INTRODUCTION
AN OUTLINE OF SHIFTING PARADIGMS IN THE PALATIAL ARCHITECTURE OF THE PRE-MODERN ISLAMIC WORLD

BY GÜLRU NECIPOĞLU

The palaces symposium held at Harvard on May 15-16, 1992, had as its aim, not completely to cover every known palace from the pre-modern Islamic world, but rather to focus on some examples that have recently attracted scholarly attention. Since the monuments discussed in this volume are spread over many centuries and regions, no attempt has been made to impose a common theme or mode of analysis. Instead the papers, which deal primarily, though not exclusively, with royal palaces, address a wide variety of issues raised by a specific building type.

A collection of papers on palace architecture is valuable because thus far Islamic architectural history has been dominated by research on religious monuments. This is understandable, given the small number of palatial structures that have survived. As competing symbols of power, royal palaces were often abandoned or destroyed by successive dynasties, unlike religious public monuments that generally continued in use after undergoing modifications to accommodate sectarian differences. The emphasis on religious architecture in scholarship also stems from the traditional view that the visual and material culture of the Muslim world was primarily shaped by religion, a view reflected in the use of the problematic term "Islamic" in qualifying art and architecture. The symposium papers reveal the limits of that view by exposing a palatial world of dynastic ideology, fantasy, and desire whose horizons, often rooted in pre-Islamic precedents, refused to be bound by religious culture.

Nineteenth-century Orientalists who believed in the timeless unity of Islamic art and architecture (a belief echoed in some recent scholarship) constructed the notion of a monolithic Islamic visual tradition composed of archetypal elements recycled in various combinations over the ages in different regional idioms until their final "degeneration" in the Western-influenced modern era. As a result, Islamic architectural history has tended to concentrate on the early medieval period, regarding subsequent developments as derivative rather than as reflecting a dynamic capacity for change and innovation. That is why until quite recently the modern era has almost entirely been ignored in the canonical scholarship as even less worthy of study than the "later Islamic" period extending from the mid thirteenth to the eighteenth century. The scarcity of studies on nineteenth- and twentieth-century palaces has consequently limited the scope of this volume to the pre-modern era.

The stereotyping of Islamic architecture as a static tradition also obscured the significant paradigmatic shifts over time by encouraging the taxonomic classification of building types according to formal, chronological, and geographical criteria with little attention to contextual meanings, intertextual allusions, and cross-regional synchronic patterns. "Difference" was downplayed to highlight unity, thereby denying historical change to the visual culture(s) of the Islamic lands. Until quite recently a symposium on palaces would have centered on the question of what makes a palace or a group of palaces "Islamic," a question likely to generate a list of shared elements regardless of context. Today the search has shifted from identifying such unifying common denominators to interpreting the nuances of their differing syntactic combinations in specific settings.

The way in which the papers in this volume have been ordered accentuates changes in palatial paradigms without losing sight of longue durée patterns, some of which had pre-Islamic origins. The ancient Near Eastern and late-antique Mediterranean palaces covered in part 1 are followed by a chronological sequence of papers on palaces from the Islamic world, grouped in terms of four distinctive palatine paradigms corresponding to changing conceptions of the state and images of sovereignty. The first two are dealt with in part 2, the third in part 3, and the last one in part 4. I will here briefly comment on the individual papers, sketching some of the broader historical patterns into which they fit, and introducing relevant background information not covered in the volume itself to develop a fuller picture of the four paradigms.

Winter's survey of ancient Near Eastern palaces...
from the Early Dynastic through the Achaemenid periods analyzes the morphology, building technology, decorative programs, and functions of Mesopotamian palaces together with their possible contributions to Islamic ones. It shows that the horizontal spatial division of royal palaces into inner residential (bišanu) and outer administrative (babanu) courtyards (reminiscent of the Islamic separation of inner [andalūn] and outer [birūn] spaces) was complemented by an equally important vertical division of space. This was expressed in the prestige of upper stories, a pattern also typical of the early Islamic palaces whose iconography of height is discussed by Bloom.

As repositories of treasures, gifts, booty, archives, libraries, and workshops for industries such as textile-making, the Mesopotamian royal palaces described by Winter fulfilled functions similar to those of their Islamic counterparts. Unlike the smaller palaces of princes and governors the large royal palaces, from which the state was run, supported an extended household and provided a setting for court rituals and ceremonies, including the administration of justice, that would continue to play a central role in the Muslim era. Their monumental gates, official throne rooms, multi-story facades, hunting parks, formal gardens, and pleasure pavilions also found parallels in Islamic palaces. Precisely because maintaining the productivity of the land through costly irrigation works was a major function of Mesopotamian kings, gardens became associated with royal pleasure, luxury, power, and territorial appropriation, associations that would be perpetuated well into the fourteenth century when Ibn Khaldun counted the planting of gardens, the installation of running water, and the construction of monumental palaces as being among the pleasurable “fruits of royal authority.”

Bier’s paper assesses the influence of Sasanian palaces on early Islamic ones. In it he argues that a realistic conception of Sasanian palace architecture still eludes us because we have uncritically accepted unreliable reconstruction drawings that have become almost “iconic.” The dearth of reliable archaeological data leads him to conclude that the architectural impact of Sasanian palaces on early Islamic ones was probably minimal, even though their symbolic and ceremonial inspiration was undeniably strong. Bier hypothesizes that luxury objects and Pahlevi texts on court ceremonial rather than a direct antiquarian study of Sasanian monuments influenced early Islamic palaces.

The reuse of some Sasanian palaces in the Islamic era may provide the missing link. As Bier acknowledges, the palaces in Firuzabad (Gur) and Bishapur were occupied during the Islamic period, and the Ilkhanid palace at Takht-i Sulayman (discussed by Blair) incorporated Sasanian remains. Such examples can be multiplied. According to Tabari, for example, the White Palace in Ctesiphon (the Sasanian royal residence located about a mile north of the great ceremonial iwan) was used as a temporary residence and a state prison in the seventh century. The Arch of Chosroes itself (popularly known as the Taq-i Kisra or Iwan-i Kisra), whose demolition was begun in the eighth century by the Abbasid caliph al-Mansur, remained largely intact until the tenth century when a later Abbasid caliph, al-Mukafi, reused its materials in the Taj Palace of Baghdad. This introduces us to a recurrent theme in the volume, which is the use of spolia from earlier structures that had royal associations.

In addition to the palaces of the Sasanians which Bier’s paper deals with, I would like to draw attention to those of their Arab vassals, the Lakhmids in Iraq, which seem to have played an important role in indirectly filtering Sasanian influences to early Islamic palaces. These included the Khavarnaq, famed for its domed construction imitating the structure of the heavens, which was built in the Lakhmid capital Hira by the ruler Nu‘man (d. after 418) for his Sasanian suzerain’s son, Prince Bahram Gur. The palace, created by the Greek architect Sininmar, who was then killed so that he could not build a superior structure to rival it, was praised in pre-Islamic Arab poetry as one of the wonders of the world along with its neighbor Sadir. This product of Hira’s mixed pagan Arab, Persian, and Byzantine culture foreshadows the eclectic combination of motifs derived from each of these three traditions in the Umayyad palaces whose decorative programs are analyzed by Grabar and Soucek.

The Khavarnaq continued in use during the early Islamic era; Tabari describes a banquet the Umayyad ruler ʿAbd al-Malik held there after his victorious entry into neighboring Kufa following a rebellion. On that occasion he had toured the palace, inquired about who had built it for whom, and allegedly speculated on the theme of the mutability of fortune. Ibn al-Faqih reports that every governor who came to Kufa expanded or
renovated the neighboring Khavarnaq palace. According to Baladhuri the propagandist Ibrahim ibn Salamah added a dome to it in the early days of the Abbasid caliphate when the palace was given to him as a fief. Mas'udi provides additional evidence for the Khavarnaq's use by such early Abbasid caliphs as al-Saffah, al-Mansur, and Harun al-Rashid who used to go there to rest. The reuse of building materials from a Sasanian palace at Hira in the Umayyad governor's palace-cum-mosque complex at Kufa (638–39) and the Abbasid caliph al-Mutawakkil's (847–61) introduction of a new type of audience hall in Samarra—called al-Hiri because it was inspired by a palace built by Nu'man's descendants in Hira—once again confirms the Lakhmid capital's importance in the transmission of Sasanian influences.

The charging of Islamic palaces with heavenly associations can also be traced back to ancient Near Eastern precedents. Bier describes how the tenth-century Buyid ruler 'Adud al-Dawla, who had rebuilt the round Sasanian capital of Gur, renaming it Firuzabad, and had dreamed of renovating the palace at Ctesiphon, had also built a palace near Shiraz whose 360 rooms were each painted differently. This building in Shiraz recalls the Haft Paykar palace of the Sasanian ruler Bahram Gur who was brought up in the Khavarnaq. The Haft Paykar had seven domed garden pavilions, each of them inhabited by a princess from the seven climes and painted in a different color corresponding to the seven planets. Bahram Gur would give audiences in a different pavilion each day of the week, varying the color of his robe to match the decor of that day's reception hall. 'Adud al-Dawla is also said to have given daily audiences, each in a different room of his palace in Shiraz, whose halls equaled in number the days of the year. This type of cosmological symbolism, reflecting the auspicious felicity and power of the universal monarch protected by the heavens, enjoyed a continued life in Islamic palaces with their “domes of heaven,” whose earliest known examples are discussed by Bloom.

Curčić's paper on late-antique palaces provides a background for the Mediterranean heritage of early Islamic palaces. Palaces proliferated in several cities during the Tetrarchy, when Rome had ceased to be the only center of imperial power; Curčić outlines the characteristics of these third- and fourth-century Tetrarchic palatine complexes in Antioch, Split, Thessaloniki, and Gamizgrad (Romuliana) that culminated with the Great Palace in Constantinople. As cities began to undergo a process of irreversible decline, he argues, late-antique palaces and villas borrowed urban forms to acquire an aura of prestige. These included city gates that became closely associated with the imperial palace through colonnaded avenues marked at their intersection by tetrapylons, neighboring imperial baths accessible both to the court and the public, and an open space or hippodrome acting as a buffer zone between the palace and its urban setting.

The late-antique phenomenon outlined by Curčić has a parallel, I believe, in early Islamic times when palatine cities proliferated during Umayyad and early Abbasid rule. The Umayyad administrative center of 'Anjar, founded by al-Walid I in 714–15, for example, recalls the small towns of the Tetrarchy with its two arcaded main streets intersecting at a tetrapylon, and its bath house outside the palace precincts. Its layout adapts such late-antique models as Diocletian's camp in Palmyra and Antioch, sites close to the power base of the Umayyad rulers in Syria, to new functions. When the Abbasid capital moved to Iraq, the influence of ancient Mesopotamian royal cities increased, but al-Mansur's Round City of Baghdad, founded in 762, is not so different in conception from the palatine cities of the Tetrarchy. This fortified palace-city, which functioned as an administrative royal center for the caliph and his trustworthy clients, also borrowed urban forms, such as axial ceremonial avenues, a buffer zone around the central palace acting as a maydan, and four city gates closely associated with the palace—from their second-story domed audience halls the caliph could survey the four directions of his universal empire. The scholarly controversy about the appropriate terminology for Tetrarchic palatine complexes, which according to Curčić have variously been referred to as palaces, fortified chateaux, villas, or cities, reflects an ambiguity in form and function that also characterizes Baghdad, where the traditional distinction between city and palace was similarly blurred.

The papers in part 2 of the volume deal with the first two palatine paradigms of the early Islamic period. The first one consisted of urban palace-cum-mosque complexes that proliferated during Umayyad and early Abbasid rule between the seventh and eighth century. In it the *dār al-imāra* (palace of government), with or without a *qubbat al-khadrā*, was juxtaposed to the congregational
mosque, forming a single unit. The second paradigm that emerged during the ninth and tenth century was characterized by sprawling extra-urban palatine complexes no longer attached to congregational mosques. This important change in the spatial relationship between the palace and the mosque, initiated in ninth-century Samarra, marked the increasing seclusion of the Abbasid caliphs from their subjects, as the tribalism of the Umayyads gave way to a sacred absolutism that in many ways revived ancient Near Eastern concepts of kingship. The dār al-imāra was now replaced with the dār al-khilāfa (palace of the caliphate), which architecturally and ceremonially projected the new caliphal image first adopted by the Abbasids and subsequently by the Fatimids and the Umayyads of Spain. The second paradigm therefore coincided with the hegemony of three rival caliphates that had divided the Muslim world into Sunni and Shi'i states in the tenth century. The palaces of the caliphs and their vassals shared a common vocabulary subtly manipulated to differentiate competing dynastic and religious identities.

The relatively accessible and visible Umayyad caliphs had moved back and forth between the juxtaposed spaces of their palace-cum-mosque complexes that expressed their dual role as monarchs and religious leaders. According to Mas'udi, Muawiya used to give audiences five times each day, first to the poor and the general public as he was seated at the minbar of his mosque's maqsūra after having led the canonical prayers, and then in his royal audience hall at the adjoining dār al-imāra where he received the grandees in a hierarchical order according to their rank. Ibn Khaldun writes that the first four caliphs and the Umayyads "did not delegate the leadership of prayer" because they considered it to be an exclusive caliphal privilege. It was the Abbasid and then the Fatimid caliphs who "chose men to represent them as prayer leaders," reserving for themselves the leadership of prayer on Fridays and religious holidays for the "purpose of display and ostentation." This change in ritual explains the physical separation of the caliph's palace from the congregational mosque in the second paradigm, a separation now mediated by elaborate processions between the two realms on Fridays and religious holidays. The pompous processions of the secluded caliphs, not so different from those of their Byzantine rivals, had a continued life in many later Islamic courts.

Abbasid court ceremonial had a decisive impact on other caliphal courts. Mostly hidden behind the high walls of their palaces, the secluded Abbasid caliphs gave public audiences only twice a week, on Mondays and Thursdays, entrusting the administration of the state to their viziers and a large bureaucracy that further screened them from their subjects. The tenth-century Buyid secretary Hilal al-Sabi' describes how the Abbasid caliph, wearing a coarse black robe and headgear, sat during these public audiences on his elevated throne (sidillā), veiled behind a curtain that would periodically be lifted to reveal him in splendor. Adorned with the insignia of the Prophet's sword, staff, and holy mantle, he projected a sacred image as the Prophet's legitimate successor. He displayed in front of him the Qur'an of 'Uthman, a potent symbol of religious orthodoxy. The Abbasid caliph's public image impersonating the Prophet was not so different from that of the Byzantine emperor who acted as Christ's vicegerent on earth. Both the Abbasid and Byzantine palaces were sacred realms with heavenly associations whose ceremonial had a distinctively religious coloring. By the tenth century the Fatimids and Umayyads of Spain would articulate their claim to caliphal status by emulating Abbasid palace architecture and ceremonial which they put their own stamp on through differences in detail.

The Abbasid caliph's public audience hall in the Dar al-Khilafa at Baghdad communicated with a large courtyard known as al-Salam, whose ceremonial is described in Hilal al-Sabi's tenth-century book of ceremonies. There was a special protocol for entering and proceeding through this courtyard where only the caliph could ride on a mule and only a few privileged dignitaries were allowed to sit on a chair. To guarantee silence, officers armed with bows were stationed there "to prevent and shoot down any crow that flew or croaked," while serried ranks of perfectly still slave soldiers were lined up on both sides behind ropes stretched "to prevent commotion, inconvenience, mingling, and overcrowding, and to enable the caliph to see and recognize from afar whoever is admitted." Al-Sabi' describes a reception the Abbasid caliph al-Ta'izz gave there in 977 to the Buyid ruler Ādud al-Dawla who walked "between the two rows, and no one behind the ropes stirred" until he arrived at the door of the caliph's raised throne (sidillā) whose curtain was pulled open. Ādud al-Dawla then climbed the threshold and kissed the ground twice in the middle of the
A famous reception given in 917 by al-Muqtadir at the Dar al-Khilafa of Baghdad for an embassy sent by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus helps us visualize the ceremonial of the earlier caliphal palaces in Samarra described by Northedge, some of whose features were repeated in Baghdad when the Abbasid court moved back there in 892. For this reception the palace complex in Baghdad was decorated with lavish furnishings for the two months during which the ambassador and his retinue were kept waiting. On the reception day the caliph’s slave soldiers were lined up along the processional avenue that led to the palace, while thousands of chamberlains, slave pages, and eunuchs were stationed on the roofs, upper chambers, courtyards, gateways, passages, and audience halls of the palace. After being conducted in a stately procession through the avenue filled with spectators, the envoys passed from successive courtyards, where they mistook various dignitaries for the caliph, until they were finally conducted into his presence through a vaulted underground passage. The sight of the caliph enthroned in majesty “overcame and overpowered” them. Then an order was given to conduct them through the palace.

The long itinerary included the royal stables; the zoological gardens; the New Kiosk with its artificial pond (thirty by twenty cubits) of white lead “more lustrous than polished silver” containing four boats and surrounded by a garden whose palm trees were decorated with rings of gilt copper and flanked by orchards; the Tree Room, where a silver tree of moving branches on which were perched gold and silver singing birds stood at the center of a domed round pond, accompanied by figures of mounted horsemen holding lances that turned “on a single line in battle formation,” and the Pavilion of Paradise decorated with rugs and precious armor. After touring twenty-three separate palaces, out of breath the ambassadors finally returned to the presence of the enthroned caliph now accompanied by his five sons. He gave them a letter, and they were led out from a private gate to the riverfront where boats took them back to their lodging. This description gives us an idea of the sequential order in which the vast palatine complexes of Samarra and their Fatimid or Spanish Umayyad counterparts would have been experienced by official visitors, filled with awe and amazement at the theatrical displays.

The papers in part 2 cover some, but not all, of the early Islamic palaces built between the seventh and tenth centuries. Grabar reconsiders the known examples of Umayyad palaces. Much like the earlier scholars of late-antique palaces criticized by Čurčić, who regardless of major differences in sitting, scale, and layout had sought to define unifying typological or iconographic formulas, Grabar criticizes himself and others for trying to fit all surviving Umayyad palatine structures into a single pattern. He also suspects that attempts to correlate these palaces with an Umayyad ceremonial life have too often dealt with the “virile sensuality” of al-Walid II “who was in many ways an eccentric.” Since this Umayyad prince spent most of his life in exile in his “desert castles,” while his uncle ruled as caliph, his dolce vita is not typical of the life of the caliphs in such capitals as Damascus and Rusafa, whose palace-cum-mosque complexes housed official public ceremonies punctuated by the rhythm of the five daily prayers in addition to private majlises.

Judging from the admittedly problematic archaeological remains of Kufa and ‘Anjar, it seems clear that such urban palace-cum-mosque complexes featuring monumental courtyards with axially aligned gates and throne rooms differed considerably from the less formal “desert castles” or villas. This difference confirms Grabar’s point that trying to fit all surviving Umayyad palatial structures into a single type regardless of scale, function, patronage level, and urban or extra-urban context is a major methodological error. Grabar invites Islamicists to make a fresh start after having deconstructed the faulty assumptions of previous studies on Umayyad palaces. He...
recommends detailed monographic studies yielding individual hypotheses about particular palatial monuments.

In the last part of his paper, Grabar turns to the problems of interpretation posed by the idiosyncratic decorative programs of some Umayyad palaces. In the case of the royal bath house of Qusayr ‘Amra, once attached to a palatial residence, he notes the predominance of images representing women which may provide a clue to who the bath’s patron was. Could this bath have been built for the household of a royal consort and her son, the mother of the “amir” or prince to whom good wishes are offered in an inscription? Was the amir, possibly the young child bathed by naked women in several paintings, an heir to the caliph represented enthroned on the central throne apse of the bath hall? Such questions can only be resolved with the kind of detailed monographic study Grabar recommends.

Although Grabar finds Qusayr ‘Amra’s kaleidoscopic array of pictorial themes bewildering, he does not dismiss the possibility that iconographic analysis may eventually yield a coherent interpretation. Since many of the bath’s paintings draw upon a visual repertory of subjects with late-antique and Sasanian precedents, such as hunting, bathing, gymnastics, allegorical female personifications, and the enthroned ruler, it would be valuable to determine how its decorative program was related to that of late-antique or Byzantine imperial baths, some of which probably survived in the Umayyad territories. Soucek, for example, refers to a monumental Byzantine bath in Tiberias which may have influenced the iconography of the Umayyad bath house in the Khirbat al-Mafjar palace.

The throne apses of such Umayyad royal baths as Qusayr ‘Amra and Khirbat al-Mafjar can be compared to those of Roman imperial baths decorated with the image of the ruling emperor.22 The ekphrasis of a royal bath built by the emperor Leo VI (886–912) at the Great Palace of Constantinople testifies to the use of such imperial imagery in Byzantine bath houses as well. It was adorned with statues, relief sculptures, and representations of the emperor as “the earth ruler on the proconch,” accompanied by the empress and allegorical female personifications. The edifice, “aglow like the vault of heaven,” also featured a dome depicting the emperor’s cosmic kingship.23 This description recalls the enthroned cosmic ruler represented on the apse of Qusayr ‘Amra, with the seas under his feet and the vault of heaven above, flanked by half-naked female figures in the Sasanian style bearing fertility symbols under an arcade whose roundels contain personifications of the classical earth-goddess Gae holding a cloth filled with fruits, also associated with fertility and abundance. Another bath in Gaza or Antioch, only known from a sixth-century description, also featured a “dome of heaven” like Qusayr ‘Amra, suggesting that we are dealing with a now lost Mediterranean tradition of bath-house decoration against which the novel combination of motifs encountered in the Umayyad context has to be interpreted.24 That bath domes continued to be decorated with heavenly bodies after the Umayyad period is revealed by Redford’s reference to a Rum Seljuq bath house with painted astrological imagery on its dome in the Alara castle near Alanya.25

The ekphrasis of Leo’s bath concludes with the observation that it provided an “awesome sight”: “The manifold beauty of the bath has the grace of healing; it takes away men’s sickness and grants strength.” This passage provides yet another parallel to the Islamic tradition of decorating bath houses with figural imagery that would have been inappropriate in other contexts. The use of painted figures in baths is legitimized in some hadith collections and in a text by al-Gazuli because of their therapeutic value: “In good baths you also find artistically painted pictures of unquestionable quality. They represent, for example, lovers and beloved, meadows and gardens and hunts on horseback or wild beasts. Such pictures greatly invigorate all the powers of the body, animal, physical and psychological.”26 While this passage explains why figural images were tolerated in baths, it does not clarify Qusayr ‘Amra’s royal iconography, which deserves additional study. Soucek’s paper addresses the problems of interpretation posed by the idiosyncratic decorative program of yet another Umayyad bath house attached to the palatial complex of Khirbat al-Mafjar. She argues that the bath hall as a whole, but especially its facade and porch, represented an attempt to translate into visible form Umayyad legends about Solomon’s flying throne and bath which she reconstructs from early texts. Comparing the bath’s decoration with the Solomonic iconography used in some later Mughal and Qajar palaces, Soucek concludes that such context-specific imagery has to be interpreted through textual and visual sources most directly related to each case. She presents a suggestive body of circumstantial evidence that not only links the bath
hall with Solomon, but also with al-Walid II. Soucek’s new reading of the elusive Umayyad bath house, whose meaning has puzzled so many scholars, confirms Grabar’s observation that the future of studies on Umayyad palatial architecture rests on detailed monographic works sensitive to the iconographic specificity of individual monuments and capable of presenting familiar buildings in a different light.

Bloom’s paper addresses the iconography of a group of early Islamic palaces known to have had a *gubbat al-khadrā*, a term usually understood to mean a green dome, but interpreted by him as a “dome of heaven,” an imperial symbol with a long tradition in the ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean worlds. Starting with the earliest remaining astronomical domes at the bath houses of Qusayr ʿAmra and Khirbat al-Mafjar, Bloom turns to the public audience halls of Umayyad and early Abbasid palace-cum-mosque complexes in Damascus, Rusafa, Kufa, Wasit, Hashimiya, and Baghdad, all of them crowned by a *gubbat al-khadrā* and characterized by high second-story domed reception halls visible from a great distance. Bloom argues that the ninth-century Abbasid palatial complexes in Samarra represented a major shift from verticality to horizontality as second-story audience chambers lost their ceremonial function and externally visible “celestial domes” were replaced by vaulted iwans.

Northedge’s paper on the caliphal palaces of Samarra refers to several substructures that once supported upper stories, such as the triple-arched Bab al-ʿAmma originally topped by a second-story audience hall reached by a ramp, which he compares to the majlisies crowning the gates of al-Mansur’s Baghdad. This suggests that horizontal sprawl did not always exclude verticality. Nevertheless, texts no longer mention the *gubbat al-khadrā* in describing the public audience halls of Samarra, a recognizable sign of imperial power that conferred added visibility to the palace-cum-mosque complexes it crowned. Masʿudi’s reference to an upstairs throne room in the Jaʿfari palace built by al-Mutawakkil north of Samarra, where al-Muntasir was enthroned in 861, suggests that second-story audience halls continued to be used alongside iwans. This hall’s throne was surrounded by painted figures of a crowned ruler flanked by attendants, which recalls the painted dado of standing male attendant figures at the throne room of Lashkari Bazar in Bust, a palace complex built for the Ghaznavid rulers who were vassals of the Abbasids. Al-Muntasir’s audience hall also featured Persian inscriptions—the earliest textual reference to such inscriptions known to me—whose first extant examples were discovered in another Ghaznavid palace built for Masʿud III (1099–1115) in Ghazna. Such poetic inscriptions in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish continued to be used in many later palaces.

Northedge analyzes the Dar al-Khilafa built by al-Muʿtasim at Samarra in 886, which was occupied and modified by his successors until 884. On the basis of recent archaeological investigations he identifies the palace’s major components which he correlates with texts. One of these, a public palace with official-administrative functions where the caliphs gave their biweekly public audiences, featured a central cruciform domed reception-hall block, overlooking, on one side, gardens with pavilions along the Tigris and, on the other side, a great public courtyard (corresponding to the al-Salam in Baghdad) that culminated in a polo maydan and racecourse. Another unit enclosed within a massive buttressed wall functioned as the private residence of the caliph and his women, containing royal apartments, caliphal mausolea, and a prison for important personages. Northedge also refers to some of the court ceremonies held in Samarra, including the caliph’s triumphal processions.

Ruggles describes the Madinat al-Zahra near Cordoba, founded in 936 and completed around 976, as an architectural frame for the Umayyad ruler ʿAbd al-Rahman III’s new role as caliph. This palatine city had only a short life; Ruggles concentrates on the fame it acquired after it was sacked in 1010. She analyzes poems that show how the ruined site had acquired legendary status as a memento of the glory of a bygone “golden age,” inspiring poets and travelers to contemplate the past. Nostalgia provoked by ruins was, of course, a topos, but Ruggles interprets the Madinat al-Zahra poems as more than mere topoi, charged as they were by the particular historical context of Muslim Spain’s Christian reconquest. She shows that the palace’s memory was kept alive not only in literature but also in the architecture of many later Andalusian palaces that emulated it as a model.

The Madinat al-Zahra was largely inspired by Abbasid models, reinterpreted through the lens of Umayyad dynastic memories. Like Samarra, built to isolate the caliphal court and slave army from Baghdad, this suburban palace-city was built outside the capital Cordoba, with which it was
nevertheless intimately connected. Being close to each other, the two were linked together by ceremonial processions when foreign embassies would be conducted to the Umayyad caliph's presence from Cordoba between two rows of slave soldiers. From the gate of Madinat al-Zahra to the caliph's audience hall richly robed dignitaries stationed at regular intervals were once again mistaken for the caliph until the ambassadors finally encountered him, seated on the ground at the center of a sand-strewn courtyard, wearing coarse clothes, with a Qur'an and a sword in front of him. His pious humility echoed the Abbasid caliph's sacred persona. According to al-MaqAQI the Umayyad caliph, too, "was obliged to maintain a certain distance and not to mingle to an excessive degree with the people, nor to show himself in public"; his splendid seclusion paralleled that of the Fatimid and Abbasid caliphs. The view-commanding royal quarters of Madinat al-Zahra's uppermost terrace, fronted by large fishponds amidst formal gardens criss-crossed with water channels, have elsewhere been compared by Ruggles to the riverfront belvederes of Samarra and Lashkari Bazar. One of the royal reception halls featured a gold dome and a huge mercury-filled tank stirred to create the illusion that the hall was revolving, no doubt another example of a "dome of heaven" recalling those of Nero's Domus Aurea and the Throne of Chosroes.

The legendary palaces and garden pavilions of the Abbasid caliphs, immortalized by the popular imagination of the Thousand and One Nights, had a far-reaching influence from the Umayyad court in the west to that of the Ghaznavids in the east. The audience halls, garden pavilions, majlis and the triple gates of the Samarran palaces described by Northedge would be reinterpreted in the ninth- and tenth-century palaces of Baghdad and in the courts of other contemporary dynasties. The T-plan Samarran majlis was only one of the building types that spread from the Abbasid court to Egypt, Syria, and Sicily. Originally imported to Samarra from Hira by al-Mutawakkil (847-61), it had a central royal iwan, flanked by two subsidiary halls and fronted by a tripartite portico with three doors, the one at the center wider and taller than those at the sides. Mas'udi says that the royal iwan represented the center of the army and that the two wings alluded to its right and left flank in battle formation. Tabbaa suggests that the cruciform audience halls and four-iwan plans of Abbasid palaces may similarly have corresponded to the caliph surrounded by his four groups of guards, a correspondence testifying to the intimate link between architectural forms and the structure of court ceremonies.

In addition to the brick or mud-brick palaces in Samarra described by Northedge, there was also a considerable Abbasid tradition of temporary architecture. Tha'alibi, for example, tells of a cool summer pavilion created for al-Mansur (754-75) made of wet canvas stretched over a dome-shaped wooden frame; "after that, the practice arose of using a suspended matting of woven reeds, and the use became general." Mas'udi also describes a domed wooden pavilion, covered in tent-like fashion with silk brocade, next to a fishpond of al-Mansur's paradisal al-Khuld palace in Baghdad, from which the caliphs used to gaze at the Tigris river. Tabari mentions a double-domed canvas-covered wooden pavilion built for Harun al-Rashid, which suggests that such temporary palatial structures were occasionally translated into more durable materials. Movable tent-like wooden pavilions, also referred to by the thirteenth-century Seljuq historian Ibn Bibi, would become particularly important in the semi-nomadic Mongol and post-Mongol courts where new tent-like pavilion types were invented.

Regional interpretations of Abbasid palatial building types appeared in Ifriqiyya, Algeria, and Sicily during the reign of the Aghlabids (800-909), and in Egypt during the rule of the Tulunids (868-905), both of them dynasties founded by former Abbasid army officers. Ahmad ibn Tulun (868-84), who held onto his power using a large slave army based on the Abbasid model, built in his capital Fustat a palace and Friday mosque in the Samarran style, with a large hippodrome (maydan) for polo matches in between. The troops would gather on Fridays at the Ibn Tulun Mosque to which the ruler ceremonially rode from his palace in the manner of the Abbasid caliphs. A triple-arched triumphal palace gate facing the maydan was used during parades when Ibn Tulun rode alone on horseback under its middle arch with his army marching through the two smaller side arches. This recalls the triple-arched Abbasid gates and the tripartite layout of the T-plan majlis, whose structure also corresponded to the caliph and the two flanks of his army. Like its Abbasid models, the Tulunid gate was crowned by a second-floor audience hall whose windows provided a view of the maydan and the city.
Ahmad's son Khumarawayh (884-96) enlarged the palace complex, creating there a garden featuring rare fruit trees whose trunks were coated with sheets of gilt copper, lead-lined channels with jets of water, and plants forming decorative patterns or inscriptions. In front of a royal hall known as the Golden House, where Khumarawayh had set up wooden statues of himself wearing a crown and surrounded by a female entourage, was a fifty-cubit-square lake filled with mercury, no doubt inspired by Abbasid precedents. There Khumarawayh used to take naps; to cure his insomnia, he floated on an air mattress tied to four silver columns, guarded by his loyal blue-eyed lion. Like their Abbasid counterparts the outing gardens of the Tulunid palace featured belvedere pavilions providing a view of the city and the Nile.

The palace of the Fatimid caliphs (909-1171) in Cairo, founded in the second half of the tenth century, also reinterpreted Abbasid models that the Fatimids had first encountered when they conquered the Aghlabid territories in North Africa. Their earlier capital in Ifriqiyya, al-Mansuriyya, was a round royal city with a palace at its center built by the Fatimid caliph al-Mansur (946-53) on the model of the Round City of Baghdad (founded in the eighth century by his namesake al-Mansur), a potent symbol of caliphal authority. Like its successor in Cairo, this palace complex was a collection of separate structures, including one called al-Khavarnaq which was built in the middle of a large pool fed by many water channels.

Towering height was a distinguishing feature of the mountain-like Fatimid palace in Cairo whose high walls pierced by several gates screened the secluded caliphs from public view. It is described by the mid-eleventh-century traveler Nasir-i Khusraw as follows:

The sultan's palace is in the middle of Cairo and is encompassed by an open space so that no building abuts it. Engineers who have measured it have found it to be the size of Mayyafareqin. As the ground is open all around it, every night there are a thousand watchmen, five hundred mounted and five hundred on foot, who blow trumpets and beat drums at the time of evening prayer and then patrol until daybreak. Viewed from outside the city, the sultan's palace looks like a mountain because of all the different buildings and the great height. From inside the city, however, one can see nothing at all because the walls are so high. They say that twelve thousand hired servants work in this palace, in addition to the women and slavegirls, whose number no one knows. It is said, nonetheless, that there are thirty thousand individuals in the palace, which consists of twelve buildings.

Nasir-i Khusraw continues to describe the subterranean passages of the Cairene palace that joined together its separate buildings; one of them connected the harem to a suburban garden outside the city. Such underground passages were also typical in the Abbasid and Spanish Umayyad courts. In the Fatimid palace, where nobody except the caliph was allowed to ride, there were also several ramps from which the caliph could mount on his mule to elevated belvederes that we know existed in Abbasid and Aghlabid palaces as well.

The Cairene palace was the stage for the court ceremonies and rituals of the infallible imam of the Shi'i Isma'ili community, venerated as a semi-divine descendant of the Prophet. It was composed of two palaces separated by a public maydan known as the Bayn al-Qasrayn (i.e., Between the Two Palaces). The greater Eastern Palace featured individually named separate halls, sometimes jointly referred to as "brilliant palaces" (al-ğusur al-zahira) since they emanated the divine radiance of the Shi'i caliph. This recalls Winter's reference to some ancient Near Eastern palaces as being filled with the same kind of "radiance" as the ruler whose kingship had "descended from heaven"; a similar concept informed the design of the Mughal imperial palaces discussed by Asher and myself. The Fatimid Eastern Palace contained the reception halls and residences of the caliph, his slave attendants, and his numerous harem guarded by eunuchs. Some were installed with automata, common in contemporary Islamic and Byzantine palaces; one of them featured statues of singing girls who bowed and stood up to greet the caliph as he sat on his throne. In addition to several royal belvederes surmounting the palace’s outer walls was a domed audience hall crowning its main entrance, the Golden Gate, where the Fatimid caliph could survey the public maydan below behind a grilled window (shubbâk). Primarily intended for recreation, the smaller Western Palace with garden pavilions that overlooked an orchard was connected to its companion by a subterranean passage. Like the Abbasid and Spanish Umayyad palaces, the Fatimid palace in Cairo also featured a collection of caliphal tombs in its sacred royal precincts.

In 1049 Nasir-i Khusraw attended a banquet there, one of many that the Fatimid caliph gave
on the two great Islamic holidays, in addition to his regular biweekly public audiences. He describes the Eastern Palace as being composed of twelve free-standing structures and a royal audience hall connected to the kitchens by a subterranean passageway:

There were twelve square structures, built one next to the other, each more dazzling than the last. Each measured one hundred cubits square, and one was a thing sixty cubits square with a dais placed the entire length of the building at a height of four ells, on three sides all of gold, with hunting and sporting scenes depicted thereon and also an inscription in marvelrous calligraphy. All the carpets and pillows were of Byzantine brocade and buqalamun, each woven exactly to the measurements of its place. There was an indescribable latticework ballustrade of gold along the sides. Behind the dais and next to the wall were silver steps.44

The 60-cubit one must have been the Great Iwan (also called al-'Aziz, the Glorious) built by the caliph al-'Aziz in 980 for the public audiences the Fatimid caliphs held on Mondays and Thursdays. Its elevated throne (sidillâ) crowned by a domed baldachin was closed on three sides; its fourth, open side overlooked the audience hall through a ceremonial grilled window (shubbâk) draped with a curtain, which during public audiences was lifted to reveal the ruler enthroned in majesty.45 Similar palaces of smaller dimension were built by the vassals of the Fatimids in North Africa and by the Normans in Sicily.46 The twelfth-century Norman palaces of Palermo, which preserve the memory of now lost Aghlabid and Fatimid prototypes, are the few extant examples of a once widespread early medieval palatine tradition that originated in the Abbasid court.47

Part 3 focuses on a third palatine paradigm, which emerged in the early eleventh century and culminated with the hegemony of the Great Seljuqs and their successors in Iran, Iraq, Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt. In it urban citadel-palaces proliferated. In a recent article Bacharach interprets this phenomenon as expressing the separation between the ruler and the ruled, not in terms of the “horizontal distance” that characterized the previous arrangement, but rather as a “vertical distance” that permitted a greater interaction between the two. He argues that citadels became the locus of government primarily because of the alien origins of the new military leaders and changes in military technique at the time of the Crusades. He notes that these rulers were forced to protect themselves in citadels from the urban mobs, but at the same time “sought to span the gap between themselves and the populace by sponsoring foundations that serviced the population.”48

I would like to add that not only the Turkish and Kurdish rulers of the east (including the slave sultanates of Delhi) but also the Berber rulers of the Maghrib and Spain moved their palaces into urban citadels at a time when the Muslim world, splintered into numerous independent military states, was troubled by internal warfare and the external threat of Christian or Mongol conquerors. The new political configuration of the eleventh century is described by Ibn Khaldun:

When the character and appearance of the caliphate changed and royal and government authority took over, the religious functions lost to some degree their connection with [the powers in control], in as much as they did not belong among the titles and honors of royal authority. The Arabs later on lost all control of the government. Royal authority fell to Turkish and Berber nations.49

It was in this context that the sprawling extraurban palatine complexes of the caliphs and their vassals gave way to the much smaller defensive urban citadel-palaces of modest principalities which no longer enjoyed the support of thousands of slave troops. This is recognized by Ibn Khaldun: “The ancient dynasties had many soldiers and a vast realm. . . . We live in a time when dynasties possess small armies which cannot mistake each other on the field of battle. Most of the soldiers of both parties together could nowadays be assembled in a hamlet or town.”50 In the rapidly shrinking Byzantine world, modestly scaled citadel-palaces also replaced the monumental palatine complexes that had reflected late-antique and early Byzantine imperial ambitions.

The citadels of the Seljuq successor states, which often featured a palace complex with administrative and residential facilities, baths, barracks, and a prominent mosque, reflected a shared ethos despite regional variations. Their elevated tower pavilions and belvederes with grilled windows provided an outlet for the ruler’s commanding gaze. With the exception of the Rum Seljuq citadel in Konya, whose royal mosque was attached to dynastic tombs, the citadel-palaces of the Zangid, Ayyubid, and Mamluk rulers no longer contained mausolea. Following the example of the funerary madrasa built by the Zangid ruler
Nur al-Din in Damascus (1172), the new pattern that emerged in the post-Seljuq eastern Islamic world was the proliferation of domed mausolea attached to charitable public foundations, mostly madrasa and khanqah complexes, which were often lined up along a processional avenue linked to the citadel-palace. These public buildings not only served to glorify the military rulers and provide an income to their progeny, but also to legitimize them in the eyes of the public, the ulama, and the Sufi shaykhs. Their annexed mausolea departed from the traditional pattern set by the caliphal palaces which had enshrined a private collection of family tombs. That pattern was only perpetuated in North Africa and Spain (e.g., the Nasrid dynastic tombs inside the Alhambra and the Saadian dynastic necropolis adjoining the Badia Palace inside the Qasba of Marrakesh).51

The Ayyubid citadel in Aleppo, the Mamluk citadel in Cairo, and the Rum Seljuq citadels of Anatolia, discussed in the papers of Tabbaa, Rabbat, and Redford respectively, were all built by dynasties steeped in the cultural heritage of the Great Seljuq sultanate whose legitimacy rested on the military support it gave to the orthodox Sunni Abbasid caliphate in Baghdad. Until its sack by the Mongols in 1258 the caliphal capital Baghdad continued to play an undisputed role in providing cultural inspiration and religious legitimacy to the military rulers of the splintered Seljuq successor states in an age of “Sunni revival” that would increasingly turn to Sufism on the eve of the Mongol invasions. This pattern was perpetuated by the Mamluks who stationed a line of Abbasid caliphs in Cairo (1261–1517) to legitimate their rule. Even the Turkish slave sultanates of Delhi continued to seek investiture from the Cairene caliphs, demonstrating the vitality of the Abbasid legacy until it abruptly came to an end when the Ottomans terminated Mamluk rule in 1517.

Religious orthodoxy and the official homage paid to the Abbasid caliphs played a central role in shaping the architecture and ceremonial of the citadel-palaces built by the Seljuq successor states. The definitive split between the caliph and the sultanate in this period brought about a radical separation of the religious and royal functions that were once united in the person of the early caliphs. This explains the unprecedented emphasis of the new military rulers (who had no religious claim to legitimacy other than the investiture they received from the Abbasid caliphs) on the ancient Near Eastern theme of royal justice. This was expressed by the creation of a new building type, the dār al-ʿadl (palace of justice) whose origin is difficult to pinpoint. It may well have had Seljuq precedents in Iran and Iraq, but no archaeological evidence remains to confirm such a hypothesis. Its earliest known example in Syria was built outside the Damascus citadel by Nur al-Din Zangi in the 1150s to provide a setting for the mazālim court (antonym to ʿadl, justice) where the oppressed could redress their grievances. The same practice was perpetuated by the Ayyubid rulers who frequented their dār al-ʿadl at the foot of the Aleppo citadel, described by Tabbaa, twice a week on Mondays and Thursdays. The Mamluks inherited this institution from their Ayyubid masters. While the early Mamluk ruler Baybars I (1260–77) held his biweekly mazālim sessions in a dār al-ʿadl located just below the Cairene citadel, subsequently this function acquired a more elaborate ceremonial and a more monumental architectural setting (dealt with in Rabbat’s paper) when it was moved to the Great Iwan inside the citadel.52

The mazālim court was not a new institution, but the Seljuqs and their successors emphasized the systematic administration of justice by the ruler to an unprecedented degree by placing the dār al-ʿadl in a highly visible public space outside the citadel walls.53 Both ceremonially and architecturally this building expressed the growing accessibility and visibility of the new military rulers whose royal image differed from the religious persona of the caliphs, almost too sacred to be seen. According to the early thirteenth-century historian Ravandi, the Great Seljuq ruler Malik Shah (1072–92), for whom the Siyāsāt-nāma was written by his grand vizier Nizam al-Mulk, no longer secluded himself from the people by a curtain in the manner of the caliphs, but rather spoke face to face with his subjects. Tabbaa quotes Nizam al-Mulk’s discussion of the mazālim court where the ruler is advised to hold such a court twice a week to hear without any intermediary the complaints of his subjects.54 He interprets the Ayyubid dār al-ʿadl beneath the Aleppo citadel as an outgrowth of this type of mirror-for-princes literature.

Tabbaa shows that the Aleppine citadel was linked to its urban setting through several functions. He interprets its tall minaret dominating the city’s skyline as a symbolic declaration of the triumph of Islam against the crusaders, affirming the role of the Ayyubids as the guardians of
orthodox Islam. The same interpretation can be extended to the prominent mosques in the citadels of Konya and Cairo discussed, respectively, by Redford and Rabbat. Tabbaa also observes that elements with royal associations derived from a prestigious past (e.g., four- iwan courtyard, tripartite throne-room façade, shādīrūn fountain with a muqarnas hood, and muqarnas portal) were recombined at the citadel palace in Aleppo to form a new type. This was an abbreviated version in miniature of the caliphal palaces of ninth-century Samarra and tenth-century Baghdad that had come to represent a "distant Golden Age."55

The fifteenth-century author Khalil al-Zahiri describes the citadel-palace in Cairo, which monumentalized its Ayyubid models, as follows:

This palace has no equal in area, splendor, magnificence, and height. Around it are walls, moats, towers, and a number of iron gates which make it impregnable. It would take a long time to give a detailed description of the palaces, rooms, halls, belvederes, galleries, courts, squares, stables, mosques, schools, markets, and baths that are found in the palace.56

Rabbat’s paper deals neither with the whole Cairene citadel, nor with the ceremonial that governed its internal layout and its interaction with the city outside. Instead it focuses on a particularly famous building, al-Nasir’s Great Iwan, also known as the Dar al-‘Adl, which functioned as a stage that provided an “unobstructed view” of the sultan during his biweekly mazālim sessions, the review of troops, coronations, iqṭa distributions, and the reception of ambassadors. The openness of this columnar hall with a single wall at the back, which Rabbat interprets as reflecting the accessibility of the Mamluk ruler’s justice to all, recalls the many-pillared Chihil Sutun halls with porches open on all three sides, whose earliest known examples in Timurid palaces are mentioned by O’Kane. Such open, pillared halls with only one wall at the back may well have had a pre-Timurid Iranian origin; they continued to be widely used as public audience halls (dātvan) in the Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal palaces discussed in my paper.58

Rabbat links the Great Iwan’s “basilical” plan, with its central aisle culminating in a green-tile-covered wooden dome supported on twelve columns, to Umayyad and early Abbasid public audience halls crowned by a qubbat al-khadrā. The green domes of this Mamluk audience hall and of the citadel’s neighboring mosque reveal that at least in these instances the term qubbat al-khadrā did indeed mean “green dome,” suggesting that perhaps its two meanings were not mutually exclusive. Rabbat speculates that the Great Iwan’s layout, unusual in Fatimid audience halls, may have represented a deliberate revival of forms associated with the dār al-imāra-cum-mosque complexes of the early caliphates. If so, the Great Iwan once again exemplifies the post-Seljuq nostalgia for a caliphal golden age, also shared by the Ayyubids and the Taifa kings of Spain who had idealized Madinat al-Zahra’ through poetry and architectural imitations that culminated with the Alhambra.

The Mamluk citadel-palace in Cairo, like the Alhambra, represented the culmination of the third paradigm. Its buildings did not invent new types, but monumentalized and reinterpreted existing ones either directly inherited from the Ayyubids or, as Rabbat argues, selectively revived from older models whose prestigious royal associations were used to bolster the exalted self-image of the Mamluk sultanate, the last bulwark of the long-lived Abbasid legacy.

Redford’s paper interprets the palaces of the Rum Seljuqs in Anatolia and the dissolution of their palatial imagery after this dynasty was defeated by the Mongols in 1243. In addition to the courtyard-centered citadel-palace type already encountered in the papers of Tabbaa and Rabbat, Redford identifies another prevalent type that existed side by side with citadels, the suburban palace featuring garden pavilions and kiosks which he links to later examples from Timurid and Safavid Iran. The Anatolian Seljuq suburban palaces whose view-commanding pavilions were often accompanied by tents foreshadowed Mongol-Ikhanid, Timurid, and Safavid semi-nomadic patterns addressed in the papers of Blair and Redford. Nevertheless, the juxtaosition on the Konya city walls of Shāhnāma inscriptions and Persianate reliefs with spoliated figural Roman sculptures exemplified the hybrid syncretism of the Rum Seljuqs who ruled in a recently conquered frontier land. Redford highlights the “Persianate aspirations” of the Rum Seljuqs whose self-image was inspired by the Shāhnāma and medieval Persian mirror-for-princes literature. Nevertheless, the juxtaosition on the Konya city walls of Shāhnāma inscriptions and Persianate reliefs with spoliated figural Roman sculptures exemplified the hybrid syncretism of the Rum Seljuqs who ruled in a recently conquered frontier land. Redford argues that the Anatolian palaces and their decorative programs had a predominantly Iranian Seljuq inspiration, even though no archaeological evidence remains in Iran.

Redford shows how the royal imagery once confined to the private setting of palaces began to
burst out during Alaeddin Keykubad’s reign (1219–37) into the public sphere, appearing on city walls, city gates, and public baths. This dissolution of the boundary between the private and public domains represents a curious reversal of the late-antique phenomenon of Tetrarchic palaces appropriating prestigious urban forms. Redford notes that the urban citadel-palace of the Blachernai in Constantinople and the walled suburban palaces that complemented it were not so different in conception from those encountered in the Rum Seljuq territories during the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He also draws attention to the cross-cultural interchange between the neighboring Byzantine and Rum Seljuq courts, exemplified by a twelfth-century Persianate pavilion in the Byzantine palace of Constantinople, the Mouchroutas, which featured a muqarnas dome and figural tiles showing “the Emperor himself, seated on the floor in the manner of a Seljuq monarch.”9 This recalls the use of Islamic building types, muqarnas vaults, and figural paintings side by side with Byzantine mosaics in the contemporary twelfth-century Norman palaces of Sicily, testifying to the relative fluidity of medieval cultural boundaries that would increasingly harden during the early-modern period.

Part 4 covers the palaces of the Mongols and their successors in the east which constitute a fourth paradigm characterized by the coexistence of two palatine types: urban citadel-palaces and suburban garden palaces. These two were, however, transformed in terms of scale, spatial organization, architectural vocabulary, decorative programs, and functions. The new paradigm, initiated by the Ilkhanids in the second half of the thirteenth century and elaborated by the Timurids, culminated in the early-modern imperial palaces of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals, all of whom shared a common nomadic imperial heritage. That heritage would engender distinctive dynastic palace idioms which synthesized Islamic, Turco-Mongol, and East Asian elements first seen in the Mongol palaces of Yuan China.50 The fourth palatine paradigm had no impact on the eastern Islamic lands which perpetuated older traditions that culminated in the Alhambra. As Oleg Grabar once put it, “The Alhambra stands at the end of a historical development and is, despite all its perfection, a formal dead end.”51 It would continue to provide a model for the later palaces of Spain and North Africa which largely remained cut off from new developments in the palatial architecture of the post-Mongol eastern Islamic world.

The Mongol sack of Baghdad had brought about a radical split in the Muslim world, separating the tradition-bound Arab-speaking realms of the Mamluk sultanate and the Maghrib from the Persianate Turco-Mongol sphere in the east, extending from Anatolia all the way to China. Noting this linguistic-cultural split Ibn Khaldun wrote:

When non-Arabs, such as the Daylam and, after them, the Saljuqs in the East and the Zanatah and Berbers in the West, became the rulers and obtained royal authority and control over the whole Muslim realm, the Arabic language suffered corruption. But when the Tatars and Mongols, who were not Muslims, became the rulers in the East, this element in favor of the Arabic language disappeared, and the Arabic language was absolutely doomed. No trace of it has remained in these Muslim provinces: the Iraq, Khurasan, the country of Fars [southern Persia], Eastern and Western India, Transoxania, the northern countries, and the Byzantine territory [Anatolia]... The sedentary Arab dialect has largely remained in Egypt, Syria, Spain and the Maghrib.62

While the memories of a glorious past continued to be evoked in the Arab lands, in the post-Mongol eastern Islamic world new cultural orientations would forever transform palatial architecture.

If Cairo, referred to by Ibn Khaldun as “the mother of the world, the great center (iwâm) of Islam, and the mainspring of the sciences and the crafts,” was the dominant cultural center of the fourteenth-century Arab world, it was Tabriz (followed in the fifteenth century by Samarqand and Herat) that assumed that function in the east.63 By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries these cities, too, would be eclipsed by the new cultural capitals of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals (Istanbul, Isfahan, Agra, and Delhi) where distinctive architectural idioms clearly demarcating the territorial boundaries of each empire were created.

Unlike the Seljuq successor states the Mongols and their successors no longer sought religious sanction from the Abbasid caliphs to legitimize their rule. The Ilkhanids derived legitimacy through their noble descent from Chinghiz Khan and their adherence to the Chingizid yâsâ, a body of dynastic laws and customs. After converting to Islam, they sought to balance secular dynastic tradition (surf) with Islamic law (shari'a), a balance that each of the Mongol successor states
would redefine according to its own theory of dynastic legitimation. The relative sense of unity that had prevailed in the Muslim world since the "Sunni revival" of the eleventh century was followed during Mongol hegemony by the rising fortunes of Sufism that temporarily bridged the gap between Sunnism and Shi'ism from the late thirteenth through the fifteenth century. This unity would be shattered in the sixteenth century with the adoption of Twelver Shi'ism as the Safavid state religion, creating an early-modern pattern of competing ideologies not so different from the rivalry of the three tenth-century caliphates.

The two dominant post-Mongol palatine types, urban citadel-palaces and suburban garden palaces, were imperial in scale unlike their relatively small predecessors. They embodied a new self-confidence, different from the backward-looking revivalism of the third paradigm. Although references to the Islamic and pre-Islamic past continued to be made, these were now balanced with bold departures from inherited models. What largely disappeared from the post-Mongol palaces of the east was the fabulous aura of the caliphal palace which the shrunken medieval Muslim states had sought to emulate with reduced means "like a cat that by blowing itself up imitates the lion."63 The new palaces no longer thrived on bewildering effects, such as mercury-filled pools and automata. In them the symbolic language of tents in vast garden enclosures with only a few architectural accents took on an unprecedented prominence reflecting the ethos of imperial nomads.

The new ceremonial practices introduced under Ilkhanid rule included the qūrlāy (an assembly of nomadic tribes gathered to elect or acclaim the new ruler in tents where great feasts took place) and the greater participation of royal women in public celebrations.64 Far from remaining secluded, the new semi-nomadic rulers hosted lavish banquets for the tribal chiefs of their feudal clan confederations that no longer relied on centralized slave troops. Feasting, already important in the Seljuq period when Nizam al-Mulk had regarded it as indispensable for the ruler to keep an open table for tribal followers, continued to be emphasized by the Ilkhans, Timurids, and Safavids as part of their tribal-nomadic legacy. This shared legacy would, however, be transformed in the Ottoman and Mughal courts where festive royal banquets with freely circulated wine gave way to different ceremonies.

Blair's paper on Ilkhanid palaces starts with a discussion of the court's annual migrations between winter and summer camps in giant tent cities. In an attempt to delineate what a "typical Ilkhanid palace" might have looked like, Blair focuses on the Takht-i Sulayman (Throne of Solomon) palace, the only partially excavated palace from that period. Built by Abaqa in the 1270s, before the Ilkhans had converted to Islam, it occupied the site of an ancient sanctuary where the "Sasanian emperors were crowned" and incorporated forms and royal myths from Iran's pre-Islamic and Islamic past. Accompanied by narrative paintings, its Persian inscriptions from the Shāhnāma, recalling the ones quoted on the Rum Seljuq city walls, legitimized the present "through identification with the past." The Shāhnāma would continue to inspire the royal imagination of the post-Mongol dynasties, founded by Turkish-speaking rulers who adopted Persian as their court language, just as the Turkic Ghaznavids and Seljuqs had done before them.

Blair hypothesizes that the Takht-i Sulayman's layout, composed around a spacious four-iwan court containing an artificial pond in the middle, was similar to that of other Ilkhanid palaces such as the one in Sultanıyya, known primarily from texts. Its function as a "hunting lodge" complemented by its use as an encampment site for the Mongol hordes recalls the suburban Anatolian Seljuq lake-side palaces described by Redford whose architecture was supplemented by tents when the assembled armies would encamp there.65 Both Blair and O'Kane refer to another extra-urban Ilkhanid royal complex, Ghazan's summer palace in Ujan at Azerbaijan where the audience hall was a golden tent pitched at the center of a walled chahār bagh garden featuring pavilions, towers, and a bath. Portable domical tents with a wooden skeleton were also used in the Mongol imperial palaces of Shangdu and Dadu, built for Kubilai Khan in the early thirteenth century.66 The domed tent of the Mongol ruler Göyük (1246-49) "resembled the green cupola [i.e., dome of heaven] and a model of the highest vault, where the designs from the abundance of embroidery and the beauty of the colouring appeared as a sky with the lights of the stars shining as lanterns." Similarly the Ilkhanid ruler Ghazan Khan's imperial tent, which took 200 men 20 days to erect, had a dome decorated with shiny stars and colored jewels resembling the celestial dome.67 These examples show that "domes of heaven" continued to be interpreted as cosmological metaphors of the heavens and paradise.
The legacy of Mongol and Timurid imperial tents discussed by Blair and O'Kane would be perpetuated in the Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal courts. The Timurid historian Khvandamir, for example, describes an elaborate tent of the Mughal emperor Humayun whose structure also alluded to the heavens. It had "twelve compartments corresponding to the Signs of the Zodiac" and a large central tent resembling "the empyrian heaven which covers the lower heavens" that enclosed the twelve smaller tents surrounding it on all sides. This description recalls the twelve pavilions or saraycha that surrounded the monumental royal iwan of the Sultan-iwayya palace whose heavenly associations were highlighted in the sources, a layout also reminiscent of the twelve free-standing halls Nasir-i Khusrw saw at the Fatimid palace. The preoccupation with tents in the post-Mongol period created an intimate dialogue between permanent and impermanent palatial structures, generating new pavilion types and spatial schemes that translated the organizational principles of imperial encampments into more lasting materials.

O'Kane's paper correlates palace design in the Iranian world during the Ilkhanid, Timurid, and Safavid periods with the rhythms of pastoral nomadism that regulated court life well into the twentieth century. He highlights the nomadic legacy of these Persian courts that "set them apart from their Mamluk, Ottoman, and Mughal contemporaries" who built their palaces in urban citadels. By contrast the semi-nomadic rulers of the Iranian world, who regarded life in citadels as "claustrophobic," preferred to move about in tent encampments, temporarily settling in suburban gardens with pavilions. O'Kane describes the elaborate tents used in court ceremonies, their royal symbolism, paradişical associations, and the great banquets they housed, together with the few architectural remains of Timurid palaces. In the last part of his paper he interprets the Safavid royal palace in Isfahan as a mixture of nomadic and urban ideals that brought together the Timurid suburban garden ensembles "within a tighter framework." He links the absence of fortified walls in this palace and the court ceremonies enacted there, particularly the shah's banquet receptions inside garden pavilions, with the Timurid heritage.

O'Kane's paper brings us into the early-modern period covered by the last three papers on the Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal courts. The seminomadic Safavid pattern of mobility he discusses was paralleled by the Mughal court's movements among several capitals, in addition to seasonal visits to royal garden encampments in Kashmir. This mobility was reflected in the creation of several Safavid and Mughal capitals, each furnished with its own palace. Unlike the Ottomans, these two dynasties did not seek to establish a single fixed capital where all rulers would concentrate their cumulative architectural patronage and where all of them would eventually be buried. In Istanbul the Ottomans would merge Turco-Mongol, classical Islamic, and Romano-Byzantine imperial traditions, creating a sedentary empire that replaced tribal ties with an impersonal centralized bureaucracy and an army dominated by household slaves. The Ottoman sultans would in many ways revive the secluded persona of the caliphs by mysteriously appearing behind the grilled ceremonial windows (shubbāk), as described in my paper.

The persistence of the citadel-palace type in the Ottoman and Mughal capitals can be explained by the survival of earlier traditions in each region. The imperial scale of these citadelpalaces reflected the expanded size of the extended royal households they supported. They accommodated a series of spacious courtyards with official and residential functions, in addition to extensive outlying royal gardens whose waterworks and pavilions re-created the atmosphere of a suburban landscape inside the citadel walls. They were supplemented by several neighboring suburban garden palaces that could be visited for brief periods for amusement and hunting.

In the Ottoman and Mughal citadel-palaces traditional iwans, T-plan majlises, and multistory qasrs or qīṭām gave way to predominantly single-story structures of light construction reminiscent of tent forms. These palatine complexes represented a post-Timurid synthesis with their sprawling layout guided by the organization of imperial tent encampments. They appropriated large spaces, making their point not through dominating verticality, but through their horizontal expanse and numerous buildings that reflected a complex institutional organization maintained by a large staff. Axially planned symmetrical four-iwan courts so prevalent in the condensed format of medieval citadel-palaces were now replaced with a looser arrangement of free-standing or attached modular buildings organized around a succession of courtyards that culminated in royal gardens with pavilions. The monumental mosques
that once had dominated the skyline of medieval citadel-palaces built in the age of the "Sunni revival" also vanished, together with the ceremonial homage paid to the now extinct Abbasid caliphate, but the administration of royal justice continued to play a central role in the court ceremonial of the early-modern empires. The palace precincts which featured small private chapels were often connected to their urban setting by processional avenues punctuated with dynastic monuments.

The Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal palaces continued to allude to pre-Mongol palatine traditions, both Islamic and pre-Islamic. The Safavids and Qajars not only elaborated the Šahnāma's image of kingship, but also ceremonially visited such ancient ruins as Persepolis (popularly known as the Throne of Solomon or Throne of Jamshid) as the Buyids had done before them. Displaying spolia from Persepolis at the gate of the Isfahan palace was only one of the ways in which the Safavid rulers expressed their connection to the pre-Islamic Persian royal tradition, also reflected in their use of the title "shah" (which the Ottomans appropriated after defeating the Safavids in 1514).

Pre-Islamic traditions of kingship also provided inspiration for the Mughal and Ottoman courts. Just as the Mughal emperor Humayun imitated the architecture and ceremonial of Bahram Gur's heavenly Haft Paykar palace in his seven-domed palace at Dinpanah in Delhi, so ancient Near Eastern and Hindu concepts of divinely illumined kingship were used to bolster the semi-divine royal image of the Mughal emperors Asher and I discuss. The Ottoman uses of the past were not limited to the Byzantine imperial heritage, but also included the ancient Near East. Süleyman I, for example, promoted his image as the "second Solomon" and had painters of miniatures record his visit to the famous Sasanian castle of Qasr-i Shirin while he was on a military campaign in Iraq. His painters also depicted Süleyman drinking wine from the Iranian king Jamshid's magic ruby cup that reflected the whole world, a symbol of universal rule presented to the sultan on the eve of a campaign directed against the Safavids.

A similar preoccupation with Solomon and Jamshid in the Qajar and Mughal courts emerges from Soucek's paper, which shows how legends about the two were often inextricably interwoven.

Kleiss's paper on Safavid palaces argues that Safavid pavilion types exhibited a remarkable continuity with those of pre-Islamic Iran, a continuity he traces from the Achaemenid and Sassanian periods well into Qajar times. He describes different Safavid palatine structures including pavilions attached to urban royal palaces, countryside villas, royal caravansarys with four-iwan courts lined up along the road between Isfahan and the Caspian Sea and free-standing pavilions on the same route serving as way stations around which tents would be pitched. Kleiss also discusses the building materials, vaulting techniques, and decoration of these Safavid pavilions.

Asher's paper analyzes how elements with royal associations manifested themselves in the sub-imperial palaces of Mughal India. Noting that only one-fourth of the Mughal empire's subjects were Muslim, Asher points out that maintaining imperial authority in the hinterlands required a careful balancing of fluctuating relations between the ruler and the nobles who governed the provinces. Like their imperial models the sub-imperial palaces, therefore, played an important role in the "flow of Mughal power as well as the execution of justice." The governor's and prince's palaces analyzed by Asher exhibited differing combinations of local and imperial motifs to reflect the relative status and political aspirations of their patrons.

My paper compares three imperial palaces, the Topkapı in Istanbul, the Safavid palace in Isfahan, and the Mughal Red Fort in Delhi, to highlight the different ways in which their architecture and ceremonial framed the gaze in representing the monarch's official public image. The relative visibility and invisibility of the monarch had informed palace design from ancient times onward. Winter writes, "traditions of visibility and sight-lines, both of and by the ruler, can become significant indicators of cultural and national attitudes toward authority and the person of the ruler." From the urban palace-cum-mosque complexes where the accessible Umayyad caliphs made regular public appearances punctuated by the five daily prayers; the sprawling palatine complexes of the Abbasids, Fatimids, and Spanish Umayyads where the sacred caliphs remained in studied seclusion; and the citadel-palaces of the Seljuq successor states that embodied the growing accessibility of the just ruler in his dār al-ʿadl, to the palaces of the Ilkhanids and Timurids where tribal followers were entertained by the ruler in banquets, the palace paradigms we have encountered thus far reflected differing attitudes toward the ruler's visibility. So did the three
palaces compared in my paper whose ways of staging the monarch's public appearances were rooted in different concepts of absolute monarchy and theories of dynastic legitimacy. These three palaces were composed of similar units, but their syntactic combination and ceremonial articulation differed considerably. My paper accentuates these contextual differences that come into clearer focus through a synchronic comparative analysis.

As Winter warns the reader at the very beginning of the volume the official rhetoric of the early-modern palaces still remained largely confined to "royal voices," often concealing the dialectical interaction between the ideal monarchical order portrayed in ceremonies and actual practice. The official images of kingship constructed in these palaces would remain effective well into the eighteenth century when new palatine paradigms, increasingly influenced by European models, were formulated to accommodate changing customs and conceptions of the state just before the emergence of modern nation states.
Notes

1. In addition to the papers presented at the symposium, this volume includes a new contribution by Scott Redford who was unable to attend the meeting.

2. For the early-medieval bias in the field, see Oleg Grabar, "Reflections on the Study of Islamic Art," *Muqarnas* 1 (1983): 1-14. He writes: "We have a vision of Islamic art in which the earliest monuments create the norms by which the whole artistic span is defined" (p. 8).


4. The first three paradigms have recently been outlined in Jere L. Bacharach, "Administrative Complexes, Palaces, and Citadels: Changes in the Loci of Medieval Muslim Rule," in *The Ottoman City and Its Parts*, ed. I. A. Bierman, R. A. Abou-El-Haj, and D. Preziosi (New Rochelle, N.Y., 1991), 111-28. To these I added a fourth paradigm while I was organizing the palaces symposium.

5. He also writes, "Gardens and irrigation are the results of sedentary culture. Orange trees, lime trees, cypresses, and similar plants having no edible fruits and being of no use are the ultimate in sedentary culture, since they are planted in gardens only for the sake of their appearance, and they are planted only after the ways of luxury have become diversified," Ibn Khaldūn, *The Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal, 3 vols. (New York, N.Y., and Princeton, N.J., 1980), 2:295; 1:359.


18. One such gilded window grille (shubbākh), originally installed in the dār al-khilāfah of Baghdad, behind which the caliphs sat in state, was sent together with other captured caliphal insignia to the Fatimid caliph in Egypt by the amir al-Basasiri, who in 1055-56 had deposed the Abbasid caliph al-Qa’im bi-ʿAmr Allah; it was reinstalled at the Fatimid grand vizier’s palace in Cairo; see Ghada Hijjawi Qaddumi, "A Medieval Islamic Book of Gifts and Treasures: Translation, Annotation, and Commentary on the Kitāb al-Ḥadāya wa al-Tuhaf," Ph.D.
20. According to al-Sābī the caliphal palace in Baghdad, which was estimated to be a city as large as Shiraz, "contained, among other things, farms and farmers, private livestock and four hundred baths for its inhabitants and retainers." He adds that its population in al-Muqtaḍar’s reign (902–32) included 20,000 domestic servants (dāriyyah ghilmān), and 10,000 black and Slav servants; in al-Muqtaḍar’s reign (908–32) it had 11,000 black and Slav servants, thousands of chamber servants (khuṭri ghilmān) in addition to 4,000 free and slave girls; see Hilal al-Sābī, Rusūm Dār al-Khilāfah, 13–14.

21. The Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs held private majlises with wine and music where they would undress before close attendants and boon companions behind a curtain, following a custom initiated by the Sasanian monarchs; see al-Jāhiz, Le livre de la Couronne, trans. Charles Pellat (Paris, 1954). These private audiences should not be confused with their more formal public counterparts.

22. Fikret Yegül writes, "The idea harks back, also, to the Kaiserzaal, or the imperial hall, of the Roman bath-gymnasium complexes in which the ruling emperor (not in person but in image) was honored in a central apse, at the end of the royal axis," Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1992), 348–49. For Roman-Byzantine baths in Antioch and Syria, see Baths and Bathing, 324–39.


27. At the Balkuwara palace (849–59) in Samarra, each court was built slightly higher than the preceding one, until one reached the central throne room on the highest platform which commanded an unhindered view of the whole palace complex, the Tigris, and the distant irrigated landscape extending along the river’s opposite shore.

28. Maṣūdī, Les prairies d’or, 6:290. See also Sheila Blair’s paper in this volume.

29. The palaces in the Lakhmid capital Hira remained an example of vanitas vanitatum as late as the tenth century when they inspired the Abbasid poet al-Sharīf al-Rādi to compose two elegies; see Shahid, "al-Hira," 3:463. Similarly a song-poem the Abbasid musician al-Mawsili recited to the caliph al-Muṭṭasim during the inauguration of his palace in Samarra began with a “romantic remembrance of the old dwelling places and how their vestiges were effaced”; Qaddumi, "A Medieval Islamic Book of Gifts and Treasures," 136. The ninth-century Abbasid court poet al-Buhtūrī also composed nostalgic poems lamenting the ruins of the Iwan-i Kisra and of al-Muṭṭasīn’s Jafā’fari palace, demolished by the caliph’s successor in 861; see al-Buhtūrī, Divān, trans. A. Wormhoudt (Oskaloosa, Iowa, 1975), 25–27, 36–38. Much later, when the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II toured the ruins of the Byzantine Great Palace and the neighboring Hagia Sophia after having conquered Constantinople in 1453, the dilapidated state of these monuments allegedly led him to muse on the transitoriness of worldly power; see Gülrız Necipoğlu, Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1991), 3. A similar reaction was provoked by the ruins of Hadrian’s villa in Pope Pius II’s memoirs record his visit to that site in 1461; Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Memoirs of a Renaissance Pope: The Commentaries of Pius II, trans. F. A. Gragg (New York, 1959), 193. I owe the last reference to John Pinto.


32. D. Fairchild Ruggles, "The Mirador in Abbasid


34. Masʿudi’s description is translated and interpret-ed in Hazem al-Sayyed, "The Development of the Caïreene Qā'a: Some Considerations," *Annales is-lamologiques* 23 (1987): 31-53: “And al-Mutawakkil originated in his days a construction that people had not known. And it is known as the ḥirf with two sleeves and porticoes (kummayn wa aruqa) . . . . the portico had in it the seat (maṣīṣ) of the king which is the chest (ṣadr) with the two sleeves (kummān) to the left and right. And in the two bayts that are the pair of sleeves would be his close attendants (ḥavwāṣ), and in the right of the two of them is the clothing closet (ḥażnāt al-kiswa) and in the left what is needed of drink. And the space of the portico is taken up/permeated by the chest (ṣadr) and the two sleeves, and the three doors are over the portico. And this construction was called to this day “the ḥirf with two sleeves” in reference to al-Hifrā. And the people followed al-Mutawakkil’s lead in this and it became famous to this end.”


36. The geographer al-Bakri (1068) describes the Aghlabid irrigation works and gardens in the suburbs of Kairouan, one of which featured a circular water tank with an octagonal tower in the middle, crowned by a belvedere pavilion with four doors; al-Bakrī, *Description de l’afrique septentrionale*, trans. M. C. de Slane (Paris, 1965), 59-60. This recalls a similar belvedere tower built in early-tenth-century Baghdad, the Qubbat al-Himar (Dome of the Ass), referred to by Tabbaa in this volume, which was surmounted by a small domed pavilion that the Abbasid caliph could ascend on his mule from a spiral ramp to enjoy the view of the surrounding landscape.


38. In a building called a dār al-imāra, built adjacent to the Ibn Tulun Mosque’s maqṣūra, Ahmad used to change his garments, rest, and perform the ritual ablutions before presiding over the Friday prayer. This no longer extant structure must have resembled the brick royal annex with a four-iwan court and ablution halls discovered adjacent to the qibla wall of the ninth-century mosque of Abu Dulaf at Samarra, similarly designed for the Abbasid caliph’s use when he went to pray in his mosque. The latter is described in Creswell and Allan, *A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture*, 370-71.


43. Nāṣer-e Khosrow says the gate’s vestibule had platforms for the ministers and the grand vizier where they presumably held public audiences; Thackston, *Nāṣer-e Khosrow’s Book*, 46.


47. Composed of several interconnected tower pavilions, the multi-storied Norman royal palace in Palermo was surrounded by a belt of suburban
55. The audience iwan in Aleppo with its muqarnas hood over a shādirwān placed at the back wall recalls a description of the Buyid ruler Samsam al-Dawla’s (983–98) throne room in Baghdad, where he sat on an elevated throne (sidīla) under which ran a stream of water in a lead-plated channel; Hilāl al-Sābi, Rusūm Dār al-Khilāfah, 20.


58. The sixteenth-century public audience hall at the Topkapi Palace was an Ottoman version of such an open, pillared hall; its form, too, is described in the sources as reflecting the free access to sultanic justice; see Necipoğlu, Architecture, Ceremonial and Power, 79–84.


60. The mid-thirteenth-century Mongol imperial palace in Karakurum, for example, was the creation of separate teams of Cathayan and Muslim builders who were asked to construct pavilions in their own respective styles and decorative modes; see Juwayni, The History of the World Conqueror, trans. J. A. Boyle, 2vols. (Manchester, Eng., 1958), 1:236–39; and Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt, Chinese Imperial City Planning (Honolulu, 1990), 148–50. Such a deliberate mixture of styles finds a parallel in the construction of variegated garden pavilions at Samargand to commemorate Timur’s victories over different kingdoms whose builders and artisans were transported there, and in the grouping of garden pavilions built in the Byzantine, Timurid-Turkmen, and Ottoman modes at the fifteenth-century Topkapi Palace; see Ahmad Ibn ‘Arabshāh, Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir, trans. J. H. Sanders (London, 1936), 309–10, and Necipoğlu, Architecture, Ceremonial and Power, 210–17, 244–45, 249–50.


64. The verse about the cat and lion is cited with
reference to the caliphal ambitions of the Taifa kings of Spain in Ibn Khaldūn, *The Muqaddimah*, 1:469.


66. The function of Takht-i Sulayman as an encampment site was proposed by Roya Marefat in a paper she presented at the MESA meetings in 1991.


70. On one occasion the Safavid ruler Tahmasp I invited the exiled Mughal emperor Humayun in 1543–44 on a hunting expedition to Persepolis which lasted several days; Jauhar, *The Tezkereh al Vaktūr or Private Memoirs of the Moghul Emperor Humāyūn*, trans. C. Stewart (New York, 1969), 66–68.