / 11th century.

⁽²⁾ See D. Hill and O. Grabar, *Islamic Architecture and its Decoration* (London, 1967), Figs. 3-4. This probably dates from the second rather than the first half of the eleventh century A.D., as pointed out by M. Meinecke, « Zur Entwicklung des islamischen Architekturdécors im Mittelalter »,

Der Islam XLVII (1971), p. 206.

⁽³⁾ See B. O'Kane, « The Minaret of Vabkent », *Proceedings of the Symposium on Saljūq Art, Edinburgh 1982*, ed. R. Hillenbrand (forthcoming), Pl. 1 c.

⁽⁴⁾ I am grateful to Douglas Pickett for this information.

⁽⁵⁾ V.A. Shishkin, « Nadpisi v ansamble Shakhi-Zinda », in *Zodchestvo Uzbekistana. Materialy i isseledovaniya. II. Ansambli' Shakhi-Zinda*, ed. P. Sh. Zakhidov (Tashkent, 1970), pp. 49, 70.

Six other mausoleums have similar work, ranging in date from the mausoleum of Ḥvāḡa Aḥmad (1340's) to that of Amīr Zāda (788/1386) ⁽¹⁾. A year earlier, however, the Mausoleum of Šīrīn Bika Āqā (787/1385-6) ⁽²⁾ had been built with a facade totally revetted with mosaic-faience, anticipating its virtual monopoly in the fifteenth century. The brief florescence of deeply cut moulded and glazed tiles had run its course. Even if a later building was to be decorated in tilework other than mosaic-faience, the choices seem to have been a mixture of underglaze-painted tiles and overglaze-painted in the form of *lāḡvardīna* or *cuerda seca* (Pl. XVIII *b*) ⁽³⁾.

Outside of Samarqand the mausoleum of Buyān Qulī Ḥān provides the best-known and indeed the finest example of this technique ⁽⁴⁾. The magnificent arabesque composition of the spandrels of the entrance arch seems to have been fired in one piece ⁽⁵⁾, and is the most ambitious example of this technique ever carried out (Pl. XVII *b*). One specific feature links the tilework of Buyān Qulī Ḥān to Fūšanḡ, the border of alternating circles and crosses which surrounds the larger inscription and the cartouches on the tier above (Pl. XVI). Several pieces from Buḡara have a border of similar crosses, a motif that does not seem to be found on tilework of this kind from other monuments ⁽⁶⁾.

The technique is also known from other regions of Transoxiana. One example with numerous affinities to Fūšanḡ was first published only ten years ago by Liya Mankovskaya ⁽⁷⁾. It was found at Qāḡār Tepe near the town of Beshkent ⁽⁸⁾ in the Kaška Darya valley. It consists of a slab 110 × 26.5 cm with an epitaph of two lines of Persian poetry surrounding a tear-drop medallion, evidently forming the top tier of a cenotaph. Mankovskaya compares its shape and technique with that of another cenotaph from the

⁽¹⁾ For these see Nemtseva, *op. cit.*, Fig. 9 Nos. 7 and 14. The others are Mausoleum of an unknown lady (762/1361) Fig. 9 No. 8; Mausoleum II (1360's-70's) Fig. 9 No. 11; Mausoleum of Šād-i Mulk Āqā (773/1371) Fig. 9 No. 14 and Mausoleum of Tuḡlū Tekīn (777/1375) Fig. 9. No. 14.

⁽²⁾ *Ibid.*, Fig. 9 No. 21.

⁽³⁾ E.g. Mausoleum with the craftsman's signature Ustād 'Alī Nafasī, Nemtseva, *op. cit.*, Fig. 9 No. 18.

⁽⁴⁾ Many fragments are now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. See A. Lane, *Victoria and Albert Museum, A Guide to the Collection of Tiles* (London, 1960), p. 8. A good colour reproduction of one of them is found on the cover of

Y.H. Safadi, *Islamic Calligraphy* (London, 1978).

⁽⁵⁾ It may well be made of several pieces, but the divisions are invisible to the naked eye. Cf. Pl. XIV *b*, where the divisions of the large inscription tiles are only just apparent.

⁽⁶⁾ Lane, *op. cit.*, Pls. 6 d, 7 d.

⁽⁷⁾ « Reznoe polivnoe nadgrobie XIV veka s Kadzhartepa », *Obshchestvennie Nauki v Uzbekistane*, 1976 No. 9, pp. 56-9. A shorter account is given in *Eadem, Arkhitekturie Pamyatniki Kashkadari* (Tashkent, 1979), pp. 72-4. Subsequent references to Mankovskaya are to the former publication.

⁽⁸⁾ Beshkent is located not far from the better known town of Karshi.

Mausoleum of MuḤammad Bašāra in Tāġikistān ⁽¹⁾ (Fig. 3) and also notes the relationship of the latter with other tiered cenotaphs from the Šāh-i Zinda ⁽²⁾ (Fig. 3). Although Fūšanġ lacks the teardrop medallions which characterise all of the above cenotaphs its succession of smaller tiers is obviously closely related.

It can be seen then that the technique of deeply cut terracotta tiles glazed in various colours had a rather brief *floruit* from the 30's to the 80's of the fourteenth century, with the finest work being produced around the middle of that period. The quality of the work at Fūšanġ suggests that it was executed before the decline of the technique in the 70's.

THE SCRIPT It is only on the larger tiles on the base of the cenotaph that the calligrapher had the space to use two registers and display his skill to best advantage. The script, as mentioned above, is in a very fluid form of *nashī* characterised by the ligature of letters which are normally independent. It is thus related to scripts used in chanceries, usually called *riqā'* in Iran, where both the speed of writing and the desire to obfuscate the text to the less literate resulted in letters and words that would be run on together ⁽³⁾. A calligraphic album page copied on 4 Ramaḍān 777 / 27 January 1376 by Abū Ishāq b. Ḥusayn al-Yazdī ⁽⁴⁾ illustrates this clearly (Pl. XVII c). A wonderful example at Fūšanġ occurs with the word *sūdi* (Pl. XIV d). The very beginning of the first letter departs from the norm, since instead of the stroke starting above the line it begins with an upward curve, apparently in order to counterpoint the curve in the opposite direction of the following *vāv*. This leads straight on to the *dāl*, which in turn follows without a break upwards and loops around in a flourish which tails off in a straight line to mirror the « toothless » *sīn*. Also characteristic is a tendency to exaggerate the length of certain letters, such as *nūn* (Pls. XIV c-d) and *ya'* (Pl. XIV b).

⁽¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 59. The cenotaph is apparently contemporary with the mausoleum, dated 743/1342-3 in an inscription of deeply cut glazed terracotta tiles on the entrance facade. The mausoleum is published by L.S. Bretanitsky, « Ob odnom maloizvestnom pamyatnike sredneaziat-skogo zodchestva », *Materialy i Issledovaniya po Arkheologii SSSR*, No. 66, *Trudy Tadzhijskoi Arkheologicheskoi Ekspeditsii* (Moscow, 1958), pp. 325-57. For a photograph of the facade see Pugachenkova, *Srednaya Aziya*, Pl. 163.

⁽²⁾ For a colour photograph of the cenotaph of

Qutam b. Abbas see Moslem Religious Board of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, *Historical Monuments of Islam in the U.S.S.R.* (n.p., n.d.), Pl. 21. For a monochrome reproduction see D. Brandenburg, Samarkand (Berlin, 1972), Pl. 67.

⁽³⁾ See P. Soucek, « The Arts of Calligraphy », in *The Arts of the Book in Central Asia*, ed. B. Gray (London, 1979), pp. 14-6.

⁽⁴⁾ Topkapı Saray Library, H. 2152, f. 25 b. I would like to thank Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı for their permission to photograph this.

Again, however, we find that the only parallels for architectural use of *riqā'* are in fourteenth century Transoxiana. A telling comparison is with the *yā'* of *nāgahī* (Pl. XIV *b*) and that of a fragment from the Mausoleum of Buyān Qulī Ḥān, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Pl. XV *d*). The proportions, including the exaggerated sweep of the tail, are almost identical. The *kāfs* in both may also be compared, with each exhibiting a long horizontal stroke which curves first downwards from the upright and then gently upwards, ending a loop which at Fūšanġ merges into the spiral background (Pl. XVI, *kāf* of *Tāġīkam*). As one would expect, the Šāh-i Zinda also provides numerous parallels, ranging from the relatively restrained example of the *ziyārat-hāna* ⁽¹⁾ to the over-hasty inelegance of such later examples as Šād-i Mulk Āqā ⁽²⁾ or the anonymous mausoleum II (Pl. XVIII *b*).

THE INSCRIPTIONS For convenience of reference to the photographs, Salġūqī's readings of the inscriptions are reproduced here together with his notes, which are distinguished from mine by his initials. Parts of the text which he transcribed have now disappeared and are placed between brackets. Dotted sections show parts which were already missing at the time of Salġūqī's recording.

The lower inscription :

Pl. XVII <i>a</i> { حال و مال من (ای عزیزان عبرتی کیریت ⁽³⁾ از احوال من اعتمادی نیست بر دنیای دون بل چشم زخم ^(?) دیده بودیت) ای خداوندان مکنت حال من ترك و تاجیکم مسخر دور و نزدیکم مطیع (طالع و بختم همایون بود و میمون فال من) ناکھی عین الکمال دستبرد خود نمود بس که کرد است اینچنین ایام با امثال من یکنفس در حالت تسلیم جان سودی نداشت دارو کیر و احترام و دولت واقبال من
Pl. XVI {	
Pl. XIV {	

⁽¹⁾ See D. Brandenburg, *Samarkand* (Berlin, 1972), Pl. 66.

⁽²⁾ Hill and Grabar, *op. cit.*, Pl. 82.

⁽³⁾ *Gīrit* and *būdīt* are remnants of Pahlavi: read *gīrid* and *būdīd* (F.S.).

Translation ⁽¹⁾ :

..... my state,
O Dear Ones, learn from my condition.
There is no reliance on this base world other than fatal misfortune.
Did you see, Lords, my height of glory?
I conquered Turk and Tāḡik, far and near were obedient to me,
My destiny and luck were auspicious, my omens fortunate.
Suddenly my true destiny made itself manifest,
For He has done this to so many like me.
One breath of my glory could not help me when I relinquished my life.
Take the remedy and my respect and fortune and prosperity.

Upper inscription :

	(زال غرورش صفائی ندارد)	
Pl. XV c	{ دریغا دریغا بقائی ندارد	نعیم کل او برد ملک حیاتش ⁽²⁾
Pl. XVI	{ کنون بیش حاجت روائی ندارد	زیبای ⁽³⁾ اندر آورد صاحبقرانی
	{	سپهر سخا و کرم خواجه غازی ⁽⁴⁾
Pl. XV a-b	{ چود) انست کین خس بهائی ندارد	(بهمت بزد برجھان پست پائی
	{ طمع زین جهان جز دعائی ندارد	بفردوس اعلی شد آرامگاهش
	{ که با او فداک ماجرائی ندارد)	چو رفت او بقا باد اردوبقارا

Translation :

.....
The water of his pride does not have purity.
His generosity is what destroyed him,
Alas, alas, there is no continued existence (in this world).
He conquered the hero,
Now he has no needs.

⁽¹⁾ I am most grateful to Abbas Daneshvari for his help with the translations.

⁽²⁾ *Sic.* Perhaps the reading is incorrect (F.S.).

⁽³⁾ The *yā'* is omitted by Salḡūqī.

⁽⁴⁾ The tile with this line is now in the Herat Museum.

The summit of liberality and generosity Ḥvāḡa Ġāzī

.....

He spurned the world of material gains

As he knew that this (world of) rubbish has no value.

The highest heaven became his resting place,

Only wishing for a prayer from this world.

As he is dead may there be eternity for Urdū Buqā⁽¹⁾,

Because heaven has no conflict with him.

Of the crucial inscription on the upper prism which provided the name and probably the date of death of the deceased, only a few words could be made out :

وهو الامير ... المعظم ... العادل المظفر المنصور ... المعظم

and he is the amir ... the great ... the just, the victorious, the triumphant ... the great.

Although the inscription mentions two names, Ḥvāḡa Ġāzī, the occupant of the tomb whose name is enshrined in popular memory and Urdū Buqā, presumably a relative of Ḥvāḡa Ġāzī, it has not been possible to identify either from the sources. Salḡūqī thought it might be possible to identify Ḥvāḡa Ġāzī with Nāṣir al-Dīn Alp Ġāzī b. Kizil Arslān⁽²⁾, one of the *maliks* of the Ġurids who was made governor of Herat around 600/1203-4 by the Ġurid Sultan Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḡammad⁽³⁾. There are two problems with this identification, however, firstly in that the title *amir* alone (as recorded on the prism above) is unlikely for one styled *malik* in the sources, and secondly in that the date is, as we have seen, over a century too early. Whilst a saint may have had a mausoleum erected over his grave or repaired at a later date, this is less likely in the case of a secular figure. With no other evidence to hand, one can only speculate that the occupant of the tomb was a Kartid amir. The parallels with the tilework mentioned above make it likely that the monument was erected in the 60's or 70's of the fourteenth century — probably after the Mausoleum of Buyān Qulī Ḥān (c. 1360 A.D.) and of course before Timūr's passage in 782/1381.

⁽¹⁾ *Sic.* Perhaps Urdū Buqā is the *laqab* of one of the descendants of Muḡammad Ġāzī (F.S.).

⁽²⁾ Salḡūqī, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

⁽³⁾ Ġūzḡānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣiri*, ed. H. Ḥabībī (Kabul, 1964), p. 401, tr. H.G. Raverty (London, 1881), p. 472.

PERSIAN VERSES

The use of Persian, and in particular Persian poetry, was still a comparative novelty in architecture at this time. The Ribāṭ-i Malik between Buḥara and Samarqand has Persian verses on its entrance portal ⁽¹⁾, while they were employed extensively in the Palace of Mas'ūd at Ġazna for a panegyric of the Sultan ⁽²⁾. The closest parallels with Fūšanĝ, however, are again with the Šāh-i Zinda.

Persian poetry is found there on the carved wooden grille which separates the room containing the cenotaph of Quṭam b. 'Abbās from the *ziyārat-hāna* of 735/1334-5 ⁽³⁾, and in tilework in the mausoleums of Ḥvāġa Aḥmad (1340's), Šād-i Mulk Āqā (773/1371) and Ṭuglū Tekīn (777/1375) ⁽⁴⁾. The tradition of Persian poetry in mausoleums goes back to their appearance on the tomb of Kay-Kā'ūs in his hospital at Sivas (617/1220) ⁽⁵⁾. The present inscriptions are similar to the earlier ones cited in that they emphasize the transitoriness of human life, but their emphasis on the deceased in the form of specific references to him, and in the use of the first person ⁽⁶⁾, are quite unusual. This may be explained by the fact that the inscriptions at Fūšanĝ are on the cenotaph rather than on the building as in all the other examples.

CONCLUSION

There is ample reason to suppose that the mausoleum of Muḥammad Ġāzī was erected contemporaneously with its cenotaph for a Kartid amir in the third quarter of the fourteenth century. As so little of Kartid architecture has survived outside of Turbat-i Ġām ⁽⁷⁾, any remaining monument must considerably enrich our knowledge of their cultural legacy.

An initial feature worthy of note is the disparity between the richness of the tiled cenotaph and the plainness of the building which housed it. Whether this reflects other Kartid buildings it is no longer possible to say. The Kartid additions of 763/1361-2 to the Shrine at Turbat-i Ġām certainly show a wide range of decorative techniques,

⁽¹⁾ A. Bombaci, *The Kūfic inscription in Persian Verses in the Court of the Royal Palace of Mas'ūd III at Ghazni* (Rome, 1966), p. 37. The building is thought to date from 471/1078-9, although the attribution is not certain.

⁽²⁾ *Ibid.*

⁽³⁾ Shishkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 70.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 66, 59 and 58 respectively. For examples from western Iran see B. O'Kane, «The Friday Mosques of Asnaḳ and Sarāvar», *Archaeo-*

logische Mitteilungen aus Iran XII (1979), p. 345.

⁽⁵⁾ M. van Berchem and H. Edhem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum. III^e Partie. Asie Mineure. I. Sivas, Diwrigi (MIFAO, t. 29)* (Cairo, 1917), p. 9.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. the inscription at Asnaḳ: O'Kane, «Asnaḳ», p. 345.

⁽⁷⁾ See L. Golombek, «The Chronology of Turbat-i Shaikh Jām», *Iran* IX (1971), pp. 27-44.

including tilework ⁽¹⁾, which suggests that the choice made at Fūšanġ to expend most of the resources available on the cenotaph was a deliberate one. An alternative hypothesis, that Ḥvāġa Ġāzī wished to acquire *baraka* by interment in an earlier tomb of a pious šayḥ raises more problems, however. No trace of an earlier gravestone was found, and it might be thought unlikely that the later amir's cenotaph would displace that of the šayḥ in the most prominent place in the middle of the tomb. Earlier in the fourteenth century Faḥr al-Dīn Kart had patronised seven of Herat's most important shrines ⁽²⁾, and while no traces of this work have survived, it may possibly have included tiled cenotaphs.


That at Fūšanġ is noteworthy in extending the range of the technique of deeply cut tiles glazed in various colours beyond Transoxiana.

Apart from the technique, however, it shares three features with other examples from Transoxiana : firstly its shape in the form of several tiers, secondly its use of an extremely cursive script related to *riqā'* and thirdly in the use of Persian poetry. This fourfold correspondence suggests that the tiles were not of local manufacture. Although, therefore, the presence of the cenotaph in Fūšanġ does enlarge the known geographical boundaries of this technique, it does not lead to the conclusion that others like it were common — or are likely to be found — in other regions of Ḥurāsān.


⁽¹⁾ These are primarily underglaze-painted tiles. I hope to publish them in the near future.

Monuments of Timurid Herat (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1981), p. 229.

⁽²⁾ T. Allen, *A Catalogue of the Toponyms and*




b. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : *pišāq*.



a. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : exterior.



a. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : interior with cenotaph.



b. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : interior, zone of transition.



a. — 'Iṣqābād, Mazār of Niẓām al-Dīn : interior, zone of transition.



b. — Ribāṭ-i Sāḥib Zāda, Hānqāh of Ġalāl al-Dīn Aḥmad : interior, zone of transition.



b



d



a



c

a-d. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : cenotaph, lower inscription.




a. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : cenotaph,
upper inscription.



b. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : cenotaph,
upper inscription.



c. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : cenotaph,
upper inscription.



d. — Victoria and Albert Museum, London : tile 636-1900 from
Mausoleum of Buyān Quli Ĥān, Buḥāra. Crown Copyright.




Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzī : cenotaph.




a. — Fūšanġ, Tomb of Muḥammad Ġāzi : tiles from cenotaph.




b. — Buḥara, Mausoleum of Buyān Quli Ḥān : entrance portal.



c. — Topkapı Saray Library, H. 2152, f. 25 b : calligraphic page of Abū Ishāq b. Ḥusayn al-Yazdī. 4 Ramaḍān 777/27 January 1376.



b. — Samarqand, Šáh-i Zinda : Anonymous Mausoleum II (1390's).



a. — Samarqand, Šáh-i Zinda : zone of transition of Ziyarat-hána.