

RIBÂT-I MALIK,
A MONUMENT ERECTED AT HARÇANG,
BUHÂRÂ, BY THE HÂKÂNID (HÂKÂNÎ
TURK) MONARCH ÇU TIGIN NAŞR II
ŞAMSU'L-MULK, SON OF İBRÂHÎM, IN
H. 471/1078

EMEL ESİN *

I. *Şamsu'l-Mulk's Dynastic Background:*

The lineage called, by their contemporaries, “Hâkânî Turk” (Imperial Turk), or “Turkish Hâkâns”, or “Sons of Afrâsiyâb”, or “İlik-Hans”, the Kara-hanids of modern history (840–1220),^{1**} adhered to Islam around 926 and became, simultaneously, the founders of the first major Turkish Islamic state and of its architecture. Their written *vakfiyyas* (pious endowments) express their concern for the welfare of their subjects, in whom they saw “God’s worshippers” confided to their care. Some members of this dynasty, (reputed to have banished wine from their court), had achieved a saintly reputation. Such was Satuğ Buğra who, won to Islam when yet a child, was instrumental in the conversion of large numbers of Turks.² The devout tendency continued³ with ‘Alî’s sons, Manşûr, who, in 451/1024 foresook royal rank to become a *derviş* and Naşr Arslan İlik (died 402/1012) who, on the eve of a battle where many could have died, risked his own life and went unattended to the camp of Maḥmûd of Gazna, to plead for peace. In an earlier essay,⁴ Naşr’s son, Böri Tigin Tamğaç Hâkân İbrâhîm I (444-60/1052–68)⁵ had also appeared as a beneficent ruler, who built a hospital, mosque, and *madrasa* in Samarqand. This Hâkân, distinguished from other members of the dynasty who bore the title Tamğaç, by the epithet “the Great”, was penetrated by religious principles to the point of not accepting contributions to the treasury, the sources of which were not

* Dr. Emel Esin is a specialist of the history of medieval Turkish Inner Asian culture and art.

** For the footnotes and bibliography see the preceding Turkish article.

canonically legal. But he was also a stern worldly administrator, who by a stratagem, tempted the robbers to come to his court, to then execute them. Ibrâhîm I revealed in his poetry, that he was not as immune as his ancestors, to worldly temptations. He composed verses in *mu‘ammâ* style, in which Arabic, Persian and Turkish words were mixed into riddles. He evokes thus a meeting, at the palace gate, with a young person, clad in the black ceremonial garment of the Hâkânids (a custom also noted by ‘Utbî), wearing a hat with a plume (or horn or foliated brooch), whom he compares to a gazelle, pursued by himself, in the guise of a panther. The Hâkân’s notorious predilection for architecture was considered, by him, as a failing. He had been so absorbed by the construction of a palace, which was to immortalize him in posterity, that he waved aside a plaintiff’s case, but wept in remorse, when reproached by the complainant. Towards the end of his life even before a stroke paralyzed him, a preacher’s rebuke had so affected him that he wanted to “shut his gate to state affairs” (to abdicate).

The contemporaries, as well as later historians, have been puzzled by an act of this scrupulous monarch, the condemnation to death of the highly respected scholar, Abû'l-Kâsîm of Samarkand.⁶ It is reported that this holy man had himself wished to achieve martyrdom. When in Mecca, at the cave of Mount Hirâ, where the first Coranic verse had been revealed to the Prophet of Islâm, he had prayed for “the dignity of martyrdom”. Professor Togan suggests that Abû'l-Kâsîm may have objected, on the ground of Islamic respect for liberty of conscience, to Ibrâhîm I’s attempt to impose the Hanafî sect on all his subjects. Barthold also sees in this event the prelude of the opposition between state reason and religion, which was to be a feature of Hâkânid rule. The ‘*ulama*⁷ (the scholars of theology) exercised influence on the executive power, through their sermons to the population and the *gâzîs* (the army), to the point, in one instance, of ordering the ruler’s dethronement, even death. The scholars’ might was however balanced by the administration, who thought that the exemption from taxes, granted to the ‘*ulamâ*, could be “a spot, on the crescented brow of the *tuğra* (the royal seal)”, as a despoliation of the needy population. Abû'l-Kâsîm’s fate may have been the result of detraction, in these complex circumstances.

II. *Şamsu'l-Mulk* :

The principal personage, to be commented in this essay, İbrâhîm I's son, Abû'l-Hasan Çu Tigin Naşr II Şamsu'l-Mulk⁸ (460–72/1068–80), who displayed “the maturity in intelligence and sapience”, worthy of “a just sovereign”, was entrusted with power, in his father's lifetime. He had been educated by renowned scholars, such as ‘Abdullâh, son of Muḥammad of Şûmân and learned even the science of *hadîs* (Prophetic Tradition), to the degree of being considered trustworthy in transmission. It is in this aspect that he is cited in Ibn Mâkûlâ's biographies, with the additional information that he was proficient in the art calligraphy and knowledgeable in most sciences and arts. His interest in architecture is apparent in the monuments erected during his reign. Professor Togan further mentions the patronage extended by Şamsu'l-Mulk to the mathematician-astronomer-poet ‘Omar Ḥayyâm and the poet Şahâbu'd-Dîn ‘Am‘aḳ of Buḥârâ. From the cultural point of view, some divergences are to be observed between the western and eastern courts of the Ḥâkânids. The westerners who considered themselves “worth a thousand Kâşğars”, were as yet in the wake of the immediately preceding, local Sâmânid period (892–992, with, possibly since 962, the suzerainty of the Ḥâkânid Buğra Beg). This difference becomes apparent, in the fact that while *Kutadğu-bilig*, the first peak of Turkish Islamic literature, treated the momentous problem of combining Islam with Turkish tradition, ‘Am‘aḳ and even the western Turkish princely poet Payğu Melik, wrote Persian poetry, with flippant metaphors on the pre-Islamic aspects of the Turks. Such are ‘Am‘aḳ's *kasidas* (odes), dedicated simultaneously to Şamsu'l-Mulk and to some “idol” (a figurative term for beauty) in his service. The allusions to “idols” and to “witchcraft” were linked by Iranians to the Chinese and the Turks (some of whom were Buddhist or Manichean), sorcery being the art of the Turkish *kams* (shamans) and of Afrâsiyâb the legendary Turkish monarch, ancestor of the Ḥâkânids. Thus, the one, or other addressee of ‘Am‘aḳ's poem is an “idol” of such beauty that when he showed himself, the eyes of the people were turned into an imagery (a Buddhist temple, or Mani's painted scroll, in which idols were said to be depicted). The “idol”'s stature was that of a coniferous tree. Such metaphors were repeated by ‘Am‘aḳ and ‘Utbî, for the Turkish guards, “the cypress-like cavalry”, or

“the fairy-countenanced Turks”, “the moon-faced Turkish pages as they were called. There were, apparently, non-Muslims among the Turkish soldiery, compared by ‘Am‘aḳ, to the demons, subjugated by Sulaymân. Together with beautiful Turkish slave-girls, “Ḥitâ’î” (Cathayan. Chinese, or eastern Turkish) ones are also mentioned, by ‘Utbî. ‘Am‘aḳ’s “idol”’s teeth were like a string of pearls, revealed in smiles. A terror or turmoil-inspiring hair, also alluded to, could be a tail-standard or the long hair of Turkish princes. ‘Am‘aḳ describes Şamsu’l-Mulk’s flags as rose-hued, hence perhaps, the allegory of the “hair” (tail-standard), flying over rose-gardens. The tail-standard *tug* (perhaps together with a drum) of the “heirs of Afrâsiyâb’s crown and throne” was said to be borne by the personification of time, who turned the wheel of the firmament. ‘Am‘aḳ hails Şamsu’l-Mulk, in connection with his name Naşr, which means victory:

“Naşr, who brings victory to the Prophet’s faith!”

Guardian of Islam, ruler of the east and of China”

Titles like “Monarch of the Turks and of the Chinese” and “ruler of the east and of China” were given to the Ḥâkânids, as, yet, the recently islamized Turkish areas, such as Kâşğar, the Ḥâkânid capital, were not always distinguished from China, by Arabs and Iranians.⁹ The military successes attributed to Şamsu’l-Mulk, are evoked by ‘Am‘aḳ, in verses in which describe him, as a dragon, mounted on an eagle-like horse, brandishing Zu’l-fikâr, the sword of the caliph ‘Alî.

Şamsu’l-Mulk, although himself a theologian, could equally be unkind to the ‘ulamâ.¹⁰ When, in 460/1068, he had just acceded to power, Şamsu’l-Mulk condemned to death the scholar Ismâ‘îl Şaffâr, son of Abû Naşr, whose only guilt is said to have enjoined the Ḥâkân to assure the reign of virtue and to forbid its denial. If, as reported, the eminent Ḥanafî teacher Abû Bakr Muḥammad Saraḥsî, son of Aḥmad (died 483/1090) was arrested around 465/1072 (during Şamsu’l-Mulk’s reign) in Buḥârâ (Şamsu’l-Mulk’s capital), to be then sent to jail in Üzkend, this persecution also falls on Şamsu’l-Mulk. Saraḥsî criticized the reigning monarch for oppressing the people, under heavy taxes. He also relates the cup rite of allegiance (*and*, in Turkish) at the court. Yet, the ruler who threw Saraḥsî into a well, then imprisoned him in the Üzkend citadel, obliging the

scholar to dictate his voluminous treatise to students, may not be Şamsu'l-Mulk. Üzkend, the location of the jail, had been annexed by Şamsu'l-Mulk's father, but lost, at a date which I could not determine, by Şamsu'l-Mulk, to the eastern Hâkânids.

Şamsu'l-Mulk's reign had started with perturbances, already in his father's time. The Hâkânids' southern neighbours, the Selçuk dynasty, sought to extend their rule to western Turkistan, the land of origin of their ancestry.¹¹ The opposition between the two dynasties could momentarily be appeased, when Şamsu'l-Mulk invited the Selçuk, a newly founded dynasty, to "matrimonial alliances with ancient houses" in the years 453-57/1061-64. The Selçukid Alp Arslan wed Sâra,¹² a daughter of Yûsuf Kadir Hâkân (died 424/1032). This lady titled Hân Melik, or Şâh Hâtûn, was the widow of the Gaznavid Mas'ûd, son of Maḥmûd (she had been with him, when he was killed in India, in 432-1040). Kâşgarî reveals the exceptional physical vigour of this princess,¹³ which the Turks evoked, apparently in humorous guise, with the saying: "Never wrestle with a girl! Never race with a mare!" The pre-nuptial wrestle, a rite among certain Turkish tribes, had immediately ended, as a "touch of the (bride's) foot" knocked down Mas'ûd. When Sâra was wed to Alp Arslan, the latter's son Malikşah married Calâliya, daughter of the Hâkânid 'Îsâ (a brother of Şamsu'l-Mulk), titled Terken Hâtûn and Şamsu'l-Mulk himself, received as bride, 'Ayşa, Alp Arslan's daughter.¹⁴

Another perturbation, encountered, already in his father's life time by Şamsu'l-Mulk, was to lead him to his career of patron of architecture. In sequel of Tamğaç Hâkân's preference for Şamsu'l-Mulk, as heir, manifested in 460/1068, another son, Toğan Tigin, had attempted to seize Nûmiçkaş, the capital of the Buḥârâ province, often called with the same name.¹⁵ Şamsu'l-Mulk chose, as defensive headquarter, the citadel, initially built by the branch of the Kök-Türk dynasty, reigning in Buḥârâ (the Sons of Kara Çurin Bayğu Türk).¹⁶ The citadel had been restored, in the eighth century, by a "Turkish Melik (king)", in the octagonal form attributed to the Yetiken constellation (the Seven monarchs: Ursa Major), which the Turks revered. When Kuṭayba, son of Muslim, head of the Omayyad army, occupied Buḥârâ, in 94/712, he turned a temple, within the citadel, into a mosque. The adjoining sandy area, to which the temple's

western gate opened, was reserved to occasions when the congregation became numerous, as *namâzgâh*. The temple, in two sections with monumental portal, which was to be traditional in the cathedral mosques of Buĥârâ, seems to have then been started. Some aspects of the then extant architectonic elements may be imagined, through Nil'sen's reconstitution of the façade and courtyard (pls. I/a,b) of another K k-T rk citadel, that of Faraĥs  (Varaĥs ), also turned into a mosque.¹⁷ Some architectonic elements, which were to survive, in the Islamic age, may be here observed: the monumental portals (*t k*), with contiguous vaulted passages (*ayv n*), the heavy pillars; a wavy faade, constituted by a succession of hemi-cylindri-form projections (pls. I/a,b).

Later, the cathedral-mosque of N mikaĥ had been enlarged, with an additional courtyard, situated to the east, closer to the city's circumvallation. The wooden minaret, located in this eastern part, was used by Toĥan Tigin, when he tried to capture N mikaĥ, to shoot at the citadel. The citadel counter-attacked and the conflagration of the wooden minaret spread to the eastern courtyard of the mosque. When master of the situation, Őamsu'l-Mulk chose N mikaĥ, as winter residence (Samarkand was the estival capital).¹⁸ The damaged mosque was repaired and a minaret, in baked brickwork, was for the first time built, in the land. The construction of monumental minarets, as well as that of moulded, varnished, sometimes glazed architectonic revetments, were inovations, introduced to western Turkistan by the H k nids. Moulded, varnished and occasionally glazed tiles (in blue and green hues) had been in use in eastern Turkistan, including K ĥgar, the pre-Islamic H k nid capital, before the dynasty's conversion (ca 926),¹⁹ but not attestend in the islamized western Central Asian zone. These arts advanced westwards, with the annexion of provinces, by the H k nids, in the Tenth century. Such remnants were found in the ruins of the monuments erected by Tamĥa H k n, (444-60/1052-68) in Samarkand.²⁰ 'Am'a seems to allude to such artworks, in a verse: "golden lamps, beside emerald-coloured *miĥr bs*."

The problem of the construction of monumental minarets, in brick-work, appears also to have been solved by the H k nids, with the experience of Buddhist reliquary-towers, of column-like cylindri-form variety, very numerous in Turkish Buddhist cities of eastern

Turkistan (pl. VI/a) where they were called (in Turkish) *ediz-ev*.²¹ It will be seen below that the Hâkânid minarets (pls. VI/b,c) resembled the column-like variety of *ediz-evs* (pl. VI/a).

When the cathedral-mosque of Nûmiçkaş²² was repaired, Şamsu'l-Mulk took the precaution to separate it with a ditch from the citadel, viewed as scene of past and possibly future strife. An additional courtyard, situated further to the east and thus nearer the city walls, was provided. The minaret in brickwork, as well as a *makşûra* (private oratory) were placed in the new mosque. Like the *makşûra*, the *mihrâb* and the *minbar* (pulpit) of the new mosque had been carved and painted, in Samarkand. As in the Samarkand monuments, built by Şamsu'l-Mulk's father, moulded tiles, inserted with gem-like glazed pottery, may have been used, in the Nûmiçkaş cathedral-mosque.

Upon Şamsu'l-Mulk's desire to reside, in winter, at Nûmickaş, a former property of the Kök-Türk dynasts, equally utilized by the Sâmânids, and located conveniently at the western gate of the city, was proposed to him.²³ The property was however too small for Şamsu'l-Mulk's retinue. A dignitary suggested that these could be put up by the citizens. Şamsu'l-Mulk sent one of his pages as guest, to this dignitary. Shortly after, the host's complaints showed the undesirability of the retinue, within the city, where they were forbidden to abide, after dusk. The property at the city's western gate became a cultural institution.

Şamsu'l-Mulk bought estates situated south of the city and constructed the residence which was to be known, in Turkish, under the name *Goruğ* (a preserved woodland) and in Persian, as Şams-âbâd (the abode of the sun, Şamsu'l-mulk means Sun of the realm). The property was enclosed within walls, said to be a *mîl* long (one-third parasang, ca. 6000 feet), in which were the monarch's dwellings (*karşî*, in Turkish; *kâh*, in Persian), a park for tame deer, a pigeon-house and pastures for horses. Şamsu'l-Mulk had apparently reconstituted the Turkish type of royal residence, the *ordu*, a circumvallation in which, however, the impression of a natural surrounding could be given. Such had been the *ordu* of T'ong Yabğu in the sixth century, Bing-yul on a mountain where a thousand torrents cascaded and the bells of the tame deer were said to tinkle incessantly. The *ordus* and *karşîs* of the Hâkânids of Kâşgar were also "flower-gardens",

within walls, fortified by “mighty towers” and surrounded by hunting reserves. The palace of Buhârâ seems also depicted in the odes dedicated to Şamsul’-Mulk, by ‘Am‘aḳ, a native of that province. ‘Am‘aḳ described a “marmorean and steely” citadel, segregated by a precipitous moat, to which one could penetrate only through a narrow, crescent-shaped bridge. The luminaries and the stars were represented on the palace’s camphor-white dome, likened to a tent-cupola. The walls were as finely ornamented as the scales of “Chinese salamander effigies, in temples.” The floors were carpeted. The Leo constellation had been metamorphosed into the tame lion, represented on the royal canopy (or tapestry: *şâdirbân*). One could deduce from this metaphor that the effigy of a lion appeared on the Hâḳânid *kurvi-çovaş*²⁴ (the silken canopy, or cupola tent of the monarch). ‘Am‘aḳ further specifies that Shamsu’l-Mulk’s cupola-tent was ruby coloured. The palace of another western, Hâḳânid, Ibrâhîm IV Tamğaç Hâḳân, son of Husayn (574-600/1178-1203), is described in an elegy which depicts the throne, raised on a dais, in the arch of a portal.²⁵ The elegy evokes the sun as emblem, on the cupola-tent. The sun and its astrological throne, the Leo constellation, were also the symbol of the Kâşgar Hâḳânids.²⁶

‘Am‘aḳ celebrates further the wonders of Şamsu’l-Mulk’s park, where grew wine-hued tulips, the *sadbark* (the hundred-petalled rose, perhaps a lotus), together with dark (violet) hyacinths which veiled the white nudity of the narcissi. In addition to the gazelles, ‘Am‘aḳ mentions boars and leopards, probably in a hunting reserve, outside the palace grounds, again, as in descriptions of the estates of the Kâşgar Hâḳânids.

III. *The Ribât-i Malik at Harçang:*

Şamsu’l-Mulk had also erected hospices, named Ribât-i Malik (the royal *ribâts*). The Hâḳânid *ribâts* had kept up the Arabic name, but deviated in function from the Neareastern prototype, introduced in the second/eighth century to Central Asia by Islam. The early Central Asian Islamic *ribât* had been a frontier defensive fortification, in which, together with warriors, teachers of Islam dwelt and travellers could reside. In Buddhist Turkish lands, on the other hand, the *buyan* was essentially a monastery, in which, however, travellers could be accomodated and a hospital and school could exist.²⁷ Although

the pristine variety of the *ribât* continued, at least for a while,²⁸ the tradition of the *buyan* also survived, under the linguistically and functionally kindred guise of the *muyanlık*, which became a hospice, hostelry, *madrassa* (theological school) and *zâviya* (convent for Muslim mystics). The name *ribât* was extended to this variety of endowments, equally called *hân*.

Şamsu'l-Mulk is credited with the foundation of two *ribâts*.²⁹ One of these was on the road between Samarkand and Hocasand, at Ak-kütel, one relay north of Cîzak.²⁹ After some confusion in the texts, which necessitated research, the other *ribât*'s ruins were found, more to the west, on the highway from Buhârâ to Samarkand, 18-20 kms. west of Karminiyya, in a locality still called "The Monarch's steppe" (Çöl-i Malik).³⁰ This was the site called Hârçang in sources mentioning the second *ribât* built in 471/1078. The name Hârçang had been erroneously identified with Hartang, the burial-place of the eminent traditionalist, the Imâm Buhârî. Hârçang, on the other hand, was the field of the decisive battle of 382/992, where, with the connivance of the Sâmânid general Fâ'îk who was a Turk, the Hâkânid army had routed the Sâmânids and occupied Buhârâ.³¹

The monument of Hârçang had been seen by Lehmann, in 1842, in partially preserved state. The entrance portal survived, down to our times (pls. II/a,b).³² The monument's remnants were finally buried under bulldozers, when a new road was paved.³³ However, the earlier, research and the recent excavations, in addition to former drawings and photographs (pls. II/a,b), permitted the reconstitution of the *ribât*, at least on paper.³³ The publications of the coins and pottery is announced for later years.

The distinction, between the two *ribâts* could not however be clearly established, notwithstanding several mentions of foundation acts met with in various manuscripts. The remnants of the Ak-kütel *ribât* were not seen, and archaeological evidence on this edifice was missing. The monuments having been situated, east and west of the same Samarkand, the written records could not be decisive. Both A. Semenov and Z. V. Toğan had come across quotations, from the dedicatory inscriptions of Şamsu'l-Mulk's *ribâts*, in registers of the Nakşbandî order of mystics. I could not get hold of Semenov's article, and Nemtzeva's account of it leaves some obscure points.³⁴ An Arabic inscription, giving the date 471/1078, is said to be connected

with Nurbad, described as the locality of Hoca İsmâ'îl Buḥârî. Could the İmâm Muḥammad ibn İsmâ'îl Buḥârî be meant, and is Nurbad another name of Hartang, where the İmâm is buried? The possible confusions between Hartang and Harçang had been noted by Barthold. The entry found by Professor Togan³⁵ is dated in Ramazân 472, when Şamsu'l-Mulk had apparently recently died and was written in one of the cells of a complex, situated at Nûrâbâd, a locality of Samarkand, which belonged to the estate of the *ribât*: “(Nurâbâd) belongs to the estate of the *ribât*, in square shape (or, with *rab*‘, dependencies), in the province (private domain?) (or, during the reign) of the learned and just supporter of the Truth and of the Religion, Abû'l-Ḥasan Naşr, son of İbrâhîm, may God’s mercy be upon him (his soul). The inscription, on the pinnacle of the entrance portal of the *Ribât* is: The just sovereign Abû'l-Ḥasan, son of İbrâhîm, son of Naşr, a *mavlâ* (supporter, ally)³⁶ of the Commander of the Faithful, thankful for the grace and bounties granted to him by God, provided, in the months of the year 471, for the construction and elevation of this site. Naşr, son of İbrâhîm, is known as Şamsu'l-Mulk”. Perhaps because of the similarity between the terms “province (or private domain) of Şamsu'l-Mulk” in the inscription and the name “Çöl-i Malik” (the monarch’s steppe) now given to Harçang, the Arabic inscription is sometimes related to that *ribât*. However, the Arabic inscription mentions Samarkand, whereas the ruins of the Harçang monument were found west of Karminiyye, which was considered a frontier between the provinces of Buḥârâ, to the west and of Samarkand to the east. The Arabic inscription may therefore refer to the Aḡ-kütel *ribât*, which was effectively, in the Samarkand province, on the way to Hocand. Anyway, the partly deciphered inscription in moulded terracotta (the passage giving the date could not be read), on the entrance portal of the Harçang monument is in Persian:³⁷ “The monarch of the whole universe who constructed this edifice . . . The people and . . . He embellished the earth, for the Lord’s sake. . . This exalted station, he . . . its completion. May the Lord protect this paradisiac site, from destruction.” The calligraphic Kûfî inscription may be Şamsu'l-Mulk’s (he was known as calligrapher).

The Coranic verses III/16-17 had been inscribed, on the southwestern minaret: “God is witness that there is no other deity but He.

And the angels and the possessors of sapience are (thereon) witnesses. In perpetuity, with justice. There is no other deity but He, the Glorious, the Sapient. Verily God deems Islam, as religion."

The Coranic verses were followed by the threefold repetition of the Arabic *al-mlk*, which may be diversely vocalized, in the first two instances, ending however in *al-mulk li'llâh* (The sovereignty belongs to God).

The rank of universal monarch, attributed to this member of the primate Turkish dynasty, the Hâkânids, is also met with in a poem dedicated to Cibril Kadir Hâkân Abû'l-Ma'âlî, son of Aḥmad (died 496/1102):³⁸ "If courtesy, religious observance, generosity and mercy were sought throughout the universe, they would be found in this monarch of the universe."

The Hârçang monument³⁹ was an oriented quadrangular edifice, covering a superficies of 91 × 89 ms (86 × 86 internally) (pl. VII). Şamsu'l-Mulk's *ribât* displayed many features of the Buḥârâ architectural tradition,⁴⁰ traced to the Kök-Türk period (pl. I/b) and later, such as the monumental portals and the double courtyards (pl. VII). Another peculiarity observed in a Kök-Türk citadel in the Buḥârâ province,⁴¹ (pl. I/a), the succession of hemi-cylindrical projections, was only partially reproduced, on the Hârçang façade (pl. II/b). The two pairs of minarets, which were taller on the southern main front and lower at the north, may have been similar to the one in brickwork, initiated by Şamsu'l-Mulk, at the cathedral-mosque of Nûmiçkaş, in 460/1068.

The ogival arches, which Lehmann qualified as Gothic (they are probably among the earliest models of Gothic arcades) had been a common feature of Buddhist architecture, in eastern Turkistan, (the pointed form related to the leaf of the Bodhidruma, the *Ficus religiosa*, in the shade of which the Buddha had reached enlightenment). Similarly to the evolution from the Buddhist column to the minaret, the ogival arch seems to have advanced westwards, in the Hâkânid period, from that dynasty's centre, Kâşgar, where Buddhist culture had prevailed before Islam. Moulded and glazed varieties of tiles, the eastern origin of which was equally noted, were also used at Hârçang.⁴⁴ The diverse disposition of bricks, adapted to architectonic elements, seen at Hârçang (pl. III/b), was a pre-Hâkânid technique, in the Buḥârâ province.

Nemtzeva⁴⁵ points to other features, peculiar to Turkistan, in the construction of the H̄arçang monument. She notes that through the unsteadiness of the soil, which is often a residue of earlier layers of culture, the foundations could not be deepened (with the exception of columns and minarets, where depth is unavoidable). The steadfastness of the edifices, even a certain degree of security, against earthquakes, was obtained through other devices. Such was the multiplication of constituent material (cobble, at base; timber, for the framework, some columns and curvaceous parts; moisture-resistant abode, coated with decorative, baked earthenware for the -rest). Through the duplication of adobe and baked bricks, the most elaborate of which were moulded and varnished, or glazed, the walls became unusually thick-set, contributing to the building's solid balance. The abode walls could also be plastered, painted and illumined with liquid gold, as commented by Saraḥsî, the scholar said to have been jailed by Şamsu'l-Mulk.⁴⁶ Nemtzeva indicates at H̄arçang, the fragments of carved stucco and alabastrite, as well as traces of foliate motifs painted in red and black, within niches.

The articles, dedicated to H̄arçang, by Asanov and Bulatov, discuss another aspect of Central Asian architecture, in connection with this *ribât*. Was there a standard common unit, comparable to the *modulus* of the Romans, which through diverse multiplications, would establish a relationship, between the dimensions of the monument's various parts? Bulatov⁴⁷ had already pointed out that Fârâbî, the renowned philosopher of the tenth century, born in Turkistan (he was a Turk),⁴⁸ had introduced this concept, in his treatises on the application of geometry to architecture. Fârâbî had indeed perhaps initiated the term *mastara* (measure of alignment),⁴⁹ the root *saṭr* of which, as its Persian equivalent *rast*, are used as architectonic terms, to designate a succession of arcades, or the order of disposition of the pavement of a hall.⁵⁰ The origin of Fârâbî's line of thought may have been the *modulus*, or some other unit, known in his native Central Asia, such as the Buddhist *tâla* tree.⁵¹ The Turkish Buddhist texts⁵² do mention the *tâla* (*tal* in Turkish), but not in connection with measures, for which they cite the *karış* (span) and, the *kulaç* (fathom) and as architectural unit, the *kerpiç-kibi* (brick-mould). As in medieval Turkistan, the floors were paved with brickwork, the term is reminiscent of the Arabic *saṭr*, in its aspect of the disposition of bricks, for

a pavement, and of Fârâbî's *mastara*. Indeed, about a century after Fârâbî, Sarāḥsî stated that the ancient custom (of Turkistan) was to order a construction, by citing the number of bricks to be used. Sarāḥsî remarks that, in order to avoid disagreement, it was advisable to state, not only the surface measure but also those of more difficult parts, such as elevated walls, columns, *tâks* (portals), and the qualification of the brick, to be employed. Bulatov cites another eminent scholar, also born in Central Asia, who drew inspiration from Fârâbî. Muḥammad, son of Muḥammad Abû'l-Vafâ of Bûzjân (328-88/940-98), on an instrument of Ḥorâsân called *mabahrama*, connected apparently with the gimlet (*bahrama*).⁵³ This could be a yard-stick, like the Ottoman Turkish *burgaḡa*,⁵⁴ which had holes, bored with a gimlet. Asanov has however reached the conclusion that the common denominator unit, used at Ḥarçang, was 6,05-6,18 m. in length.⁵⁵ Asanov's unit could amount to 24 or 25 bricks, the average length of bricks being, at Ḥarçang, 0,24-0,245 m.⁵⁶

A notable feature of the Ḥarçang monument, possibly a heritage of cold northern Asian Turkish lands,⁵⁷ was a system of heating with underground hearths.⁵⁸ Another amenity, water, was distributed with pipes, to many parts of the edifice.⁵⁹ The water-reservoir was surmounted with a cylindrical and domed room to which one penetrated through a portal (pl. VIII), constituting a *sardâb* (a cool room, against the summer heat).

The interior of the Ḥarçang monument was partly modified, sometime, in the same eleventh, or in the early twelfth, century. The initial lay-out seems to have been as follows (pl. III/a).⁶⁰ On entering through the main portal, decorated with octagonal terracotta revetments and bearing the inscription (pl. II/a,b,c), one reached an equally ornate vestibule, the walls of which bore alabastrite mouldings. Benches, in brick, were placed along both sides. Both sides of the vestibule were reserved to the needs of service (kitchens, with numerous stoves; store-rooms, refuse-pits, and stables). Crossing the first (southern) courtyard, one reached the second portal, leading to the further (northern) courtyard, which was raised higher, with three rows of bricks. The initial arrangement of the northern premises is so surmised (pl. III/a): The central part of the northern section appears to have been a ceiled ceremonial room, screened by a low wall, bearing short double-columns (a *makṣûra* :

a dignitary's private enclosure) and by peripheric porticoes. On both sides of the porticoes, there were open courtyards. The central room could have received light from both sides, through the *makşûra*'s screen. The symmetrical courtyards of 36,5 × 18,7 ms. each, flanking the ceremonial room and its porticoes, had three cells, at each end.

At the close of the eleventh century, or early in the twelfth, the ceremonial room was modified. The elaborate second construction could only have taken place in a peaceful period, after the monument's completion, which happened a year before Şamsu'l-Mulk's death. Şamsu'l-Mulk's brother and successor Hızır Hâkân reigned only briefly. His son, Aḥmad (472-83/1081-89),⁶¹ was accused of having forsaken Islam for a dualistic faith, akin to Manicheism and condemned to death by the *'ulamâ*. Thereupon, the Selçukid Malikşâh occupied the territory of the western Hâkânids. The puppet monarchs, nominated by the Selçuk overlords, had to face popular revolts.

The renovation of the ceremonial room was perhaps the work of another Hâkânid patron of architecture, Muḥammad II Arslan Hâkân, son of Suleymân (495-524/1102-30).⁶² This monarch, whose mother was a sister of the Selçukid ruler Sanjar, could maintain peace between his maternal and paternal families and attend to architectural activities. The cathedral-mosque and minaret, built by Şamsu'l-Mulk at Nûmiçkaş still seemed too close to the citadel, and Arslan Hâkân is said to have "transported" these monuments, within the city walls (perhaps rebuilt with the same material). The "transported" minaret collapsed once but, after its restoration, survived to our day, as the well-known Uluğ-minâr of Buḥârâ. The then built cathedral-mosque also stands yet, although in restored state. Şamsu'l-Mulk's palace, Goruḵ, was repaired and turned into a *namâzghâh* (an open-air mosque, only with *mihrâb*, pulpit and pedestals aligned for those who proclaimed the prayer intervals, for larger congregations). The Hâkânids followed the Ḥanafî interpretation of the Prophetic injunctions, on admitting women to daily prayers, in the mosque, as well as on festive occasions (celebrated at the *namâzghâh*), while only those who could not be objects of temptation were allowed to join the Friday congregational prayer.⁶³

Arslan Hâkân built his own palace at Baykent, another residence of the K k-T rk dynasty, situated on a peak. Water was conducted, from the lake Kara-k l, in proximity as far as the charitable foundation

constructed by Arslan Hâkân, at the same time, which was situated at the foot of the citadel's hill, then taken uphill, with difficulty, through stone pipes. The Hâkânid combination of royal residence and charitable foundation, attested at Baykend, may explain the existence of what appears to be a throne-room, at the centre of the northern section of the Harçang ribât. The octagonal platform, added to the ceremonial room, during the renovation (pl. VII/b), together with the monumental archway on the northern side, could have served as setting and dais for the throne, but also as *şahn* (rostrum) for a *madrâsa* (theological school). In any case, as doubtlessly prayers were performed in the ceremonial room, the portal,⁶⁴ opening towards the southern part of the edifice, could have served as *mihrâb*. A palace gate of Nûmickaş was also used, as *mihrâb*. If the Harçang ceremonial room was reserved to the Hâkân, when he performed the Friday congregational prayer, together with his retinue, it was obligatory that a gate be opened, towards the place where the whole congregation was gathered. In this case, the ceremonial room assumed the function of a *makşûra* (private oratory), as is also apparent from the screen, composed of a low wall, with short double-columns around it. The *makşûra* could have existed before the renovation, or was perhaps then restored. In view of the obligation to open the gate of the *makşûra* to the bulk of the congregation, where could these have gathered, within the precincts of the Harçang monument? This question finds perhaps an answer in the changes effected in the southern courtyard, during the renovation (of pls III/a and VI/c, VII/b). The area of this southern courtyard, adjoining the *makşûra* or ceremonial room had been segregated, with walls, from the other half, left to service quarters. In this secluded part, next to the *makşûra*, a pair of archways, possibly serving as *mihrâb*, had been added (pl. VI/c).

The major change, within the ceremonial room, was the erection of a large cupola, surrounded with sixteen smaller ones. The central cupola, 18 ms. in diametre, which had an aperture at the summit, rose above a polygonal drum, the sixteen facets of which were decorated with concentric arches, the whole supported by eight pairs of pillars, bearing arcades (pl. VII/c). The central domed space was surrounded by the *makşûra* and a quadrangle of archways, surmounted by the sixteen smaller cupolas. The weight of the smaller

cupolas was borne, on one side, by the eight pairs of double-pillars supporting the central cupola, and on the periphery, by parallel columns. On the south-north axis, the porticoes ended in monumental portals. The rest of the quadrilateral area had been divided into cells (pls. VII/b,c). The centre of the northern part of the *Ḥarçang* monument was thus completely segregated and might have received light, from the aperture of the central cupola, as well as the axial pair of portals. There could have been doors, opening from the porticoes, to the pair of symmetrically disposed courtyards, on both sides (pl. VI) b,c).

The entity, consisting of a large central domed space, surrounded by quadrangularly aligned cells, with lesser cupolas, appears as a reminiscence of earlier Turkish heaven-worship and cosmographic concepts. Such was the image of the *ordu* (residence) of celestial deities, at the summit of which rose the station of the god of heaven (pl. IV/b) and the related temple architecture (*tengrilik*, in Turkish).⁶⁵ The kiosk of ancient Chinese and early medieval Turkish dignitaries, called in Turkish *kaḥḳ* (the zenith of the sky)⁶⁶ had also similar cosmographic forms, an ornate roof replacing sometimes the dome, in areas near China. In western Turkistan, however, the dome prevailed, as seen in the reconstitution of a dwelling in a citadel, dated in the seventh-eighth centuries, at Baba-ata (pls. IV/c,d), in the land of the Oğuz Turks, from whom descend the Selçuḳ dynasty. The similarity of this edifice's central room (pl. IV/c) to the Turkish cupola-tent, the oldest symbol of the universe and universal monarchy (pl. IV/a), had been commented in earlier essays.⁶⁷ One may here add the same remark in what concerns the *sardâb* (the cool summer room) of *Ḥarçang* (pl. VIII). The celestial symbolism survived after Islâm, both in literature and in architecture. As remarked by Asanov and also noted, in the above-cited works by the author of these lines, a similar arrangement may be seen in an early mosque, near Buḥârâ (pls. V/a,b,c),⁶⁸ built in a city, the name of which (Kökşibaġân) means "Temple of heavenly deities", in mixed Turkish-Soghdian. The city had belonged to a "Turkish king", opposed to Islam, who abandoned it in the eighth century. The mosque was dated, by Yakubovskiy, in that same century, by others, in the eleventh.

While the Baba-ata dwelling's central dome surmounted the restricted area of an audience-room (pls. IV/c,d), the Kökşibaġân

mosque had to shelter, in one space, a whole congregation. The problem of functional divergence was structurally solved, through the suppression of the inner dividing walls and the substitution of pillars, to bear the weight of the central and peripheric cupolas. Asanov remarks that the same solution had been evolved at H̄arçang, the pillars being multiplied in proportion with the increased size of the central cupola (pl. VII).

Both Nemtzeva and G. A. Pugaçenkova noted that the H̄arçang ceremonial room constituted an archetype, in Turkistan, for similar buildings.⁶⁹ It is underlined that the Özbek ruler ‘Abdullâh H̄ân, a patron of architecture, had resided, in 1579, at H̄arçang.⁷⁰ Indeed, the *madrasa* built by this monarch, in Buḥârâ,⁷¹ is reminiscent of the H̄arçang ceremonial room. Other examples are further cited.⁷²

Nemtzeva⁷³ also followed the H̄arçang prototype's tracks, in Iran and Turkey. In what concerns Turkey, she thus provides an answer to A. Kuran's⁷⁴ question on the origin of the *madrasas*, built in the twelfth century, by the Dânisment dynasty, in Nîksar and Tokat (pl. IX/a,b,c). If chronologically aligned, the monuments cited by both authors, with the addition of earlier ones, mentioned above, an uninterrupted survival of symbolism and a stylistic chain may be observed: The Uyğur painting, showing the celestial palace (ninth-tenth centuries: pl. IV/b); the princely dwelling of Baba-ata (pl. IV/c: seventh-eighth centuries) lead to the Kōkşibagân mosque (pl. V; eighth to eleventh century) and to the H̄arçang ceremonial room (pls. VI/b,c; VII/c, eleventh or early twelfth century). Then proceeding southwards to present Turkmenistan, Nemtzeva points to the funerary monument of the Selçuk Sultan Sancar, in Merv (the work of an architect of Saraḥs, whose Turkish identity appears in this name, Muḥammad, son of Atsız,⁷⁵ twelfth century). In Turkey, Kuran⁷⁶ cites the two *madrasas* of Yağıbasan, in Nîksar and Tokat, built in the same twelfth century (pls. IX/a,b,c). Nemtzeva's next examples in Turkey, are the mosques of ‘İsa-beg, at Selçuk (fourteenth century) and finally those of Sinân (sixteenth century), the Süleymâniye of Istanbul and the Selimiye of Edirne, in which she sees the apogee of the composition, consisting of a cupola, raised on pillars.⁷⁷

